

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9134173

**Foundations of Muslim images and treatment of the world
beyond Islam. (Volumes I-IV)**

Towghi, Malek Muhammad, Ph.D.

Michigan State University, 1991

Copyright ©1991 by Towghi, Malek Muhammad. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**FOUNDATIONS OF MUSLIM IMAGES AND TREATMENT
OF THE WORLD BEYOND ISLAM**

Volume I

By

Malek Muhammad Towghi

A DISSERTATION

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History

1991

ABSTRACT

FOUNDATIONS OF MUSLIM IMAGES AND TREATMENT OF THE WORLD BEYOND ISLAM

By

Malek Muhammad Towghi

This is a study of Muslim self-images and Muslim images and treatment of the world beyond Islam, to determine foundations, nature and repercussions of such images and treatment. Dissatisfaction with existing major explanations of Muslim behavior in modern times and concern about contemporary Islamic Resurgent movements' call for a complete Islamization of Muslim societies and states form the rationale for undertaking such a study. The Resurgent movement insists that in all aspects of life, including conduct of relations with others, and on all individual and state levels, Muslims must follow the teachings of pristine Islam as found in the Quran and authentic sources of information about the Sunnah of the Prophet Muhammad. The Resurgents maintain that the Quran-Sunnah-based Muslim self-images and teachings govern and direct Muslim images and treatment of the world beyond Islam. So, an explanation of Islamic teachings in this regard helps to understand the extent of their influence on Muslim images and treatment of others and also the nature of such treatment.

This study proceeds from an exploration of the Quran-Sunnah-based instructions concerning Muslim self-images and Muslim images and treatment of nonconformists and non-Muslims,

particularly on issues of modern significance such as peaceful coexistence, pluralism and basic human rights. These teachings are examined through a study of the elaborate descriptive and prescriptive material in sacred Islamic scriptures clustered around the five elements of Islamic Synoptic Credo -- **IMAN MUJMAL**, i.e., belief in 1) God, 2) Angels, 3) Books and Messengers, 4) the Hereafter, and 5) Predestination. In addition to the text of the Quran, the earliest representative Traditional Islamic works in the categories of **SUNAN**, **TAFASIR**, **SIYAR-MAGHAZI-TABAQAT**, **TAWARIKH** and **QISAS** are used as primary sources.

Through a methodical elaboration of the basic Islamic belief system as propounded in the above-mentioned sources, this study demonstrates that regardless of external factors, belief in the Islamic worldview based on the Quran and the Sunnah leads believers inevitably to form specific images of the world beyond Islam and to act accordingly. Compared and contrasted to some modern universal standards, these images and consequent behavior are problematic and questionable. Similarly, keeping in view concerns of our time about international behavior and fundamental human rights, and referring to some universally accepted norms, values and trends, this work demonstrates that Muslims are likely to behave in questionable ways if, in their conduct of relations with nonconformist and non-Muslims, they follow the Quran and Sunnah of the Prophet Muhammad as envisaged by the Resurgent fundamentalists. The conclusions also explain and emphasize

that the Quran-Sunnah-directed patterns of thought and behavior concerning nonconformists and non-Muslims are more likely to hurt Muslim societies themselves than pose a serious danger to the world beyond Islam, particularly the West.

Copyright by
MALEK MUHAMMAD TOWGHI
1991

I dedicate this humble work to the memories of:

- 1) Utbah Ibn Rabiah, the great peace-maker;
- 2) Abd Allah Ibn Ubayy, the great nonconformist;
- 3) Hubayshah (Husaybah? Hasibah?), the great lover who could not survive after her young beloved husband was beheaded;
- 4) Zabir Ibn Bata who refused to live after the loss of his loved ones;*

and to

- 5) Salman Rushdie, the great path-maker.

* We will meet the first four in Part III, Section 9 of this study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For a late middle-aged spouse and father of six growing children, with very limited financial resources, graduate studies in a Western institution quite different from one's school and college background - and more demanding - were inherently difficult. Being an Iranian during the late 1970's and the 1980's, and a compulsive activist, made the task harder. Above all, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service's sadistic attitude toward me and my family continues to be mind-boggling and life-paralyzing - as it has been so for the last thirteen years.

I could not sustain the ordeal without having the love, affection, guidance, encouragement and support of our numerous American teachers, neighbors, fellow-students, colleagues, friends, acquaintances and those mobilized by them. I wish I could mention them by name, one by one. They are too many. To be indiscriminate, however, is to be ungrateful to all. The credit for my survival goes to the following three persons' sustained, extraordinary and magnanimous multi-dimensional support and guidance.

- 1) Hasinah, my SHIRAH ZAL Baluch wife
- 2) Professor Donald Lammers, Chairperson of my Doctoral Committee, whom Hasinah calls godfather of our family.
- 3) Professor Alan Fisher, Co-Chairperson of the Committee and director of my dissertation, who has been a "godfather-in-reserve".

Expressing my gratitude to the above three, I can do only one thing: to say that **BARG-E-SABZ AST TUHFA-E- DARWISH.**

I thank Professors David Robinson and Warren Cohen for

honoring me by being on my Committee; Mr. Marc Van Wormer for being a self-less life-long friend and supporter; Professor Surjit Dulai for his continued affections; Mr. Thomas Elliot P.C. for his continued legal and moral help in our never-ending struggle with the USINS; Dawn Kirby, a good friend, who put up with my repeated revisions (and with those suggested by Professors Lammers and Fisher) while typing the dissertation for many years; Sue Sunday for providing the much needed help in this regard during the last stage; and David Jones for his editorial help.

I salute all of my teachers at Michigan State University, particularly those in the department of history.

I think with love and appreciation of our six children, Sharif, Farough, Nasser, Abolhasan, Fouzieyha (Fawziyah) and Omar (Umar) who faced our difficult circumstances with courage and continued their education. I wish we could help Sharif and Farough more. I also thank Jonathan Oakes for being a nice son-in-law.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
A Discussion of Primary Sources	32
The Key and the Bibliography of the Main Primary Sources	57
Transliteration Table	74
CONCLUSIONS, FIRST	84
 PART	
I. BELIEF IN GOD.	136
II. BELIEF IN THE EXISTENCE OF ANGELS	177
III. BELIEF IN THE BOOKS AND MESSENGERS	219
Section	
1. The Concept	219
2. The Era of the Prophet Adam and His Sons	237
3. The Era of Nuh (Noah) and His Sons	258
4. The Era of Hud and Salih	290
5. The Era of Abraham and His Sons	312
6. The Era of Moses and His Followers	366
7. The Era of Jesus Christ and His Followers	439
8. The People of the Book	479
9. The Era of the Last Book, the Quran, and of the Last Messenger of God, Muhammad	515
Segment	
1. The Quran and Muhammad at Mecca.	519
2a. The Quran and Muhammad after the Establishment of a Dar al-Islam at Medina: A Study of Islam in Power	610
2b. Methods Used in Relationship with Non-Muslims	716
3. Foundations of Muslim Images and Treatment of Modern Tendencies and Values	823
IV. BELIEF IN RESURRECTION AFTER DEATH: THE HEREAFTER	901
V. BELIEF IN AL-QADA WA'L-QADAR, PREDESTINATION	940

APPENDICES	973
APPENDIX I: Islamic Synoptic Credo and the Importance of the Model (Sunnah) of the Prophet Muhammad	974
APPENDIX I-A: God's Asma al-Husna, Most Beautiful Names	979
APPENDIX I-B: A Replacement Note	987
APPENDIX II: The Ordinance of Medina	988
APPENDIX III: Towards an Understanding of the Quranic -Islamic Lexicon	993

INTRODUCTIONS

Developments in the world of Islam after the first quarter of the twentieth century, crowned by the Iranian Revolution of the 1979 CE, make a reconsideration of various dimensions of Islamic thought and Muslim behavior relevant and necessary. The rise of a "Resurgent" Islamic movement spearheaded by an effective, organized doctrinaire 'Islamic International' aimed at securing power in order to create all-encompassing 'Islamic States' is the most significant development of this period. In its organizational structure and methods, in its images and treatment of modern thought, in its articulation of a totalistic vanguardistic ideology and in its expansion and effectiveness, this Resurgent movement is different from the two earlier Islamic movements of modern times, i.e., the Jihadist movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and from the Muslim 'Modernist' trends of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This Resurgent movement has also distinguished itself from the general body of traditional clergy, i.e., the Madrasah-trained ulama. The Resurgents have universalized the Jihadists' limited aims and spheres of action and influence; they have redefined the Modernists' theses about the compatibility of Islam with the modern worldviews and norms; and they have rejected the ulama's comparative quietism and semi-secularism. The Resurgent movement has also put in retreat all Reformist and humanistic and secular-liberal as well as Marxist-ideologies in the world of Islam. Recent (1990) electoral victories of the Islamic Salvation Front (**AL-JABHAT AL-INQADH AL-ISLAMIYYAH**) of Algeria, an affiliate of what we call the Islamic International of the Resurgent Islamic movement are among its latest manifestations. Among the declared intentions of this movement is to create 'Islamic States', i.e., to capture political and military power

in order to apply the Quran and Sunnah (model and teachings) of the Prophet Muhammad to all aspects of life. The Quran and Sunnah, the Resurgents believe, must also direct Muslim conduct of relations with and Muslim responses to non-Muslims and nonconformists. (For an explanation of the terms such as the Resurgent movement, Islamic International, Jihadist and Modernist movements, the ulama and the Reformists and other trends in the Muslim world see Appendix I-B).

An understanding of the consequences of this Resurgent movement's ambitions is essential for two reasons.

1) After some uncertainties of the last three centuries about the future of Islam as a political power, the Resurgent movement has not only effectively articulated the possibility and necessity of practicing an all-encompassing Islam, but has also led Muslims, by and large, to think that such a practice will be a panacea for their economic and social ills. After the Revolution of 1979, an 'Islamic State' as envisaged by the Resurgent movement has become a reality in Iran. The Resurgents have committed Pakistan constitutionally to become such an Islamic State. In the Sudan of 1990, the Resurgents seem to have again captured power. In almost in all Muslim countries including Turkey - the only Muslim country committed constitutionally to secularism -- the Islamic International of the Resurgent movement is exerting effective pressure for the Islamization of states as described above and in Appendix I-B. Compared to other Islamic and secular movements, the Islamic Resurgents, through their Islamic International, are the most organized, active and effective among Muslims living in Western and other non-Muslim-majority countries.

2) Beyond an unambiguous declaration of intention to apply the Quran and Sunnah to all aspects of life, and also beyond general hyperbolic and misleading claims about the efficacy and propriety of such an application, the vanguards of this movement evade meaningful discussion of relevant issues. For example, the Resurgents do not tell the world and their constituencies (after they consolidate power)

whether or not the Quran and Sunnah would allow regularly the kind of elections which took place in Algeria (1990) in which all citizens regardless of their lifestyles, party affiliation and ideologies, would be able to compete freely for leadership, expressing with immunity their thoughts, e.g., belief in the separation of religion from politics and state affairs. More serious issues related to basic human rights to life, equality of opportunity and intellectual freedom are involved on which the Resurgent movement, perhaps disingenuously, prefers to remain vague if not silent. As discussed in the conclusion of this study, Muslim masses and intellectuals, more than non-Muslims, need to see the full picture before they march farther along the road to the Islamization of their states and societies as envisaged by the Resurgents.

Leaving to other studies an evaluation of the possibility, propriety and sufficiency of pristine Islam to solve modern social and economic problems, this work as its primary thesis, demonstrates that Muslims are likely to behave in predictable ways if, in their conduct of relations with non-Muslims and nonconformists, they follow the Quran and the Sunnah of the Prophet Muhammad. The nature of the Quran-Sunnah-based images and treatment of the world beyond Islam is contrasted to some modern norms, values and trends which we will soon describe in detail.¹

In contrast to some important explanations of Muslim behavior in our time,^{1a} this work, through a methodical elaboration of the basic Islamic belief system, implies that regardless of external factors, belief in the Islamic worldview based on the Quran and Sunnah, leads Muslims inevitably to form specific images of the world beyond Islam and act accordingly. The Islamic belief system, like others, generates and reinforces a particular worldview, certain self-images among the believers, and specific modes of thought and behavior towards perceived nonbelievers and nonconformists. Contrary to some modern opinions, Muslim thoughts and actions are conditioned, wittingly or

unwittingly, more by their basic belief system than being, necessarily, responses to external events or to others' images and treatment of Islam. To the extent that Muslims maintain faith in their belief system and feel duty-bound to think and act accordingly, more benevolent images and treatment of Islam are unlikely to cause desirable changes in Muslim images and treatment of others. As we will see, non-Muslim benevolence may be exploited but is not to be reciprocated by true believers.

Though primarily concerned with the two themes mentioned above, this study also serves two other purposes. 1) About half of this work deals, chronologically, with the Prophet Muhammad's life and career. Compared to all modern studies in this field, relevant parts of this work (Part III, Section 9, Segments 1,2 and 3 in particular) may be considered a new biography of Muhammad with different perspectives and interpretations. 2) Our methodical elaboration of the Islamic belief system and explanation of the Sacred Islamic Scriptures serves some basic needs of beginning students of Islam in Muslim and non-Muslim societies.

This is our method: Taking seriously the Resurgent movement's determination to apply the Quran and Sunnah to all aspects of life, we recognize that the Quran mediated by the Sunnah does provide believers with elaborate descriptive and prescriptive directions concerning conduct of relations with non-Muslims and nonconformists. Keeping in view concerns of our time about international relations and basic human rights, we study the Islamic belief system in detail to expose these directions.

The Islamic belief system, the fundamental creed of Islam, is formed by the **IMAN MUJMAL**, "(Islamic) Synoptic Credo." It is summarized further in the **SHAHADAH**, "Witnessing (that there is no god but God and that Muhammad is the Messenger of God)." The Synoptic Credo tells a Muslim "to believe in I) God and II) His angels, and III) His Books and

Messengers and IV) in the Last Day and V) in predestination of good and evil (, salvation and damnation) by Him -- **AN TUMIN BI'LLAH, WA MALAIKATIHI-I, WA KUTUBIHI-I WA RUSULIHI-I, WA'L-YAUM AL-AKHIR, WA'L-QADAR KHAYRIHI-I WA SHARRIHI-I** (Mu-MFA,1:37, e.g.). [For an understanding of such references see the Key to the Bibliography of Primary Sources at the end of this Introduction.] The first part of the Shahadah ("I witness there is no god but God" -- **ASHHAD AN LA ILAH ILLA'LLAH**) reiterates the belief in the first part of the Synoptic Credo, i.e., belief in God. The second part of the Shahadah ("I witness Muhammad is indeed the Messenger of God" -- **ASHHAD ANN MUHAMMAD RASUL ALLAH**) emphasizes the most important aspect of the third part of the Synoptic Credo: belief in God's "Books and Messengers." Through elaborate Islamic teachings this part of the Shahadah reminds Muslims that Muhammad is the last and fully realized of the Messengers-Prophets and that the Quran received through Muhammad is the final and most comprehensive version of Divine Books. So, basically the five elements of the Synoptic Credo form the entire Islamic belief system. (See Appendix I). In the earliest stages of their Islamic education, Muslim children learn to declare this creed in first person, singular -- **AMANT-U BI'LLAH WA...** It is repeated by believers on various occasions during their lifetime. The meanings and various dimensions of these five fundamental elements of Islamic faith, along with their corollaries and implications, are extensively authenticated, elaborated and repeated in the vast Sacred Islamic Scriptures: the Quran and Tradition² (as explained in the following discussion of our primary sources).

This vast material is divided for the purpose of this work into five Parts corresponding with the five elements of the Synoptic Credo, i.e., belief in I) God, II) Angels, III) Books and Messengers, IV) Hereafter and V) Predestination. Part III (which deals with the Islamic concept of Books, i.e. Revelations, received by Islamic Messengers of God from Adam to Muhammad, and explains the Muslim version of sacred universal history and eschatology) is divided into nine Sections.

Section 9 of Part III is also a partial biography of the Prophet Muhammad for our specific purposes. This Section is divided into three Segments dealing with 1) the Prophet's life in Mecca, 2) his career in Medina and 3) the Prophet's (and the Quran's) attitude toward the equivalents of what we will describe as modern norms and nonconformism.

In all cases, we will be looking, primarily, for descriptive and prescriptive materials which determine Muslim self-images and their images and treatment of the world beyond Islam. For example, our sources describe God's attributes and patterns of the Almighty's actions, likes and dislikes. Of the Angels in whose existence a Muslim must believe, the sources tell us they are divided into loyalists and renegades, equivalents of Muslims and non-Muslims and nonconformists. Similarly, Islamic sacred history describes the pre-Muhammad world in terms of believers (Muslims) and nonbelievers. The material about the Hereafter and Predestination describes how and why some are rewarded and others condemned. Since God is described to be on the side of Muslims, i.e., the loyalist Angels and pre-Muhammad Muslims, the two groups become, in the Muslim mind, Muslim heroes worthy of imitation. The fallen angels, Satan and the Jinn, and those human beings of the past who rejected the Message (Islam) of the previous Books and Messengers of God become the villains in Muslim thought. Consequently, the described differences and confrontations between these Muslim heroes and villains are equated in Muslim consciousness with perceived differences between Muslims and non-Muslims, becoming a source of inspiration, authentication and reinforcement for Muslim self-images and for Muslim images and treatment of the world beyond Islam. These perceptions can be related to certain modes of Muslim behavior toward non-Muslims and nonconformists.

On Muslim relations with non-Muslims and nonconformists, Islamic sources are frankly prescriptive. There are definite and unambiguous decrees and instructions in the Quran and Tradition which exhort Muslims to maintain certain self-images and to adopt certain images and

treatments of non-Muslims. Muslims are, for example, told by the Almighty that they are the "best people" -- **KHAYR UMMAH** (Q3:110), the cream of mankind so to say, and that the non-Muslims are "like animals, rather worse" -- **KAL-ANAM BAL HUM ADALL** (Q7:179) - the scum of the earth. Similarly, explicit injunctions of the Quran and the Sunnah oblige the believers to treat non-Muslims and nonconformists in particular ways in various situations.

It is incorrect, however, to think of a strict compartmentalization of the descriptive and prescriptive material in our sources. In most cases, particularly in the Quran and its Tradition-based exegeses, the descriptions of God, Angels, Prophetic history, Hereafter and Predestination are repeatedly linked to the prescriptions, i.e., decrees and exhortations concerning Muslim self-images and their images and treatment of others. The descriptions are aimed at reinforcing and justifying the prescriptions.

Why Comparison of the Past to the Present?

As an implied secondary thesis of this work it was suggested that one may speculate about the link between the deep-rooted effects of these historical traditional materials and certain patterns of Muslim behavior and responses to contemporary phenomena. Normally, such speculation is questionable. It might be said that, as they have done with other traditional scriptures, historicists have ways to rescue the Quran and Tradition, avoiding value judgment, simply marveling at this fascinating Islamic heritage of the past, and connecting it to social, economic and accidental circumstances of history. For historians, there is undoubtedly much to cause even enchantment with Muhammad as an extraordinary historical figure, to forgive him for some questionable acts, and to admire him for triggering, unwittingly, a chain of events that resulted in the emergence of a potentially brilliant and universal Afro-Eurasian civilization. The hurdle, however, is created by the Muslim belief system formulated after Muhammad's death and universally

accepted by believers. It is this belief system resurrected and articulated repeatedly by the Resurgents of the past and present that deprives Muslims of the benefits of the historicist treatment of Islam - of an **EINFUHLUNG** and **VERSTEHEN**. It was this belief system which deprived Muslims of the benefits of a renaissance, generated long before the Renaissance, in the Afro-Eurasian Islamicate milieu. Again, it is this belief system resurrected and activated by contemporary Resurgents that is frustrating the dreams of Muslim Modernists and secular humanists alike.

According to this belief system, activated by the Resurgents, an effective linkage between the past and present is inevitable. This is done because Muslims believe that the experience of the Quran and Muhammad in dealing with non-Muslims during 610-632 CE is eternally valid and binding, not historically specific. This is a logical result of Muslim belief in the Quran as the last Word of God, and in Muhammad as His last Messenger whose Sunnah is to be followed by believers of all times. Islamic sources repeatedly remind believers of the ageless applicability of the teachings of the Quran and Muhammad. For example, Q2:11 (passim) condemned **AL-MUNAFIQUN**, the so-called "Hypocrites", the nonconformist 'Muslims' of the Prophet's time. (See Part III, Section 9, Segment 3). In his commentary on the passage, Tabari says that though it was revealed about "the Hypocrites" of the Prophet's time, it is applicable to anyone with similar characteristics, "until the Day of Resurrection" --

NAZALAT FI'L-MUNAFIQIN ALLADHIN KANU ALA AHD RASUL ALLAH WA IN KAN MUNIYYAN BIHA KULL MAN KAN BI-MITHL SIFATIHIM MIN AL-MUNAFIQIN BADAHUM ILA YAUM AL-QIYAMAT (TS,1:389).

Before Muslims decide how to think of and treat non-Muslims and new phenomena, they have to compare particular groups of nonbelievers and their beliefs and attitudes to those Muhammad confronted. Belief in the applicability for all time of the Quran and the Sunnah of the Prophet implies the need for such rationalization. Throughout Islamic history, Muslims have sought direct or indirect precedents -- **NAZAIR** (singular:

NAZIR) in the Quran and sources of Sunnah before judging situations and problems. Contemporary Muslim Resurgent scholars and activists stick to this method. So, in identifying various imaginary and real non-Muslim groups confronted by Islamic Prophets in the past and by the Quran and Muhammad during the twenty-three years of his Prophetic career, the use of certain modern problematic terms and the approximation of Muhammad to modern phenomena, have primarily been dictated by Muslim methodology.

The Resurgent Islamic movement of our time, in its condemnation and rejection of the modern humanistic worldview, values and tendencies, has particularly articulated the idea that this modern civilization is nothing but **JAHLIYYAH** of the past. In his commentary on the term **JAHLIYYAH** in the Quran (5:50), Abu'l-Ala Maududi tells his readers that

the pre-Islamic period of Arabia is called the period of ignorance in the sense that the people had invented their own way of life based on mere guesswork or lusts. Therefore, whenever any of these ways are adopted, that period will be called the period of "ignorance." Likewise the knowledge which is imparted in [modern] schools and universities today is only a partial knowledge and cannot in any sense be the right guidance for mankind. That is why all the systems of life based on fancies and conjectures, with the help of such partial knowledge, in utter disregard of the Divine knowledge [provided only by the Quran and Sunnah], shall likewise be the ways of ignorance like the ways of the pre-Islamic period.³

Kalim Siddiqui, a London-based Pakistani Muslim activist-journalist closely attached to the Resurgent movement tells us more, confirming some of our above assertions. Rejoicing in "Islamic movements," i.e., Islam's rejection of the modern worldview, Siddiqui states

The basic resource of the Islamic movement is its size. Christianity can probably count more heads than Islam. But these figures will not be comparable for the simple reason that there is no Christian civilization in existence or trying to recover its lost ground. All Christians, lay and clergy, now accept Western civilization's interpretation of religion as a 'stage' in human development which has passed and has little further relevance beyond the personal spirituality of a few individuals. There is not comparable 'movement' in Christianity. There is no one trying to establish a 'Christian State' or even a 'Christian civilization.' No religion, philosophy or ideology today, except Islam, challenges the right of the secular world to exist. Islam in this sense is unique. It insists that human behaviour

directed and guided by Revolution (sic: Revelation?) and Prophethood alone can lead men to true development, progress and happiness, and that all secular behavior at all levels is **JAHILIYYAH** and rebellion against the Creator. This position of Islam is held by one thousand million living Muslims. Or perhaps not quite that number, because a handful, but only a handful, are also converted to the western view of religion and history.

The fact, however, is that the number of Muslims belonging to the western civilization is very small. Of the total Muslim population, perhaps no more than five percent has had western education. Of these perhaps only one or two percent accept the west's worldview and the western civilization's claim to be leading mankind towards 'progress' and ultimate 'happiness'. Those who do are the thin veneer of the ruling classes who in fact represent the penetration of the **UMMAH** by its hostile environment. Apart from this small group, largely urban and alienated, it is fair to assume that all other Muslims belong to the Islamic movement.⁴

So, Muslims cannot insist that the Quran and Sunnah are for all times to follow and then expect historians, anthropologists and sociologists to 'understand' the Quran and Tradition in their historical perspective. As for the misguided and/or uninformed liberal commentators, I can only repeat what Sadi of Shiraz (d. 1290 CE) said so succinctly:

**TARAHUM BAR PALANG-E-TIZ DANDAN
SITAM-KARI BUAD BAR GOSFANDAN**
(Show of mercy for a sharp-toothed leopard becomes injustice and cruelty to the sheep).

Why Comparison to Modern Humanism?

In this work, the Quran-Sunnah-based foundations of Muslim images and treatment of the world beyond Islam are explored (broadly and mostly in an indirect manner) in comparison and contrast to what I understand to be the Renaissance-based modern worldview and its consequent patterns of thought and action. As discussed below, this modern worldview is primarily humanistic, i.e., rationalistic, pragmatic, pluralistic, utilitarian, liberal and evolutionary. We have chosen this modern humanistic worldview as a criterion for the following reasons.

1) For the present and foreseeable future these modern values and tendencies are the most relevant to any discussion of relations between Muslims and non-Muslims and nonconformists.

2) As noticed above, it is in contradistinction to this modern

worldview that the ideologues of the Islamic Resurgent movement emphasize and project some cardinal aspects of the Muslim belief system.

As food for thought for Muslims who need to see the picture more clearly, and for the purpose of this study, we try to articulate, as follows, some relevant basic features of modern humanistic thought as it reemerged during the Renaissance and continues to evolve.⁵

I) Various dimensions of humanism dominate contemporary civilization at large. Nicola Abbagnano tells us that humanism constitutes "one of the factors of modern culture" and particularly its concept of religious tolerance "has come to be affirmed in modern world" (A-EP. See endnote/footnote 5). About Humanist influence on modern thought Edward P. Cheyney believes that the humanist movement represents "an extensive change" in art literature and thought (Ch-ESS:537). Humanism, Cheyney adds

has formed one of the main threads in the web of all modern life. It has survived in various forms... temperamental resistance to ecclesiastical and political authority, a certain warm conviction that man himself is the center of the universe, and basis for certain modern schools of philosophy and religion (ibid:540).

According to Cheyney most of the prominent post-Renaissance thinkers of the modern age are essentially humanists. Cheyney names many. For example, about John Locke he tells us that, "in turning away from the problems of ultimate knowledge to a test of man's ability to reach it, (Locke) is thinking as a pure humanist, a student of the mind of man" (ibid:541). The French Enlightenment, according to Cheyney, was influenced by Locke's "faith in the power of human nature to solve its own problems" and by Locke's ideas projected in his Letter Concerning Tolerance and the Essays on Civil Government (ibid). Also

The belief in human perfectibility on which the higher reaches of optimism and reformism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were so largely built up was humanistic belief (ibid).

Concluding his essay, Abbagnano tells us that the term 'Humanism' has

also been used to designate the following doctrines:

- 1) Communism, in that it would abolish man's alienation from himself, which is a product of private property and capitalistic society.
- 2) Pragmatism, because of its anthropocentric view which, as Protagoras did, makes "man the measure of all things."
- 3) Personalism (also called spiritualism), which affirms man's capacity to contemplate the eternal truths or in general, to enter into relationship with transcendent reality.
- 4) Existentialism, which affirms that "there is no other universe than the human universe, the universe of human subjectivity" (A-EP).

This and more is what, perhaps, Cheyney has in mind when he tells us that humanism is the "basis for certain modern schools of philosophy and religion." If the above concepts signify humanism for some, we may consider them as dimensions of modern humanism.

II. The most fundamental element in humanism is its "anthropocentric view", its Protagorian maxim that man is the measure of all things, its belief in the importance and centrality of man per se. Humanism has "faith in the dignity of the human soul", Jacob Agus tells us (W-DQD:267). In humanism, according to Emil Hirsh, "man is the cornerstone" (ibid). Cheyney tells us of the "warm" humanist "conviction" that "man himself is the center of the universe" and the central object of interest" (Ch-ESS,7:540,542). According to Abbagnano, "humanism is any philosophy which recognizes the value or dignity of man and makes him the measure of all things..." (A-EP). For H. Lavelly "person is the ontological ultimate" (L-EP,6:107). As we saw above, Communism is concerned with man's alienation, pragmatism makes "man the measure of all things" and for Existentialism "there is no other universe than the human universe." For the existentialist-humanist Jean-Paul Sartre, "man becomes an absolute for man" (W-DQD:267).

III. Humanism rejects the idea of Divine Guidance as a basis for the formation of ideological social, economic, political and educational guidelines and values, and for an understanding of nature. Regardless of belief or disbelief in the existence of a Supreme Being, a supreme

phenomenon or God, all humanists believe (or imply in practice) that such a Being does not intervene in history - at least not in mundane human affairs. For an understanding of nature and various physical and metaphysical phenomena, and for the conduct of life man is his own guide. He can and should exercise freedom in nature. According to humanism man is "free to project his life in the world in an autonomous way... (and has the) capacity to form his world, to vary it, and to better it" (A-EP). Instead of depending on Divinely revealed sources

humanists held that through classical letters the 'rebirth' of a spirit that man had possessed in the classical age and had lost in the Middle Ages could be realized, a spirit of freedom that provided justification for man's claim of rational autonomy, allowing him to see himself involved in nature and history capable of making them his realm. ... (The Renaissance humanists also believed in further) development of capacities and powers that the ancients possessed and exercised but which had been lost in the Middle Ages... (these humanists) rejected the medieval heritage and chose that of classical world instead. The privilege that they accorded to the humanities - poetry, rhetoric, history, ethics, and politics - was founded on the conviction that these disciplines alone educate man as such and put him in a position effectively to exercise his freedom... (These humanists believed that) man can and should exercise (freedom) in nature and in society... (They rejected) the fundamental institutions of the medieval world - the empire, the church, and feudalism - (which) seemed to be the guardians (and interpreters) of a cosmic order (A-EP; parentheses added).

This concept leads, inevitably, to a rejection of the idea of specific Divine Guidance through fixed channels. Humanism rejects "supernaturalism and moral absolutism, and (maintains) that the best possibilities of human beings can be achieved only by a combination of informal intelligence and the candid recognition that man must bear the responsibility for whatever standards he adopts" (Charles Frankel, W-DQD:267).

For some humanists such as Pico, Abbagnano tells us, human fate was not "predetermined" by God. It was human "decision and choice" that made a difference. According to Pico man was capable of making his "own nature without constraint from any barrier, by means of the freedom" God gave him. For Pico and others, "man is a free and sovereign artificer" able to "mold and fashion" himself according to his own choice. This

humanistic thought allowed human "wisdom" the capability to perfect human nature. Here Abbagnano reminds us that "this confidence" in human capacities was the opposite of "the medieval mentality" (A-EP).

According to Abbagnano it was this Renaissance humanism that contributed to the birth of modern science. This aspect of humanism suggests that man "can question and understand nature... with the senses" (ibid).

Implicit in the concept of man's freedom, rational autonomy and ability to vary and better the world is the recognition of the point that values and institutions as well as scientific knowledge of a particular time are not necessarily all-encompassing, perfect and eternal. It is a recognition of the possibility, even inevitability, of evolution in all realms of human thought and action. We know that Pragmatism as a dimension of humanism rejects all traditional philosophies that claim to have said the last, perfect and binding word for all peoples, all times and all places. What it says is this: the 'Truth' about things and phenomena concerning human beings is not already revealed and fixed. Nor is the 'Truth' indivisible. Pragmatism is

fundamentally motivated and justified by conditions of efficacy and utility in serving our various aims and needs... Here pragmatism counsels tolerance and pluralism... (its) critical objective (being) maximum usefulness in serving our needs.... Pragmatism... has helped shape the modern conception of philosophy as a way of investigating problems and clarifying communication rather than as a fixed system of ultimate answers and great truths (Th-EP:6:431; parentheses added).

We understand that Personalism's (or modern Spiritualism's) "affirmation of man's capacity to contemplate the eternal truths... to enter into relationship with transcendent reality" assumes that these "eternal truths" are not necessarily already known, i.e., revealed through one or more individuals of the past nor is there only one fixed and known (revealed) way "to enter into relationship with transcendental reality." Besides, apparently, man is the focal point in this intellectual-spiritual endeavor who 'creates' or 'reveals' God, not otherwise. For H. Lavelly, "Personalism"... is a philosophical

perspective or system for which "the Divine person is... the creation of finite selves" (L-EP,6:107).

Both of the two major ideologies of our time, Socialism and Capitalism, reject the idea of Divine Guidance and Divine Predestination. Socialism obviously believes in a this-worldly rationalistic cause - a particular socio-economic system - for "man's alienation," rejecting Divine predestination or any other metaphysical or extra-material basis for it. For Socialism, it is neither "the original sin" nor the wretchedness of man that comes with disbelief in God or is caused by Him. Similarly, the abolishment of this alienation is brought about, according to Socialism, by replacing one socio-economic system with another which is certainly materialistic and secular. Nor does Socialism (neither Capitalism) recommend Moksha (release from the 'wheel of life' in order to be one permanently with the Great Atman/Brahma), or **FANA FI'LLAH** ("to be lost/dissolved in God") or ask to wait for a Second Coming for bringing to an end human anxieties and sufferings, "man's alienation from himself." The doctrine of laissez'faire capitalism also believes in a this worldly rationalistic cause-and-effect-based mechanism. Regardless of his apologetic "prudential considerations or to concessions to a mode of speech called for by the standards of propriety of the time," Adam Smith's "the invisible hand" determining material consequences is not the traditional Divine Hand. [I have borrowed the first phrase in this quotation from Jacob Viner, "Smith, Adam," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 1961, 14:324 cf. 322-9].

According to Sartre, Existentialism (which according to Abbagnano is a form of humanism) is

an attempt to draw all consequences from a consistent atheistic position... Man exists, turns up, appears on the scene, and only afterwards defines himself... (Existentialism makes) every man aware of what he is and (makes) the full responsibility of his existence rest on him... (It is) an ethics of action and involvement... a doctrine which makes human life possible and... declares that every truth and every action implies a human setting and human subjectivity. ... (According to Sartrean Existentialism, man is) endowed with liberty... which he may

betray but which he cannot deny to make his way as best he can... (W-DQD:184; parentheses added).

Belief in (and respect for) religious, racial, social, political, intellectual and ideological pluralism are inbuilt in humanism. The rejection of supernaturalism and moral absolutism, the rejection of a particular category of men "as guardians and interpreters of cosmic order" simply means that no ideology per se can claim superiority over others. Humanistic ideologies are supposed to compete on the basis of rational authenticity determined voluntarily by human senses and experience and on the basis of utility for human societies IN THIS WORLD. The upholders of humanistic thoughts may indulge in intolerance and violence, but they never justify them on the basis of Divine sanction. Apparent nonbelievers who commit violence suffer, unwittingly, from the residual effects of 'Medieval mentality' which in turn was itself a residue of primitive humanity. A creed of nonviolence is an inevitable outcome of belief in man as the measure of all things. As the events of this decade indicate, those with a humanistic base of thought are more likely to regret the follies, aberrations and crimes of their predecessors. In case a humanist censors Socrates, Marx, Lenin, Stalin or Sartre, he or she would not be afraid of being struck by a thunderbolt or "roasted" in Islamic Hell or its Christian counterpart "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched". This is not so with the believers in 'Revealed' dogmas. For a humanist, as Mahatma Gandhi said, humanity is an "undivided and indivisible family" (W-DQD:267). There are no chosen people, nor are there Divinely ordained censors. That the Almighty intervenes in history in favor of some against others is an absurdity for a humanist.

IV. Humanism is concerned exclusively with this life and this visible and knowable universe. Also, it recognizes a human right to enjoy life. It is "the religion of one who says yea to life here and now" (R.W. Sellar, W-DQD:267). For humanists, political and social interests are not dominated by metaphysical and theological concerns.

Humanism is "concerned with worldly rather than with divine things" (Joseph Wood Krutch, W-DQD:267). As its "central point," humanism affirms that duty to man has replaced Duty to God, Rosalind Murray tells us (W:DQD:267). Abbagnano tells us that naturalism as an element of humanism recognizes natural aspects in human beings and consequently the value of "pleasure", i.e., this-worldly happiness. The Renaissance humanists contrasted this to medieval (Christian) asceticism and monastic life. For Lorenzo Valla (1407-1457), "pleasure is the sole good for man" and "the sole end of human activities." He denied any "religious superiority to monastic life." Instead the Renaissance humanists recognized the superiority of the "active life" and of "moral philosophy" to "metaphysics." This moral philosophy, virtues and vices and forms of civil society are to be determined by man as a "political animal", i.e. not through Divine guidance. For example, Machiavelli as a political humanist "cleared the world of politics of any metaphysical or theological suggestion...." (A-EP).

Along with the recognition of the value of pleasure, the achievement of happiness on this earth is a humanist's goal. Emphasis on the "civil functions" (discussed below) of religion de-emphasizes otherworldly concerns. Humanism rejects the idea "that this world is merely a preparation for the world to come" (Ch-ESS,7:540). Humanism is

that which is characteristically human, not supernatural, that which belongs to man and not to external nature, that which raises man to his greatest height or gives him, as man, his greatest satisfaction. It... (takes a) vivid interest in all sides of (this) life.... (It is) a philosophy of which man is the center and sanction (Ch-ESS,7:541; parentheses added).

This-worldly tangible utility is the touchstone for the rejection or adoption of any worldview.

In Pragmatism (William) James made his moral conception of philosophy unmistakably evident in saying that "the whole function of philosophy ought to be to find out what definite difference it will make to you and me at definite instants of our life if this world-formula or that world-formula be the true one" ((Th-EP,6:435, parenthesis added).

V. For our purposes, the most important legacy of humanism is its effect on traditional religious thought. Cheyney has correctly noticed that there is an inherent conflict between "genuine religious thought and humanist belief in emancipation of spirit and freedom of thought" (Ch-ESS,7:538). There existed "a non-religious element in humanism" Cheyney remarks and adds that "in the main it has been antagonistic to positive and authoritative religious belief..." (Ch-ESS,7:538, 540). The assertion that existentialism is a substitute for religion, or that man has the capacity to contemplate the truth, simply mean a rejection of the idea of Divine guidance. As for a personal God, Cheyney tells us that the humanists "were either agnostics or [those] whose gods were far away and unreal"... and uninterested in human affairs (ibid:538). This is a rejection of the idea of Revelation. Humanism was "a declaration of independence of thought from the restrictions of ecclesiastical authority.... As compared with... the ecclesiasticism of the Middle Ages humanism was uninterested in theology... unregardful... and harshly critical of the church... (and sometimes) quite indistinguishable from pragmatism" (ibid). Some Humanists were deists "with absence of all enthusiasm in religion" (ibid:541).

To the extent traditional religions have survived, they have undergone a radical transformation. Humanism has convinced an overwhelming majority of believers in traditional religions (other than Islam) 1) to adopt a civil, humanitarian and this-worldly perspective, 2) to acknowledge universal tolerance, religious pluralism and the principle of peaceful coexistence with other religious and philosophies, and 3) to accept in principle and/or in practice the separation of religion from state, social and international affairs. As in other cases, this transformation too began with the Renaissance.

As Abbagnano maintains, the humanist concept of "justifying the capacity for initiative of man in the world" changed the role of religion and introduced a new mode of belief. With reference to the

concept of a "heavenly city," belief in the "civil function" of religion "meant the commitment of man to realize as much as possible its characteristics in the earthly city". The humanist scholars saw the Bible as being equally concerned with "earthly happiness" (A-EP). So, the Almighty was brought down from Heaven to take an interest in this mundane world; and religion was given a utilitarian function replacing its traditional metaphysical, otherworldly concerns.

The most important trend in modern humanistic religious thought introduced and promoted by the Renaissance humanists was the idea of religious tolerance - a concept "which has come to be affirmed in the modern world" (A-EP). The Renaissance humanists talked of the "possibility of peaceful coexistence between the various religious confessions which remain different from each other and are not reducible to a single confession". The Truth was no longer indivisible for these humanists. Some went beyond this, expressing their convictions about

the fundamental unity of all the religious beliefs of mankind, therefore of the possibility of a universal religious peace. Moreover, according to the humanists, religious peace implies the essential identity between philosophy and religion (A-EP).

Leonardo Bruni was, apparently, convinced that St. Paul did not teach anything more than Plato (ibid). Some maintained that the ancient philosophy had already elaborated "the wisdom" Christianity was thought to have "brought to fulfillment", and that both were supported and guided by the same "reason" (A-EP). Pico della Mirandola thought of "a regenerative peace which would conciliate all the religions and all the philosophies of the world" because he and others thought all these come from a single source, a "primordial revelation" (A-EP). As Abbagnano tells us of Erasmus (1466-1536) and More (1473-1535), later thinkers continued to defend religious tolerance "in modern and effective ways" (A-EP). Beginning with John Locke (1632-1704; cf., e.g., his A Letter Concerning Toleration) we may add an unending list of 17th-to-20th century philosophical backgrounds (except Islam) pleading for some variant of this humanistic-Deistic religious tolerance and for this-

worldly humanitarian concerns.⁶

Our contention is this: the post-Renaissance world beginning with its Western component has, in general and progressively, adopted (or aspires to adopt) in practice this Renaissance-Enlightenment-based modern humanistic worldview which is by and large rationalistic, pluralistic, pragmatic, utilitarian, secular, liberal and evolutionary. Foremost among the practical outcomes of humanistic belief in man as "the measure of all things" is the recognition of inviolably basic human rights to all forms of freedom, to dignity and justice and to equality and self-determination - regardless of creed, color, race and gender. Incorporation of charters of basic human rights in constitutions of nation-states and of international organizations reflects this recognition. Regardless of the existence of fundamentalist and revivalist movements, East and West, (or their revivals), modern humanistic and pluralistic tendencies have gained world-wide acceptance, at least in principle. Excepting the world of Islam, almost all other countries have acknowledged democracy in some form, (particularly in the sense that the people, the demos, are the final authority to make or unmake laws and institutions).

A prominent feature of this modern approach in practice is the acceptance of the possibility, even inevitability of change in values and institutions. No values and institutions are necessarily divine and, consequently, eternal, constant and unchangeable. Once a traditionally 'sacred' norm begins to look like humbug it is treated as humbug, whether propounded vehemently in a Voltarian-Marxian-Sartrean manner or mildly in 'Anglo-Saxon', Hindu, Buddhist and Jewish ways. What is constant in humanism, such as an absolute right to life, liberty, dignity, justice and equality, is based on common sense, human reason and, at times, Sartrean existentialistic ethical philosophy. The humanistic version of "you shall not kill" cannot be amended by the

Almighty's change of mind by authorizing a crusade or exhorting us to "fight to kill the heathen" -- **QATILU'L-MUSHRIKIN**. Modern values teach one who acts for self-defense at least the courtesy to be regretful and not to exult in such fighting. Regardless of its degree of realization, **AHIMSA**, nonviolence, is the modern ideal. No voluptuous houri in Paradise awaits a humanist warrior. Among believers in modern values there is no place for a Muhammad Iqbal (1873-1938, an initiator of the modern Resurgent movement) to boast (in an Urdu couplet)

**TAYGHON KE SAI MEN HAM PAL KAR JAWAN HUEY HAIN KHANJAR
HILAL KA HAI QAUMI NISHAN HAMARA**
(Under the shadow of swords, we have grown young. A dagger-like crescent is our national emblem.)

These modern values, tendencies and ideals are based on a strong humanistic-stoic sense of ethics and on a growing desire to idealize and universalize these ethical bases in human transactions. Honesty and truthfulness, decent and civilized behavior, social responsibility, the work ethic, fairness, justice, concern and responsibility for all human and nonhuman life, regardless of color, creed, ethnicity and place, are cherished. Demand for equality and basic human rights, and opposition to slavery, discrimination, prejudice and torture do not typically depend for inspiration and justification on traditional religious scriptures or on precedents established by the founding fathers of these religions.

Adoption of such an approach implies a rejection or toning down of the idea of a chosen people, of a monopoly of grace and salvation for the believer in a particular dogma, and of a **KHAYR UMMAH** (Q3:110), "the best community" entitled to treat others as **SAGHIRUN** (Q9:29), (humiliate and deem them inferior). The admonition "Do not give dogs (i.e., nonbelievers) what is sacred; and do not throw your pearls to pigs" (Matthew 7:6) is no longer appreciated. Exhortations such as the one asking Muslims to be harsh on nonbelievers and kind only to the believers -- **ASHIDDA ALA-L-KUFFAR, RUHAMA BAYNAHUM** (Q48:29) -- are contradictory to modern tendencies that condemn prejudice and recommend

peaceful coexistence and pluralism.

Internationally, these modern values expect nations to coexist peacefully and respect international law and traditions. Unprovoked aggression is universally condemned. In international or inter-group dealings, deception, exploitation, hegemonism, imperialism, militarism, expansionism and the use of torture, force and violence are universally condemned by emerging modern humanistic moral standards and sensitivities (as reflected, for example, by the basic documents of the United Nations Organization). Peaceful coexistence of varying ideologies implies toleration of differences of opinion and a peaceful continuation of discourse and nonviolent interaction on controversial issues. Ideally, the process also expects demonstration, by all parties, of a degree of intellectual integrity, honesty, sincerity and openness to change on reasoned grounds.

Regardless of the correctness or incorrectness of the adopted suppositions, changes are made, by and large, voluntarily or through persuasion by a majority on the bases of utility and, broadly, scientific method. In practice, this-worldly concerns, rather than other-worldly dispositions, influence adoption or change of certain values, policies and institutions. Lest a majority decision at a particular time become permanent, leading to tyranny and stagnation, checks and balances are incorporated in modern systems. After a decision is made, those who differ or change their mind maintain their basic right to express their differences and try to persuade others to support change. Administrators and legislators are elected or appointed according to fixed schedules. Practically every election is a referendum on all issues concerned. Constitutions may be amended. All values and institutions are potentially open to criticism and change by the people without depriving other individuals, groups and states of their basic human and international rights.

Of humanism's practical effects on traditional religions we have experienced general, if not universal, agreement with the following

points. Constitutions and legal systems, by and large, are secular and pluralistic. Secularization of public institutions, particularly the separation of religion from the state is an accepted norm. Though an overwhelming majority of the non-Muslim world continues to believe in some traditional religion, in practice the Almighty (or Almighties) have been retired from day-to-day social and state affairs. In practice, a Deistic-cum-agnostic approach is maintained in most countries. The basic right to freedom of thought and expression overrides traditional religious sensitivities. 'You shall not kill a Salman Rushdie for alleged or real blasphemy is a binding commandment according to modern values.

All adherents to traditional religious denominations, or other philosophies and schools of thought, can maintain partial or complete nonconformity with standards set by the perceived hierarchies of such entities. For example, without fear of persecution, a Roman Catholic may disagree with the papal hierarchy on matrimonial issues and birth control, and a Hindu may set aside requirements of the caste system. No legal or extra-legal institution that persecutes such dissenters is allowed to exist formally. It is understood that believers in different traditional religions or their syncretic forms, as well as adherents to non-traditional philosophies and lifestyles, such as atheism, agnosticism, transcendentalism, Deism, existentialism, etc., maintain their fundamental social and political rights unaffected by their religious, philosophical or lifestyle preferences - as long as they do not impose these values on others by force and violence and so long as they perform their civic duties.

Religious and intellectual freedom, according to the modern approach, means freedom of expression and practice for all religions and worldviews. It also means intellectual and academic freedom to criticize any religion, worldview or lifestyle. No particular creed, however, is permitted by law to viciously disrespect other creeds, use intimidation and violence against them, or gain and maintain domination

through overt or covert violent nonvoluntary means. Individuals may hold, in the privacy of their homes or particular institutions, certain creeds or ideologies, but they are not allowed to discriminate against others in public affairs. Nor is humiliation or intimidation of followers of other creeds and ideas appreciated. The same applies to victimization of followers of one's own creed. One may not be tortured, killed or deprived of other basic human rights just because a majority has ruled so, or because teachings of a traditional religion so enjoin.

Presuming the universality of the modern worldview and abovementioned consequent practices, Muslim responses to these modern tendencies have been exceptionally problematic, affecting their images and treatment of nonconformists within Muslims societies and of the world beyond Islam. While the non-Muslim world, excepting the (hopefully) ineffective fundamentalist pockets, has found ways to reconcile itself with these liberal nonconformist humanistic-pluralistic approaches, the Muslim world has failed to reach a satisfactory consensus. The difference is most obvious on intellectual freedom, separation of religion from state affairs, concepts about the use of force, and also in restrictions on certain liberated styles of life. Compared to other traditional creeds, Islam has maintained a stranglehold on the political and social behavior of its adherents.

Muslim rejection of any humanistic approach which implies, among other things, intellectual freedom, is the main source of tension between Muslims and Muslims, between Muslims and non-Muslims, and between Muslims and nonconformists. It is a source of tension between Muslims and Muslims in the sense that in practice only the dominant sect or sector in a given country monopolizes power in the name of God curbing alternate opinions. For example, the Shiites lose their basic human right to freedom of speech, to mention the least, in a Sunnite-

dominated country and vice versa. [We know that for centuries after the Prophet's death more Muslims have suffered from inter-Muslim wars and sectarian tensions than from confrontations with non-Muslims. The worst victims, however are the nonconformists who prefer to limit the role of religion in common social and political affairs. Muslim rejection of the secular humanistic approach deprives nonconformist Muslims of their basic human rights as confirmed by universal declarations. It is Islam's encounter with the modern worldview -- rather than a confrontation with any other traditional religion -- that is disturbingly relevant to our time and to a foreseeable future. Although Muslim relations with the followers of other traditional religions, e.g., Judaism, Christianity, Hinduism etc., continue to have their problematic aspects, it is not the fear of domination by any non-Muslim theocracy that disturbs Muslim-non-Muslim relations. Internally and externally, the main challenge concerning Muslim relations with non-Muslims and nonconformists is posed by modern pluralistic tendencies. The problematic relations with Judaism, Christianity, Hinduism and other creeds are related more to the Muslim lack of appreciation for modern humanistic-pluralistic concepts than to the traditional rivalries between religions. The governments of Muslim citizens of Islamic Pakistan or Iran do not have to deal with an India or America committed constitutionally to follow the tenets of **RAM RAJ** (government as prescribed by Hinduism) or Christianity in their conduct of relations with other countries. In principle, what the U.S., the Soviet Union, India, and other non-Islamic countries expect of Muslim countries in international affairs is conformity with international traditions, rules, regulations and laws rooted in modern humanistic institutions and mutually-agreed-upon undertakings, rather than the Divinely given tenets of a particular group.

On relations between Muslims and non-Muslims, and also between Resurgent constituencies and nonconformists, the issue is not how Muslims are to respond to a non-Muslim theocracy; as a challenge that

simply does not exist. For example, in India -- or in the Soviet Union the United States of America -- Muslim citizens are not required to pay allegiance to a Hindu or Christian theocracy or to any agnostic-atheistic creed. Rather, they are required - as non-Muslims are also required --to be citizens in the modern humanistic sense of the word with equal civic rights. Moreover, these residents are expected to respect the pluralistic arrangements based, by and large, on secular humanistic constitutions and other basic state documents. Within Islamic countries, conversely, the question is not whether Jews, Christians, Hindus, Ahmadis, Bahais etc. should have special or superior status, nor whether such groups should be able to establish theocracies of their own. What the non-Muslims and nonconformists in Islamic countries demand is the recognition of basic human rights: the recognition, for example, of the possibility that a woman or a non-Muslim, Deist, agnostic, atheist, Marxist or a believer in the separation of religion from state affairs may become head of the government or hold a key post without being obliged to conceal religious, political and philosophical inclinations (while, of course abiding by secular pluralistic norms). Likewise, from a modern point of view, it is a basic human right of all citizens to choose a particular style of life. For example, the right to wear or not wear the veil. Modernism requires that the source of rules for decency should be the human community itself - and individuals who may determine the degree and form of adherence to traditional norms, who may change and reform standards from time to time, not adhering to any fixed divine decree.

This study will show that complex and overlapping dimensions of the Islamic belief system create and reinforce patterns of thought and action which make it impossible for a believer to conform with or be influenced by modern humanistic values and norms. Examples of a few underlying themes and convictions may be enumerated here.

1) Muslims believe that all knowledge is perfected in Muhammad whom the Almighty, graciously, gave knowledge of the past and future --

WA ALLAMAK... MIN AL-AKHBAR AL-AWWALIN WA'L-AKHIRIN; DHALIK MIN FADL
 ALLAH ALAYK YA MUHAMMAD (TS,9:200 cf. Q4:113). Muhammad, "the
 Messenger of God... was the most knowledgeable of God's creatures about
 what happened in the past and about what will happen in the future" --
 RASUL ALLAH... KAN ALAM KHALQ ALLAH BI'L-KAIN MIN AL-UMUR AL-MADIYYAH
 WA'L-KAIN MINHA ALLADHI LAM YAKUN BAD. [TT-1,1:366; cf. AbH,2:212 and
 other anthologies of Hadith literature in chapters entitled FITAN (sing:
 FITNAH) which contain eschatological reports ascribed to the Prophet.]
 So, there is no need to learn from experience or from non-Islamic
 sources. The idea of intellectual evolution becomes absurd for a
 believer.

2) Based on this perfect knowledge received from Muhammad through
 the Quran and Sunnah there is only one all-encompassing, correct and
 binding way of life: Islam. All other ways are Satanic. No solution
 to any problem should be sought beyond Islam's parameters.

Enter Islam, all of you and follow not the steps of Satan
 (Q2:208) [TS,4:251-8 tells us that AS-SILM in the verse
 means Islam]. The true religion with God is Islam (Q3:19).
 Whoso desires another religion than Islam, it shall not be
 accepted by him (Q3:83). Today I have perfected your
 religion for you, and I have approved Islam for your
 religion (Q5:3).

3) No compromises or adjustments are to be made even on minor
 affairs. Muslims must follow Islamic norms entirely, excluding all
 those not enjoined by the Quran and Sunnah. This is emphasized
 throughout the Quran and the sources about the Sunnah. For example,
 Muslims are told, some Jews who had converted to Islam asked the
 Prophet's permission for the continuation of their worship service
 during the Sabbath along with practicing Islam. This was a request for
 a minor adjustment. The Almighty rejected the request, warning that
 continuation of the Sabbath service would be tantamount to following the
 steps of Satan. All that is different from Islamic norms, such as the
 Sabbath services and traditions of creeds other than Islam, belong to
 the ways of the Devil. God tells Muslims to shun these Satanic norms --

>

WA TARIQ ASH-SHAYTAN ALLADHI NAHAHUM AN YATTABIUHU, HUA MA KHALAF HUKM AL-ISLAM WA SHARAIHU WA MINHU TATHBIT AS-SABT WA SAIR SUNAN AHL AL-MILAL AL-LATI TUKHALIF MILLAT AL-ISLAM (TS,4:255-8 cf. Q2:208).

4) Muslims' superiority and their right to impose Islam on others are Divinely sanctioned; God informs them: "You are the best nation ever brought forth to men, bidding to honor and forbidding dishonor" -- **KUNTUM KHAYR UMMAT-IN UKHRIJAT LI'N-NAS, TAMURUN BI'L-MARUF WA TANHAUN AN AL-MUNKAR** (Q3:110). This sense of superiority and self-righteousness is repeatedly reinforced by the Quran and the Prophet (See, e.g., TS,7:104-5). The Quran and Sunnah establish standards of "honor" and "dishonor". For Muslims, "bidding honor" in Q3:110 means "to command people to believe in (the Islamic version of) God and in His Messenger, and to perform Islamic rites -- **SHARAI AL-ISLAM** (TS,7:105 passim; parentheses added). It also means to fight others to kill for Islam -- **WA TUQATILUNAHUM ALAYH** until they believe in Islam (ibid). "Forbidding dishonor" means to forbid disbelief in Islam because, Muslims learn, disbelief in Islam is the worst dishonor, **ANKAR AL-MUNKAR** (ibid). To qualify as "the best nation" Muslims are duty-bound to force others to conform with Islam: "to bring them with chains on their necks in order to accept Islam" -- **KUNTUM KHAYR UMMAT LI'N-NAS TAJIUN BIHIM FI'S-SALASIL TUDKHILUNAHUM FI'L-ISLAM** (TS,7:103 cf. Q3:110). According to another report in the Sahih of al-Bukhari, Q3:110 is a Divine commandment to Muslims to 'bid honor and forbid dishonor', i.e., "You bring them (non-Muslims) with chains on their necks (and keep them so) until they enter Islam" -- **TATUN BIHIM FI'S-SALASIL FI ANAQIHIM HATTA YADKHULU FI'L-ISLAM** (Quoted by the Shakir Brothers in TS,7:103).

5) As we will see in detail, Muslims are exhorted, prescriptively and descriptively, against reconciliation, friendship and peaceful coexistence with non-Muslims and nonconformists. The Almighty tells the believers to be harsh with these heathens -- **ASHIDDA ALA'L-KUFFAR** (Q48:29). So, unlike our humanistic liberal pluralistic values that require tolerance and restraint, these Islamic injunctions authenticate

the use of force and make the adoption of tolerant attitudes impossible for the believers.

6) We know that the general climate of opinion in favor of modern values and tendencies has forced most remaining and recurring racist, fascist, reactionary, authoritarian, totalitarian and imperialistic ideologies, regimes and circles either to reform or, at least, to adopt an apologetic tone. As for Islam, it has dug a deep moat around itself -- making the Muslim mind impregnable. Islamic exhortations against **BIDAH**, "innovation", override the force of global public opinion in favor of modern tendencies, and try to render it ineffective. The believers' sense of opposition is further reinforced by the exhortation to act more vigorously when such an action may seem out of fashion. The Prophet promises great reward for those who resist innovation. "All innovations", i.e., all tendencies of thought and action different from traditional patterns of Islamic thought and action, "are delusions, errors, misguidance, and all such delusions and misguidances are in the Fire", i.e. those who adopt such **BIDAH**, "innovation", will be in Hell - - **KULL BIDAT-IN DALALAT-UN WA KULL DALALAT-IN FI'N-NAR** (). The believers are exhorted by the Prophet to revive and exert particularly the unfashionable Sunnah. The Prophet promised that for reviving each unfashionable Sunnah, particularly at times of "corruption," i.e., at times of lack of adherence to Islamic ways, the believer will receive a reward equivalent to that given to one hundred martyrs -- **MAN AHYA SUNNATI IND FASAD UMMATI FA LAHU AJR MIAT SHAHID** (). For a believer it means that adopting a Sunnah defying the contemporary climate of opinion which favors modern approaches will be the more praiseworthy. So, what is reactionary and fanatical for the rest becomes a heroic, defiant deed for a believer.

7) Islam divides non-Muslims into two categories: 1) the People of the Book, i.e., Jews and Christians and 2) the rest we have called (as discussed in Part III, Section 9, Segment 3 of this study) the People of **JAHILIYYAH** "ignorance", i.e., pagans, idolaters, polytheists, heathens

and all others who are neither believing Jews nor believing Christians. For a Muslim, in theory, the People of Jahiliyya are the worst non-Muslims. According to Islamic sacred historiography, all Islamic Prophets including Muhammad encountered these People of Jahiliyyah as the worst enemies of God. Following Islamic jargon, we may say that as explained in Part III, excepting a part of those confronted by Islamic Jesus and the Prophet Muhammad, all antagonists of Islamic Prophets consisted of the People of Jahiliyyah. Other than the Jews and the Christians, all non-Muslims (such as Meccan-Arab pagans and **AL-MUNAFIQUN** "the Hypocrites") Muhammad confronted during his lifetime fall in the category of the People of Jahiliyyah. As we will see in our detailed discussions of Islamic Prophets, these imaginary [real for believers, anyhow] and real People of Jahiliyyah are portrayed for Muslims in such a manner that, in many ways, they resemble our modern humanists.

So, we argue that contemporary problematic Muslim images and treatment of modern values and enlightened tendencies are related not only to direct Quranic decrees and Sunnah-based edicts, but are also governed by negative Muslim images of these People of Jahiliyya and by Muslim understanding of how these People of Jahiliyyah were treated by the Prophets, believers and God. We will argue that some contemporary phenomena have parallels in the patterns of thought and behavior of the People of Jahiliyyah. Many aspects of modern thought and behavior recall to Muslim minds the Jahiliyyah models of thought and action confronted, unappreciated and rejected by the Quran and Islamic Prophets including Muhammad. Hence, the Muslim lack of enthusiasm, to say the least, toward those modern humanistic, liberal-rationalistic-pluralistic tendencies. Contemporary patterns of thought and action, if approximated in the Muslim mind with those attributed to these adversaries of the Prophet, lose their credibility, and may become loathsome.

These were just some examples. The study will show how the Islamic belief system through the vast material in sacred Islamic

scriptures repeatedly encourages, exhorts and makes believers duty-bound to defy humanism on all fronts and in every respect.

A DISCUSSION OF PRIMARY SOURCES.

For an exploration of foundations of Muslim images and treatment of the world beyond Islam, Sacred Islamic Scriptures, i.e., the Quran and Traditional sources of information about the Prophet Muhammad's Sunnah (teachings and model of conduct) are our primary sources. Some familiarity with various dimensions of the Muslim concept of the Sunnah will enhance appreciation of the sources. We proceed with a Muslim definition of the Sunnah and with an indication that the Sunnah is divine for believers.

The Sunnah, according to Ibn Manzur (CE 1233-1311) is

what the Prophet commanded to do, prohibited, and complied with (NADAB ILAYH) in words or actions concerning what the Venerable Book (the Quran) has not mentioned.⁷

Mustafa al-Sibai, a graduate of al-Azhar and a famous ideologue and leader of the Resurgent movement (Syrian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood) based on Sacred Islamic Scriptures and classical Islamic sources, tells us

The Sunnah... is what is reported about what the Prophet said, did and (about his TAQRIR, i.e., what the Prophet) saw happening, (being said or done) but did not prohibit it, (and the Sunnah also is what is reported about the Prophet's) characteristics, norms and conduct -- AS-SUNNAT... WA HIA MA ATHAR ANI'N-NABIY... MIN QAL-
IN AU TAQRIR-IN AU SIFAT-IN KHULQIYYAT-IN AU KHULQIYYAT-IN
AU SIRAT.⁸

In brief, al-Sibai tells us in another classical definition, the Sunnah is

What the Prophet is reported to have said, done or confirmed by TAQRIR -- AS-SUNNAT MA NUQIL ANI'N-NABIY... MIN QAL-
IN AU TAQRIR.⁹

The Prophet's TAQRIR means he saw something being done or said without prohibiting it. So, what the Prophet saw being said or done by others, particularly by his Companions (recognized Muslims who accompanied Muhammad during his lifetime) and supporters, and did not object to it, that model of conduct becomes, for the believers, the equivalent of the

Prophet's own Sunnah. For example, what Abu Talib, Abu Dharr, Abu Bakr, Umar, Nuaym and others said and did (discussed in this study) becomes **SUNNAT AN-NABIY**, the Prophet's Sunnah, which must be praised and imitated by believers of all times as long as they do not have information that the Quran or the Prophet condemned it in the same contexts.

Abu'l-Ala Maududi, one of three high deans of the contemporary Resurgent movement and of the Islamic International, (considering Hasan al-Banna and Ayat Allah Khomeini the other two), maintains the Sunnah is based on the Prophet's verdicts/decisions (**FAYSLE**), saying (**IRSHAD**), biddings and forbiddings/commands and interdictions (**AMR-O-NAHY**), **TAQRIR** and permission (**IJAZAT**) and deed (**AMAL**).¹⁰ In a footnote, Maududi calls **TAQRIR** an Islamic "legal term", and explains it as follows: If the Prophet is reported to have observed, without forbidding, an act happening or a current norm practiced by others, such acts and norms of behavior become the Prophet's Tagrir, i.e., Sunnah. The above renders the full sense of Maududi's following note in Urdu:

SHARI ISTILAH MEN TAQRIR SE MURAD YEH HAI KEH HUZUR NE APNE SAMNE KOI KAM HOTE DEKHA HO, YA KOI TARIQAH RAIJ PAYA HO AUR US SE MANA NA KIYA HO. DUSREY ALFAZ MEN TAQRIR KAY MANI HAIN KISI CHEEZ KO BARQARAR RAKHNA.¹¹

All representative Muslim sources, past and present including the above, convincingly show in great detail that it is the Quran, the direct Word of God, which exhorts believers to follow the Prophet's extra-Quran Sunnah, and confirms the Prophet's Companions as ideal practitioners of the Quran and the Sunnah. That the Companions were rightly guided in their behavior is supported also by the Prophet's numerous sayings, these works correctly maintain.¹² Reflecting Muslim consensus of opinion about the Prophet's Companions, al-Sibai asserts

it is indeed proved from their history that they were the most godfearing and the most noble among all generations that humanity has known in the past and present. Islam spread in the world only through them and through their struggle.¹³

According to these accurate explanations, the Sunnah of the

Prophet includes, by definition and implication, his understanding, explications and application of the Quran. Muslim believers may genuinely say that the Quran minus the Sunnah becomes nonsense. As Tabari tells us

knowledge of the interpretation of some of the Quran can be attained only through the explanation given by the Messenger... [in such cases]... no knowledge can be grasped except through explanation given by the Messenger of God to his community... through a test (NASS)... or through an indication (DALALAH) which he has given, pointing his community to its correct interpretation (TC,1:32; bracket and stresses added).

Obviously, the earliest generation of "his community", the Prophet's Companions were the best in their understanding and application of the Quran.

Along with the fact that the Quran exhorts pursuit of the Sunnah, Muslims also believe that the Prophet's extra-Quranic teachings and model of conduct are Divinely inspired and sanctioned, in one way or the other. Maududi (like others) finds convincing evidence within the Quran to prove this point. For example, Maududi argues, the Quran refers to God's specific directions to Muhammad which are not necessarily stated within the canonized text of the Quran. There must be other channels of Divine inspiration for Muhammad, Maududi concludes.¹⁴ Quoting the Quran and Hadith reports, Muhammad Abu Shuhbah of al-Azhar Islamic University tells us of these channels.

Some of the Sunnah was based on clear Revelations through Gabriel..., the Trustee of Revelation; and some of it on inspirations and casting [by the angel as quoted Hadith evidence indicates] in the heart (of the Prophet); and some of it through independent judgment on the basis of what the Prophet learned from the knowledge of the Quran, principles of the Divine Law and emanation of Revelation which filled his heart, and Divine teachings which do not stop with and depend on reading, writing, acquisition and discussion and research --
 WA'S-SUNNAT BADUHA BI-WAHY-IN JALIY AN TARIQ AMIN AL-WAHY
 JIBRIL ALAYHI'S-SALAM WA BADUHA BI'L-ILHAM WA'L-QADHF FI'L-QALB, WA BADUHA BI'L-IJTIHAD ALA HASB MA ALIM AN-NABIY MIN ULUM AL-QURAN, QAWAID ASH-SHARIAT, WA MA IMTALAA BIHI QALBUHU MIN FUYUDAT AL-WAHY, WA'T-TALIM AL-ILAHY AL-LADHI LA YATAWAQQAF ALA QIRAT WA KITABAT WA KASB WA BAHTH.¹⁵

This is almost what Tabari tells us about the Divine nature of the

Prophet's explications of the Quran. The Prophet, Tabari asserts,

could not have come to know (their interpretation) unless God had taught him by inspiring (WAHY) it in him, either through Gabriel or whichever of his envoys He had wished (to use) (TC,1:138).

Acknowledging the Almighty's positive verdicts in the Quran, the Prophet's sayings and logical implications of the meaning of **NADAB ILAYH** "complying with", "Taqrir" and "Dalalah" explained above, we will consider the Prophet's Companions' and his supporters' words and deeds parts of the sacred Sunnah Muslims are expected to imitate - as long as the same sources do not tell us that the Quran or/and the Prophet condemned or corrected such behavior in the same context. Disregarding the Shiite view here, we follow the unanimous Sunnite consensus that the Prophet's Companions including those acceptable to the Shiites were the most ideal practitioners of the Quran and Sunnah.

Islamic Sacred Scriptures.

Islamic Sacred Scriptures containing the Quran and the material about the Sunnah of the Prophet and his Companions are compiled in the following types of works.

1) The Quran. According to all Muslims the Quran in its present form is the authentic collection of Revelations Muhammad received from God during his 23-year Prophetic career ca. 609-632 CE. It is God's direct Word spoken to Muhammad through one or more of the Angels. The Quran was compiled and canonized in its present form within about two decades after the Prophet's death in 632 CE. Undoubtedly it is the most authentic text among traditional religious scriptures.

Disregarding other complicated traditional ways of dividing the Quran into different segments, we may note here that it is also divided into 114 "Chapters" (sing. **SURAH**) of extremely unequal lengths. Each chapter is divided into verses (sing. **AYAT/AYAH**). Each Surah has a title. There is usually a mention or discussion of the title-word or of the title-related theme in the surah. This, however, does not mean that

the whole Surah (such as the Surah **IBRAHIM** (Abraham) is about that theme or the Quranic material about Abraham is exhausted in that Surah. Each Surah is also entitled "Meccan" or "Medinan". It means, in principle, that the entire Surah (not necessarily at once) or most of it was revealed when the Prophet was at that city.

Although the canonized Quran is not compiled in the chronological order of its 'Revelation' during the 23- year period of Muhammad's Prophethood, it is important for Muslims as well as historians and other students of the Quran to know something about the "chronology and circumstances of Revelations" -- **SHAN/ASBAB AN-NUZUL** of each segment of the Quran. Muslims have traditionally preserved the knowledge about the "circumstances of Revelation" of the Quran; Western scholars have done useful work in this regard.¹⁶ The knowledge of "circumstances of Revelations" is necessary for a correct dogmatic interpretation of the Quran. As explained in our discussion of **NASKH**, "abrogation", in this study, in case of apparent or real contradiction between certain passages of the Quran Muslims believe that the passage revealed later overrides those revealed earlier. For example, Q9:1-29 is the final verdict compared to the earlier Meccan or early Medinan "soft verses" we have discussed in detail in Part III, Section 9 of this study.

The canonized Quran is our most important source for this study. The Quran is for Muslims the authentic collection of Revelations -- God's last Book - His last Messenger Muhammad received from God. We study the Quran, however, as mediated by the Sunnah, i.e., as it was understood, explained and practiced by the Prophet and his Companions. This and more information about the Sunnah is provided by the following categories of sacred Islamic Scriptures. [Although, I have in mind particular sources (mentioned below) used for this study, the following explanations are generally applicable to most Traditional works in each category.]

2. **TAFASIR** (sing. **TAFSIR**: "explication, elucidation, explanation, interpretation..."), i.e., commentaries on the Quran. Some Traditional

commentators e.g., al-Tabari, have used the term **TAWIL** (sing.) in the same sense of Tafsir. From this category, we have selected the Tafsir of Tabari (d. 923 CE). We will also occasionally make use of the Tafsir of Ibn Kathir (d. 1373). [For full citations see "The Key and Bibliography of Primary Sources" at the end of this discussion.]

3. SUNAN (sing. **SUNNAH**: "practice, norm, conduct, tradition..."), the so-called Hadith literature (pl. **AHADITH**) means a "report" ascribed to or about the Prophet. The Sunan anthologies are collections of Ahadith arranged topically. Some Sunan anthologies are entitled **SAHIH**, "Correct" or **MUSNAD** (sing.), i.e. authentic. Others might have a different title, but they are all generically **SUNAN** in the sense that they tell us about the Prophet's Sunnah on various topics and issues.

The Sahah Sittah, "Correct Six", i.e., the six multi-volume anthologies of 'authentic' Ahadith by al-Bukhari (d. 870CE), Muslim (d. 875), Abu Dawad (d. 888), al-Tirmidhi (d. 892), al-Nasai (d. 916) and Ibn Majah (d. 886), and also to some extent the Musnads of Ahmad ibn Hanbal (d. 855) and al-Darimi (d. 869) and the Muwatta of Malik bin Anas (d. 795) are our sources for this category.

4. SIYAR (sing. **SIRAH**: "conduct"), **MAGHAZI** (sing. **MAGHAZA**, **GHAZWAH**: "military campaign, expedition") and **TABAQAT** (sing: **TABAQAH**: "class"), i.e, biographies of the Prophet and his Companions. The Maghazi concentrate on the Prophet's military expeditions in a chronological order.

The Sirah of Ibn Ishaq (d. 767 CE), al-Maghazi of al-Waqidi (d. 823) and the Tabaqat of Ibn Sad (d. 844) are our selected sources in this category.

5. TAWARIKH (sing. **TARIKH**: "history") and **QISAS** (sing. **QISSAH**: "story"). Traditional Muslim "Histories" and "Stories" begin with the story of the Creation by God, following the Quranic-Islamic version of the history of 'universe' up to Muhammad's time. After covering the Prophet's period, "the Histories" proceed further, usually, up to the author's lifetime.

The Tarikh of al-Tabari (d. 923 CE) and the Qisas al-Anbiya of al-Kisai (ca. 1200) are our guides from this genre of sacred Islamic literature.

The contents of these works overlap and are interlinked. The difference is in their order and mode of arrangement of the materials. The Quran contains nothing else but the Quran, the direct Word of God. The Quranic contents are arranged neither chronologically nor thematically. Relevant material on a topic of interest may be found in various passages throughout the Quran. Hence, one cannot understand or interpret the Quran meaningfully simply by reading it as a book. A Traditional Tafsir makes the Quran understandable for believers as well as historians. Traditional Tafsirs follow the order of the Quran. They explain, however, each word, phrase, sentence, and passage extensively. Only a few relevant aspects of these multi-dimensional explications may be mentioned here.

An authentic exegesis, Tafsir, of the Quran has to be a Tafsir **BI'L-MATHUR/MANQUL** ("based on the reported"), i.e., based on reports ascribed to the Prophet, his Companions, and "pious" and informed Muslims of the earliest generations, as Tabari will soon tell us. No Tafsir **BI'R-RAY** ("based on opinion") nor any exegesis depending on **AL-ISTIKHRAJ BI'L-UQUL** ("rational inference") as Tabari uses the term in his Tarikh (TT-1,1:8), is authentic for a believer. In the introduction to his Tafsir, Tabari gives an apt example. Referring to the Quran 2:11-2 that forbids "corruption" and ridicules the nonbelievers' "putting things right," Tabari argues that an understanding of these words and phrases on the basis of their common-sense literal meaning will be wrong. "God has given knowledge of (the true meaning of these phrases) only to his Prophet, and which can only be understood through his explanation (TC,1:33-4). After quoting several reports ascribed to the Prophet and his Companions, Tabari asserts

that it is not permitted for anyone to interpret according to his own personal opinion those verses of the Quran whose interpretation can only be known through a text (reporting), the explanation of God's Messenger, or through an indication

towards it which he has given. Moreover, whoever propounds his personal opinion on this will be at fault in what he does, even if he thereby attains the truth, for the very reason of having spoken in this way. For his conclusion will not be that of someone who is sure that he is right, only that of someone who guesses and follows his own surmise; and whoever speaks about God's religion according to his own surmise speaks concerning God what he does not know. God, exalted in His praise, forbade His servants (i.e., human beings) to do this in His Book:... (TC,1:35; stresses and brackets added). [Here, Tabari Quotes Q7:33 according to which, as Tabari uses the Quranic passage, an interpretation of the Quran based on personal opinion will be an "indecent", "sin", "unjust insolence", "associating with God that for which He never sent down authority".]

The criterion for an interpretation of the Quran is not necessarily what is rational or reasonable.

The Messenger of God said: "Whoever speaks according to his own personal opinion concerning the Quran, and is right, is (nevertheless) at fault..." He speaks falsely about God what he does not know, committing thereby a sin which he was commanded not to (TC,1;35; stresses added).

Ibn Masud, a Companion of the Prophet, reports

When one of us had learnt ten verses, he would not go further until he had come to know their meaning and how to act according to them (TC,1:35).

Reports in Tabari which follow the above indicate that it was the Prophet who taught "their meaning". As mentioned before, Tabari tells us this extra-Quranic knowledge of the Prophet was nevertheless Divinely inspired (TC,1:38 quoted above). Tabari sums up his discussion as follows.

We have spoken earlier in our book about the aspects of interpretation of the Quran: that the whole of it can be interpreted according to three aspects. There is no one way of reaching one of them, which is (the interpretation) known only to God and hidden from all His creatures.... [Here Tabari refers to the so-called **MUTASHABIHAT** material of the Quran such as some vague combinations of letters in the beginning of some Surahs, e.g., **ALIF LAM MIM**, and about the exact time of the Hereafter etc.]. The second is [the interpretation] knowledge of which God vouchsafed specifically to His Prophet and to no one else in his community.... And the third is [the interpretation] known to the people who speak the language in which the Quran was sent down... This being the case, then the commentator most successful in reaching the truth, in the interpretation of [that aspect] of the Quran which there is a way for all servants to know, is [, firstly,] the one with the clearest proof for [all] that he interprets and commentates, the one whose interpretation goes back to the Messenger of God alone

to the exclusion of the rest of his community, through Traditions reliably attributable to him, either through an extensive transmission, ...or otherwise through a transmission by righteous, reliable persons, ... or because of an indication establishing their truth; and [, secondly,] the one with the most correct demonstration for [all] that he interprets and explains, knowledge of which he can attain from the language of the day. ...Finally, his interpretation and commentary should not depart from what the pious predecessors among the Companions and the leaders, and the successors among the Followers, and the men of knowledge in the Community, have said (TC,1:40; first pair of brackets added).

So, the commentaries were based on reports ascribed to the Prophet and his Companions relevant to a particular Quranic word or passage. Tabari, e.g., tells the readers, through numerous Mathur statements and narrations how the Prophet and his Companions understood, explained, applied or practiced that particular passage and what were the "circumstances" of its Revelation. Also, like other Traditional exegetes (sing. **MUFASSIR**: one who does the Tafsir), Tabari engages in cross- reference when necessary. This is done, particularly when there are two or more passages, apparently, contradictory in sense. A Traditional Mufassir, based on reports ascribed to the Prophet and his Companions, tells believers which Quranic passage should be the basis of a final verdict or what is the real meaning of each passage.

As indicated in the above quotation, Tabari also uses a linguistic method for his Tafsir. We consider this too a Sunnah-based explication. Tabari's purpose is to clarify how the Quranic language was understood during the Prophet's time. So, a Tafsir is interlinked with the contents of the Quran, Sunan, Siyar, Tabaqat, Tawarikh and the Qisas. In the context of commentaries on a certain passage a Mufassir mentions the same or similar Hadith reports included in relevant chapters of the Sunan, or may refer to events and circumstances of Revelation of the particular Quranic passage which are mentioned in the Siyar-Maghazi-Tabaqat-Tawarikh-Qisas literature in their contexts deemed appropriate chronologically and/or thematically by the compilers.

The Siyar, Maghazi and Tabaqat we have used are primarily chronological biographies of the Prophet and his Companions. Excepting

the *Tabaqat* of Ibn Sad all works of this category used for this study concentrate on the Prophet's background (according to Islamic dogma), life and career. These biographies, however, tell us much about the Prophet's Companions and adversaries. In addition to the Prophet's biography, the *Tabaqat* of Ibn Sad has separate volumes on the Companions and the "Followers" (**TABIIN**), i.e., the first pious Muslim generation following the Companions. In his biographical sketches of the Companions Ibn Sad classifies them in different "classes" -- **TABAQAT** based on Traditional Islamic criteria. Introductory sections and some scattered notes in *Siyar-Maghazi-Tabaqat* literature contain summaries of pre-Muhammad 'universal history'. These aim at an explanation of the Prophet's genealogy, emphasizing Muhammad's importance in the whole Divine cosmic order, e.g., how he was foreseen and foretold by God and His creatures including the past Prophets. These are subjects dealt more comprehensively by the *Tawarikh* and *Qisas*.

While in the *Tafsir* literature biographical sketches, references to particular events, and Hadith reports are dispersed depending on the relevance of a particular Quranic passage, in the *Siyar-Mahazi-Tabaqat* the above materials including Quranic passages are found, broadly, in an Islamic chronological order of the Prophet's life. The author tells us which Quranic passage was revealed when and in what circumstances, and what the Prophet and the Companions said or did on such occasions. Besides, through these *Siyar-Maghazi-Tabaqat* works, we learn the Quran, broadly, in its chronological order of Revelation which makes more sense to an historian. Thus, the Quran itself studied so becomes a history of the 23 years of Muhammad's career. The same or similar reports about the Sunnah arranged topically and thematically in the *Sunan*, are found in the *Siyar-Maghazi-Tabaqat* literature in the context of narrations relevant to particular events.

The *Tawarikh* and *Qisas* are typical (Islamic version of) 'universal histories' except that what is unknown and pre-history for us is real and tangible for these Islamic 'Histories'. For them history begins

clearly with the beginning of the Creation of the universe - knowable and unknowable, visible and invisible - by God, moving along the Islamic chronology of the pre-human Angel-Jinn era and, then, along sacred Prophetic periods from those of Adam to Muhammad and their adversaries. The "Histories" differ from the "stories" in three ways. 1) The "Histories" were traditionally used by the more learned; the "stories" were compiled for popular consumption. 2) The "Histories" continue their narrations of events up to the life-time of the author; they include a full biography of the Prophet and complete treatment of the events of his time. The "Stories", after giving an account of pre-human time, concentrate 'chronologically' on pre-Muhammad Islamic Prophets from Adam to Jesus and their perceived adversaries. Hence they are entitled **QISAS AL-ANBIYA**, "Stories of the Prophets". 3) Thanks to Tabari's being a Tabari, i.e, an Iranian from Tabaristan, compared to the authors of the Qisas he includes a much larger account of secular Iranian pre-history and history, and also of regions north and west of historical Iran.

Both the Tawarikh and Qisas narrate their 'histories' and 'stories' based on quotations from the Quran and reports ascribed to the Prophet, his Companions and the Followers -- **TABIIN**. Hence much of the same material can be found in the Tafsir, Sunan, and Siyar-Maghazi-Tabaqat literature. What we mentioned about the order and intermixture of various kinds of material in the Siyar-Maghazi-Tabaqat, applies to those parts of the "Histories " which describe the life and time of the Prophet.

The fact that these are considered, usually, as Sunnite works does not make our conclusions less authentic or our understanding of Muslim images and treatment of the world beyond Islam on the basis of these sources less representative of Muslim thought in general. Points of differences between Shiite and Sunnite works of Tafsir, Sunan, Sirah, Maghazi, and Qisas are internal. These difference relate to the question of leadership (**IMAMAT/KHILAFAT**) and not to Muslim images and

treatment of non-Muslims and nonconformists. The Shiite may maintain a negative image of most of the Prophet's Companions. This is, however, not because of these Companions' problematic treatment of non-Muslims. The Shiite are critical of Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and their supporters for their usurping Ali's and his progeny's right to leadership. The second category of differences is about correct performance of rituals. Such differences exist among the four main Sunnite schools of law also. Both types of differences have nothing to do with Muslim-non-Muslim or Muslim-nonconformist relations. The only dogmatic difference between the Shiite and Sunnite is about the **MAHDI**, the "(Divinely) Guided" figure who would appear before the Last Day in order to establish an ideal universal Islamic society and state. For the Shiites this Mahdi is the same Twelfth Imam (Muhammad ibn Hasan) who lived during the ninth century and went into occultation in 874 CE. The Shiites believe in his second coming **ZUHUR** ("appearance") as the Mahdi. For the Sunnites, the Mahdi would not necessarily be the same person, the Shiite Twelfth Imam, who, the Sunnites believe, must have died after his disappearance in 874 CE. Regardless of their Sunnite or Shiite versions of the Mahdi, the eschatological materials in both Shiite and Sunnite sources do not indicate a difference in attitudes of the Shiite and Sunnite Mahdis towards non-Muslims. Whether it is the Shiite Mahdi or the Sunnite, both, along with Islamic Jesus, will annihilate the Jews and all other non-Muslims, and will establish a world-wide Dar al-Islam. A cursory look at the Shiite counterparts of Tafsir, Sunan, Siyar, Maghazi, Tabaqat, Tarikh and Qisas will show that their images and treatment of the Jinn, Satan, Qabil (Cain) and Qabilians, the victims of Noah's Deluge, Nimrod, Pharaoh, Abu Jahl, Abd Allah b. Ubayy and other non-Muslims and nonconformists are not different from what the Sunnite sources tell us. Ali is a Shiite hero for, among other things, his prominent role against Meccan 'heathens' and against the Jews of Medina and Khaybar. The Shiites criticize the Sunnites not for their harsh attitude towards non-Muslims, but for their falling victim, according to

the Shiites, after the Prophet's death, to 'Jewish conspiracies'. [See, e.g., Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, Islamic Government, translated by Joint Publications Research Service, Arlington, Virginia (1979):5]. Also note that except for the so-called Sunnite Sunan, other works of Ibn Ishaq, Ibn Hisham, al-Waqidi, Ibn Sad and Tabari are widely used by Shiite writers. Although on specific points mentioned above the Shiite ignore our sources, Tabari and al-Waqidi were occasionally suspected by the Sunnites for their Alavite (Shiite) leanings. The translation and publication of Tabari's Tarikh in Persian in Iran (1973) indicates that there is not much resentment in a Shiite milieu against Tabari. For a revised edition of this work, however, I intend to provide ample cross-references to particular Shiite sources in each category.

The existence of two problems in using al-Kisai's Qisas needs to be acknowledged and discussed. Some learned medieval Muslims expressed reservations about some QUSSAS (sing. QASS: "story teller"). The Qussas were those who narrated the kinds of stories of Creation and Islamic Prophets found in al-Kisai's Qisas. Also, al-Kisai's book is not among the earliest works of Qisas.

Qisas works as a separate genre of sacred Islamic literature appeared after the tenth century CE. W.M. Thackston in his introduction to al-Kisai's The Tales of the Prophets -- QISAS AL-ANBIYA, tells us that

...the first person known to have produced such a book... was also a Quranic commentator, Abu Ishaq Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Thalabi (d. 1036 CE), author of ARAIS AL-MAJALIS: QISAS AL-ANBIYA ("Brides of the Sessions: Tales of the Prophets").¹⁷

These Prophetic tales, however, were already recorded in "the learned" Muslim literature e.g., the Tarikh of Tabari (K:XIII, XXVII) and, through sermons and other means, were in circulation among Muslim masses.

In the more learned literature... the vast information gathered on the pre-Islamic prophets then existed in the form of Quranic commentaries in which case the legends were

of necessity broken up, with elaboration and variant accounts given under the verse or group of verses being treated, or in a form such as one must assume the earliest "universal chronologies" and "books of creation" were written. The oldest extant work of this type is the **TARIKH AL-RUSUL WA'L-MULUK** of Muhammad ibn Jarir al-Tabari (839-923) and his running chronology of all the ancient nations (K:XV).

The institution of story-telling, elaboration of Prophetic stories in the Quran and the Sunan literature, was a part of the Islamic instructional establishment. However

in response to an understandable desire on the part of the common people, who had no access to the learned literature of the commentators and divines, there arose a parallel tradition of the prophets' legends, a popular genre which served a dual purpose, first of satisfying a pious wish for elaboration on the cursory allusions to the prophets found in the Quran and second of providing a form of entertainment for the masses (ibid: XIV).

These Qussas, ("story tellers/narrators") recited from the Quran and "(expounded) on the readings in the great mosques of the empire... which as an institution remained virtually unchanged for centuries" (ibid).

These Qussas were

closely connected with the religious establishment... (They) filled a reputable and influential position. The Qass might perform the duties of the Imam in leading the congregational prayer and also the function of the **QARI** ("reciter") in reading the Quran as well as **KHATIB** ("speaker") in delivering the official sermon, but his prime function was to preach a type of "revivalistic" sermon in which the Quran and Tradition were interpreted and the people were inspired with "fear and hope". The first generation of **QUSSAS** were thoroughly grounded in the religious sciences, as the juridical function of many as well as testimony as to the learnedness and eloquence of many of them shows (ibid; parentheses added).

Beginning with the eighth century CE when the manners and scholarly qualities of some of these **QUSSAS** began to degenerate high mystics and some ulama raised questions about these popular story-tellers' performance. The mystics

criticized them for imitating mystical modes of expression in their preaching while they themselves were no mystics at all... the sessions of some of those called **QUSSAS AL-AMM** ("narrators for the common folk") may have degenerated... the divines ...criticized the lack of learning among those tellers of tales who used Traditions considered weak and untrustworthy...

Yet as Thackston quoting Goldziher notes

(it) was not the practice of preaching [these stories] per se among these narrators that was objected to for "in so far as the QUSSAS served religious ends..., they were left alone and undisturbed in their pious work; official theology gladly tolerated these free preachers and popular theologians, who in street or mosque condescended to the level of the understanding of the people" (K:XV; brackets and stresses added).

Beginning with the eleventh century the Qisas works (like works in other categories) began to be standardized by the ulama. Abd al-Rahman ibn al-Jawzi (1126-1200) was one of these standardizers. Ibn al-Jawzi was an orthodox Hanbalite jurisconsult, Traditionist, historian and preacher. "Among his chief teachers were some of the most famous ulama of his time.... (He) vigorously defended the Sunnah".¹⁸ Ibn al-Jawzi insisted that in their elaborations of the Prophetic tales story tellers should have thorough knowledge of the Quran and Tradition and should be able to extract and relate materials from history books.¹⁹

It was after this period of standardization of the Qisas that al-Kisai's Qisas al-Anbiya (Tales of the Prophets) appeared on the scene. Uncertainties exist about al-Kisai's exact name and time. Most modern researchers accept Abu Jafar Muhammad Abd Allah as the name. For T. Nagel the oldest manuscripts of al-Kisai's Qisas date from the 13th century ("Al-Kisai", El², 5:176). Thackston believes it "was written not long before 1200 CE" (K:XIX). Nagel also tells us correctly that "very famous and widely-spread books on this subject were (those of)... al-Thalabi (d. 1036) and the different versions of the Qisas written down in the name of a certain Muhammad b. Abd Allah al-Kisai ("Kisas al-Anbiya", El², 5:180).

So, al-Kisai's Tales of the Prophets as a representative work of the Qisas is selected for the following reasons. In this category, it is the earliest and least controversial work of the post-standardization period. Al-Thalabi's Qisas had appeared before this period. As Thackston has observed al-Thalabi is more mystically oriented and has some stylistic problems (K:XVI). For our general purpose of selecting

sources more acceptable to orthodox Shariah-minded circles, al-Kisai is more suitable. The honorific adjectives (**AL-SHAYKH AL-IMAM AL-ALIM AL-ALLAMAH**) inscribed with his name on the title-page of the traditional Arabic manuscript (ed. Isaac Eizenberg, Leiden, 1923) indicate that al-Kisai was perceived as a competent and respected orthodox scholar in the Muslim world. "The medieval story tellers (**QUSSAS**)... apparently held al-Kisai in high esteem"; (T. Nagel, "Al-Kisai", *EI*², 5:176). Among the recent pro-Sunnah authors mentioned above and below none mentions al-Kisai as an objectionable work.

For the basic elements of the pre-Muhammad Prophetic stories al-Kisai includes the material in al-Thalabi. Hajj Khalifa believes that **NAFAIS AL-ARAIIS**, a Persian medieval translation of al-Kisai's Qisas, is "a recension of al-Thalabi" (K:xxxiii). Although Thackston does not agree with this, he admits that al-Thalabi, Tabari and some other earlier "comprehensive compilers" formed the basis for al-Kisai (*ibid*) A comparison of al-Kisai's Qisas to the relevant parts of Tabari's *Tarikh* will show similarities in most cases. As a matter of fact, for the kind of material we are interested in for this study much is common between al-Thalabi and al-Kisai. On the other hand al-Kisai includes neither al-Thalabi's *sufistic* material nor the legends about some Muslim figures of the Prophet's time and after, e.g., legends about Amir Hamzah which may genuinely be termed as unauthentic by the learned Traditionists.

Whether it is al-Kisai's "stories" or other Traditional legends in the *Tafsir-Sunan-Tarikh* literature,

for the majority of Muslims, for the broad layers of the population in the Near and Middle East (and in the entire Muslim world), these are true stories, they are part of history.²⁰

The Qisas as they exist in the same category (or in other categories of Islamic Sacred Scriptures)

must be considered as the vivid expression of the religious feeling of the average medieval Muslims. It is in this respect that al-Kisai's Qisas *al-Anbiya* are sources of great value for scholars who want to carry out further

investigations of the popular religious life of the Islamic world, a task which has been somewhat neglected up till now (T. Nagel, "Al-Kisai", El², 5:176).

Al-Kisai's Qisas in its various versions and translations in numerous Islamicate languages has been the most widely-read (and listened-to) book in all parts of Muslim world for centuries. Practically, it was used more than all other sacred Islamic scriptures including the Quran. While parts of the Quran are recited by every Muslim for ritual purposes, mostly without understanding the meaning, the Qisas, through reading, listening and sermons, were enjoyed, understood and appreciated.

It must be mentioned that even in modern times the legends retained their importance for edifying sermons as is proved by Abd al-Wahhab an-Najjar's compilation [Qisas al-Anbiya ("Stories of the Prophets")], which was published in Egypt in the thirties of this century... (the Qisas) are abundant source of study of religious feeling and thinking of the average medieval Muslim (T. Nagel, "Qisas al-Anbiya", El², 5:180; brackets and parentheses added).

Let us not forget that

all the tales of the prophets from Adam to Muhammad are in origin interpretations of the relevant passages of the Quran... The beginning and the end of every legend is completely Traditional, containing references to the Quran and to the Hadith, the Tradition.²¹

Whether in the Qisas or in other categories, there is nothing in these legends that contradicts the Quran or the Sunan. The broad outlines of what may be fantastic for us are provided by the Quran. Besides, the Quran and, consequently, the believers are not concerned with facts the way a modern researcher, rationalist or scientist may be. The purpose of these stories, as the Quran tells us, is to show the goodness and imminent victories of the believers and the wretchedness and eventual damnation of nonbelievers. Occasional differences between two reports about the same story does not make a difference for a believer as long as these reports conform with the above purpose.

The Quran's and the Prophet's images and treatment of his contemporary adversaries and the described modes of relations between perceived believers and nonbelievers of the past are extraordinarily

similar. This and the information provided, unwittingly, by Islamic material about the "circumstances of Revelations" and about relevant events during the Prophet's life-time may be internal evidences leading one to think that the past was concocted. A believer's logic, however, works in reverse. For the believers, Islamic descriptions of the past are authentic because they conform with the Quranic prescriptions about --and with the Prophet's historical treatment of -- nonconformists and non-Muslims during the Prophet's life-time. A believer would have doubted the authenticity of these legends concerning believer-nonbeliever relations in the past, had the Quran's and the Prophet's images and treatment of Abu Jahl and Abd Allah b. Ubayy been radically different. Given the Quran's confirmation of the broad outlines of these legends along with their miraculous dimensions and along with the Quran's demand to believe in **AL-GHAYB** ("the Unseen") and in the 'fact' that the Almighty is capable of doing whatever He wills -- **YAFAL MA YASHA**, skeptical references to the fantastic aspects of these stories do not make sense to a believer.

From the Muslim point of view, the lives of the pre-Islamic Prophets are awful examples (**IBAR**) warning against the evil fate of those who are disobedient to God and His Messengers. Thus the Qisas al-Anbiya became part of universal history, as history in general was often considered as a series of **IBAR** (cf. Tabari, Tarikh, preface and pre-Islamic period)... It was the Prophet of Islam who gave to those legends an entirely new meaning, finding the events of his own life reflected in them (T. Nagel, "Qisas al-Anbia", El², 5:180).

Finally, we address a general confusion that might be created about some of our primary sources by the Resurgent activists. What we call the Reformist trends in Appendix I-B have made Resurgent activists aware of the fact that the contents of sacred Islamic scriptures could be deleterious to modern sensitivities. In their journalistic writings or during debates, the Resurgent activists confronted with such embarrassing material adopt two tactics, demonstrating either their sheer ignorance or disingenuousness.

1) They quote certain Quranic passages out of their contexts translating them in modern language which apparently oppose or

contradict the embarrassing material. We have dealt with this issue in our discussion of "the Soft Verses" in Part III, Section 9, and also in Appendix III.

2) The Resurgent activists dismiss the embarrassing material in Islamic sources by remarking rhetorically that these reports are not in authentic sources of information about the Sunnah. They say this without specifying the 'authentic' sources. Sometimes, they give the impression (which they do not mean) that the Sunnah is determined only by the Sahah Sitta (the six SUNAN works of al-Bukhari, Muslim, al-Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud, al-Nasai and Ibn Majah, those of al-Bukhari and Muslim known as **SAHIHAYN**, "The Two [Most] Correct Ones") or, more specifically, by the Sahihayn of al-Bukhari and Muslim (or by their Shiite counterparts if the interlocutor is a Shiite). In the same context they refer to an 'early Jewish conspiracy' that mixed, among other things, **ISRILYYAT**, i.e., material in sacred Islamic sources. They also remark that it is up to the learned in specific Islamic 'sciences' to decide which reports are applicable. Here, they want to refer to the so-called **ILM AL-HADITH** ("science of Hadith"), particularly its two interrelated branches: **JARH WA** ("and") **TADIL** and **ASMA AL-RIJAL**. **JARH** ("disparaging, scrutiny, criticism") traditionally means harsh criticism of unreliable transmitters of reports about the Sunnah and the consequent rejection of such reports. **TADIL** ("adjustment, declaring trustworthy") means agreement with reports about the Sunnah transmitted by supposedly reliable channels. The two terms are used as a single compound term: **JARH WA TADIL**. The specialty of **ASMA AL-RIJAL** ("names of the men") deals with an examination of transmitters of reports about the Sunnah, following some traditional criteria.

These anticipated objections may be answered 1) by an understanding of the nature of the so-called **ILM AL-HADITH** and 2) by knowing how orthodox and Resurgent scholars themselves treat the Sunan, Tafasir, Siyar, Maghazi and Tawarikh, particularly those we have used as primary sources.

KITAB AL-SHAHAWI FI MUSTALAH AL-HADITH by Ibrahim Dusuqi Al-Shahawi, a professor of Islamic law at al-Azhar, and AL-JARH WA'L-TADIL by Abu Lababah Husayn, a graduate of al-Azhar, are two of many orthodox modern works in this field.²²

Like all other authors in this field, Abu Lababah Husayn explains at length the importance of the Sunnah and how the earliest generations made efforts to preserve the material about the Sunnah. Husayn, like others, acknowledges that during the two centuries or so after the Prophet's death in 632 CE spurious reports infiltrated the Sunnah corpus, but the learned, Husayn and others argue, eventually separated the unreliable from reliable and acceptable reports through various techniques. These authors tell us in detail about the categorization of reports concerning the Sunnah based on an examination of the ISNAD, "chains of transmitters" etc. Disregarding this literature's technical and verbose discussion of traditional methods and dimensions of the "science of Hadith", e.g., their complex and inconclusive categorization of reports about the Sunnah, all the authors assume that unacceptable reports were eventually expunged from the sacred literature and that what remained, e.g., our sources, are acceptable. Responding to Western orientalist's and Muslim Reformist's objections, the above mentioned orthodox and Resurgent authors defend our primary sources. Even al-Kisai is not mentioned specifically as an unreliable source.

A word about the ISRAILIIYYAT: Here we are not concerned with an objective evaluation of the claim (which is true, from a scholarly point of view) that a great amount of the material in Islamic scriptures is taken from Jewish sources. The critics particularly refer to three of the Prophet's Companions: Abd Allah bin Salam, Kab al-Ahbar and Wahb bin Munabbih, converts to Islam with a Jewish-Yamanite background. Reports ascribed particularly to Kab and Wahb (who in most cases ascribe these reports to the Prophet Muhammad) dominate Islamic stories of the pre-Muhammad past. Past and contemporary Muslim works on Ilm al-Hadith are very specific about fabricated (sing. MAUDU) Hadith reports and

their untrustworthy transmitters whom they call "liars" (sing. **KADHIB** or **KADH-DHAB**, "a great liar"). Almost all of these works mention a long list of such "liars" and their "fabricated" reports (see, e.g., Al-Shahawi, KITAB:51-63 passim; Husayn, Al-Jarh:108-57 passim). None of these, however, includes Abd Allah bin Salam, Kab and Wahb among the "liars" nor do these works refer to any one of our sources as untrustworthy for their "fabricated" reports. Some modern orthodox ulama admit that a few reports might have wrongly been ascribed to these Companions, but, as in other cases, these ulama do not specify such reports. It is these Companions' (and others') reliability which is emphasized by the Orthodox. "Kab and Wahb", the orthodox believe, "should be considered as reliable transmitters and good Muslims who never have tried to corrupt Islam with Jewish legends and doctrines."²³

The Sunnah are not the only sources of information about the Prophet's words, deeds and silent approvals (sing: **TAQRIR**). Historically, the Siyar-Maghazi works were compiled long before typical Sunan sources came into existence. The whole corpus of Tafasir, Siyar, Maghazi, Tabaqat, Tawarikh and Qisas came into existence, was preserved and remained in use to serve a basic purpose: to know about the Sunah of the Prophet and his Companions and about their understanding, elaborations, and explanations of the Quran. The compilation of typical Sunan works after the seventh century was influenced by specific needs and interests of the medieval Muslim society. Yet, other categories of sacred Islamic scriptures were not discarded.

A look at lists of contents of the Sunan will show that the compilers were most concerned with the Sunnah about tenets of faith, various Islamic rites and things related to inter-Muslim transactions, personal and business law and women.²⁴ The compilers took it for granted that believers knew correct Islamic images and treatment of the world beyond Islam. Thanks to medieval Islam's domination and lack of any political or ideological challenge, Muslims did not need to be told

in separate "Parts" (sing. **FASL**) or Chapters (sing. **BAB**) about how to treat a **KAFIR** (heathen, non-Muslim), **MUNAFIQ** (i.e, nonconformist), **ZINDIQ** (heretic) or a **DHIMMI** (a non-Muslim living in a Muslim-ruled society) because instructions were interspersed throughout the Quran. Besides, existing Siyan-Maghazi-Tawarikh works disseminated by various means served the purpose. Yet, much of the information in the above categories of sources can be found (mostly in briefer form, but occasionally in more details) in the Sunan. For example, as we have mentioned in Part III, Section 9, Segment 1, what Ibn Sad tells us in his *Tabaqat* about Abu Dharr's behavior towards non-Muslim women is recorded more clearly in the Sahih of Muslim.

Although Maududi in particular and Abu Shuhbah and al-Sibai in general (for reasons discussed elsewhere in this study) do not specify categorically authoritative sources of information about the Sunnah, it is obvious in their elaborations that they, like other contemporary and past orthodox circles, project as authentic all the Tafsir-Sunan-Maghazi-Tarikh sources we use for this study. As a matter of fact, according to Maududi's thesis, all that has been accepted by a majority of Muslims during the last thirteen centuries as such is the Sunnah.²⁵

The material in Maududi's Sunnat was generated by some Pakistani Reformists' and legal experts' reservations about the authenticity of the Sunnah and related sources. Justice Muhammad Shafi, e.g., had remarked, among other things, that references in the Sunan are too vague and brief to determine the Sunnah on some issues. Responding to this Maududi correctly told the Justice that further explanations are to be found in other relevant categories of sources.²⁶ This is a conclusion of Maududi's long discussion (pp. 292-391) in which he refers with approval to almost all of our sources, directly or indirectly, as authentic sources telling us about the Sunnah of the Prophet and his Companions on various issues. In his references to Ibn Ishaq, Ibn Sad, Tabari, and our Sunan authors, it is clear that Maududi accepts their works as genuine sources for the determination of the Sunnah.²⁷ Abu

Shuhbah, al-Sibai and others do the same. They defend all the material and sources about which Western orientalists and Muslim Reformists have raised questions. They do not discard categorically any one of our primary sources as unrepresentative of Islamic thought.

In addition to Maududi, Abu Shuhbah and al-Sibai, the authors in another pro-Sunnah work published by Zakariyya Ali Yusuf follow the same line of argument.²⁸

In this work, Sayyid Sulayman Nadawi explains three basic points.²⁹ First, under the subtitle **AL-HADITH TARIKH AL-ISLAM** ("Hadith, i.e., History of Islam"), Nadawi argues as follows: the Quran was revealed to be practiced; it was not a mere theoretical call. The Prophet, his Companions and their Followers were the ideal practitioners of the Quran. What Nadawi wants to tell us is this: The Prophet, his Companions and the earliest generations of Muslims acted according to the spirit of the Quran. What is the source of our information about their deeds? Nadawi tells us that it is "history" that tells us how the Prophet, his Companions and their followers practiced the Quran. That is to say that information about this "Golden History of Islam" -- **TARIKH AL-ISLAM AL-DHAHABI**, as Nadawi terms the era of the Prophet and earliest Muslim generations, is to be found beyond the texts of the Quran and typical Sunan works.

Second, it is obvious that Nadawi uses the term "al-Hadith" in its Islamic generic sense, i.e., "reports" about the Prophet and his Companions. Here, Nadawi maintains correctly that "the greatest component" of such report is "historical" and "above (any critical) discussion and controversy".³⁰ That is, these reports must be accepted as they are. It is also obvious that by talking of "historical reports" "about the Prophet, his noble Companions and events related to them and about their noble deeds," Nadawi refers to the "historical" material in the Tafasir, Siyar, Maghazi, Tabaqat, Tawarikh and Qisas.

Third, referring to the classical categorization of "reports" ascribed to the Prophet and his Companions, Nadawi explains the orthodox

point of view about the "weak" (**DAIF**) and "popularly known" (**MASHHUR**) "reports" whose "chains of transmission" (**ISNAD**) are not as perfect as the two best categories of "reports" known as **SAHIH** ("sound") and **HASAN** ("fair") with a perfect **ISNAD**. As for the "weak reports", they may not be used as the basis for issuing **AHKAM** (sing. **HUKM**), i.e., legal statutes, by-laws and verdicts, Nadawi tells us. In Islamic legal language it simply means that such "reports" may not be the basis for calling a ritual practice or something related to the dogma or business and personal law legal or illegal. As for the "popularly known" Ahadith, they cannot be discarded as basis for action -- **LUZUM AL-AMAL BIHI** as long as they do not contradict the Quran (as explained by the Sunnah) or by more authentic Hadith report or by the more authentically reported acts of the Companions.³¹ As expected, all the contributors to Yusuf's **DIFA** mention our sources and more in various contexts as authentic works.

A few more examples: Ahmad Muhammad Shakir in his introduction to Tabari's **Tafsir** calls it "this glorious/ revered exegesis" -- **HADHA'L-TAFSIR AL-JALIL** (TS,1:6). For Shakir, "it is the greatest of the commentaries (of the Quran) he has ever seen" -- **WA HU-A AZAM TAFSIR RAAAYNA** and that Tabari "deserves... to be called the vanguard/leader of all commentators (of the Quran)" -- **ISTAHAQQ BIHI MUALLIFUHU... AN YUSAMMA IMAM AL-MUFASSIRIN** (*ibid*:16). Among contemporary Muslim translators and commentators of the Quran Abdullah (Abd Allah) Yusuf Ali (1872-1952) is the most popular. (Cf. his The Holy Quran, Lahore, Pakistan, 1977 and other editions.) Abdullah Yusuf Ali begins his list of authentic commentaries on the Quran with "the monumental work of Abu Jafar Muhammad Ibn Jarir Tabar".³² The Meaning of the Quran (a commentary on the Quran) and Muhammad Asad in his The Message of the Quran (1980: a translation and exegesis of the Quran) like all other exegetes after Tabari's time refer to his Tafsir, among other sources, as an authentic source for the explanation of the Quran. In his list of "Works of Reference" which form the basis of Asad's commentaries on the

Quran, he includes all of our sources except al-Kisai's Qisas (See pp. IX-X).

The Key and the Bibliography
of the Main Primary Sources

The Key. (The Key letters on the left used as references in this study refer to the item numbers on the right as in the following bibliography. Pending the preparation of a separate bibliography of secondary and other sources (along with a key list) cited throughout this study, it is to be noted here that E1 and E1² refer to The Encyclopedia of Islam (E.J. Brill, Leiden), first and second editions respectively).

* No key letters (e.g., (15:4) refers to			
* AbH	"	"	7
* AD	"	"	11
* Bu	"	"	8
* IH-MFS	"	"	5/A
* 1.1	"	"	2/A
* 1.1-IH	"	"	5/B
* 1.1-Ibn Hisham Notes	"	"	5/B
* 1.1-MFS	"	"	2/B
* IK-U	"	"	17
* IM	"	"	10
* IS	"	"	6
* IS-DSB	"	"	6
* IS-IA	"	"	6
* K	"	"	16
* M	"	"	3
* Mu	"	"	9
* Mu-MFA	"	"	9
* N	"	"	13
* Q	"	"	1
* T	"	"	14/A
* TB	"	"	14/C
* TC	"	"	14/D
* Tir.	"	"	12
* TS	"	"	14/B
* TT	"	"	15/B

* TT (39)	"	"	15/A
* TT-I	"	"	15/B
* TT-P	"	"	15/C
* TT-U	"	"	15/A
* W	"	"	4

**THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE MAIN PRIMARY SOURCES (IN
CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER).**

1. Allah, The Almighty (Revealed ca 690-632 CE),
The Quran [Cited as Q as in Q3:4-5 means verses number 4 to 5 in the Surah number 3 of the Quran. If no letter cited, e.g., 4:5-10), it means the quotation is from the Quran: Surah 4, verses 5 to 10).
2. Ibn Ishaq, Abu Bakr Muhammad (d. 767),
SIRAT RASUL ALLAH ("Biography of the Messenger of God"). [A SIRAH work].
A. Edited and translated with an introduction by A. Guillaume under the title of The Life of Muhammad, Oxford University Press (1955), printed in Karachi, Pakistan, sixth impression (1980), one volume. [Cited as 1.1]
B. AL-SIRAT AL-NABAWIYYAH, ("The Prophet's Biography"), (ed.) Muhammad Fahmi al-Sarjani Sirjani, 4 vols., Cairo (1978). [Cited as 1.1-MFS]
3. Malik bin Anas (d. 795),
AL-MUWATTA, [a SUNAN work] (ed.) Ahmad Ratib Armoush, Dar al-Nafais, Cairo (?). [Cited as M. Wensinck's reference abbreviation MA changed into M]
4. al-Waqidi, Muhammad ibn Umar (d. 823),
KITAB AL-MAGHAZI ("Book of the Expeditions") [a MAGHAZI work], 3 vols., continuous page numbering, edited in Arabic by Marsden Jones, Oxford University Press, London (1966). A Beirut Print (?) [Cited as W]
5. Ibn Hisham, Abu Muhammad Abd al-Malik (d. 833),
A. AL-SIRAT AL-NABAWIYYAH ("The Prophet's Biography") [a SIRAH-], (ed.) Muhammad Fahmi AlSarjani/Sirjani, 4 vols., Cairo (1978). [Cited as IH-MFS]
B. "Ibn Hisham's Notes" in Guillaume's translation of Ibn Ishaq's SIRAT RASUL ALLAH entitled The Life of Muhammad, op. cit. [Cited as 1.1-IH or 1.1-Ibn Hisham Notes]
6. Ibn Sad, Abu Abd Allah Muhammad (d. 844),
KITAB AL-TABAQAT AL-KABIR ("Great Book of Classes") [a 'TABAQAT' work], 8 vols., (ed.) Ihsan Abbas, Dar Sadir Beirut (?) [Cited as IS, IS-DSB or IS-IA. In rare cases IS refers to the edition and system of reference used by Wensinck. In such cases I have changed Wensinck's I.S. to IS].
7. Ahmad bin Hanbal (d. 855),
Musnad, i.e., the Authentic collection of Hadith reports by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal. [A SUNAN work]. In my use of the Musnad of Ahmad bin Hanbal, I have entirely depended on the short reference notes in

- A.J. Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition (Leiden, 1960) except that I have changed Wensinck's citation abbreviation A.b.H. into AbH.
8. al-Bukhari, Abu Abd Allah Muhammad bin Ismail (d. 870),
SAHIH AL-BUKHARI ("The Correct [i.e., Authentic Anthology of Ahadith by] al-Bukhari") [a SUNAN work], 9 vols., with a brief introduction by Ahmad Muhammad Shakir who maintains that it is a correct copy of al-Bukhari's text used by most of the medieval Muslim commentators and exegetes. Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi, Cairo (?) [Cited as Bu.]
 9. Muslim, Abu'l-Husayn ibn al-Hajj, al-Qushayri (d. 875),
SAHIH MUSLIM ("The Correct [i.e., Authentic Anthology of Ahadith by Muslim]") [a SUNAN work], 5 vols., ed. by Muhammad Fuad Abd al-Baqi, Cairo, 1955-6. [Cited as Mu according to Wensinck edition or Mu-MFA when above edition used directly.]
 10. Ibn Majah, al-Hafiz Abd Allah Muhammad bin Yazid (d. 886),
SUNAN, ed. Muhammad Fuad Abd al-Baqi, Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi (Publications), Egypt (1975), 2 vols. [changing Wensinck's I.M., cited as IM]
 11. Abu Dawud, Sulayman ibn al-Ashath (d. 888),
SUNAN, ed. Muhammad Muhy al-Din Abd al-Hamid, 4 vols., Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi (Publications), [changing Wensinck's A.D., cited as AD]
 12. al-Tirmidhi, Muhammad bin Isa bin Surah (d. 892),
SAHIH AL-TIRMIDHI BI-SHARH AL-IMAM IBN AL-ARABI AL-MALIKI ("Tirmidhi's Anthology of Correct [Ahadith] along with Commentaries by al-Imam ibn al-Arabi al-Maliki") [a Sunan work], 13 vols., Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi Beirut (?) [Cited as Tir.]
 13. al-Nasai, Ahmad bin Shuayb (d. 916),
SUNAN. For Nasai's Sunan, I have entirely depended on short notices in Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition op. cit., except that I have changed Wensinck's citation abbreviation "NAS" into N.
 14. al-Tabari, Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Jarir (d. 923),
JAMI AL-BAYAN AN TAWIL AY AL-QURAN ("The Comprehensive Exposition of the Interpretation of the Verses of the Quran"); generally known as TAFSIR AL-TABARI, "Tabari's Commentaries (on the Quran)". 30 vols. Among the following editions, the first two are used extensively, others occasionally.
 - A. Shirkat Maktabah wa Matbaah Mustafa al-Babi al-Halabi, Cairo (1954). [Cited as T]
 - B. Eds. Mahmud Muhammad Shakir and Ahmad Muhammad Shakir, Turath al-Islam (Publications), Dar al-Maarif, Egypt (Cairo) (1955). [Cited as TS]

- C. A particular Beirut edition [Cited as TB]
- D. The Commentary on the Quran... [An abridged translation of Tabari's Tafsir] by J. Cooper, vol. 1; Oxford University Press (1987). [Cited as TC]

15.

TARIKH AL-RUSUL WA'L-MULUK ("History of Messengers and Kings"). Some older editions are entitled TARIKH AL-UMAM WA'L-MULUK ("History of Nations/Peoples and Kings"); generally known as TARIKH AL-TABARI ("Tabari's History") or Annales of Tabari. Traditionally, the Tarikh is divided into 15 volumes. The number of volumes in modern editions varies. I have used the following different editions, the first two more extensively.

- A. TARIKH AL-UMAM WA'L-MULUK, eds. "A Select Number of Great Ulama" -- NUKHBAT-UN MIN AL-ULAMA AL-AJILLA, Matbaah al-Istiqamah, Cairo (1939). [Cited as TT-U or TT(39)]
- B. TARIKH AL-TABARI: TARIKH AL-RUSUL WA'L-MULUK, ed. Muhammad Abu'l-Fazl Ibrahim, DHAKHAIR AL-ARAB (publications), Dar al-Maarif, Egypt (1960). [Cited as TT-I or TT]
- C. TARIKH-E-TABARI YA TARIKH AL-RUSUL WA'L-MULUK, translated (into the Persian) by Abu'l-Qasim Payandeh, Foundation of Culture of Iran (Tehran) (1973). [Cited as TT-P]

16. al-Kisai, Abu Jafar Muhammad Abd Allah (ca.1200),

QISAS AL-ANBIYA ("The Tales of the Prophets"), translated from the Arabic with notes by W.M. Thackston, JR, Twayne Publishers, Boston (1978). [Cited as K]

Consulted Arabic edition, ed. Isaac Eisenberg, QISAS AL-ANBIY LI'L-SHAYKH AL-IMAM AL-ALIM AL-ALLAMAH MUHAMMAD BIN ABD ALLAH AL-KISAI, Leiden, 1922.

17. Ibn Kathir, Imad al-Din Ismail ibn Umar (d. 1373),

TAFSIR. I have used TAFSIR-I-IBN-I-KATHIR (Urdu) which is an annotated translation of Ibn Kathir's Tafsir into Urdu language by three famous orthodox Deobandi ulama: 1) Abu Muhammad Junaqarhi, 2) Ashraf Ali Thanavi, 3) Anzar Shah Kashmiri; 30 small vols. Published by Maktabah Fayz al-Quran, Deoband (India) (?). [Cited as IK-U]

For the Sunan works and, occasionally for Ibn Sad's Tabaqat I have mostly used Wensinck's references based on the particular editions he has used (see A.J. Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition, Leiden (1960): VII-XVIII). I have, however, frequently checked my particular editions mentioned in the bibliography. I found all the material in these editions in Arabic to which Wensinck refers in his

Handbook. For the Sunan works of al-Nasai, al-Darimi and Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, I have entirely depended on Wensinck's short references. As indicated in the above bibliography and key list, I have made changes in some of Wensinck's "Key-Reference" patterns. Wensinck's Bu and Mu for the Sahihayn of al-Bukhari and Muslim, respectively and Tir. for the Sahih of al-Tirmidhi are maintained.

Wensinck uses Roman and fat figures to describe volumes, **KITAB** ("Book") etc. and normal figures to indicate chapters (sing. **BAB**) sub-sections etc. I have tried to simplify this in order to conform with the Key-reference system I have used for other sources. Generally, the key letters which indicate the source are followed by a comma followed by the volume or **KITAB** ("Book") or Surah number followed by a colon followed by the **BAB** ("chapter/section") or Verse (only for the Quran) or page numbers. In some cases, I have indicated particular Hadith numbers.

Some Examples:

* Key, 4:6

- 4 = **KITAB** ("Book") number for most of the Sunan
or
= Surah number of the Quran
or
= Volume number for Tabari's Tafsir and Tarikh, Ibn Sad's Tabaqat and Ibn Hanbal's Musnad.
- 6 = **BAB** ("Section...") number in the Book 4 of the Sunan
or
= page number, e.g., in the volume 4 of Tabari's Tafsir-Tarikh...
or
= verse number in the Surah 4 of the Quran (If extended, e.g., :6-10, it means verses 6 through 10).

* Key:7-9 (as in W:7-9 or 1.1:7-9 or K:7-9):

This indicates that either the work is in a single volume as Ibn Ishaq's Sirah (tr. Guillaume) and al-Kisai's Qisas or it follows a continuous page number-

ing system, though multi-volume, as al-Waqidi's al-Maghazi. In all the above cases figures following the colon(:) indicate page numbers.

Translations.

Except for the following, I am responsible for the translation or interpretation of the material in the sources I have used. Most of these sources are in the Arabic language; some are in Persian and Urdu.

For the translation of the Quran, specifically in brief or large quotations, I have depended entirely on A.J. Arberry (1980), Abdullah Yusuf Ali (1977), Mohammad Marmaduke Pickthall (1959) and Muhammad Asad (1980), Arberry having the largest share. I have added the verse numbers to Arberry's translation. Because of his Ahmadi connection, I have avoided using the Quran's translation by Maulana Muhammad Ali (1917/1973), which may be unacceptable by the orthodox. Yet, a few examples of Muhammad Ali's translations may be found in this study. I apologize for not specifying in each passage I have quoted. Students of the Quran in English, however, are familiar with different styles of the five learned translators of the Quran. In some cases for the same Quranic passage I have taken phrases or words from more than one of the above translators - thinking that the meaning of the Quran is expressed better in some phrases by a particular translator and for other phrases by another translator. Had it not been for the time-consuming process of locating the verse numbers in their traditional places, I would have preferred to depend entirely on Arberry. (For genuine stylistic-thematic reasons, Arberry does not note the verse numbers at the beginning or end of each traditional verse.)

A few of my early notes from Ibn Sad's Tabaqat, were based on S. Moinul Haq's (SMH) English translation (Pakistan Historical Society, 1967/1972). I retranslated and adjusted most of relevant passages on the basis of Ibn Sad's **DAR SADIR** Beirut Arabic text (IS-DSB). For any remaining traces of the above mentioned translation I hereby register my indebtedness to S. Moinul Haq.

As indicated in the bibliography, I have used the English transla-

tion of A. Guillaume for the Sirah of Ibn Ishaq-Ibn Hisham, and that of W.M. Thackston for al-Kisai's Qisas. When using material directly from the Arabic editions of the above two works, I have indicated so. Quotations in Arabic from the same are obviously from their Arabic editions.

During the last stages of this study, I had access to J. Cooper's English translation (Oxford University Press, 1987) of the Volume 1 of Tabari's Tafsir. I have indicated so (by the initial TC,1:) when used. It was too late to benefit from the ongoing invaluable translation and publication (by State University of New York Press) of Tabari's Tarikh under the general editorship of Ehsan Yar-Shater. I do not think I have used this translation for quoting Tabari's Tarikh. I must have indicated if I have done so during the final adjustments of the draft. When quoting or referring to the primary sources, occasionally, on the basis of some secondary works (such as the Prophet's biographies by Watt, Rodinson and Lings) I have indicated so. In such or other cases, however, I apologize for any forgetfulness.

Transliteration and Transcription.

Transliteration of material from Arabic and other Islamicate languages into Latin based scripts is in a state of chaos. It becomes more chaotic when one has to deal with more than one Islamicate language in the same study. In addition to some specific Continental (German, French, etc.) patterns there are three main systems of transliteration used by Islamists writing in English: 1) "English", 2) "International" which should be called Euro-international and 3) that of The Encyclopedia of Islam (A.J. Brill, Leiden). In addition to the fact that the alphabets of Islamicate languages contain a number of letters for which the Latin-based scripts have no equivalents, the differences among the alphabets and phonological patterns of Islamicate languages pose specific problems and cause further inconsistencies in transliteration. As Latin and Greek have done to Western languages, Arabic, Persian and, to some extent, Turkish have permeated almost all Asian and African languages

used by Muslims. The usage and pronunciation of originally Arabic and/or Persian words in other Islamicate languages are influenced by local phonological patterns and special grammatical rules of these languages. The case becomes more complicated when the Arabic vocabulary is transmitted through a second intermediary language such as the Persian to a third language such as Urdu or Turkish. Evolutions and changes within each language cause further complications. [Knowledge of modern Turkish written in Latin script and of Urdu as it has evolved in Pakistan may not be a sufficient guide to Ottoman Turkish and the pre-twentieth century Urdu (Hindustani)]. A variety of 'systems' devised unsystematically by writers in different Muslim countries to transcribe into Latin-based scripts creates yet another problem.

Some examples: Ibn Sad according to the current Arabist-English system of transliteration will be **IBN SA'D** with a specific diacritical sign (an inverted apostrophe or small c to represent the guttural/emphatic sound of the Arabic character **AYN**) superscribed just after A. The same will be the case with the name of the famous Persian poet/author, Sadi. Though both words are borrowed from Arabic, as pronounced in Persian, using the standard English Arabist system will be SA'D and SA'DI with a different diacritic, an apostrophe/inverted c/comma superscribed in the same place. Now, the same words as the above names or in their other forms from the same root-words are also used in Urdu and many other Islamicate languages. Using the English-Arabist system and keeping in consideration the specific mode of pronunciation of Urdu, the same words will be transcribed **SAD/SADI** by an Urduist, without the diacritic after A. The Arabic word **WA** ("and") when used in Urdu becomes **O** as in **ROZ O SHAB** ("day and night"), the **O** sounding like **O** in the English word "rose". Now, the above **ROZ** ("day") in Urdu is borrowed from Persian with the same meaning. However, according to current Iranian Persian pronunciation, using the English-Arabist mode of transliteration, the word should be written as **RUZ** (**U** pronounced as **oo** in the English word "boot"). The Central Asian (**DARI**)

Persian pronunciation of the same letter in the same word is similar to that of Urdu: O as in rose. The vowel (**KASRAH**) indicated by I/i according to the Arabist standards becomes E/e for the same words in Persianized usage: the Arabists' and Urduists' **IHSAN SHATIR**, a name, becomes **EHSAN SHATER** for an Iranian or Persianist transcriber just as Malik Tauqi/Tauqui of Pakistani documents is the same as Malek Towghi/Toughi when transcribed by a Persian or Persianist. The English-Arabist Th in **IRTH** ("inheritance") becomes S (for the same word with the same meaning) in Persian, Dari, Urdu etc.

Last but not least is the problem created by Western popular-journalistic usage. Mussadeq/Mossadegh, Gamal Abdel/Abdul Nasser, Khomeini and Hussein of the popular journalistic usage should be Musaddiq, Jamal Abd al-Nasir/Abd an-Nasir, Khomeyni and Husayn according to the most current scholarly English-Arabist standards.³³

After agonizing much (and after most of this study was typed), I have decided to adopt, basically, what is known as the English system as used, e.g., by Oxford University Press/J. Cooper in The Commentary of the Quran (1987), an abridged translation of Tabari's Tafsir Volume 1. I call it an English-Arabist system because it is basically devised for the transliteration of material in the Arabic language. [See the Transliteration Table at the end of this discussion.] This transliteration system is currently used by most Islamists writing in English. Note that all the so-called "Western" systems provide, generally, only the basic 'alphabet' for the transliteration of single words and short phrases. Problems of detail involving, particularly, the transliteration of longer passages remain unresolved. For example, Islamists adopt different patterns of connecting two words or of changes of vowels and other elements at the end or beginning of words. Also note that the following suggestions/indications are not fully realized in this manuscript. [In order to remove inconsistencies, corrections and improvements are to be made when possible and necessary.]

For the transliteration of material from Persian, Turkish and

Urdu, I am inclined to adopt Hodgson's suggestions (see The Venture, op. cit.:16 passim) with some reservations. At least in scholarly writings, I prefer to retain the English-Arabist characters for basically the Arabic vocabulary which has become a part of other Islamicate languages. Similarly, I would retain the English-Persianist letters (such as those proposed by Hodgson) for special Persian characters for the originally Persian and Turkish vocabulary utilized in other Islamicate languages. For this reason, I prefer, for transliteration, the use of the English-Arabist characters for the Arabic and Persian vocabulary of the Turkish language instead of using specific letters devised for the modern Latin-based Turkish script. Why so? Because the Arabic and Persian vocabulary in all Islamicate languages is a common heritage of all literate Muslims and is of common use for all Islamists regardless of the number of Islamicate languages they know. It is unnecessarily confusing not to know that (Dr.) Natsir of Indonesia as it is written according to local considerations and a Dutch-based devised script is the same name we use for Nasir. More confusing is the use of modern Turkish C for Arabic J in commonly used words. It is ridiculous to transcribe **ULAMA** with a short U to **ULEMA** with a long U for a Turkish reader and **OLAMA** for a Persian. Secondly, all Islamicate languages that use basically the Arabic script (such as Persian, Urdu, Ottoman Turkish) have retained the Arabic spellings of borrowed Arabic and Persian words regardless of different patterns of pronunciation and usage. Why not do the same in a Latin-based Islamist script?

Based on my decision to adopt the English-Arabist system (as indicated in the following Transliteration Table) while using secondary sources which follow other patterns, I have changed (or should change):

DJ	for Arabic letter JIM () into as in Arabic word JIBRIL (Gabriel) in which J sounds as in John.	J
G	with a dot above it for Arabic letter GHAYN () into the diagraph as in Arabic GHAYB (unseen) in which <u>Gh</u> becomes a guttural g.	<u>Gh</u> strongly

- K with a dot under for Arabic letter **QAF** () into **Q**
as in the Quran in which Q sounds as a guttural K.
- K with a bar below it or H with a circumflex below **Kh**
it or X for Arabic letter **KHA** () into as in **KHAYR** (good) in
which **Kh** sounds "as Ch in Scottish Loch". [I have borrowed this
example from Bernard Lewis, The Arabs in History (1960):8. I do
not know Scottish.]
- O for the short vowel **DAMMA** **U**
into as in **UMMAH**.
- S with a circumflex above it for Arabic letter **SHIN** **Sh**
() into as in Arabic **SHAMS** (Sun) in which **Sh** sounds as in show,
sheep and ship.
- T underlined for Arabic letter **THA** () into **Th**
as in Arabic **IRTH** (inheritance) in which **Th** sounds, approxi-
mately, as in "through, thin".

Two modes of consonantal and one form of vowel-related assimila-
tions also should be kept in view.

- Fourteen of the 29 characters of the Arabic alphabet are
called **SHAMSI** letters. These are Ta, Tha, Dal, Dhal, Ra, Zay,
Sin, Shin, Sad, Dad, Ta, Za, Lam, Nun (T, Th, D, Dh, R, Z, S, Sh,
S, D, T, Z, L, N). When the Arabic definite article AL/Al/al
prefaces a word beginning with a so-called Shamsi letter, the Lam
(L/l) of Al becomes assimilated to the first letter of the follow-
ing word, i.e., the L is pronounced as the first Shamsi letter of
the following word making it a double consonant. In Arabic
writing this effect is shown, sometimes, by putting a **TASHDID** (
) , a diacritical sign, above the consonant. Both A and L of the
article AL are preserved in writing; only pronunciation is affect-
ed as the following examples indicate. **AL-SHAMS** ("the sun") is
pronounced as **ASH-SHAMS**, **AL-TABARI** as **AT-TABARI**, **AL-TAFSIR** as **AT-**
TAFSIR, **AL-SIBAI** as **AS-SIBAI**, **AL-SHAHAWI** as **ASH-SHAHAWI** and so on.
This effect on pronunciation does not occur when the article AL-
prefaces a word beginning with one of the 15 remaining so-called
QAMARI letters. E.g., **AL-QAMAR** ("the moon") is written and
pronounced in the same way. Some Islamists have recently begun to
transliterate, particularly proper names in their pronounced

forms, e.g., **AT-TABARI** instead of **AL-TABARI**. After agonizing much, I have decided in favor of the classical method.

Those who know Arabic would automatically recognize the Shamsi letters and pronounce accordingly as they do while reading the same material in Arabic script. [This decision, however, came late. The inconsistencies in this regard are to be removed.]

2. When a word ending in an unvowelled N is followed by a word beginning with one of the five letters Ra (R), Lam (L), Mim (M), Waw (W), Ya (Y), N is assimilated to the first letter of the second word in pronunciation and, sometimes, also in Arabic writing. For example **MIN MA** is pronounced **MIMMA**. In such cases, I prefer a hyphenated form: **MIM-MA** which is to be the basis of necessary corrections in this study.

3. Another form of assimilation which I have tried to adopt consistently in my transliterations in this study is as follows. When a word ending in a long vowel prefaces a word which begins with a "connective" Alif, **ALIF AL-WASL**, (as A in the article Al) the long vowel of the preceding word, e.g., the I of **FI** is shortened in pronunciation. Also, the connective Alif, i.e., the A of **AL** is completely disregarded while pronouncing the phrase, connecting the shortened vowel I to the L. In English transcription, which I have adopted, an apostrophe is superscribed before L to show that the A of Al, the connective Alif, is deleted in the transcription. So, for example, **FI AL-HAQQ** is transcribed as **FI'L-HAQQ**, **FI AL-ISLAM** ("in Islam") is **FI'L-ISLAM**, **FI ALLAH** as **FI'LLAH** and so on.

Almost every word in an Arabic text ends with one of the three short vowels (Fathah, Kasrah, Dammah) or with one of the three long vowels (Alif, Waw, Ya) or with one of the three forms of **TANWIN** (An, In, Un). These conditions are determined by tenses of verbs by various

states of the preceding and/or following words and phrases, and by the particular person, number and gender of a noun or pronoun according to the rules of Arabic grammar which are too many and too complex to explain here. In transliterating phrases, sentences and passages, I have followed the pattern generally used in Arabic script: short vowels and Tanwins are usually not written. Those who know Arabic follow the rules while pronouncing the word. For example **QULT** is pronounced as **QULTA** if it means "you (a male) said", as **QULTU** if it means "I said", and as **QULTI** if it means "You (a female) said). In cases I have indicated in transliteration such short or long ending vowels, I have - not consistently however - used a hyphenated form, e.g. **QULT-U**, **KITAB-AN**, **KITAB-IN** etc. As in Arabic writing, long vowels are indicated in transliteration, e.g., **QALA** (they [two males] said, **QALU** (They [more than two males] said). I have hyphenated only certain forms of such situation-affected long vowels at the end of words. A uniform standardized system for the transliteration of such end-of-word short and long vowels determined by various factors is yet to be evolved.

The orientalist's transliteration of certain Arabic words ending in T (as in **SUNNAT**, "tradition") is chaotic. In Arabic usage (in pronunciation and also, sometimes, in writing) the T in such words changes into AH when the word is used as a single word or when it occurs at the end of a phrase or sentence - thus, **SUNNAT** becomes **SUNNAH**. Now some Islamists drop the H in such cases transliterating the word as Sunna; others retain the more correctly pronounced form: Sunnah. I have decided in favor of the latter form. [Inconsistencies in the text are to be corrected.]

The equipment used to type this study lacked special diacritical signs, dots etc. devised to represent Arabic alphabet and vowel effects in Latin characters as shown in the following Transliteration Table. These missing signs are as follows which are to be kept in mind while reading quotations, names etc. in Arabic and other Islamicate languages. These signs have to be integrated when used for print.

I-A. The macron is to be used to distinguish long vowels from short vowels:

- * A/a (a long vowel as pronounced in "hall" compared to the short vowel A/a in Arabic [a consonant with a **FATHAH** not followed by Alif] which is pronounced as u in "but, cut") to distinguish A of **ALIM** (scholar) or of **MALIK** (owner, lord) from the short vowel A of **ALIM** (all-knower) or of **MALIK** (King).
- * I/i (a long vowel pronounced as ee in feet compared to the short vowel Arabic I/i [a consonant with a **KASRAH** not followed by YA] with a sound of i in "sit, bit") to distinguish the long vowel I of **ALIM** (all-knower) from the short vowel I of **ALIM** (scholar) or of **MALIK** (King).
- * U/u (a long vowel pronounced as oo in "boot" compared to the short vowel Arabic U [a consonant with **DAMMAH** not followed by **WAW**] which is pronounced U as in put) to distinguish the long vowel U of **MAZLUM** (wronged) from the short vowel U of **ZULM** () (wrong, injustice...).

I-B. The five diagraphs of our Transliteration Table (Th, Kh, Dh, Sh, and Gh) representing single Arabic letters (Tha, Kha, Dhal, Shin and Ghayn) are to be joined by a bar below the pair. Ideally, apostrophes are to be used between the same two English letters if they represent two different Arabic characters, e.g., to distinguish Th as one letter from the T and H occurring side by side as two different letters: ...T'H... Such combinations, however, are rare.

II-A. , an apostrophe which in some cases may also look like an inverted small c or a comma is to be superscribed just after A/a, I/i or U/u (depending on the needed short vowel - Fatha, Kasrah or Dammah) to integrate the glottal-stop sounding Arabic letter Hamza () as after A in the word **LAM** (dressing, bandaging) to distinguish it from **LAM** (:did not") or from **LAM** (name of the letter L) which do not need such a superscription.

II-B. c an inverted apostrophe or a small c is to be superscribed just before or after (depending on other considerations) A/a, I/i or U/u (depending on whichever vowel is needed) to integrate the guttural sounding Arabic letter Ayn () as after A in **MALUM** (known, fixed...) to distinguish it from **MALUM** (blamed, censured...) which does not need

such a superscription.

III. Each of the five Latin characters, D/d, H/h, S/s, T/t and Z/z is used for a pair of Arabic letters (somewhat similar but distinct in sound and form). One of the Arabic letters in the pair is represented by putting a dot under the relevant Latin/English character. Examples are as follows

- * D/d without a dot represents the Arabic letter Dal (د) as in **HAUD** ("to turn aside"). D/d with a dot under it becomes a velar/emphatic D and the Arabic letter Dad (د) as in **HAUD** ("basin, trough...")
- * H/h without a dot represents the Arabic letter Ha (ه), a clearly pronounced English H as in **HAMIL** ("roving, vagabond..."). H/h with a dot under it represents the Arabic letter Ha (ه), a pharyngeal/guttural H as in **HAMIL** ("porter...").
- * S/s without a dot represents the Arabic character Sin (س), hissed s as in **TAHSIN** ("beautification..."). S/s with a dot under it represents the Arabic character Sad (س), velar/emphatic S as in **TAHSIN** ("fortification...").
- * T/t without a dot represents the Arabic letter Ta (ت), a French or almost English T as **MATBU'** ("followed, succeeded..."). T/t with a dot under it represents the Arabic letter Ta (ت), a velarized T as in **MATBU'** ("printed...").
- * Z/z without a dot represents the Arabic character Zay (ز) as in **ZAHR** ("flower [collective]..."). Z/z with a dot under it represents the Arabic letter Za' (ز), a velarized Z as in **ZAHR** ("back, rear, other side...").

A last word about the popular journalistic Western usage of particularly proper names: defying the wisdom of a proverb in Arabic -- **GHALAT AL-MM FASIH-UN** ("a popular blunder is [indeed to be accepted as] eloquent"), I am inclined to retain the English-Arabist transliteration of all proper names which have an Arabic base. Thus Osman or Usman should be Uthman, Mossadegh Musaddiq, Ayatollah Khomeini Ayat Allah Khumayani, Natsir Nasir, and Abul Ala Abu'l-Ala. Similar names, which are basically Persian words, should retain a standard Latin-English-based Persianist system of transliteration. For example **RUZBEH**, **PAYANDEH** etc. For this reason classical Arabized Persian names such as (Muslim) Nayshaburi of Arabic sources should be transcribed as Nishapuri

according to the Persianist standard in a Latin-based script.

TRANSLITERATION TABLE

(English-Arabist System)

[Note: the letters are listed in the regular order of the Arabic alphabet. For the preparation of this "Table" and its corollaries I have benefitted from explanations in Bernard Lewis, The Arabs in History, Harper Torchbook (1960):8; Marshall G.S. Hodgson, The Venture of Islam, The University of Chicago press (1974), 1:3-20; J. Cooper (ed. tr.), The Commentary on the Quran by... Al-Tabari, Oxford University Press (1987), 1:xxxi-xxxv passim. The phrases within quotation marks are mostly from Lewis, in one or two cases from Hodgson.]

Arabic characters/ letters	Name of the character in Arabic	Transliteration in Latin-based English-Arabist script	As occurs in Arabic Word/s (with their English meaning in parentheses)	Explanations about correct/ approximate pronunciation	As pronounce in the English word
1. *	Alif	A	AKHIR (Last) ISHAQ (Isaac)	A in Radio as pronounced in the French language. See the following explanations about vowels.	A in hall
2.	Hamzah	,	MU'AJJAL (delayed) TA'JIL (delay) Ba' (name of the letter for B)	A "glottal stop, as in the cockney 'li'l bo'ls'."	
3.	Ba	B	BADR (full moon) ABU (father of) RABB (Lord)	English B	B in boy
4.	Ta	T	TUNUS (Tunis) ABTAR (without offspring) HARB (war)	more like a French T	
5.	Tha'	<u>Th</u>	THAWAB (reward)	The tongue	Th in throng,

			(a diagraph) tence)	IRTH (inher- MITHL (similar)	extended outward touches lightly (less emphatically than for <u>Dhal</u>) the tip of the upper front teeth)	thin...
6.	Jim	J		JIBRIL (Gabriel) MAJD (glory) BURJ (tower)	English J; pro- nounced g as in the English word goat in Egypt.	
7.	Ha'	H		HIFZ (preserva- tion) MAHFAZAH (folder) LAUH (board)	Pharyngeal/ guttural H	
8.	<u>Kha'</u>	<u>Kh</u> (a diagraph)		<u>KHABAR</u> (sing: news) <u>AKHBAR</u> (pl: news) <u>BARZAKH</u> (interval, limbo)	"spanish J nearer H than K	"ch in Scottish Loch"
9.	Dal <u>HADITH</u> (report, Closer to	D	those, with	DABBABAH (armored car) new...) HADID (iron)	Almost like English D - French D. Tongue touches inside of the upper front teeth	Almost as Th in this, pronounced lightly
10.	Dhal	<u>Dh</u> (a diagraph)		ABU DHARR (a name) MADHALLAH (humiliation) <u>SHUDHUDH</u> (anomaly)	The tongue ex- tended outward touches (more emphatically than for <u>Tha</u>) the tip of the upper front teeth	English Th in this pronounced more emphatically
11.	Ra	R		RABB (Lord) ARAB (Arab) TAFSIR (exegesis)	English R rolled/ trilled	

12.	Zay	Z	ZABUR (Psalms) MUBARIZAH (competition) BURUZ (prominence)	English Z	
13.	Sin	S	SAFIR (ambassador) MUSAFIR (passenger) FARAS (horse)	hissed S in this	like English S always hissed
14.	<u>Shin</u> FAR <u>SH</u> (Rug)	<u>Sh</u> (a diagraph)	<u>SHIAH</u> ('party', Shiite) <u>MASHHUR</u> (well-known)		Sh in shop, ship, sheep...
15.	Sad	S	SAFF (row) MUSTAFA (chosen) ABRAS (leprous)	velar/emphatic S, "tongue raised towards the palate"	
16.	Dad	D	DARAR (harm) MUDIRR (harmful) MARAD (disease)	velar/emphatic D tongue raised towards the palate	
17.	Ta'	T	TABARI (a name) MATAR (rain) HUBUT (futility)	velar/emphatic T as above	
18.	Za'	Z	ZAFAR (victory) MUZAFFAR (victorious) HIFZ (preservation)	velar/emphatic Z as above	
19.	'Ayn		'ARAB (Arab) SA'D (A name) RUKU' (bending)	guttural/glottal sound of A; "to Anglaphones difficult to pronounce	
20.	<u>Chayn</u>	<u>Gh</u>	<u>GHAYB</u> (unseen) <u>MUGHUL</u> (Mongol, Mogul) <u>TIBGH</u> (Tobacco)	"voiced equiv- alent of <u>Kh</u> above"; "a strongly guttural g,	

				similar in sound to the gamma in modern Greek".	
21.	Fa'	F	FARD (duty) GHAFUR (all-forgiving) SAFF (row)	English F	
22.	Qaf	Q	QAMAR (moon) IQTA' (fief) TAUQ (necklace)	"A guttural K pronounced far back in the throat"; "uvular/guttural K"	
23.	Kaf	K	KALLA (not at all) TAKALUB (dogfight) MALIK (King)	English K	
24.	Lam	L	LABID (a name) MALIK (owner) MILAL (nations)	English L	
25.	Mim	M	MADINAH (city) UMMAH (nation) AM (year)	English M	
26.	Nun	N	NABIYY (Prophet) ANBIYA (Prophets)	English N	
	INSAN (humanbeing)				
27.	Ha'	H	HAYJ (excitement) MAHIB (dreaded) held, habit	Not pharyngeal but pronounced	As H in home how, with-
	SUNNAH (tradition)	English H			
28.	Waw	W or U (I prefer U when in the middle or end of a word when WAW is silent	WA (and) MAUDUDI (a name) AU (or)	See the following explanations about vowels	

29.

ya'

y

YA (O)
AYYAM (days)
NABIYY (Prophet)

See the following explanations about vowels

Vowels

Two vowel systems are used in Arabic texts:

I) Long Vowels are indicated by the three Arabic characters, Alif (), Waw (), and Ya' (). In our English-Arabist system they are transcribed in the form of three macronized English letters as follows:

- A always pronounced as the a in the English word 'hall' to represent the vowel Alif in Arabic words, e.g., **ADAM** (Adam; only the first A), **ISHAQ** (a name), **BILA** (without), **QABIL** (Cain)
- U always pronounced as oo in the English word 'boot' to represent the vowel Waw () in Arabic words, e.g., **ABU** (father of), **NUH** (Noah), **MUSA** (Moses), **QALU** (they said)
- I always pronounced as ee in the English word 'feet' to represent the vowel Ya' () in Arabic words such as **ISA** (Jesus), **QIL-A** (it was said), **QABIL** (Cain) the second I of **KITABI** (my book)

Note that in certain situations the above three Arabic vowels change in pronunciation to corresponding short vowels, though the letters are retained in the Arabic text as they are. In our English-Arabist transliteration system, however, short vowel symbols replace the long vowel letters in such cases.

II. Short Vowels.

The three short Arabic vowels are indicated by three special diacritics (with particular names) in Arabic texts. These diacritical signs, which are determined for almost each letter in each word by complex but systematic rules, are normally not indicated in a written Arabic text. In our English-Arabist system, however, they are transcribed as follows:

- A to represent the pronunciation of the Arabic short-vowel diacritic I called **FATHAH** which is supposed to be placed just above the relevant letter, e.g., above the Arabic T in the word **MUQTADIR**, (potent). The Fathah which is always pronounced as u in the English words cut, but, etc., is transcribed in our system as the A after the T in this case
- U to represent the pronunciation of the Arabic short-vowel diacritic I called **DAMMAH** which is supposed to be placed just above the relevant letter, e.g., above the Arabic M in the word **MUQTADIR**, (potent). The Dammah which is always pronounced as U in the English word put is transcribed in our system as U after M in this case.

I to represent the pronunciation of the Arabic short-vowel diacritic I called **KASRAH** which is supposed to be placed just below the relevant letter, e.g., below the Arabic D in the same word **MUQTADIR**, . The Kasrah which is always pronounced as i in the English words bit, sit, writ, etc., is transcribed in our system as I after D in the same case.

So, what looks in Arabic as **MQTDR** in which M is supposed to have a Dammah above it, T a Fathah above it and D a Kasrah below it is transliterated to **MUQTADIR** using the English-Arabist system.

ENDNOTES TO INTRODUCTIONS

¹In "the world beyond Islam" are included non-Muslim individuals and entities within and without countries with a Muslim majority, and also all patterns of thought, action and lifestyle which are not necessarily inspired and justified by Islam. We also consider those nonconformist Muslims a part of "the world beyond Islam" whose aspirations and actions are perceived to be un-Islamic (or not based on Islam) by representative Islamic circles. As discussed in Part III, Section 9, Segment 3 of this study, for the Resurgents, such non-repentant nonconformists are like the AL-MUNAFIQUN, "the Hypocrites" of the Prophet's time who were declared non-Muslim by the Quran and the Prophet Muhammad.

1a

³Sayyid Abul Ala Maududi, The Meaning of the Quran (henceforth Meaning), [an English rendering by Muhammad Akbar of Maududi's exegesis of the Quran in the Urdu language entitled TAFHIM AL-QURAN], Islamic Publications Ltd., Lahore, Pakistan (1971), 3:51; brackets added. For more examples of the similarity of modern Western/humanistic civilization and thought with the pre-Islam Arab JAHILIYYAH explained in the literature produced by the Resurgent revivalist movement see Maududi, A Short History of the Revivalist Movement in Islam, Islamic Publications Limited, Lahore, 1972. Originally in Urdu (Tajdid-o-Ihya-i Din), it was published in 1940. For an introduction to the vast modern revivalist literature on this theme see Yvonne Y. Haddad, "Sayyid Qutb: Ideologue of Islamic Revival", Charles J. Adams, "Maududi and the Islamic State", Michael M.J. Fischer, "Imam Khomeine: Four Levels of Understanding", John L. Esposito, "Muhammad Iqbal and the Islamic State", and Abdulaziz Sachedina, "Ali Shariati: Ideologue of the Iranian Revolution" in J.L. Esposito (ed.), Voices of Resurgent Islam, 1983 (Oxford University Press).

⁴Kalim Siddiqui, ed., Issues in the Islamic Movement, 1981- 82, The Open Press Limited, London (1983), pp. 19-20.

⁵The literature on Humanism and related modern values, tendencies and institutions, on the evolution of Humanism, its numerous dimensions and effects on modern secular and religious thought is too expansive for a review here. It involves a survey of intellectual history of not only the West, but also rest of the world (including its Islamic parts) since the Renaissance. My generalizations are understandable enough for an average informed and educated reader. For some references, I have depended on the following sources: Nicola Abbagnano, "Humanism", The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Reprint Edition 1972, vol. 4:66-72; henceforth referred to as A-EP. Edward P. Cheyney and F.C.S. Schiller, "Humanism", The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, The MacMillan Company, New York (1932), vol. 7:537-43; henceforth referred to as Ch-ESS; H.S. Thayer, "Pragmatism", The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ibid, vol. 6:430-6; henceforth referred to as Th-EP; J.H. Lavelly, "personalism", The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ibid, vol. 6:107-110; henceforth referred to as L-EP; Webster's Dictionary of Quotable Definitions, Second Edition, 1988; henceforth referred to as W-DQD.

⁶For positive liberal-socialistic Christian responses to the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and succeeding liberal revolutions see, e.g., chapters V and VI in William A. Clebsch, Christianity in European History, Oxford University Press, New York, 1979.

⁷Lisan al-Arab, 3:1224, Cairo, Dar al-Maarif edition.

⁸Mustafa al-Sibai, AL-SUNNAT WA MAKANATUHA FI AL-TASHRI AL-ISLAMII' Cairo?, MIN AL-SHARQ WA'L-GHARB (series) (1966):53. Henceforth Sibai, AL-SUNNAT

⁹ibid. I use the term Tradition to cover 1) commentaries on and elaborations of the Quran as in the Tafsir, Sirah, Maghazi, Tabaqat and Qisas literature (explained in this introduction) produced during the three to five centuries after the Prophet's death and 2) reports, deeds and norms ascribed to the Prophet Muhammad, his Companions and the Muslim generation that immediately followed the Companions. Occasionally, I include in Tradition all that was acceptable to earliest Muslim generations.

¹⁰Abu'l-Ala Maududi, SUNNAT KI AINI HASIYYAT [in Urdu], Islamic Publications, Lahore [Pakistan] (1963):38-9. Henceforth Maududi, SKUNNAT. Terms used as in the Urdu language by Maududi.

¹¹ibid:39.

¹²For Quranic references and the Prophet's sayings which admire and sanctify the divine nature of the Prophet's and his Companions' Sunnah and exhort believers to follow their exemplary model see Muhammad Abu Shuhbah, DIFA AN AL-SUNNAT WA RADD SHUBHAH AL-MUSTASHRIKIN WA AL-KITAB AL-MUASIRIN [henceforth: Abu Shuhbah, DIFA, al-Azhar University Press, Cairo (?):9-19, 197-12, passim. Maududi, SUNNAT, op. cit.:74-1265, 206-27, passim. al-Sibai, AL-SUNNAT, op. cit.:343-52, passim.

¹³al-Sibai, AL-SUNNAT, op. cit.:17.

¹⁴Maududi, SUNNAT, op. cit.:118-25.

¹⁵Abu Shuhbah, DIFA, op. cit.:3-4 [see footnote 12].

¹⁶The most impressive Western studies in this field of Quranic studies are those of Theodor Noldeke (1836-1930). Next to Noldeke in importance, in my opinion, are William Muir (1819-1905), J.M. Rodwell () and Arthur Jeffery in this field. For comprehensive information about various aspects of Quranic discussions and detailed bibliographies related to the field see A.T. Welch, "Al-Kuran", EI²,5:400-29 and J.D. Pearson's short bibliographic note about the translation of the Quran in other languages in the same:429-32. For a succinct report on Traditional Muslim exegeses of the Quran of various ages and schools see J. Cooper's introduction to The Commentary on the Quran by Al-Tabari, being an abridged translation of Tabari's Tafsir by J. Cooper, Oxford University Press (12987), vol. 1, particularly pp. xiv-xxix. For a recent Muslim defense of Traditional views and works on ASBAB AL-NUZUL and related topics see Muhammad Khalifa, The Sublime Quran and Orientalism, Longman, London and New York (1983), chapters 2 and 4 in particular.

¹⁷K:XVI; also see Jan Knappert, Islamic Legends, [henceforth: Knappert, Legends]. Leiden, (1985):3, passim.

¹⁸"Ibn al-Jawzi", EI²,3:751; for Ibn al-Jawzi's standardizing principles of the Qisas see Thackston's introduction and footnotes in K:xiv-xv,

xxix footnotes 15 and 16.

¹⁹ibid.

²⁰Knappert, Legends, op. cit.:1.

²¹ibid:2, 5.

²²Ibrahim Dusuqi al-Shahawi, KITAB AL-SHAHAWI FI MUSTALAH AL-HADITH [henceforth: al-Shahawi, Kitab], Cairo? (1966). Abu Lababah Husayn, AL-JARH WA'L-TADIL [henceforth: Husayn, AL-JARH], Riyad (Saudi Arabia) (1974). The works of Maududi, Sibai and Abu Shuhbah mentioned above and of Yusuf mentioned below deal in part with JARH WA TADIL and ASMA AL-RIJAL etc. For related discussions also see G>H.A. Juynboll, The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature [henceforth: Juynbell, Authenticity], Leiden (1969); Muslim Tradition [henceforth: Juynboll, Tradition], Cambridge University Press (1983); Alfred Guillaume, The Traditions of Islam, Beirut (1966). In his The Authenticity (pp. 39-40) Juynboll lists nine more modern Arab-Muslim works in the same field.

²³Juynboll, Authenticity, op. cit.:138 cf. 121-38.

²⁴See Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition, Leiden (1960)-:xi-xvi.

²⁵See Maududi, SUNNAT, op. cit.:35-40, passim.

²⁶ibid:390

²⁷ibid, e.g.,:59, 112-8, 230, 338-90.

²⁸Zakariyya Ali Yusuf (ed.) DIFA AN AL-HADITH AL-NABAWI [henceforth: Yusuf, DIFA, Matbaah al-Imam, Egypt (?). This work is a collection of pro-Sunnah essays by well-known Muslim scholars such as Muhammad Yusuf Musa professor of Islamic Law at the Azhar, Muhibb al-Din al-Khatib, chief editor of MAJALLAH AL-AZHAR (official organ of the Azhar University), Sulayman Nadawi, a famous Indo-Pakistani alim, Mustafa al-Sibai, a Syrian graduate from al-Azhar and a leader of the Muslim Brotherhood, Mahmud Muhammad Shakir, the famous and learned editor of Tabari's Tafsir and others.

²⁹ibid:28-30.

³⁰ibid:29.

³¹ibid:30.

³²Abdullah Yusuf Ali, "Principles of Tafsir and Some Works on Tafsir", in Khurshid Ahmad, The Holy Quran: An Introduction, al-Falah Publications, Karachi (?):55; cf. 50-7.

CONCLUSIONS, FIRST

A Note.

During the last many years spent working on this study a specter haunted me to the extent that I delayed its completion thus depriving myself and my family of the possible material benefits of the 'union card' called a doctoral degree, and disappointing my respected teachers, well-wishers, friends and colleagues by this procrastination. Along with my other deficiencies and limitations, my yet to be settled struggle with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service and the need to work for a living, this specter, more than any other factor, has left obvious stylistic and other technical defects in the draft which I am too exhausted to remove at this point. Uncertain resumptons after long delays have caused asymmetry and repetitions. These repetitions unto themselves were caused by my awareness of the inherently provocative and controversial nature of this work and the consequent desire to document the points as much as possible. The following is a brief explanation of the specter.

After the completion of a first reading of relevant primary sources, I realized that if I remain honest to a minimum degree of intellectual integrity and to my knowledge and conscience this study would inevitably be a scathing critique of Islam. The specter that haunted me was two-pronged. 1) Keeping in mind the upholders of the liberal-progressive cause with which I continue to adhere in my humble ways, I was concerned about my image and the liberal-progressive images of my intentions. 2) More haunting was my fear that this kind of work might be used and abused by the reactionary Right of the West.

The appearance during the last two decades or so of a series of critical studies on Western images and treatment of Islam and other non-

Western cultures (mostly by liberal progressive Westerners of undoubted intellectual and professional integrity) crowned by Edward Said's vociferous Orientalism and other works, and also the rise of Khumaynism made my dilemma more acute. I was aware of the fact that most of these authors were genuinely sympathetic to non-Western cultures and were honestly critical of the West's neo-colonialism, cultural hegemony and overt and covert racism. This was a continuation of the noble tradition of self-criticism and of respect for others inspired by Herodotus and revived by the Renaissance in the West. This tradition, however, also suffered from a fallacy of some Renaissance and later Western thinkers. This fallacy may be stated in simple words as follows: 'The enemy of my enemy is my friend'. It was taken for granted that all victims of Western imperialism and racism were not only innocent but also worthy and good -; and, perhaps, better than the West in all respects. This indiscriminate sympathy for non-Western peoples and cultures encouraged non-Western intellectuals and activists to take pride in their inherently reactionary march towards self-ghettoization and in experimentation in nonsense.

While before Khumayni this irresponsible flirtation with (and indiscriminate authenticization of) non-Western cultures was limited to a few intellectuals and academicians, the rise of Khumaynism mobilized a broad spectrum of liberal progressive activists and opinion leaders of oppressed communities in the West (such as African Americans) in defense of the Resurgent Islam. The genuine appreciation for Iran's heroic struggle and overthrow of a pro-West authoritarian regime degenerated, after Khumayni's abduction of the Revolution, to equating Islam with progressive change and anti-imperialist struggle. A critical study of the psyche, publications and pronouncements of the Western organized Left, of the peace movement circles, of free-lance liberal-progressive writers and of African-American intellectuals, activists (and, consequently, masses) will indicate this misunderstanding of and blind love for the Resurgent Islam. Edward Said's hysteric outcry for Islam

and the 'certification' of Khumayni as a 'saint' by one of the noblest African-American statesmen and civil rights leaders created a situation in which any objective study of Islam would be equated with 'orientalism' as defined by Edward Said, and with Uncle Tomism. For some of my African-American students and friends and also for many Third Worlders and their American liberal-progressive sympathizers it was difficult to believe that one could be a genuine liberal progressive and yet demonstrate along with the Jews against Louis Farrakhan.

I was also aware of the likelihood that any criticism of things related to the non-Western world will be used and abused by Western racists, a particular brand of self-righteous Jews and Christians and, worse than that, by Western intelligence networks. American intelligence circles' reported exploitation of the famous Italian socialist Ignazio Silone's criticism of Stalinist aberrations is an example. [For this particular example, I am indebted to my colleague and dear friend, Professor Kenneth W. Harrow of Michigan State University.] For these various elements of the reactionary Right I can only record a simplistic request: "Please do not read this work and do not use it for your primitive and inhuman causes". I request the rest, particularly the liberals and progressives, to read my following conclusions first. Obviously, in the above and following notes, I have only alluded to many subjects pending separate and more comprehensive studies on each topic.

Alarming the world beyond Islam was not the aim for undertaking this study. It is the world within Islam which is the principal victim of Islamic belief system and hostage to the consequent patterns of thought and action. Persistent commitment to practice the Quran and Sunnah as envisaged by the Resurgent fundamentalists does not pose a serious threat to the Western world and its extensions. In practice, the Islamic mentality has been an asset to the West and industrialized world in contemporary history. Islamic fundamentalism deprives the world of Islam of the best of the West: the heritage of the Renaissance

and the Enlightenment; - scientific thought and liberal-socialistic tendencies-- while making it vulnerable to the worst of the West: 'sophisticated' racism, Christian self-righteousness and neo-colonialism. Only that part of the West which is inherently and consciously loyal to the great ideal of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, struggling sincerely to transcend religious chauvinism and Eurocentricism (such as the Soviet Union and Western liberal-progressive circles), and certain parts of the Third World (such as South Asia) suffer to some extent from the mentality generated by the Quran and Sunnah. Yet, the masses within the Muslim world, deprived of social justice and the right to human dignity, and barred from enlightenment, necessary for intellectual and social evolution and, consequently, from economic development, are the foremost sufferers. With certain goals for the adopted method in mind, this concern for all the inhabitants of the world of Islam - Muslims, nonconformists and non-Muslims -- motivated me to expose certain problematic dimensions of the commitment to practice the pristine Islam of the Quran and the Sunnah.

The reasons for my belief that Islamic fundamentalism is not a significant long-range threat to modern civilization beyond the realm of Islam are as follows. The world has developed enough defense mechanisms against the kind of Muslim onslaughts that took place in the past. The 'pull-factors', the ideological, political, technological and military vacuums and disarrays which made Muslim expansionism of the past possible, no longer exist. Even if the industrial-business world's greed or treacheries make the possession of nuclear weapons possible for a Muslim country its victims are most likely to be some Bengalis, Kurds, Baluch, Berbers or Sindhis or other Muslim countries or a Hindu India if deprived of deterrent force. [Pakistan's Punjabi-Urdu speaking rulers would have used nuclear force against East Pakistan (now Bangladesh)'s rebels had they possessed such a force. It is not farfetched to speculate similarly about both Iraq and Iran in the context of their recent war. Iraq did not hesitate to use poison gas against Iran and

the Kurds. Western Kissengerian think-tanks know where to stop. Alternatively, they provided both Iraq and Iran with weapons as long as one exhausted the other short of complete victory.] Above all, any informed thinker can foretell that the technological-material gap between Islamdom and the West will remain unbridgeable during the foreseeable future. Islamic fundamentalism will help to maintain this gap.

Regardless of occasional nuisances the fundamentalists might pose for the outside world, and tragedies they might create for individual families of the world beyond Islam, Western circles, perhaps, know that the backward-looking Islamic fundamentalism is inherently a self-beguiling, self-consuming, self-destructive force. It is something that Ibn Khaldun understood long before, though he blamed bedouinism for it rather than Islam frontally.¹ All know that progress in modern terms and an all-encompassing Islamic dogma are what an Arabic proverb tells us: **AL-DINAN LA YAJTAMIAN, LA FI'L-SAMA WA LA FI'L-ARD** ("two contradictory (phenomena) which reconcile neither in heaven nor on earth"). As we have seen in our study Islam (like all other unreformed traditional creeds) is uninterested in building this world. The heroes, for the believers, are Noahs who rejoice in the destruction of the world, not perceived Nimrods who build it.

Of course, amid the Muslim ocean of destitution and desert of deprivations there exist palaces and islands in which petrodollar-paid Western technology and knowhow have materialized the fantasies of the Qisas (like those about Solomon's palaces etc. made by the Jinn and slaves) and of The Thousand and One Nights. One may see even in poverty-stricken Cairo, Karachi and Dhaka a few mansions of the parasitic elite more luxuriously furnished than their counterparts in developed countries. The superstructures built in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and other oil Sheikdoms created and sustained by Western powers may be quite impressive. The buildings and installations there may be equipped

with the latest of modern technology in every field. Yet any thoughtful person can see the artificiality of the situation and the hollowness of the absence of intellectual and social infrastructure and of the work ethic necessary to make all this relevant, productive and self-sustaining. All know that as soon as foreign technicians and technocrats - these modern genii - and foreign labor - these neo-slaves, neo-Sakhrs and neo-coolies - leave the whole machinery will come to a standstill. The believers in these dreamlands have no incentive for work. The Islamic belief system works against the kind of learning and work ethic that enables the natives to replace the foreign work force. Citizens of the oil fiefdoms benefit generously not necessarily for their services but for their political acquiescence. Meanwhile Islam works as an opiate to make the believers think that the dole is God-given, a special Divine favor for the inhabitants of the 'sacred' Arabia. So, why work, even in the household, when Egyptian and other African and Asian maids - these modern counterparts of the medieval slavegirls - are available. An item analysis of the 'investments' of these fundamentalist oil fiefdoms will indicate that beyond deposits and luxury purchases of their elite in Western countries, causes such as the following attract their funds more than meaningful research and development:

- * counter-revolutionary ventures around the world aimed at frustrating and annihilating liberal-progressive movements. This is done, most probably, in collaboration with Western intelligence agencies.

- * Distribution of millions of copies of the Quran and other Islamic material in the Soviet Union, aimed definitely at creating trouble for the Soviets.

- * Giving aid to poor Muslim countries in such a way that they become helplessly dependent and, consequently, vote in favor of these fundamentalist oil fiefdoms in international bodies. Such an item analysis will also indicate that the West has been the ultimate

beneficiary.

Commitment to the Resurgent Islam increases internal tensions diverting energies from progress. After a serious belief in a dogma that entitles man to speak for God and fight for Him, the rise of sectarianism within the community of believers is inevitable. Just after the Prophet's death, Islamic communities plunged into civil wars. These blood-baths continued for centuries until the Western intervention in modern times. All parties claimed adherence to the Quran and Sunnah. If those so close to the Prophet - his Companions and the earliest Muslim generations - could not agree on issues of life and death (to them), it is futile to expect Muslims now to reach consensus on the same issues or many other questions as to determine the correct verdict of the Quran and Sunnah. Modern nonconformist humanistic trends, particularly the idea of separating religion from common social and political affairs will continue to grow within each sect. Also, regardless of the disingenuous rhetoric about Islam's fair treatment of the Dhimmis, the believers will never be able to convince non-Muslim citizens of the post-Enlightenment era to accept willingly and happily the humiliation and depravation of an inferior status that the Quran and the Sunnah impose on them in a Dar al-Islam. The over-all result will be persistent tension in each Dar al-Islam between a dominant sect or clique and rest of the citizenry, thus diverting all human and material resources from the much-needed social and economic development. The Sudan is only one example where basically the Resurgent-led movement for Islamization of the state has kept the country in a state of civil war for decades with tragic consequences. The debate about Islamization, its extent and acceptable model have absorbed, directly or indirectly, the best and most of intellectual energies of the Muslim world for the last half a century, thanks to the Resurgent Movement. This has happened, while fundamental questions of state-making have remained unresolved and, consequently, human, economic and educational conditions have deteriorated approaching unavoidable points of explosions or

disasters, e.g., in Bangladesh.

Unlike the past, there are no more 'empty spaces out there' to divert energies. Vulnerable Byzantiums, Irans and Spains, chaotic Turkistans, helpless Africas and Indias and shapeless Southeast Asias exist no longer. Under fundamentalism there will be only one target for its primitivities and for the frustrations of the Islamic world: itself. Since 1979 when the fundamentalists gained power in Iran, all can see that the Muslim world has been tearing itself apart rather than posing a real long range danger to others. All can see that Islamic fundamentalism has already changed the agenda in the Muslim world, frustrating the nineteenth-early twentieth century Modernist inspirations for progress. More industrialized countries have been the main beneficiaries of the chaos and hysteria created, directly or indirectly, by fundamentalist upheavals. Continuous brain drain from Muslim countries and net gains of the currencies of industrial lands are only two examples. What purchased Western weapons destroyed in Iran and Iraq is to be rebuilt (if at all so) by purchased Western technology and knowhow. It is difficult to believe that any importer of raw materials and exporter of finished goods and services would prefer to see the emergence of a 'this-worldly' approach in the Muslim world that might move towards self-sufficiency and eventually compete in the utilization of these resources and markets. Given competitive capitalism's natural preferences and Western civilization's insatiable greed, Western industrialized countries would prefer to have no more Japans in the non-Western, non-Christian zones of the world. Persistence of the inherently anti-intellectual, irrational, anti-materialistic and anti-pragmatism Islamic mentality fulfills this desire.

There exists some explorable evidence to argue that during the colonial period Western Powers, for their immediate self-interests and long-range strategies, did not hesitate to prefer more reactionary

elements of the Muslim world (and elsewhere) to the more enlightened. The gradual retreat of idealistic, humane and internationalistic liberalism in Europe during the nineteenth century paved the way for what became, in my words, ruthless and soulless (if not immoral) Kissengerian Real politik justified and reinforced in Western minds by 'sophisticated' racism, cultural chauvinism and Christian self-righteousness. Leaving the colonial period for a separate study, I can refer here only to some (at least) circumstantial evidences to argue that, except for the brief Khumayni-era, during the whole Cold War period, fundamentalist Islam in general and the Resurgent movement in particular helped the West, wittingly or unwittingly, in the West's global crusade against Marxism and other progressive trends, and in the West's antagonistic approach towards genuine liberal materialism inspired, ironically, by Western Enlightenmentarian ideals.

The Islamic Republic of Pakistan, the mother of contemporary Resurgent Islam and anti-Soviet bulwark in South Asia, continues to be among the most-favored Western allies. As in other Muslim countries, Pakistan's authoritarian-military regimes could never crush secular forces in that country had they not been sustained by Western moral (immoral?), political, military and economic support.

The overthrow of the secular-minded Sukarno government (which insisted on remaining nonaligned at a time when, for John Foster Dulles, nonalignment was immoral), and the annihilation of the Indonesian Communist Party (the largest in the Muslim world) would not have been possible without an active collaboration of the Masjumi Party - one of the four founding groups of the Islamic International of the Resurgent movement. Benefitting the West, the barbaric treatment of hundreds of thousands of Indonesian 'Commies'--these perceived Abu Jahls and Ibn Ubayys of their time - could take place (after Hitler) only in an atmosphere created by the Islamic mentality.

The West, the United States, could not create a Vietnam for the Soviets in Afghanistan without the use of Islam in its most

irresponsible, primitive, vulgar, cruel and inhuman forms, without the active ideological campaign spearheaded by all the affiliates of the Islamic International and without the very active collaboration of the most fundamentalist regimes of Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and Iran. Had there not been the so-called Islamic factor, the, comparatively, more secular Muslim governments would not have followed so meekly the U.S.-Pakistan-Saudi line during the Afghan crisis.

Western intelligence agencies know well that the West's most staunch, acquiescent and dependable ally, Saudi Arabia, is the financial and moral backbone of all fundamentalist Islamic movements, particularly of the Resurgents. Saudi Arabia has been a place of refuge for the leaders and activists of the Muslim Brotherhood, Jamaat Islami and Masjumi party at times when these Resurgents had difficulties with the more secular nationalist governments in their respective countries. Through a careful study of ever-growing Resurgent-dominated "Islamic Centers" in the Western world, it will not be difficult to discover a triangle of collaboration, exchange of information and flow of funds between Western intelligence circles, Islamic Resurgents and Saudi embassies and establishments. This bond was particularly reinforced during the CIA's and Islam's joint Jihad against Afghanistan¹.

During the whole Cold War period, the Resurgent ideologues voted for the West calling it **AHWAN AL-BALIYYATAYN**, "lesser of the two evils". Here, according to the Resurgent-fundamentalist Islamic mentality, the West became the People of the Book dominated by Christianity, the lesser of the two 'lesser evils': Judaism and Christianity. The Soviet Union, Marxism, all liberal-progressive trends including secular nationalism were equated with **JAHILIYYAH**, outright atheism, paganism etc.

Case studies of Muslim countries during the Cold War period will indicate that, specially on crucial occasions, the Islamic International joined ranks against all secular liberal, nationalist and marxist forces. These secular forces could not be defeated without the direct and indirect Western support for the Islamic elements. The so-called

Western cause could not win in the absence of Islamic factor. Serious clashes (as in Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Indonesia) between the Islamic International and local regimes took place only when these regimes were headed by secular and nationalist figures (such as Jamal Abd al-Nasir and Ahmad Sukarno) less committed to the Resurgent model of Islamization and marked by the West as enemies. Although when confronted, the with corruptions and perversions of the Saudi system, they never carry out against the Saudis the kind of vicious campaign they do against Sukarnos, Nasirs, Tarakis, Saddams and others not in the Western camp. With reference to the West's betrayal of its commendable ideals, hypocrisy seems to be something common between the West of 'real politik' and the Resurgent Islam.

Ideologically, it was Islam spearheaded by the Resurgents which frustrated the rising force of genuine liberal secular Arab nationalism. It was the rising Resurgent Islam of Iqbal reinforced by Maududi and utilized by the pro-West Muslim elite bourgeoisie that cut India into pieces and plunged it into bloodbaths. It is not difficult to see the West's place in confrontations in these two regions. The West, the Saudis and other Islamic forces were on the same side against Abd al-Nasir's bid for Arab unity on a more secular nationalistic basis, e.g., during the wars in Yaman and Oman. Mr. Jinah's Islamic Republic of Pakistan armed and aided by the West forced Mahatma Gandhi's secular federal democratic India to divert its energies and resources for defense against Pakistan from the much needed post-colonial reconstruction. Within Pakistan (and all other Muslim countries), the West marked all opposition figures as 'hidden communists' justifying its support for its Islamic puppets who, undoubtedly, served well the Western cause during the Cold War.

The Khumayni phase of the Resurgence in relation to Islam's benefits for the West is an exception, to some extent. The difference lies in a combination of factors which may be put in two major categories: 1) Khumayni's unique personality and 2) special

circumstances of Iran.

Various trends and factors worked together in the making of Khomeini's personality. There was the inherent anti-authoritarianism of the Persian-populist-Shiite traditions. [On this subject in general, see Manochehr Dorraj, From Zarathustra to Khomeini: Populism and Dissent in Iran, Boulder and London (1990).] It was reinforced by the bitter Shiite consciousness of perceived or real injustice and victimization perpetrated by those in power. This consciousness was further strengthened by the fact, as Khomeini saw it, that the domineering West, particularly the United States, and almost all Sunnite authoritarian rulers (e.g., the Saudis and Zia al-Haq) were in the same camp.

Regardless of Khomeini's own Islamic universalistic rhetoric, he could not be immune from centuries' old Iranian nationalistic feelings sustained by the survival of various pre-Islamic elements (e.g. the Persian language) in the body culture of Iran. Now, in modern times, it was the West that had frustrated nationalistic aspirations, for example those of Musaddiq whom Khomeini always admired before the Revolution. It was the name and political martyrdom of Musaddiq the nationalist that all opposition leaders including Khomeini used against the Shah whom they saw as a U.S.-imposed and U.S.-sustained enemy of nationalistic aspirations symbolized by Musaddiq. This Iranian nationalism had to work against the West.

After Uthman Dan Fodio and some Deobandi ulama, Khomeini was the only orthodox Muslim leader actively in politics and power who sincerely flirted with Tasawwuf, Islamic mysticism. Tasawwuf has one common effect on its practitioners: it makes them less 'pragmatic' in the opportunistic sense of the word, more other-worldly and more consistent in action with their beliefs. Along with the Shiite belief which equates martyrdom with the highest degree of victory, Tasawwuf made Khomeini stick to what he had said against the all-powerful West. Unlike the pragmatic Sunnite Shariah-minded ulama such as Abu Yusuf (

) and al-Awzai () who had worked within the medieval Muslim establishment, the medieval Sufis are famous for their defiance of (or dissociation with) the powerful the and establishment. While the model of Abu Yusufs and al-Awzais makes it possible for their modern adherents such as Abd al-Aziz bin Baz to acquiesce, the Sufi model of Hallajs could not allow Khumayni to indulge in what he thought was hypocrisy: to change for this-worldly concerns. As a Sufi, Khumayni was well aware of Rumi the Sufi Master's taunt:

**ZAHIDAN KIN JALWAH BAR MIHRAB-O-MINBAR MI KUNAND
CHUN BA-KHALWAT MI-RAWAND AN KAR-E-DIGAR MI KUNAND**
(contrary to their pretentious displays [of righteousness and piety] on the altar and pulpit [i.e. the stage] these 'pious' do 'something else' in their privacy.)

Now, this "something else" in the Persian language alludes to the worst evil and most shameful actions. Putting aside our view of the primitivity of the concept, Khumayni was an authentic man of God the way he knew God as a Muslim and a Sufi. As a Sufi, he could not but challenge and defy the United States, the most powerful and the most arrogant Establishment of the time as Khumayni saw it.

Above all, there were those unique folk characteristics in Khumayni which are much admired and talked about in the Middle East and Central Asia, though least practiced. In all traditional societies, these characteristics distinguish a heroic-charismatic personality from a mediocre and average type. In the Persian and other languages of the region these traits are described in terms and words which, unto themselves, when uttered, provoke emotions and inspiration. They are, e.g., **LUTI-GARI** (chivalry, to be lavish of one's possessions, e.g., one's own wellbeing - for a cause); **GHAYRAT** (sense of honor, defiance); **MARDANAGI** (manliness, courage); **SHARM/HAYA** (pudency/prudery); **YAKDANDAGI** (adamant, persistence). These traits generate, among other things, strong self-respect and consciousness about one's equal rights to those of any other contemporary humanbeing; - be it a Shah or a president. This consciousness in Khumayni and other revolutionaries was, most probably, reinforced by modern thought. It is a kind of feeling that

citizens of free societies take for granted. Khomeini, however, lived in a society where (as in all authoritarian societies) everyone except the supreme ruler -- the Shah -- and his family was 'nobody'. Khomeini's opposition to the system brought him further humiliations. It was too much for a person with above-mentioned characteristics. For Khomeini the West was responsible for all this. "The son of Riza Khan," as Khomeini used to call the Shah in a typical **LUTI** sarcasm, could maintain such a tyranny, Khomeini thought, only with the help of the West. Khomeini could not forget this. None with 'some Ghayrat and Haya in his eyes', as is said in the Persian, would. Although the "son of Riza Khan" was gone, the West was still there. Mardanaqi called for its defiance.

Beyond Khomeini's personality, Iranian circumstances of the early 1980s were also responsible for his regime's anti-Western postures. The Revolution of 1979 was the culmination of a century long anti-Western movement. The movement had started in the nineteenth century as a response to Western intervention in Iran. After the failure (in practice) of the Constitutional movement which aimed at the creation of a democratic parliamentary Iran in the image of the United Kingdom, and then, after the overthrow of Musaddiq in 1953, the reformists and revolutionaries of all kinds related these failures to the Western intrigues. All factions of the six main forces (the [liberal-social democratic] National Front/Musaddiqists; Marxist-Leninists and democratic socialists; the Regionalists, particularly the Kurds; independent intellectuals; the so-called Islamic Marxists, i.e., Mujahidin-i-Khalq; and Islamic Resurgents under Khomeini) were united in their opposition to the West, particularly to the U.S. The Shah was portrayed by all as an outright Western puppet. Anti-Western feelings permeated the whole Iranian society. Anti-Westernism was the main credential of the Revolution. It is true that after the Revolution Khomeini and his clerics monopolized power and gradually put other forces aside. But it is also true that during this struggle for power

anti-Westernism remained to be the highest credential each group used for itself to disqualify others. In order to compete particularly with the Left which had strong ideological and organizational roots in the society, and thus maintain credibility, the Khumaynists had to demonstrate the authenticity of their anti-Westernism. Note that all the above-mentioned forces within themselves had strong leftist-socialistic-revolutionary cadres and tendencies. Within the Khumaynists, there were elements inspired by Khumayni's anti-Westernism. It was with reference to those with the Khumayni camp who might adopt a softer position towards the West that some Khumaynists began to call themselves the followers of **KHATT-E-IMAM** "Imam's line". The informed know that it was an allusion to Khumayni's stubborn anti-Western approach. As a matter of fact, the Khumaynists or the so-called moderates within Khumayni camp could be overthrown had they shown any tilt towards rapprochement with the West, particularly during the first five years after the Revolution. Iranians had suffered too much for the Revolution to allow the replacement of a clean-shaved pro-West **DARBAR** (royal court) with a bearded counterpart. This is not to say that the Reagan-Bush era with its insistence to 'stand tall' and consequent return to the CIA's old questionable modes made any rapprochement possible. Iraq's invasion of Iran and continuous overt or covert Western support for Iraq further reinforced Khumayni's anti-West belligerency.

Regardless of the fact that the anti-Westernism of Khumayni and genuine Khumaynists is above any suspicion, yet there remains enough to say that even the Khumayni model of Islamic Resurgence helped, unwittingly, the Western cause in many ways. I suspect Western think-tanks anticipated this. The very nature of Islamic ideology of any model was inevitably useful for and exploitable by the West. Khumayni the sincere selfless revolutionary man, like all other great humanbeings

of Islamic history, had to be overshadowed by Khumayni the believer in Muhammad, the Last Messenger of God. It is futile to expect Khumayni and other great figures of Muslim history to realize and accept that in all respects, even in authentic piety and genuine godliness, they were much greater than Muhammad or any one of his Companions. Khumayni, the great son of modern age, had to suffer from the primitivities of Islamic medieval times.

In addition to what has already been alluded to about the consequences of the Islamic belief system that eventually benefit the industrialized world we may refer to more.

The Iranian-Shiite-Khumaynist wing of Islamic International of the Resurgent movement was nevertheless reactionary, eventually benefitting the West. As mentioned in Appendix I-B, the rise of Resurgent Islam under Khumayni was the culmination of the Fidaiyan-i-Islam movement in Iran. Among the clerics, the Ayat Allah Sayyid Abu'l-Qasim Kashani (d. 1962) had close links to the Fidaiyan. Both Kashani as an activist clergyman and speaker of the Iranian parliament, Ma'jlis, (1952-3) and the Fidaiyan played an important role during Musaddiq's downfall orchestrated by the CIA in 1953. Kashani and Fidaiyan pulled away their support from Musaddiq to say the least, when he needed it most to confront the CIA's scheme. The CIA, Kashani and the Fidaiyan had one common 'grievance' against Musaddiq: his refusal to crusade against communism. [See, e.g., Henry Munson, Jr., Islam and Revolution in the Middle East, Yale University Press (1988):51-3; Mohammad Amjad, Iran: From Royal Dictatorship to Theocracy, Greenwood Press (1989):50, 62.]

Kashani and Iran's most prominent ulama strongly endorsed the CIA coup. And the Ayatollah Muhammad Bihbihani... actually organized a lumpenproletarian demonstration of support for the pro-Shah troops that surrounded Musaddiq's residence. Kermit Roosevelt, however, who directed the whole (CIA) operation, claims that the CIA gave up trying to involve the ulama in Musaddiq's ouster because they were asking too much money!... it is clear that Kashani and most Mullahs were delighted by Musaddiq's downfall - which they could have easily prevented by mobilizing their followers.... These facts are not usually mentioned by the Ayatollah Khomeini when he condemns the CIA for overthrowing the government of Iran in 1954. [Munson, op. cit.:53; stress added; for this collaboration between Kashani and

other clerics respected by Khomeini, the CIA, and the pro-U.S. Iranian regime after Musaddiq, also see James A. Bill and Wm. Roger Louis (eds.), Musaddiq, Iranian Nationalism, and Oil, London (1988):L cf. Kashani in the index.]

Shahrough Akhavi, also quoting other sources, tells us that

A growing body of evidence tends to support the view that Kashani's followers accepted money from the Americans to bring the crowds out in opposition to Musaddiq.... Ahmad Aramish, a partisan close to Kashani (was) a go between for the United States and Kashani.... Americans... gave him money to turn over to Kashani in exchange for Kashani's mobilization of anti-Musaddiq crowds.... After the coup the Iraqi ambassador in Tehran faithfully reported to the British that the Shah and [his Prime Minister] Zahedi personally visited Kashani to thank him for his role in the overthrow of Musaddiq. [Shahrough Akhavi, "The Role of the Clergy in Iranian Politics, 1949-1954", in Bill and Louis, op. cit.: 112, 117 (n. 28); brackets added.]

The very fact that Khomeini and his regime have tried to restore Kashani's tarnished image and defend his stand against Musaddiq indicates that his Islamic clerical class loyalties are stronger than the urge to condemn any member of this class for collaboration with the West against a secular Musaddiq. In Khomeini's Iran Kashani is the hero and

Musaddiq has become an unperson. Khomeini, if he alludes to him at all, is said to refer to him as 'that nationalist man'. Kashani's rehabilitation has advanced also in the West [Shahrough Akhavi, "The Role of the Clergy in Iranian Politics, 1949-1954", in Bill and Louis, op. cit.:91.]

In their rehabilitation of Kashani and the Fidayan, ignoring their treacheries and collaboration with the CIA coup against Musaddiq, the Khomeinists refer unapprovingly to Musaddiq's secularism, his non-belligerent attitude towards the Left and to his disinterest in the Islamic system of government (ibid:91-117, 122-4). "The clerics finally opposed Musaddiq because they feared republicanism, communism, anticlerical policies, neglect of the clergy and religion in public life" (ibid:92). It is this Islamic mentality that the Western Establishment thinkers know well and exploit accordingly, regardless of the believers' intentions to benefit or not to benefit the West. That, in order to capture power, Khomeini and most of his trusted

revolutionary clerics had not conspired with the West is immaterial. The sophisticated West no longer needs that kind of direct primitive arrangement. What matters is the fact that through Khomeini and his clerics Islam's abduction of Iranian Revolution was to be a bonanza for the Western/U.S. Establishmentarian interests, an excuse for the return of Western self-righteous jingoism, hegemonism and neo-colonialism, and a setback for the post-Vietnam moralistic revisionism in the West.

[There is a bulk of literature by Iranians that talks about a conspiracy between the U.S. Establishment and the Khomeinist clergy to take over . There exists some circumstantial evidence to support the claim in its broad outlines. But because this literature is produced mainly by the pro-Shah 'royalists' and needs careful scrutiny, here we ignore this line of argument.]

We begin with a simple fact. During the revolutionary upheaval in Iran the forces of the Left and the Democratic National Front led by Matin Daftari (from his mother's side, a grandson of Musaddiq) were the only alternative to Khomeini and his Islamic regime. Matin Daftari, though a nationalist liberal social democrat, was respected and trusted not only by the genuine Left and the so-called Islamic Marxists but also by the Regionalist groups such as the Kurdish Democratic Party and similar elements, in the non-Persian speaking-non-Shiite regions of Iran. Remember that all these Regionalists had also Leftist-progressive leanings. With the active participation of the Left, the formation of a coalition of all anti-Shah secular element, under Daftari was a strong likelihood. The simple fact is this: given Iran's economic, strategic and geopolitical importance in a Cold War era, any student of international affairs can tell that the U.S. would have preferred any rascal to the Left or to a coalition led by a strong social democrat admired by the Left and progressive Regionalists.

If the U.S. could not accept the participation of the best of Eurocommunists in the government of a safe Italy, how could the American Establishment with all that lust for communist-radical blood

(particularly of non-Euro color) allow in the Iran of a chaotic region the Tudeh Party and/or the People's Fidaiys (**FIDAIYAN-I-KHALQ** not to be confused with **FIDAIYAN-I-ISLAM**) join in a government led by a liberal social democrat willing to allow the Communists their democratic right to coexist in a pluralistic system. The U.S. was particularly unlikely to allow this at a time when the West was conducting an anti-Soviet, anti-communist crusade against the neighboring Afghanistan. Given Khomeini's Islamic ideology and the performance of his predecessors, e.g., Kashani, the West could rest assured that the Resurgent Islamic Republic of Iran would automatically be on the Western side in this crusade-cum-Jihad. Also, given Islamic ideology, the West could also depend on Khomeini to do the West's dirty work: destruction of all secular forces which happened to be overwhelmingly radical liberal, social democrat and Marxist-Leninist. The West could also hope that this ideological civil war in Iran and the clerics' primitivities and inefficiencies would eventually frustrate the Revolution's promises to overthrow Western hegemony and thus discredit the idea of revolutions and resistance to neo-colonialism.

Remember that after Vietnam two processes were at work. Within the West, particularly in the U.S., liberal, progressive and humanitarian intellectuals and journalists and peace activists had created a revisionist mood and genuine concern for human rights of all peoples. The U.S. Cold War policy of support for corrupt tyrants, the CIA's performance and Western neocolonialism in general were under attack from within the Western societies. Among an increasing number of Western commoners and intellectuals there was an honest growing readiness to let justice prevail in the Third World. This was a moral evolution (if not a revolution) in the making. America, this first child of the Enlightenment, was coming home. Kissingerism, the resurrected Metternichism, was on retreat. Although it was too early for the entrenched U.S. Establishment to change much, Jimmy Carter's election as president, his courageous reference to the malaise in the

system, and his persistent emphasis on human rights and consistency between American ideals and practice in the conduct of foreign policy symbolized the readiness for a change. This moral-political evolution coincided and interacted with another process aboard. Both inspired each other and were inspired by each other.

Western Cold War policy of alliance with Third World dictators and of antagonism towards liberal-progressive forces was not only being exposed to Western peoples but also was not working. Western puppet authoritarian rulers were losing ground everywhere. More Cubas, Vietnams and Nicaraguas were in the making. So, the mood for change in the West was also realistic.

The best of all this was the fact that due to the above-mentioned moral-political evolution in the U.S. these revolutions (and those in the making) in the Third World were viewed by a growing number of U.S. citizens with sympathy and respect rather than with reactionary jingoism. More Americans were realizing that what is good for the Third World is not necessarily bad for the West. There was hope that this international transition would take place peacefully without arousing psychological tension between the North and the South -- in such a way that both parties will be proud of their performance: The Third World radicals of their sacrifices and the West of its revisionism and humane and magnanimous retreat. Resurgent Khumayni's hijacking of the Iranian Revolution killed these hopes.

The Iranian Revolution was the greatest after the French Revolution. For the internationalist liberal cause, for the seekers of solidarity among all peoples, for the hopes of meaningful reform and progress in Iran and the region, and for the image and interests of all radical revolutionary movements in the Third World it proved to be the worst. Also, it helped destroy the nascent liberal moral evolution in the West, providing an excuse for a return of self-righteousness exploited by the Right. For their rehabilitation, the Nixons and

Kissingers should be thankful to Khumayni's Islamic Resurgence more than to any other factor. The following is a brief account of how it happened.

Once Khumayni committed the state system to Islam, he had to disregard his pre-Revolution rhetoric about human rights. There was no place in Islam for liberty and pluralism in their modern sense, and for reasons of which the world had sympathized with the Revolution. Following the principles of the Quran and Sunnah, the Islamic Republic of Iran treated seekers of human rights as "hypocrites", as "those who fight God and His Messenger" and as "the corrupt on the earth," liable to the death sentence. Beginning with the secular Kurds all opposition groups were crushed. Islamic injunctions were applied strictly. For all Iranians it meant loss of all human rights in their modern sense. For non-Muslim minorities it meant surrender to humiliation - be **SAGHIRUN** as the Quran 9:29 demands -- and acceptance of a third class status as the same Quranic verse dictates. For the Bahais as declared apostates (sing: **MURTADD**), it meant death or being forced to conceal their faith by declaring themselves as Muslims. Instead of gaining the ideal political and intellectual liberties the Revolution had promised, all Iranians lost what they had during the Pahlavi regime: religious, social, cultural and personal freedoms and better economic opportunities. Consequently, Iran lost the best of its children: hundreds of thousands of Iranians abroad, mostly graduates from Western universities, had no incentive to return to the suffocating Islamic Republic. These Iranians had played an important role in the Revolution hoping to participate in the reconstruction of a free, fair and democratic Iran. Pressed by their revolutionary zeal, those who ventured to enter Iran lost their lives or returned to the West. Ironically, these anti-West revolutionaries had no alternative to begging the same West for asylum. The mass exodus of mostly educated and productive Iranians caused a further brain drain. As a very able hard-working young Iranian engineer and system scientist who is now

teaching in an American university put it to me, one can not work in a society that denies the right to a weekend beer after having worked hard for a full week.

Inspired by Iran, an hysteric upsurge of Islamic Resurgence engulfed the Muslim world, devaluing, delegitimizing and weakening all secular forces including authentic anti-imperialist elements. Islam with whatever it means replaced bread, butter, freedom and progress in the agenda for social action. For the outside observers the Islamic world was suffering from an indigestion of civilization. Unable and unwilling to deliver promised political, economic and social reforms that would satisfy Iranians and win admiration abroad for the Revolution, the Islamic regime indulged in trivialities within the country such as the dramatic hostage-taking and in terrorism abroad. Khomeini's call for the assassination of Salman Rushdie shocked the civilized world.

Contrary to his rhetoric about Muslim unity, Khomeini and the ruling clergy could not shun their basic Shiite dogmatic views. It is impossible for a believing Shiite to declare Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Aisha as equally good and worthy Muslims as Ali and Fatima. It is like expecting a pope to shun celibacy or censor Pius XII for not issuing a bull against Hitler's crimes concerning the Jews, or expecting Jerry Falwell to accept honestly George McGovern and Jimmy Carter as equally good Christians as Ronald Reagan and George Bush. Now, it was natural that oppressed Shiites in countries ruled by Sunnite tyrants (e.g., in Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Pakistan) or those deprived of their fair share (as in Lebanon) would identify more vehemently to Khomeini thus threatening the status quo. Particularly the pro-Western Sunnite rulers, mainly through whispering campaigns, exploited those sectarian differences alienating the Iranian Revolution from the Sunnite masses.

Under general radical pressure in the area, even the pro-West rulers were obliged (before the Iranian Revolution) to pretend solidarity with the anti-imperialist cause. The Revolution in Iran

symbolized the struggle against Western hegemonism. With the deterioration of the Revolution caused by its Islamization, the words "revolution" and "radicalism" lost integrity among the masses and support from intellectuals. Along with this, went down the anti-imperialist fervor. The die-hard radicals were put in an embarrassing position. The beneficiaries of all this were the pro-West circles in the West. By August-September 1990 it was possible for the Saudis and the Persian Gulf Sheikdoms to welcome openly American and other Western forces in the region, something that was impossible in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Khumayni proved to be worse than Trotsky, Stalin and Mao in confusing, dividing, defaming and, consequently, neutralizing the Left and radical liberals. For various historical and psychological reasons, in modern times, the Shiites in general and particularly those in Sunnite dominated communities (like the Regionalists) have been at the forefront of secular liberal-progressive movements. The Shiites in Sunnite-ruled lands and the Regionalists such as the Kurds, Berbers, Baluch and Sindhis have been among the least interested in the Islamization of state as envisaged by the Resurgents. With the rise of Khumayni, the Shiite wings of Islamic Resurgence (e.g., **AL-DAWAH** in Iraq, Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf oil fiefdoms, and **HIZB ALLAH** in Lebanon) attracted and absorbed a great number of Shiites to their ranks - at the cost of secular forces. Particularly in Lebanon these indoctrinated Khumaynist fanatic Shiites proved to be more dangerous and ruthless against remaining Shiite anti-imperialist leftists than traditional pro-West circles.

In addition to the nonsense of Trotskyism versus Stalinism, Maoism versus 'revisionism', the question of how to deal with the Islamic factor of Khumayni without betraying the Revolution further fragmented the radical liberal-progressive camp. While all secular forces were getting a thorough thrashing from Khumayni, some so-called revolutionaries (such as Ahmad Jibril) degenerated to the extent of

offering their services to Khomeini to assassinate Salman Rushdie. Most of the organized Left continued to cooperate with or shield Khomeini for the sake of Revolution. Internally, various factions of the Left spent their energy on squabbles while continuously changing positions about the Khomeini phenomenon. The net result was loss of respect and influence for these anti-imperialist forces, as far as the masses and unattached intellectuals were concerned. It was disgusting for an intellectual to see, e.g., a so-called Marxist-Leninist repeating Khomeini's charges against the Bahais.

The Iran-Iraq war damaged the general cause of the Revolution more than any other factor. This was made possible by the Islamic factor. Western strategies sustained the war. Meanwhile, the war contained and exhausted the Revolution, rescuing Western interests in the region from a possible revolutionary onslaught.

We are not in a position to evaluate Iran's charges that Iraq's invasion of Iran was a U.S. conspiracy. What can be said is this: the War could not continue for such a long time without the West's calculated moves that sustained it. Our Henry Kissinger was loud enough to tell us that the war was good for the West as long as it did not end in a clear victory for Iraq or Iran. An honest Western embargo could have ended the War long before it did.

It is true that the war was triggered by Iraq's invasion, but we need to look for the Islamic factor. Let us consider some points step by step. The Arab Shiites in Iraq, though a majority, were oppressed by an Arab Sunnite ruling clique. Before the Revolution, however, the Iraqi regime had the situation under control - through ruthless force and because of lack of effective moral-political support for the Shiites from Iran. The a-religious and politically conservative Pahlavi regime of Shiite Iran could inspire neither Iraqi believers among the Shiites nor the radicals. The Khomeini era changed the situation. For Iraqi

Shiites Khomeini was both a true believer and a better revolutionary than Saddam Husayn. Above all, Khomeini and the Shiite clergy were now masters of a resourceful country. Khomeini did not conceal his desire for the overthrow of the Bathist regime in Baghdad. Now, Baghdad could no longer exploit Iraqi Shiites' Arab nationalist feelings by referring to a pro-West, pro-Israel regime in Tehran. Besides, Khomeini did not want to annex an Arab Iraq to the Persian Iran. He simply wanted Iraqi Shiites, who were in majority also, to dominate Iraq. The Bathists were in serious trouble. In desperation, Saddam Husayn thought he had only one choice: to preempt a revolution in Iraq by attacking and destroying its source of inspiration, Iran.

Saddam Husayn had hoped that Arabic speaking Iranians of Khuzistan would welcome and collaborate with the Iraqi invaders. He soon realized that Khuzistani Arabs' Shiite loyalties (particularly at a time when the Shiite clergy ruled Iran) were stronger than their enthusiasm for Arabism led by a Sunnite Arab who, in any case, had not been generous to the Iraqi Shiite Arabs. Also, the Arab radical-Leftist forces in general, regardless of Khomeini's anti-liberal, anti-left policies, sympathized more with Iran (because of its revolutionary credentials and other reasons) than with Iraq. Hafiz Asad of Syria combined both excuses (Alavite-Shiite and radical) to side openly with Iran. So, Saddam Husayn had to depend more on his Sunnite credentials and on the pro-West Sunnite regimes. Throughout the war these Sunnite regimes exploited the worst (and most effective) of sectarian feelings to discredit the Iranian Revolution.

Let us be reminded that the Shiite-Sunnite issue is an Islamic issue. Had there not been a significant oppressed Shiite population in Iraq vulnerable to Khomeini and likely to revolt against the Bathists, Khomeini would not have thought aloud about exporting the Revolution to Iraq (more than he did about other Muslim countries). Consequently, Saddam Husayn would not be so desperate to trigger the war. Had it not been for this basically sectarian reason and its historical background

it is more likely that the Bathist Iraq would have flirted with the revolutionary Iran as the Bathist Syria and Arab radical circles did. In that case the target would be the pro-West Arab regimes.

So, basically it was the strong commitment to Islam inevitably degenerating to sectarianism that created the war and destroyed the Revolution, benefitting Western interests and pro-West elements in the region.

The Islamic factor and its post-Revolution manifestations destroyed the nascent liberal moral humanitarian evolution in the West by providing excuses for the hysteric, jingoistic and self-righteous rise of the reactionary Right. The conduct and demeanor of the Resurgent Islam led by Khumayni inspired the reinforcement of Thatcherism in the United Kingdom and prepared the ground for the Reagan-Bush takeover of public opinion in the United States. I also believe that the rise of Falwellism, politico-Christian fundamentalism, during the same period was not a simple coincidence or just another cycle of fundamentalism in North America. It was a response, as far as the psyche of Christians of a particular socio-economic class is concerned, in the following way: if Islamic fundamentalism works among Muslims, 'Why should not our Christian fundamentalism with better credentials do the same in Christian communities'? Both mixed religion with politics. It was to say, 'My shit is better than his shit because it stinks less'. Some basic differences between the Bible and the Quran enhanced the syllogism.

While the questionable aspects of U.S. policies and performance in Vietnam and Cambodia and against Salvador Allende and Muhammad Musaddiq tended to create sympathy among the American people for the victims and embarrass the American Establishment, while Fidel Castro had maintained at least the moral integrity of his revolution, the loss of all human rights in the post-Revolution Iran, the vulgarities and cruelties of, e.g., hostage-taking, and the Resurgents' loud intentions to export that

kind of revolution everywhere in the world created the impression that 'these people out there in the Islamic world' do not deserve any respect and sympathy. Remember that though the Vietnamese had suffered more from the U.S. policy, and the Kissinger-inspired U.S. policy of strangling Vietnam economically was in affect after American defeat, the Vietnamese did not indulge in the kind of cruel and vulgar drama against Americans the Khumaynists staged. As a result, though Americans had lost hundreds of thousands of lives in Vietnam and suffered a humiliating military defeat, on a people to people level, Americans did not explode in indignation against Vietnamese. Regardless of the U.S. government's revanchist policy, sympathies for Vietnamese and regrets over the U.S. Vietnam policy persisted. Despite Reagan-Bush era efforts, Americans who died in Vietnam could not get the kind of image their WWI and WWII counterparts have in American consciousness. Those who returned from Vietnam could not get the kind of emotional reception American hostages received on their return from Tehran. Without Iran, it would have been less easy for the Reagan administration to sabotage the Sandinista regime (in part, with money paid by Khumayni, for arms to destroy Iraq and himself), continue active involvement against the revolutionaries in El Salvador, and venture into Grenada. Also, without Iran it would have been more difficult for the U.S. government to keep Americans indifferent about continued vindictive economic policies against Cuba and Vietnam. For average Americans, there was some justification to allow themselves to be brain-washed by Reagan-Bushism helped by Falwellism. This justification was provided by Khumayni's Resurgent Islam which must also have revived in some Western minds the fear of Islam's medieval Jihadist-expansionist record. In brief all that was good and helpful in the West for the Third World (and not necessarily bad for the West itself), Carterism and sympathy and respect for human rights of the Third World went down the drain of the Islamization of the Revolution in Iran.

Though Islamic Iran's violations of human rights and international

norms exceed others' it is interesting to note that in all respects the West put much less pressure on Khomeini's Iran than it had on Allende's Chile, Castro's Cuba, Musaddiq's Iran, Qaddafi's Libya, the Soviet bloc and, now, on Saddam's Iraq. As a matter of fact, except for the freezing of Iranian funds by Carter administration in the aftermath of the hostage crisis, the Reagan-Bush administration has done nothing to hurt the Islamic Republic. The U.S. has persistently groveled to do business with Iran as usual. It is Iran that under revolutionary pressures (mentioned above) has refused to do business in the open. Establishment thinkers such as Gary Sick have always protected post-Revolutionary Iran's interests in the U.S. This is not to suggest that the U.S. should have taken any drastic action against Islamic Iran. Nor is it to agree with the theory that Khomeinists and the U.S. had directly conspired. Nor is it to suggest the existence of a secret love affair between Islam and America. Yet there is something dubious. Is it not because Islamic Resurgence even in its Khomeinist mode serves, in the long run at least, the Western imperialistic, neo-colonialistic and capitalistic cause? The West had not to wait for long. From the very beginning, Khomeini's Iran became an effective partner of the West during the Afghanistan crisis. Given Iran's strategic position and long borders with Afghanistan, without Khomeini's partnership the West could not win the crusade against Kabul and the Soviet Union so easily. Actually, the scenario without Khomeini would have been completely different. A Left-liberal government in Tehran would not fight for Islam against Kabul. Without Islam's abduction of the Iranian Revolution the Islamic fervor which enhanced the anti-communist crusade-cum-Jihad would not be there. It was not bad business for Americans to ignore the temporary loss of an embassy compound in Tehran for a great victory in Afghanistan bringing the Soviets to their knees.

What does the continued flirtation with the so-called moderate Rafsanjani mean? The West knows well that as a cleric Rafsanjani's so-called moderation would not enhance human rights for Iranians.

Rafsanjani's clerical class is doomed by Islam not to allow liberty and enlightenment in Iran. The West is simply looking for another Saudi type: a regime that may perpetuate the worst primitivities within its own domain but be a little bit more pliable in international affairs and less concerned about its revolutionary credentials than some hard-liners, Rafsanjani's perceived rivals, are supposed to be.

Before going to the final section of this conclusion let me insert a hunch here concerning the West's uses and abuses of Islam in general. For a particular brand of racist and self-righteous Westerners, I suspect, Resurgent Islam is good for another reason too. Barring its people from enlightenment and cultural, social and intellectual evolution (which may bring them to par with the Westerners), Resurgent Islam keeps alive a certain kind of human species to be looked down upon or to be admired as animals in a zoo are. Without the existence of 'backward' people, how could our Western snobs survive and how could Western racists support their flagrant subtle theories of racial superiority? For an alert and sensitive Third Worlder it is not difficult to detect this kind of ego-massaging snobbery behind the plastic smiles and facade of paternalistic attitudes and theories of some Westerners.

If it is so that the Muslim world itself is and will remain to be the victim of Resurgent Islam perpetuating internal tensions and backwardness and making Muslim communities more vulnerable to exploitation and abuse from without, what can be done? It was mainly the search for an answer to this question that motivated me to undertake this study. My underlying assumptions are obvious. I believe that unless something relevant to Islam and similar to the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Enlightenment happens in the world of Islam, no

enduring and meaningful progress and change are possible to take place; history will continue to repeat itself perpetuating agonies, tragedies, deprivations and primitivities in Muslim world.

The Renaissance, the Reformation and the Enlightenment challenged some basic assumptions in the Western world providing alternatives which were gradually adopted (or are being adopted) by almost the entire world except the world of Islam. I believe that this modernism could not herald had the above three movements and their corollaries not challenged the Western "medieval mentality". I also believe that these movements could not have succeeded and endured had the challengers of the "medieval mentality" not been the West's own daughters and sons. For various reasons, the world of Islam needs similar self-critique and self-revaluation.

First, because it is our problem and we ourselves are the victims of Islamic mentality. Salvation is seldom offered on a platter. Second, because of the very fact that the West was politically and militarily an aggressor and colonizer during the last two centuries or so, anything offered by the West creates suspicions. Unfortunately, this has been an excuse overplayed by genuine nationalists and exploited by reactionaries and demagogues for an indiscriminate rejection of the West. Particularly after the World War II, political struggle for the decolonization of the Third World degenerated into a crusade against every thing related to the West. This was called a fight against the West's cultural hegemony and imperialism. Unfortunately, many Western liberal-progressive circles with good intentions but unaware of the intensity of the Third World's cultural problematics justified and encouraged the self-ghettoization of the Third World. This was done in the good name of tolerance, cultural pluralism and diversity. These duped liberals forgot that this was a self-imposed apartheid. The nationalists forgot that the existence of the very so-called 'national cultures' had created a vacuum and possibilities for the West's colonial advances -- and that the West could not dominate had it not been

equipped with the modern worldview and its consequent modes of thought and action explained in the introduction to this study. This misguided, primitively emotional, reactionary, unfair, unpragmatic and irrational indiscriminate treatment of the West is symbolized by the Muslim world's images and treatment of modern Western orientalist. Among Western Islamist orientalist, in my opinion, there are those who should have been considered by Muslims (and thanked accordingly) as intellectual counterparts of Tom Paine and Lafayette serving an alien cause so selflessly. Without the painstaking efforts of these orientalist much of Islamic heritage would have remained in oblivion or been destroyed for ever. The unfortunate fact, however, is that in the Muslim pseudo intellectual world the worst name is to call one an orientalist. I, as a student of Islam, and all Muslim Reformists will remain obliged to these Western orientalist **ASATIDHAH** (sing.: **USTADH**), "masters". Yet more individuals with a Muslim background are called for to carry the cross. Third, as mentioned before - and if my hunch is correct - there are those Westerners, particularly the Establishmentarians, who do not want us to get rid of Islam. It is interesting to note that in the context of The Satanic Verses affair most of those who shed crocodile tears for 'Muslim sensitivities' against Salman Rushdie were linked to the corporate business world or to the Establishment (as consultants, e.g., Robin Wright) or, in general to the "People of the Right" -- **ASHAB AL-YAMIN**, using a Quranic term for 'good' Muslims promised the best part of Paradise (see Q56:27-40, 90-1). Of course, among these Western "People of the Right" joining ranks with their Muslim counterparts were also religious fundamentalists whose own humbug could survive only by a resurrection of the inquisition which they are demanding in North America in many forms to strangle freedom of thought and expression.

With all my deficiencies and limitations, I, as an individual with a Muslim background, undertook this yet to be refined study for the above-mentioned reasons. This is a humble contribution to what (pending the use of a better term) I call Reformist tendencies. There is

however, a basic difference between my approach and those of almost all Reformists (that I know) except Salman Rushdie and some of his predecessors or contemporaries such as Jalal al-Azam. As briefly mentioned in Appendix I-B, modern Reformists have suffered from two basic interrelated fallacies. First, the Reformists have assumed that the kind of reforms which have taken place in other communities within the general parameters of traditional religions should be possible in the world of Islam. Second, they have emphasized imaginary differences between the so-called medieval Islam and 'the prestine' Islam of the Companions, Muhammad and the Quran (or the 'pristine' Islam of Muhammad and the Quran or the 'pristine' Islam of the Quran or, in its most radical form, the prestine Islam of the Meccan Quran only). The basic assumption is that Islam in its original form was good and is compatible with the modern age and sensitivities. Later, particularly during the medieval age after Muhammad died, the Reformists claim, Islam was corrupted or misunderstood by the succeeding generations.

This study is based instead on an understanding that 1) because of cardinal differences between basic Islmaic teachings as recorded in basic sacred Islamic scriptures, and the basic teachings of other traditional religions, the kind of reforms and adjustments which seem to have taken place in other religious communities are impossible to materialize among believers in Islam. 2) As far as modern sensitivities are concerned, the so-called pristine Islam is worse than the alleged medieval or later Islam. What is objectionable from a modern point of view in the medieval or later Islam belongs to the prestine Islam of the Quran and Sunnah. What was good (from our point of view) in medieval or later Islam is exactly what the believers in the pristine Islam correctly consider an aberration and betrayal of the Quran and Sunnah. The modern Islamic Resurgent movement stands for the correction of these aberrations. In brief, as a Baluchi proverb says, **AP CHA BUNAP-A LURD INT**, "the water is muddy from its source".

Here one may refer to the fallacies of the Reformists' assumptions

only in brief. First, regardless of one's basic Marxist or semi-Marxist cynicism about all traditional (particularly Western) religions, Muslim Reformists seem to be oblivious to the fact that for various historical-cultural-intellectual reasons there are some basic differences between the sacred Islamic scriptures, i.e. the Quran and the Sources of the Sunnah, and other sacred scriptures, e.g., the Vedas and the Bible. It is not necessary to be a believing Hindu, Buddhist, Jew or a Christian to acknowledge the existence of some very obvious basic ethical and humanitarian teachings compatible with the modern age. Similarly there is some ground for a believer to interpret the Vedas and the Bible in ways that satisfy modern sensitivities. A Buddha, a Mahavira or a Gandhi can defy the caste system supposed to be prescribed by the Vedas and yet be considered good Hindus by a Hindu believer. The basis for a re-interpretation of the primitivities of the earlier Books of the Bible is provided by the later Books (including the New Testament) of the same Bible. Without suppressing one's conscience, without disregarding historical facts, and without believing that the Almighty talked to him, the Moses of the Bible can easily be respected by a Modernist as a non-violent freedom fighter struggling to free his enslaved people. Similarly, without hurting one's conscience, the Biblical Prophets and Jesus can be loved and respected as 'nice guys'. About violence and sex, differences between Islamic and other sacred scriptures are too obvious to ignore. Regardless of the debate about the adherence or lack of adherence of the followers to the basic teachings of their scriptures, one simply cannot compare the cardinal belief of Eastern religions in Ahimsa, 'you shall not kill' of the Old Testament, and 'offer your other cheek' of the New Testament to the "kill them wherever you find them" of the Quran. The noble asceticism of these and all other religions simply can not match the Prophet's Companion ABud Said al-Khudri's ...Hadith report: **KUNNA NAZIL WA'L-QURAN YANZIL** (). As for the second fallacy, enough is shown in the body of this work to see how the pristine Islam of the Quran and Sunnah contradict our

Reformists claims or expectations about the same. With all respect and sympathy for the Reformists, I think, it is time to pursue what I consider to be the Rushdie line: to expose the problematics of Islam. It is futile to hope for a Reformation and reinterpretation of Islam within general parameters of Islam in order to make it compatible to the present and future. The Quran and the Sunnah do not allow such a Reformation or reinterpretation. It is impossible to prove that the so-called pristine-Islam of any kind is different from Muslim historical experience or from the so-called medieval Islam and thus better and compatible with modernism. Pending further necessary refinement this is what I have tried to do: to expose the problematics of Resurgent Islam as food for thought for all.

I do not expect that colossal forces of centuries old traditional belief systems and consequent patterns of thought and action can be overthrown overnight. In the case of Islam factors such as the following diminish further the possibility of a desired intellectual revolution: harsh Islamic punishments on an official-legal level and in the form of social pressure for alleged or real apostasy; the vicious circle of socio-economic-intellectual backwardness; the lack of moral courage; intellectual bankruptcy of all liberal-left elements; demagoguery of politicians; and, above all, international politics. On this last point we have already mentioned how Western strategic interests wittingly or unwittingly reinforce Islamic fervor and reactionary regimes in the Muslims world. The day before yesterday, Lenin and Stalin thought, in order to weaken the capitalist-imperialist enemy, it was necessary to flirt with Islamic and other forms of reactionary nationalism. Yesterday, Western powers needed Islam to defeat the Soviets in Afghanistan. Today, the whole world for its own interests it deems necessary to rescue the most conservative Islamic regimes in the Arabian Peninsula. The West was fortunate that during the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and the following liberal revolutions no counterparts of American forces in Saudi Arabia and no

counterbalancing economic, military, technological and intelligence aid from beyond the West was available for the upholders of the medieval mentality to offset, drastically, indigenous evolutionary, and revolutionary forces. The picture is undoubtedly gloomy. Yet, using a Sartrean concept, for those with a sense of social commitment, the alternative to action is to succumb voluntarily to these colossal forces and give up hope.

There is some hope for secular elements in search of new strategies. I do not expect that the exposure of the problematic aspects of Islam will result in a mass conversion to agnostic or atheistic humanism or to any other traditional religion. I do believe, however, that the events of this decade in particular have prepared the ground for initiating vigorously two interrelated movements: 1) within Muslim countries, the movement for the separation of religion from politics and state affairs; 2) a world-wide movement for human rights in Muslim countries.

The source of hope is the basic intuition of the Muslim masses and of intellectuals. There is ground to claim that a majority of Muslim masses and freethinkers never accepted Islam out of purely spiritual and/or intellectual conviction. Nor has the majority of Muslims practiced Islam with voluntary enthusiasm. As part III, Section 9, Segment 1 of this study shows the more thoughtful and civilized Meccans who formed the majority remained unconvinced by Muhammad. Later in Medina, Islam prevailed only by force combined with charlatanism and an exploitation of human greed. Historical accidents also played their part. Without Aus-Khazraj rivalries there would be no invitation to Muhammad to go to Medina. Without the greed for booty native Medinan Arabs would never betray their allies: Qaynuqa, Nadir and Qurayzah Jews. Once in power, the Prophet did not hesitate to use intimidation and violence along with manipulation of all human frailties. In brief, after the establishment of a Dar al-Islam in Medina, conformity had to

be forced on believers by this-worldly material rewards, by the sword and/or by other means for which modern languages have normally two words: disingenuous and vulgar.

After the Prophet's death, Islam sustained itself and expanded primarily by force enhanced by the Quraysh vested interests against the non-Quraysh (and then, the Arab vested interests against non-Arabs), by historical accidents, by 'pull factors' (i.e. problems of the Iranian and Byzantine empires), and by the helplessness of the people within Islamized domains. The vested interests continued to play their part. Given the fact that the Umayyads led by Abu Sufyan were forced, manipulated and bribed to surrender to Muhammad in and after 630 CE, and given the persistence of Umayyad-Hashimite rivalries and animosities, any thoughtful historian can say that had the Umayyads not inherited an empire created by Muhammad, Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman in the name of Islam, they, i.e. the Umayyads, would not perpetuate and expand the same into a greater empire convincing themselves (or pretending to be convinced) of the authenticity of Islam - thanks, initially, to the vested interests. (Many early 'Muslim' Umayyad princes and caliphs continued to express doubts about Muhammad's authenticity as a true Messenger of God. Their personal lives and attitudes toward social and intellectual issues adamantly defied orthodox Islam.)

Faith in Islam among Muslims of a second and succeeding generations has been sustained by similar vested interests of ruling and upper classes through the creation and legitimization by these classes of an all-encompassing multi-faceted totalitarian Islamic Establishment which has used, among other things, continuous indoctrination by various means, channels and institutions - an elaborate Islamic educational/instructional system being the most important institution. Use of ruthless force which includes a variety of social pressures has crowned the whole system.

It is said that Muslims have seldom converted to other religions. This would be a genuine argument in favor of the strength of Muslim

conviction had there not been the punishment of death for apostasy in Islam and a network of legal, social, political and economic pressures devised to confront an apostate, his family, friends and loved ones in the society - or had there been the possibility for an exchange of ideas in Muslim society allowing individuals and groups to evaluate with immunity pros and cons of Islam and other alternatives. Note that the so-called Dhimmis had to accept a third class citizenship and numerous political, social, economic and religious limitations. Conversion to Islam was the only way to escape these deprivations and humiliations. It is nonsense to boast about the strength of conviction held intact in a closed society flooded continuously with one-sided brain-washing propaganda from birth to death under the shadow of sword.

There is enough evidence in Islamic sources to explore and demonstrate that the basic human instinct of Muslim masses, and the rational faculties of thoughtful Muslims have always revolted, overtly and covertly, against all-encompassing Islamic demands and dogmas. The Quranic version of universal history (which was produced on the basis of the Prophet Muhammad's own experience with his contemporaries) is a confession that the majority of human kind from the time of Islamic Adam to the time of Muhammad disfavored Islam. There must be something wrong with Islam - not with the overwhelming majority of humanbeings.

Who are these **ARAB** (bedouins) and **AL-MUNAFIQUN** ("hypocrites") against whom the Quran grumbles and rumbles throughout? These were people who had accepted Islam during the Prophet's lifetime and had soon realized that it was terrible in all respects. Part III, Section 9, Segment 3 of this study tells how these disaffected Muslims were dealt with.

We know that for all 'pious' Muslims and the Resurgents of all times, the Umayyads were less authentic Muslims than their puritan rivals whom they defeated. The Umayyads could not prevail without the support of an overwhelming Muslim majority. One can argue about all Muslim dynasties that, other things equal, Muslim masses and

intellectuals have always preferred the less conformists to more puritans.

As for the intellectual revolt against Islam, the story of an Islamicate renaissance before the Renaissance, of an Islamicate enlightenment before the Enlightenment, and of the Islamic inquisition of the Islamic Middle Ages is yet to be told in a systematic way in modern works. We may refer to some points briefly. Along with other factors, the liberal attitude of the Umayyads and early Abbasids made it possible for the learned to challenge, directly and indirectly, overtly and covertly, Islamic dogma and orthodoxy. The counter-revolutions of Ahmad ibn Hanbal, al-Ashari, al-Ghazali and Nizam al-Mulk, and the consequent restabilization and re-imposition of what we call the Islamic Establishment frustrated, crushed and delegitimized the Islamicate renaissance and enlightenment. Yet, anti-Islamic and un-Islamic intellectual trends continued to express themselves in various forms to which we can only refer here rather than explain. The informed know that fundamental assumptions, thought patterns, philosophies and preferences of Ibn al-Muqaffa (d. 757), al-Kindi (d. 860), al-Farabi (d. 950), Ibn Sina/Avecenna (d. 1037), Ibn Bajjah (d. 1138), Ibn Tufayl (d. 1185), Ibn Rushd/Averroes (1198), Ibn Khaldun (d. 1406) and many others disregard and/or challenge cardinal aspects of Islamic dogma and teachings. For this very reason these great thinkers did not get from the Shariah-dominated Islam the kind of recognition, appreciation and respect awarded to the Malikis, Abu Hanifahs, Shafiis, Ibn Hanbals, al-Asharis and al-Ghazalis. Similarly, unpreempted Sufism, popular religion and Persian poetry crowned by Hafiz (d. 1309), through their traditions of universal tolerance and love, social and intellectual conscientiousness, stoicism, cynicism and skepticism, continued their defiance of the Quran-Sunnah-Fiqh-based Islam.

Who are these thousands of ZANDAQAQ/ZANIDAQ (sing.: ZINDIQ = heretic, freethinker, atheist, agnostic, Deist...) of all ages and regions about whom Islamic historical accounts such as Tabari's Tarikh

tell us frequently - and so nonchalantly - that ZANDAQ-A WA QUTIL-A, "he became a zindiq and was killed"? These were people with Muslim names, most of them highly learned, who wrote or expressed opinions against Islamic orthodoxy. As Ali Mir Futrus in his Hallaj (1958? Tehran? in Persian) quoting Islamic classical primary sources tells us, among these freethinkers with Muslim names were the QARAMITAH, respected by their contemporary intellectuals, who ridiculed Islamic teachings and expressed opinions such as follows.

Three persons, a shepherd (i.e., Moses), a quack (i.e., Jesus) and a camel-driver (i.e., Muhammad) misled/confounded the people of the world. But, in his jugglery, charlatany and artfulness, this camel-driver (i.e., the Prophet of Islam) was ahead of the other [two] -- BE NAZAR-E-ANHA SEH NAFAR MARDOM-E JAHAN RA GOMRAH KARDAND: SHABANI (KEH MAQSUDISHAN MUSA BUD) TABIBI (KEH MURADISHAN ISA BUD) WA SHOTORBANI (KEH MANZURISHAN MUHAMMAD BUD). WA IN SHOTORBAN (PAGHAMBAR-E-ISLAM) AZ DIGARAN SHOBADEHBAZ-TAR, SABOKDAST-TAR, WA MUHTAL-TAR BUD (p. 62; parentheses in original.)

Among these were some Mutazilah who refused to believe that the Quran was a Divinely revealed book or was superior in quality, asserting that stories of miracles in the Quran are nonsense (ibid:84). Some of the Mutazilah criticized Muhammad for having too many wives (ibid). Among these medieval 'Muslim' freethinkers was a certain Ibn Qutaybah who, looking at a crowd of believers gathered for Friday congregational prayers, remarked

IN KHARAN RA BE-BINID, CHIGUNEH IN ARABI ISHAN RA GOMRAH KARDAH AST -- Look at these asses! How has a bedouin (Muhammad) confounded them?! (ibid:85; parentheses added).

The Zanadiqah ridiculed the whole Islamic belief system and thought it was the result of mental derangement -- HADHYAN (ibid:92). For the great physician-philosopher al-Razi (d. 923 or 932) "miracles of Prophets are nothing but deceit, fraud and jugglery" -- MOJIZAT-E-PAYGHAMBARAN CHIZI JUZ KHODEH WA NAYRANG WA SHOBADEH NIST (ibid:104). For al-Razi "all humanbeings are of equal status", and Islamic concept of Prophethood is "irrational and unacceptable". "This concept of Prophethood", al-Razi thought, "has brought nothing but catastrophes, savage wars in the name of religious dogmas, and absurd beliefs" (ibid).

We know that the Islamic inquisition strangled these critical trends and movements. Only the post-Mongol chaotic political-military situation allowed, unwittingly, the survival of these trends in underground and semi-underground forms mostly through esoteric movements and writings, particularly Persian poetry. [For brief accounts of un-Islamic and anti-Islamic views expressed by medieval 'Muslims' and of terrible punishments they received see, e.g., numerous recent works in the Persian language by Ali Mir Futrus, and similar brief works in Arabic by Hadi al-Alawi, specifically, his MIN TARIKH AL-TADHIB FI'L-ISLAM ("From History of Persecution-Torture in Islam"). Both Mir Futrus and al-Alawi quote and refer to authentic Islamic classical primary sources.] Our point, however, is this: as long and as much as it was possible, intellectual challenges from within the Muslim society confronted Islam. These voices of dissent were silenced only by persecution and ostracism.

Along with intellectual challenges, Islam had to confront undeclared opposition from Muslim masses. Because of its impossibility and undesirability Muslims throughout history and in all regions have found ways to dodge Islam. The Shariah-based Islam was seldom practiced in total by the majority of Muslim commoners, particularly in rural and off-the-centers of power areas. Emotionally, these masses were sustained by elements of their beautiful pre-Islamic native cultures, by preempted and unpreempted Sufism and by what the Sharii Islam disapproves: semi-Islamized popular religion.

Physically, the practice of Islam has been impossible for an average working humanbeing. We may mention only two examples out of thousands. [Salman Rushdie's character, Salman, does not exaggerate when he, as a Muslim exclaims in agony that there are "rules about every damn thing", to be followed by Muslims. Those familiar with Islamic sacred law know that what Rushdie enumerates in this context are actual Quran-Sunnah-based instructions for believers. See The Satanic

Verses:363-5 passim.] If performed according to Islamic instructions only the five-time-daily prayers require at least three hours per day. It is absurd to claim that one can fast (abstaining from all kinds of food and drink) from dawn to dusk for a full month and yet maintain normal productivity and behavior. [A social history of Muslim masses concerning their nonadherence to Islamic teachings is yet to be compiled. I believe, given time and resources, there are ways to document such a claim.]

Recognition of the institution of 'legal devices' -- **HIYAL** (sing.: **HILAH** = "stratagem, maneuver, ploy, trick...") by all schools of Islamic law is a confession of the fact that total adherence to Islam is impossible for an average person in normal circumstances. [For the believers it is not important to think that these Islamically legalized and authorized **HIYAL** are nothing but lessons in self-deception and in how to defraud the Almighty and society. For some details about this Islamic legal institution and further references see J. Schacht, "**HIYAL**", *El*²,3:510-13].

A basic line of argument of the Resurgent movement is that after the first four "Rightly Guided caliphs" -- **KHULAFAT RASHIDUN** (according to the Shiites, after the Prophet), Muslims failed to practice Islam in an ideal way. For the Resurgents, most of Muslim history has been an history of aberrations and deviations from Islamic teachings. [See, e.g., Maududi, A Short History of the Revivalist Movement in Islam (1940/1972).] We agree with this assessment and take it as a proof in support of our claim that it was simply impossible and unpalatable to practice the 'ideal' Islam.

Contrary to the reputation of its influence on Muslim society, the modern Resurgent movement and its Islamic International have failed to gain enthusiastic support from Muslim masses and intellectual. This is because, I believe, knowing that the Resurgents aim at forced compliance with an all-embracing Islam using power of state, Muslim masses and intellectuals prefer absence of an authority that will, e.g., apply the

HUDUD (sing.: HADD = corporal punishment, such as flogging, amputation and stoning, for violations of Islamic teachings, or which might drastically change existing modern or semi-modern social, political, economic and educational systems. Fearing, e.g., the legalization of polygamy and of men's right to unrestricted divorce while curbing women's right to demand divorce so easily, and also fearing the imposition of various social and legal restrictions, women seem to be at the forefront of opposition to the Islamization of the state as envisaged by the Resurgent movement.

The best evidence supporting our claim is the electoral record of Pakistan. Though repeatedly nullified by Martial Law and military regimes, many general and local elections have been held in Pakistan since 1947 - thanks to the British-Indian National Congress legacy. Jamaat Islami, one of the four founding and best organized parties of the Islamic International (the other three being the Muslim Brotherhood of the Arab world, Masjumi of Indonesia and Fidaiyan-e-Islam of Iran) always competed in these elections. Unlike many secular progressive groups, the Jammaat did not suffer from legal limitations. Thanks to the fanaticism, it had always more committed members and workers, and more organized resources than any other political party. The Jamaat always mobilized the Almighty and Muhammad on its side during election campaigns projecting itself as the only representative of ideal pristine Islam. It was seen so by the people. Yet, compared to other major national and regional secular and semi-secular parties, the Jamaat attracted the least number of votes. In most cases it failed to win even a single seat in local bodies and provincial and federal assemblies. [Available record of Pakistan's various elections can easily document our claims.]

In the beginning of modern Indonesia's history, the Masjumi party, benefitting from a pluralistic electoral system under Sukarno, was able to form only once a coalition government (with Dr. Nasir of Masjumi as Prime Minister). However, the very fact that in the final struggle

between democracy and authoritarianism Masjumi sided with the U.S.-supported military coup to end democracy in Indonesia indicates that the Masjumi had no chance to remain in power through a democratic process.

The disbelief of the founding fathers and ideologues of the Islamic International in democratic process is clearly reflected in their basic writings. [See, e.g., J.L. Esposito, (ed.), Voices of Resurgent Islam (1983), particularly essays by Y.Y. Haddad and Ch. J. Adams respectively on Sayyid Qutb and Maududi; Five Tracts of Hasan al-Banna (1906-1949), translated by Charles Wendell, University of California Press (1978)] . Instead of belief in democratic process, Hasan al-Banna (the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood), as Wendell in his introduction to the above Tract has correctly note "was deeply impressed by the organization of the Nazi, Fascist, and Communist parties, and by no means rejected the tactics they employed to gain and sustain their power" (p. 5). For Hasan al-Banna, in his own words, "Force is the surest way of implementing right" (p. 80), i.e., Islam, not elections. The first item in his 50-point manifesto for "political, judicial, administrative, social, educational and economic" reforms is a demand to abolish the multi-party system in order to form a "single phalanx" (p. 1265, cf. pp. 126-31), which will, obviously, be the Muslim Brotherhood. A cursory look at the fifty points of this manifesto (which may be called the Manifesto of the Islamic International) will indicate that the Resurgent Islam does not expect Muslim masses and intellectuals to surrender to its program enthusiastically and voluntarily.

Had Western imperialistic strategies, local authoritarian rulers and eventually the military regimes not disrupted the evolving liberal democratic Wafdist trends in Egypt (and elsewhere in the Arab world), the Muslim Brotherhood and other affiliates of the Islamic International could not gain the kind of popularity they seem to have.

Having said the above, the point I want to make is this: an overwhelming majority of Muslim masses has always preferred to, at

least, evade full enforcement of Islam without challenging it frontally. Had there not been the fear of persecution, legal limitations, social pressures and of ostracism many Muslim intellectuals would have continued the medieval critical traditions. I believe a great number of thoughtful Muslims feel (without being able to express these feelings for above mentioned and consequent psychological reasons) that Islam's pervasive restrictions on the human mind and body distort human personality; its prescribed conduct of affairs with non-Muslims and nonconformists hurts the human conscience. Had the Muslim subconscious a tongue and could that tongue speak with immunity, it would have recited aloud, addressing the all-embracing Islam of the Resurgents

**ATINI HURRIYYAT ATLIQ YADAYY-A
QAYDUK-A ADMA MASAMI**

("Give me my freedom, release my hands;
Your shackles (have) bloodied my wrist(s)").

[The couplet is by a modern Arab poet whose name I do not remember. The poet has not necessarily meant what I have used the couplet for.]

By aducting the Revolution in Iran and imposing an Islamic regime par excellence, Khumayni and his clerics have done, unwittingly, a great service to the cause of secularism, idea of separating religion from state affairs. Before the establishment of the Islamic regime in Iran, Islamic International-affiliated circles used to whisper that none of the existing Muslim countries, including Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, was completely Islamized. Thanks to Khumayni, for the first time in Muslim history (after 661 CE for the Sunnites and after 632 for the Shiites) a pure Islamic regime was established in Iran. Thus, Muslim masses and intellectuals saw in action the true and pure Islam of the Rusurgent movement. After the establishment of the Islamic Republic of Iran all affiliates of the Islamic International acknowledged the Islamic authenticity of Khumayni regime. [Evidence for this can be found in statements, declarations and the practical attitude of all segments of the Islamic International throughout the Muslim world. The Shiite - Sunnite differences on certain dogmatic and legalistic questions are irrelevant for our purposes. To the extent that Islam affects the

society at large, the Sunnite Resurgents and Ualma do not (and can not) challenge the authenticity of Khumayni's Islam.]

Those familiar with the Iranian situation know well that an overwhelming majority of Iranians, after having seen the nature of all-embracing Islam power, would prefer its replacement with any other system except, perhaps, the so-called Islamic Marxism of the Mujahidin-i-Khalq which combines totalitarian-fascistic elements of both Islam and Leninist-Stalinist vanguardism. Khumayni's Islamic regime has survived, primarily, the force. The constitution and basic laws of the Islamic Republic bar individuals and groups who do not accept (or want to change) these Islamic laws from participation in political activity. That tyrannies in control of vast resources of the state in a closed society last long does not prove their popularity- particularly in a situation when opposition is crushed by violence and is in a disarray, and the international situation reinforces the status quo.

Having seen the performance of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the initial hysteric glee of Muslim masses for the victory of Islam, and about Islam's efficacy to solve social, political, and economic problems has changed to gloom. The Sunnite Resurgents' disingenuous apologetic whispers telling the world beyond Islam, and the masses and intelligentsia within, that their Islam would be different from that of Khumayni reflects these Resurgents' awareness of the unpopularity (within and outside Iran) of their Iranian comrades' conduct.

I believe that along with the historical record Muslim nonpreference of Islam-in-power-and-politics, Pakistan's deadlocked (if not failed) experimentation with political Islam, increasing exposure of the Saudi and other Persian Gulf Sheiks' perversions ongoing tragedies in Lebanon and Sudan (caused by the Resurgents' mixing religion with state affairs), and above all the Iranian experience have prepared ground for a movement calling for complete constitutional separation of religion from politics and state affairs. It is something that modern Turkey did successfully in this century. For the success of such a movement,

during campaigns in Muslims societies, a frontal attack on Islam is neither necessary nor expedient. Yet there are ways for materilizing suppressed Muslim desires for separating religion from politics without challenging their centuries old imposed sensitivities. In order to prepare an appropriate manifesto, secular intellectuals, leaders and activistis of the Muslim world need to do some hard work. The pre-requisite for the success of such a movement is a degree of mutual understanding among all secular forces. More specifically, the Marxist-Lenist forces have to shun dogmatic primitives and "leftist" fundamentalism aside, read Marx anew and find ways to cooperate sincerely with liberals and social democrats. The so-called Marxist-Lenists must understand that the road to meaningful socialism goes through liberalism not by making puerile "big leaps". Separation of religion from state affairs is the first stage of liberalism.

In modern times, the concept of human rights in formal documents was introduced by the first two children of the Enlightenment: Revolutionary France and the United States of America, more specifically, by the United States Declaration of Independence, 1776 and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, 1789. The concept was incorporated in the U.S. Constitution and extended through the 16th Constitutional Amendment of 1913. Temporary setbacks inflicted on the French Revolution, and the rise of nationalism, industrialized capitalism and New Imperialism during the nineteenth century imposed a hiatus on further evolution and proliferation of the concept. Yet, the concept of human rights survived in the West--thanks to the Greco-Roman and Judaeo-Christian background of Western civilization, to the resumption of liberal revolutions from the mid-nineteenth century, and to the articulation of the idea of socialism particularly by Karl Marx. This is not the place for a survey of multi-dimensional and internationalist concerns for human rights as reflected in Western thought during the

period through a vast and variegated literature. Here, I refer only to the first Geneva Convention of 1864 led to the establishment of the International Red Cross, to a branch of human rights law reaffirmed in 1977, and the to international treaties of 1906, 1929, 1949, and 1977 for more humane treatment of prisoners of war and civilians during wars.

After the establishment of the League of Nations in 1920, concerns of human rights have been universalized and incorporated in most cases in international law. Through series of treaties, covenants, conventions, resolutions, declarations, pacts, accords, agreements, and announcements, the whole world has committed itself to observe human rights. We may refer to the following in a chronological order:

*The Declaration of Human Rights and Duties worked out in 1929 by New York Institute of International Law and submitted to International American League Committees. (Cf. Articles 1 and 2 in particular).

*The Chapultepec Resolution of Inter-American Conference, 1945.

*The United Nations Charter, 1945.

*Introduction of the obligation of protection human rights to peace treaties since 1947, e.g. the peace treaties of February 10, 1947 with Bulgaria (arts 2,3,4), Finland (arts 6,7,8), Romania (arts 3,4,5), Hungary (arts 2,4), and Italy (arts 15), and of May 15, 1955 with Austria (arts 6,7,8).

*The Declaration of American Rights and Duties (Bogota), 1948.

*The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948, adopted by a United National General Assembly resolution.

*Celebration of each December 10, since 1950, as the World Human Rights Day.

*Human Rights European convention, 1950: A convention for the protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedom. (Cf. the main 19 articles. Signed also by Turkey).

*The UN General Assembly Resolution of November 20, 1929 known as the Declaration of the Rights of the Child.

*The consequent International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, unanimously adopted by the UN General Assembly.

*Declaration of the year 1968 as the International Year of Human Rights.

*Human Rights Teheran Proclamation, 1968, unanimously adopted by the UN General Assembly.

*The International Covenant of Economic, Social and Political Rights, 1968? (Cf. arts 16,22).

*Human Rights American Convention, 1969 (called also the Pact of San Jose 1969) signed by members of the Organization of American States.

(Cf. the Preamble and the first six chapters).

*The Helsinki Accord, 1975.

*The Declaration of Consultative Political Committee, 1978, of the Warsaw Pact countries.

*Announcement by the United States Department of State, January 1978, of a U.S. official definition of human rights.

[For the above information, I am indebted to Edmund Jan Osmanczyk, The Encyclopedia of the United Nations and International Agreements, Taylor and Francis, 1985 and to David P. Forsythe, Human Rights and World Politics, University of Nebraska Press (1983).]

The most glorious era of international commitments to human rights coincided, unfortunately, with the Cold War. Consequently, action on these commitments was politicized by the polarization of the world in the two American-and-Soviet led camps. [This sad story is told, among others, by David P. Forsythe in his Human Rights and World Politics, op. cit.] The apparent end of the Cold War, however, provides opportunities to divert world attention to a venue of the worst violations of human rights: the Islamic world.

It is time to tell Islamic Resurgents and their constituentcies that as long as they aspire to apply an all-embracing Islam to all aspects of society including its conduct of relations with its own citizens and with the World beyond, the world has no other choice but to scrutinize Islam as a political ideology and not disregard and tolerate it as a mere traditional religion. If the world cannot allow questionable parts of other traditional religious scriptures, or Mein Kampf and similiar documents to be the basis of constitutions and fundamental laws of states in modern times, why treat the Quran and the sources of the Sunnah (which are worst) differently? Through a minute comparison and contrast to relevant articles in international agreements on human rights and behavior of world communities and states it is possible to demonstrate that on these agreements' subjects of interest (related to human rights and international behavior) the Quran and the Sunnah sanctify and enjoin action in opposite directions.

It is time to tell the Resurgents, their supporter, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Iran, the Sudan and rest of the Muslim world that their interventions or acts to Islamize their states according to the teachings of the Quran and the Sunnah contradicts flagrantly their solemn pledges, through various international documents and institutions, to protect and promote general and specific human rights and behave in the community of nations within certain parameters. It is time to shun hypocrisy and have a Helsinki II aimed at the world of Islam.

The most appropriate body to spearhead such a global movement for human rights and for compliance with existing agreements is the United Nations if it is willing to rescue its credibility. As Forsythe has noted, the seventeen most important international agreements on human rights (except the University Declaration, 1948, and the 1975 Helsinki Accord) are treaties, i.e., the world community can demand compliance according to international law. Also, for the United Nations "there is an array of measures available for the formal implementation of human rights", (Forsythe, op. cit. :43 cf. entire Chapter 2).

All Muslim countries are signatories to these international agreements. It is time to challenge their hypocrisies and question their disingenuous behavior in this regard. [It is true that only Saudi Arabia, among Muslim countries, abstained in 1948 from voting in favor of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and that the Declaration is not a treaty. Yet, Saudi Arabia and all other Muslim countries have pledged to abide by enough other international documents (such as the UN Charter) which oblige them to comply with world standards on human rights and international behavior.

International pressure on Muslim countries for human rights would help enlightened secular forces as well as minorities and nonconformist majorities in these countries to enhance the movement of the separation of religion from common, social, and state affairs. Exposure and documentation of problematics of the Quran and the Sunnah (as this study

does) help both movements for the separation of religion from state affairs, and for human rights. Such studies could be used as source material to confront the Resurgents and their constituencies about the inappropriatenesses and impossibility of conducting relations with citizens and humankind strictly on the the basis of the Quran and the Sunnah.

ENDNOTES: CONCLUSIONS, FIRST:

'The United States, particularly, has learned how to deal with some basic contradictions between the ideals of Jefferson's America and the norms of Muhammad's Saudi Arabia. It is true that the Saudi system, its media and press, in order to maintain the regime's Islamic fundamentalist credentials, frequently violate the most fundamental human rights, and spread what could normally be called hate-literature against humanity beyond Islam. Had the originators of this kind of material been the Nazis, Ku Klux Klan or Afrikaners, there would be a big hue and cry. In addition to what is mailed directly from Saudi Arabia (and other Muslim countries), Saudi embassies around the world distribute this literature to Muslims abroad. The booklet entitled **FATAWA LIL-MUSLIM FI'L-MUGHSTARAB** ([Islamic] Legal Verdicts for Muslim[s] in Alien Lands) is just one of thousands of examples. The booklet indicates in print that it is published officially by "the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia" and distributed "with good wishes" by "Office of the Cultural Attache of the Saudi Arabian Kingdom at Washington". The booklet answers hypothetical or real questions about the teachings of the Quran and Sunnah concerning Muslim conduct of life in non-Muslim countries. The answers are published as **FATAWA**, i.e., Islamic legal and binding verdicts issued by a Saudi department headed by Abd al-Aziz bin Abd Allah bin Baz, an Alim and the highest Saudi Arabian authority for Islamic religious affairs (see p. 16). One of the questions in the booklet: "Is it permissible for a Muslim to become an American citizen?" (p. 5). The answer, a **FATWA**, a binding verdict, is as follows

It is not permissible for a Muslim to become the citizen of a country governed by non-Muslims. Because such a citizenship is a means of friendship with them (i.e., non-Muslims) and implies agreement with the falsehood they stand for -- **LA YAJUZ LI-MUSLIM- IN AN YATAJANNAS BI-JINSIYYAT BILAD-IN HUKAMATUHA KAFIRAT-UN, LI- ANN DHALIK WASILAT-UN ILA MAWALATHIM, WA'L-MUWAFQAQAT-I LIMA HUM ALAYH-I MIN AL-BATIL** (p. 5).

The **FATWA** states the classical verdict of the Quran and Sunnah that friendship with non Muslims in any form is forbidden. The Fatwa adds that even a simple stay (**IQAMAH**) in a non-Muslim-ruled country, i.e. in a Dar al-Harb, is forbidden. It quotes the Quran and the Prophet's sayings which strongly condemn Muslims who live in non-Muslim-ruled lands (p. 5). The Fatwa reminds that it is an Islamic duty to perform Hijrah, to leave "the pagandom" -- **BILAD AL-SHIRK**, (in this case the U.S., obviously) for the Dar al-Islam (ibid). Those who stay must have an Islamic justification, the Fatwa asserts. It enumerates these justifications. First and foremost, Muslims staying temporarily in non-Muslim countries must be fully aware and informed about Islam -- **MIN AHL AL ILM WA'L-BASIRAT FI'L-DIN**. The purpose of the stay should be propagation of Islam in order to convert or influence at least some of the non-Muslims; or there must be other (sing.: **MASLAHAH**) specific Islamic purposes.

Another question:

Is it permissible to begin addressing the **KUFFAR** (heathen, non-Muslims) with **SALAM** [the greeting **AL-SALAM ALAYKUM** which means "Peace be on you"], particularly when such addressed persons are among important figures such as university professors? (p. 13, brackets and parentheses are added).

The questioner is told that it is not permissible for a Muslim to begin greeting non-Muslims with Salam, wishing peace for them, even if they are important figures as stated -- **LA YAJUZ LI'L-MUSLIM AN**

YABDAA'L-KAFIR BI'L-SALAM WA LAU KAN MIN DHAWI'L-HAYAT (p. 13). The Fatwa quotes the Prophet who said "Do not begin conversation with the Jews and Christians with Salam", i.e., with wishing peace for them (ibid). It simply follows the basic Islamic principle that no non-Muslim is to be wished well or be the recipient of any kind of Muslim good-will. Another Fatwa instructs Muslim graduates of Western countries not to wear the particular graduation gown because of its Christian origin (p. 14). The Fatwa in this context quotes the Prophet who said **MAN TASHABBAH BI-QAUM-IN FA HUA MINHUM** -- "Any one who imitates a (non-Muslim) nation becomes one of them" (ibid). The stress is again on segregation and on the well-known principle of **KHALIFU-HUM**, (" [always] do just the opposite of what they]i.e., non-Muslims, particularly the Jews and Christians] do.") Almost all of the answers to various questions have one common theme as instructions to the believers: treat the non-Muslim society as a community of untouchables unworthy of Muslim intimacy and fraternity.

Now, who cares if this kind of behavior violates flagrantly the commitments to the Charter of the United Nations and basic principles most of the civilized nations stand for as indicated in their constitutions and in national, regional and international treaties and covenants. Also, who cares if on a people-to-people level this kind of material reinforces hatred among the believers for the 'heathen' American commoners, as long as the U.S. Establishment, informed of the psyche of Saudi fundamentalist ulama and of the nature of Islamic authoritarianism, thinks that the situation is in control - as far as 'real politik' is concerned. The events during the recent Iraq-Kuwayt crisis (August-September, 1990) proved that American confidence is well-placed. While the abovementioned hate-booklet was still in circulation in the United States, its author, Abd al-Aziz bin Baz along with "the most conservative leaders," commenting on the presence of American troops in Saudi Arabia, told the believers through Saudi television and other media that American armed forces were there "to defend Islam" and "will be rewarded by God for their good deeds" (The New York Times, August 24, 1990, p. 5, continuation of the news item on p. 1). So, Islamic fundamentalism is in control and ready to serve the Western cause when it is really needed.

PART I: BELIEF IN GOD

'I WITNESS THERE IS NO GOD BUT GOD; I WITNESS MUHAMMAD IS INDEED THE MESSENGER OF GOD. [The Shahada, The Testimony to declare oneself a Muslim. In order to become a Muslim, one must first recite the Shahadah. It is usually called the first "pillar", RUKN, of Islam

'I BELIEVE IN GOD AND HIS ANGELS, IN HIS BOOKS AND MESSENGERS, AND IN THE LAST DAY AND IN PREDESTINATION TO GOOD AND EVIL BY GOD THE EXALTED. [IMAN MUJMAL, "Synoptic Credo" of Islam.]

Confession and declaration of belief in God form the first parts of both the Shahadah and Iman Mujmal, (Islamic) Synoptic Credo." Sacred Islamic literature explains extensively the meaning and requirements of belief in God through various conceptual tools. The concept of God's **ASMA AL-HUSNA** "the Most Beautiful Names" is one (See Appendix A). These "Names" project various **AYAT**, "signs", and **SIFAT** "attributes", of God in the Muslim mind, summarizing dimensions of the Muslim belief in God, the Almighty's attributes, ways, likes and dislikes. In this Part, our discussion of the effects of Islamic belief in God on Muslim self-images and on Muslim images and treatment of the world beyond Islam will use, generally, the concept of God's "Most Beautiful Names" as a framework.

For our specific purposes, the "Most Beautiful Names" of Islamic God may be divided into six categories (see Appendix A for details).

Category I. In this category we put those Divine "Names" and attributes which emphasize God's uniqueness, eternity, mysteriousness, inaccessibility, extraordinary majesty and glory, omnipotence, omniscience and related characteristics.

Category II. The Divine "Names" and attributes in this category tell Muslims that God is Creator ex nihilo of all creatures, of all states of body and mind, of capacities and attributes, as the shape-giver, nourisher and destroyer, able to recreate after destruction and annihilation.

Category III. The Divine "Names" and attributes in this category convince Muslims that God is the Lord and sovereign ruler of the whole universe, of all Being.

Category IV. The Divine "Names" and attributes of this category emphasize that God provides Guidance to be followed by His creatures. These "Names" also explain the rationale for the superiority of Divine guidance and tell the believers that the Almighty takes notice of adherence or lack of adherence to such Divine Guidance.

Category V. These Divine "Names" and attributes project God as a just and sovereign judge.

Category VI. The Divine "Names" and attributes in this category tell Muslims that a) God is affectioante towards some and rewards them and that b) He is harsh towards others whom He punishes. (For details, see Appendix A.)

Our above arrangement and categorization of God's attributes take into consideration Muslim concept of 'history' and eschatology outlined below. Specifics of this Islamic worldview along with particular references will be mentioned in relevant sections.

The Omniscient, Omnipotent, Mysterious, Eternal and Glorious God created the whole visible and invisible universe including human beings out of nothing and for no reason.¹ God creates and destroys spontaneously, at will.

...to Him belongs all that is in the heavens and the earth; all obey His will - the Originator of the heavens and the earth; and when He decrees a thing, He but says to it 'Be,' and it is (2:116-7). 'God creates what He will. When He decrees a thing He does but say to it "Be," and it is' (3:47). He created him (Adam) of dust, then said He unto him, 'Be,' and it was (3:59). The only words We say to a thing, when We desire it is that We say to it 'Be' and it is (16:40). It is He who gives life, and makes to die; and when He decrees a thing, He but says to it 'Be,' and it is (40:68; also see 19:35).

Because God is the Creator of all being, He is the Owner -- **MALIK**. So, the visible and invisible physical universe obey and follow God's will and guidance and glorify him automatically.

All that is in the heavens and the earth - all obey His will (2:116). Have they not regarded all things that God has created casting their shadows to the right and to the left, bowing themselves before God in all lowliness? To God bows everything in the heavens, and every creature crawling on the earth, and the angels. They have not waxed proud; they fear their Lord above them, and they do what they are commanded (16:48-50). ...to Him belongs whosoever is in the heavens and the earth; all obey His will (30:26).

So do "the moon, the stars and the mountains, the trees and the beasts" (22:18; 55:6). What we consider natural phenomena are conscious acts of nature to obey and glorify God. (See T,14:116-7 passim cf. Q16:48-50; T,15:130 cf. Q22:18; T,21:35 cf. Q30:26.) Also Believers are told why sometimes the stars, the sun and the moon disappear and cannot be seen: they are gone to prostrate before God -- **YAQA LI'LLAH SAJID-AN HIN**

YAGHIB (T,17:130 cf. Q22:18). They do not reappear until permitted by the Almighty -- **THUMM LA YANSARIF HATTA YUDHAN LAHU** (ibid). Al-Kisai gives similar explanations.

... God created in the backbone of the heavens and the earths, a white pearl with seventy thousand tongues to glorify Him. With each of these tongues it glorifies Him in seventy thousand languages... water... has never ceased to glorify God, for its act of exaltation is its quaking and movement... Then the water was told, "Be still!" And it was still, awaiting God's command. This is limpid water... (K:5-6) ...angels never cease glorifying and praising god, be they standing, sitting, kneeling or prostrated, as God hath said in the Quran 21:20 (K:12).

As in the Quran 14:33, al-Kisai tells us the sun and the moon perform their courses as ordered by God. So, as in the Quran 22:61 "God causeth the night to succeed the day, and causeth the day to succeed the night" (K:15).

He subjected the sun and the moon, each one running to a term stated. He directs the affair; ...the thunder proclaims His praise, and the angels, in awe of Him. He looses the thunderbolts, and smites with them whomsoever He will;... To God bow all who are in the heavens and the earth, willingly or unwillingly, as do their shadows also in the mornings and evenings (Q13:2-15).

Nature changes course, extraordinary events take place, i.e., miracles happen, when God wills so.

In following God's Guidance and obeying Him, the jinn and human beings are somewhat different from the rest of God's creatures. Although God created the jinn and human beings also for the sole purpose of serving and worshipping Him (51:56), the Quran and Tradition in general grant "limited free will" and "a kind of autonomy" to them as Abu'l-Ala Maududi tells us in his introduction to the Quran.² When the Quran tells us that along with the moon, stars, mountains, trees and the beasts, "many of mankind" "bow to God" (22:18), it mentions in the same verse that "many (others) merit chastisement," "abased" by God (ibid), i.e. there are many others among humans who do not follow Divine Guidance. It is in this context that God's attributes of Category IV, as a watchful Guide, become most relevant.

As indicated in God's attributes of our fourth category, God, however, insists that human beings (and the jinn), though granted limited autonomy, must follow His **HUDA**, Guidance. Refusal to do so is considered to be rebellion against God's lordship (as emphasized in Category III), ingratitude to God, the creator - Nourisher (as mentioned in Category II), and confrontation with an Omnipotent, Glorious and Majestic God of attributes of Category I.

Belief in God as a watchful Guide is incorporated in (or is the basis of) Islamic concepts of Revelation -- **WAHY**, Messengership -- **RISALAT** and/or Prophethood -- **NUBUWWAT**. Through a select number of individuals (Messengers/ Prophets), God reveals His Guidance about all aspects of thought and action to the jinn and human beings. Before Adam was created, God appointed jinn individuals such as Amir ibn Umayr ibn al-Jann (sic) and Saiq ibn Naiq (sic) as His Prophets to the jinn (K:21). After Adam, apparently, only humans were appointed as Messengers of God for both humans and jinn, telling them how to serve and obey God. Adam was the first and Muhammad the last human Messenger of God. Divine Guidance -- **HUDA'LLAH** was repeated, perfected and conveyed in a final binding form to mankind (and the jinn) through the Quran and the Sunnah (model) of Muhammad.³ Also, as the second part of God's attributes in our category IV indicates, the Almighty watches the adherence or lack of adherence by humans and the jinn to His Guidance conveyed through the Messengers in this world.

God's attributes of Category V as the Judge and of Category VI as one who rewards or punishes are relevant to the here and now as well as to the Hereafter. Those judged as conformists to His guidance may be rewarded, and nonconformists in this regard may be punished in this world. The main venue, however, in which above two categories of Divine attributes materialize is the Afterlife.

At a certain time in the future God will terminate the whole existence in this world: "All that dwells upon the earth will perish, yet still abides the Face of thy Lord, majestic, splendid" -- **KULL MAN**

ALAYHA FAN-IN WA YABQA WAJH RABBIK DHU'L-JALAL WA'L-IKRAM (55:26-7).

Note that the Almighty is able to do what He wants. There will be an Other World, a Hereafter. God will resurrect all human beings, the jinn, and the angels from dead - and whatever else He will. After this Resurrection the Day Hereafter will begin with a Day of Judgment. God shall judge all human beings - from Adam to those born until the end of this world. The Divine verdict will be based on a simple criterion: Those who follow God's Guidance in this world - received through His Messenger would be sent to Paradise to enjoy an eternal life of bliss, comforts and luxuries. Others will go to Hell to suffer forever.

So, in L. Gardet's words, "God the Unique One, the Creator and Lord of judgment polarizes the thought of Islam; He is the sole reason for its existence".⁴ The omnipotent God creates, vigilantly guides, sits in judgment which results in reward or punishment for the judged.

Our categorization of God's "Beautiful Names," i.e., His ways and attributes also implies the existence of a link (in Muslim mind) among these categories. Each category of the Divine attributes creates vertically and horizontally, the whole Islamic stream of consciousness relating consequences of faith in a particular category of God's attributes to the justification of Muslim self-images and of Muslim images and treatment of others based on the Divine attributes of other categories. For example, Muslim belief in God as one who rewards and punishes effectively (Category VI) is based on belief in His attributes of Category V as **AL-HAKAM**, the Judge. God's judgment is just because of His attributes of Category IV: 1) as the Guide -- **AL-HADI**, through His Messengers He has already told all human beings how to conduct their affairs, warning them of consequences. 2) As an All-seeing, All-knowing, ever-watchful God, He knows well who has and who has not conformed with His Guidance. Why should God, at all, tell us what to do and what not to do? In response a Muslim would refer to the Almighty's attributes in Category III: He is the Lord of human beings -- **RABB AN-NAS** (114:1), the Lord of all Being -- **RABB AL-ALAMIN** (1:1), the

Sovereign King of the Kingdom -- **MALIK AL-MULK** (3:26) of the whole universe, a King Omnipotent -- **MALIK MUQTADIR** (54:55), the true King -- **MALIK AL-HAQQ** (20:114; 23:116), indeed the King of human beings -- **MALIK AN-NAS** (114:2). Should not such an Omnipotent True King tell the subject how to behave? (Note that our believer is neither an Athenian nor a Frenchman!) What justifies this Lordship? The attributes in Category II provide the answer: God creates and nourishes all creatures. Human beings owe their existence and faculties to Him. Note that the bulk of Quranic argumentations in favor of Islam follows this line of 'logic.'

Is God capable of doing all that the attributes from categories six-to-two involve? The attributes in Category I provide a positive answer. Besides, these attributes in Category I close the door against any further argumentation and rational doubt. The attribute **AL-QUDDUS**, "the Holy," as Gardet tells us, signifies "that neither imagination nor sight can penetrate the mystery of God." (See Appenxdix A.) That God is **AL-AZIM** "All-Glorious" and **AL-AZIZ** "All-Mighty" also implies that He is "Inaccessible... beyond the limits of human understanding..." (*ibid*). One example of how this pattern of thought works in the Muslim mind should suffice. After the short introductory Surah 1 ("The Opening") God tells us in the beginning of the first major Surah ("The Cow") that the Quran "is the Book, wherein is no doubt, a guidance to the godfearing who believes in the Unseen" (2:2-3). Abu'l-Ala Maududi explains the passage as follows:

...this Book is based on the Truth because its Author, Allah, possesses full knowledge of the Reality. Therefore, there is no room for doubt about its contents. The first condition to benefit from the Quran is that one should be a **MUTTAQI**, that is, one who fears God... The second condition for obtaining guidance from the Quran is that one must believe in the "un-seen" - those things which cannot be perceived by the senses and which do not come within human experience and observation. It is obvious that God, Angels, Revelation, Life-after-death, Paradise, Hell, etc. can neither be seen nor tasted nor smelled nor measured nor weighed: such things must be taken on trust from the experts (Prophets)...⁵

Using the Divine Names-Attributes as a general framework we

continue our study of Muslim belief in God. In the following discussion of the effects of Islamic belief in God on Muslim self-images and on Muslim images and treatment of non-Muslims we keep under consideration alternate humanistic-rationalistic patterns of thought and behavior discussed in the introduction to this study. We begin with the status of man per se. All humanists agree that man is 'somebody', definitely not a worm, if not a God. Compared to this, the Muslim belief in God relegates man to nobody, almost a worm. Such an outlook results both from an abstract belief in the Divine attributes as emphasized by the "Beautiful Names" and from what the Quran, i.e., the Almighty and Tradition teach the believers about man. Belief in God's attributes of category I, in God's uniqueness, inaccessibility, extraordinary majesty, omnipotence and omniscience is directly contrasted in the Muslim mind to the nothingness of all creatures including human beings.

It is not any physical or intellectual evolution or discovery of realities through senses that can redeem man from what he is: **ASFAL AS-SAFILIN**, "the lowest of the low (95:5); only with the Islamic version of a 'medieval legacy' may human beings escape from being worse than animals. Perhaps there are no other religious scriptures comparable in quantity and quality to those of Islam in their attempt to humiliate men and remind them of their humble, mean and problematic nature .

Almost all Muslim and non-Muslim scholars agree that the short Sura 96: **AL-ALAQ**, "the Blood-clot" was the first of the Quran revealed to Muhammad.⁶ The Almighty in this first revelation to Muhammad, in a downgrading tone about human beings per se, portrayed a negative image of Man. This short Sura contradicts some basic humanistic concepts about Man. In the first two verses of the Surah God told Muhammad to preach that "He created Man of a blood-clot --**KHALAQ AL-INSAN MIN ALAQ** (Q96:1-2).⁷ This is not a lesson in biology; it aims at reminding humans of their low origin. Besides, God tells Muslims in this Sura that man's knowledge is limited to what God taught him (96:4-5). Other Quranic verses reinforce the idea: human beings "have been given of

knowledge nothing except a little" (17:85) and they "understand nothing except a little" (48:15). The idea of man's self-sufficiency is ridiculed (96:7) and condemned as a transgression (96:6). Human ability to find the right way without Divine Guidance, **HUDA**, is questioned (96:11) and denied. Man's humanistic claim of "rational autonomy" and of "the capacity to form, vary and better and perfect it" without Divine Guidance, i.e., without the Islamic version of what the humanists called the "medieval mentality," are certainly disparaged by the Almighty in His first communication with His last Messenger to mankind.

No indeed; surely Man waxes insolent, for he thinks himself self-sufficient (96:6-7).

Human beings have only one way to salvation: to follow **HUDA**, Divine Guidance (received through Muhammad). Any human being without Divine Guidance will be humiliated and tormented by the Almighty and is to be warned in alarming and insulting language:

No indeed; surely, if he gives not over, We shall seize him by the forelock a lying, sinful forelock. So let him call on his concourse! We shall call on the guards of Hell (96:15-8).

The theme of human beings' low origin, of their inherent baseness and weakness, is repeated throughout the Quran. Of man's low origin the Almighty remarks, ridiculing all human beings -- **JAMI AN-NAS**, as Tabari (T,14:78) tells us:

He created man of a sperm-drop; and behold, he is a manifest adversary (16:4).

This is a reference to man's disbelief in God (T,14:78), i.e., Islam. Condemning inherent human ingratitude to God to whom they owe everything and projecting His own glory, omnipotence and omniscience the Almighty reminds them, deprecatingly:

He originated the creation of man out of clay, then He fashioned his progeny of an extraction of mean water (32:4-9; 35:10-11 serves a similar purpose).

Q16:4 is repeated in question form aiming at further ridicule:

Has not man regarded how that We created him of a sperm-drop? Then lo, he is a manifest adversary. And he has struck for Us a

similitude and forgotten his creation; (36:76-8).

The context of the Surah **AL-INSAN**, "Man," makes it obvious that God is not simply telling the story of Creation when He asks

Has there come on man a while of time when he was a thing unremembered? (76:1), ... nothing (19:67).

The Almighty repeats His favorite phrase quickly:

Surely We created man of a sperm-drop, a mingling, trying him; and We made him hearing, seeing (76:2).

For those who forget this nothingness of their stature and do not act accordingly God has "prepared... chains, fetters, and a Blaze" (76:3-4). The next Surah repeats the same theme for the same purpose by reminding humans of their insignificance when God asks, "did We not create you of a mean water?... Woe that day unto those who cry it lies" (77:20-4).

Perish Man! How unthankful he is! Of what did He create him? Of a sperm drop He created him... and... then makes him to die, and buries him, then, when He wills, He raises him. No indeed! Man has not accomplished His bidding (80:17-23).

God of Islam challenges frontally the concepts of man's rational autonomy, of his capacity to discover the truth independently of Divine guidance and solve his problems with the help of his material resources, and of his freedom to act and choose.

Shall man have whatever he fancies? And to God belongs the First and the Last... they have not any knowledge thereof; they follow only surmise, and surmise avails naught against truth (75:23-30). But as for him who is self-sufficient, and cries lies to the reward most fair... his wealth shall not avail him when he perishes (92:8-11). What, does man reckon he shall be left to roam at will? Was he not a sperm-drop spilled? Then he was a blood-clot, and He created and formed, ... (75:36-9). Nay, but man desires to continue on as a libertine, asking, when shall be the Day of Resurrection? (75:5-6).

For reasons known only to Himself, the Almighty has, apparently, one kind statement about Man per se; but He immediately modifies it along the line He generally takes in the Quran:

We indeed created Man in the fairest stature then We restored him the lowest of the low - save those who believe, and do righteous deeds; (96:4-6).

The first verse above and similar remarks in the Tradition about the beauty of man's structure refer obviously to God's own excellence as the Creator not to the excellence of man's nature. As for man's nature other Quranic passages tell the Divine truth:

Man was created a weakling (4:28). We created man in trouble. What, does he think none has power over him, saying 'I have consumed wealth abundant'? What, does he think none has seen him? (90:4-7).

The Almighty is best qualified to tell the believers of man's nature.

We indeed created man; and We know what his soul whispers within him, and We are nearer to him than the jugular vein (50:16-7).

The Quran portrays Human beings as ungrateful to God. They plot against their own soul unaware of their self-destruction -- **WA MA YAMKURUN ILLA BI-ANFUSIHIM WA MA YASHURUN** (6:123). "God is bountiful to men; but men are not thankful" (10:60). "Surely man is sinful, unthankful" (14:34). "Man is clearly unthankful" (43:15). "Man is ever unthankful" (17:67). These themes are repeated mostly in the same words, in 2:243; 7:10; 11:9; 12:38; 16:55; 22:66; 23:78; 27:73; 32:9; 40:61; 42:48; 67:23; 80:17; 82:6; and in 100:6.

Human beings emerge in the Quran as niggardly, wicked, impulsive and peevish, addressed by the Almighty in unflattering words. These "Children of Adam" are "perverts"; their

likeness... is as the likeness of a dog; if thou attackest it lolls its tongue out, or if thou leavest it it lolls its tongue out... they are the losers. We have created for Gehenna many jinn and men; they have hearts, but understand not with them; they have eyes, but perceive not with them; they have ears, but they hear not with them. They are like cattle; nay, rather they are further astray... (7:172-83).

Of man's selfish, hasty and reckless impulsiveness God remarks contemptuously

When affliction visits a man, he calls Us on his side... but when We have removed his affliction... he passes on, as if he never called Us... (10:12-4). And if We let a man taste mercy from Us, and then We wrest it from him, he is desperate, ungrateful. But if We let him taste prosperity after hardship that has visited him, he will say, 'the evils have gone from me'; behold, he is joyous, boastful - (11:9-10). Man prays for evil, as he prays for

good; man is ever hasty (17:11). Man was created of haste (21:37). We offered the trust to the heavens and the earth and the mountains, but they refused to carry it and were afraid of it; and man carried it. Surely he is sinful, very foolish (33:72). Surely man was created fretful, when evil visits him, impatient, when good visits him, grudging (70:19-21). As for man, whenever his Lord tries him, and honors him, and blesses him, then he says 'My Lord has honored me.' But when he tries him and stints for him his provision, then he says, My Lord has despised me' (89:15-6). ...and man is very niggardly (17:100),... the most disputatious of things (18:54), striving to diverse ends (92:4), greedy (102:1-2. These themes are repeated in 17:67, 83; 39:8, 49; 41:49-52 and in 42:48).

Details of the Quranic-Islamic story of the creation of the universe in general and of Adam in particular emphasize the insignificance of creatures, including human beings and reinforce a negative image of human nature. In the introduction to his Tarikh... (History...) before telling us the story of Creation, Tabari - after praising eloquently the Lord on a full page, using some of the "Beautiful Names", mostly those of our Category I, - asserts that the Almighty

created His creatures without any need He had for their creation and originated without any requirement He had for their origination -- **KHALAQ KHALQAHU MIN GHAYR DARURAT-IN KANAT BIHI ILA KHALQIHIM, WA ANSHAAHUM MIN GHAYR HAJAT-IN KANAT BIHI ILA INSHAIHIM (TT-1,1:4).**

Using Quranic passages such as 51:56-8 Tabari continues

God created the jinn and humans only to worship Him; He desires of them no provision, neither does He desire that they should feed Him. Surely God is the All-provider, the Possessor of strength, the Ever Sure... So His creation of these (creatures) when He created them did not add anything to His dominion. Nor did He lack an atom's weight before He created them; nor will a hair's breadth diminish from Him if He annihilates them and makes them nonexistent (TT-1,1:4).

So, the whole creation is a thing of naught for the Lord. Of God's creation of human beings, al-Kisai remarks: "He sent them forth with limited excellence" (K:3).

Various aspects of the story of the creation of Adam in the Quran and Tradition, (e.g., in Q2:30-6; TS,1:439-541; TC,1:206-68) do not indicate any high stature for Adam and his progeny. God did not create man in His own image. He created Adam not because He had decided to

create a superior creature. The Almighty wanted to demonstrate His own grandeur: to show "that God is capable of everything and that God's knowledge encompasses all things" (K:3). Before Adam was created, the jinn - a particular "tribe" of angels - dwelled on the earth. They displeased God. "So God sent Iblis, the Devil (a prominent angel then) against them with an army of angels."⁸

Iblis and those with him killed them and pursued them to the islands in the oceans and to the summits of the mountains. When Iblis had done this, he was filled with a secret conceit. He said: "I have done something which no one else has ever done... but God recognized what was in his heart,... So God said to the angels... "I am about to place (a **KHALIFAH**, "substitute") on earth" (TC,1:212 passim). The last sentence within quotation marks is a translation of a part of the verse 2:30, related to the Quranic story of Adam's creation. I have replaced "vicegerent," Cooper's (Arberry's) translation of the Arabic work **KHALIFA**, with my translation "substitute" for reasons discussed below).

This was a reference to the Almighty's intentions to create Adam and mankind to dwell on earth. As in the Quran 2:30-6 the angels referring to the nature of mankind (which they knew through the knowledge God had bestowed upon them, Tabari tells us), asked the Almighty: "Will you place thereon one who will work corruption there, and shed blood?" God said: "Assuredly I know what you do not know" (2:30). This was not a reference to anything good in Adam and mankind which God knew and the angels did not know. Rather, as Tabari immediately tells us, it meant God told the angels "Assuredly I am informed, as you are not informed, about Iblis's heart, about his arrogance and conceit" (TC,1:212 passim cf. 2:30). Throughout his commentaries on the verse 2:30 (TC,1:206-27) and his own final verdict (p. 227), Tabari tells us repeatedly that by saying that He knew what the angels knew not, God had in His mind

the arrogance towards his Lord which was hidden in Iblis's breast. So their Lord said to them: 'I know that one of you thinks differently from what you say', and that was the knowledge that was hidden to them of the affair of Iblis and of the arrogance which he had kept secret (ibid:227).

So, the purpose of Adam's creation was negative: to punish Iblis and his comrades, the jinn - not necessarily to create a better creature.

Note that the Quran, i.e., God, and Tradition, e.g., Tabari's

commentaries, do not challenge and refute the angels' observations about the problematic nature of Adam and his progeny. These sources emphasize the angels' lack of knowledge about God's real purpose which was to punish Iblis for his pride in his performance. On the other hand, Tradition, explaining brief Quranic remarks about **INSAN**, humankind, depicts Adam in the making as a fatuous hasty, "hollow" cursed creature - to the extent that these sources allow Iblis (Satan) to humiliate Adam. Before God breathed life in Adam's structure made of

clinging clay... he remained forty nights as an inert body, and Iblis used to come to him and kick him, and he gave a hollow ring... (the structure) was something blown up which is not solid... (Iblis) used to go in through his mouth and come out through his rear, and go in through his rear and come out through his mouth; then he said: "you are nothing... you were not created for anything" (TC,1:212 passim).

Iblis also said of Adam: unlike God who is "solid" -- **SAMAD**, this is a "hollow" creature (TC,1:215). Satan also remarked: "This 'creature' will not straighten" (IS-B,1:27). It was not only Satan who thought that man is crooked by nature.

Numerous Traditions in this regard (e.g., Tabari's commentaries on Q2:30-6) inform us that the Quran, the Prophet Muhammad, and his companions used to tell these stories to point to some inherent problematic aspects of man resulting in his sinful rejection of Islam. The Quranic stories of Adam's creation are usually told in the context of condemnation of man's ingratitude to God by following Satan, i.e., rejecting Islam. It is implied that Iblis's assessment of Adam and his progeny was correct. This inane creature, **INSAN**, follows his worst enemy, the Satan. The Almighty begins a Quranic story of the creation of Adam (20:115-24) with the following remark:

And We made covenant with Adam before, but he forgot, and We found in him no constancy (20:115).

The Almighty hereby wants to tell the Prophet Muhammad not to grieve if people oppose His commandment, i.e., Islam and Muhammad's Prophethood and, thus, follow their enemy, Satan. This is nothing new, God informs the Prophet; "this is what their father, Adam, did in the past... Then

Satan whispered to him and he (Adam) obeyed him and opposed My commandment" (T,16:220 cf. Q20:115). In the same context Tabari quotes the following Tradition reported by the Prophet's cousin, Abd Allah b. Abbas saying:

Indeed the human being is called so because he made a covenant with Him and then forgot (it) -- **INNAMA SUMMIYA'L-INSAN LI-ANNAHU AHID ILAYH-I FA-NASIYA** (*ibid*:22. In Arabic the words **INSAN** "human being" and **NISYAN** "forgetfulness" are supposed to have the same root-word).

Other Traditions about Adam-in-making support what Satan said concerning Adam's "hollowness."

And when the breathing had reached his navel, (Adam) looked at his body and marvelled at how beautiful was what he saw. Then he went to get up, but he could not (because God's breathing had not yet reached his legs).

This is when, Tabari tells us, God said (as in Q17:11 sarcastically: "Man is ever hasty, i.e., restless, impatient in pleasure and hardship" (TC,1:213).

And when the spirit entered his eyes, he saw the fruits of the Garden; then, when it entered his belly, he craved for food and jumped hastily, before the spirit had reached his feet, towards the fruit of the Garden - whereupon He said (as in Q21:37): "Man was created in haste" (TC,1:216).

Tabari tells us in the same contexts that when the Quranic verse "Has there come on man a while of time when he was a thing unremembered? (76:1)" was recited Umar, the Prophet's companion and second caliph of Islam, remarked "If only that time, i.e., when man was 'a thing unremembered,' (i.e., nonexistent) were now, O Messenger of God!" (TC,1:221; parentheses added). That is, being a human being is unworthy, undesirable and a tragic curse; it is better not to be than be a human. As a believer, Umar would never have uttered this had he known the Almighty to have a better image of man per se. Ibn Sad in his Tabaqat (IS-B,1:25-35) and Tabari in his Tarikh (TT-1,1:92-6) and in his Tafsir elsewhere (T,15:48-50; T,17:25-8) repeats the above stories and more about the weak and problematic nature of Adam and his progeny. According to the Prophet's prominent Companion, Salman the Persian, when

Adam was in the making it was Friday evening and getting dark. His feet had yet to be completed. Adam impatiently said to God, "O Lord of the night, be quick; the night is approaching." The Almighty gibed: "Indeed man is a hasty creature" -- **QAL YA RABB AL-LAYL, AJIL; QAD JA AL-LAYL. QAL ALLAH: WA KHULIQ AL-INSAN MIN AJAL (IS-B,1:30; also see T,17:26).**

Ibn Sad ascribes the report about the etymology of the word **INSAN** directly to the Prophet. **INSAN** is called so, the Prophet said, because the first **INSAN**, Adam, forgot (or used to forget) -- **NASIYA**. To substantiate this lesson in etymology, the Prophet gave an example of Adam's forgetfulness. Adam who was destined to live for 1000 years asked God to give forty years of his age to David, one of his favorite offspring. Apparently, God knew about the forgetful and quarrelsome nature of His new creature. God said: "Then, it is to be written and sealed so that it is not changed." God also told the angels to witness the deal -- **IDHAN TUKTAB WA TUKHTAM WA LA TUBADDAL... WA ASHHAD AL-MALAIKAT**. However, the Prophet added, at the time of his death at the age of 960 years Adam quarrelled with the angel of death insisting that he had forty more years to live. When the angels reminded him of his voluntary gift to David, our old man refused flatly, saying: "Good Lord, I have not done so" -- **YA RABB MA FAALT-U**. The Almighty had to bring the written document as an evidence -- **FA ANZAL ALLAH ALAYH AL-KITAB WA AQAM ALAYH AL-BAYYINAT**. In the context of this story, the Prophet generalized: "(Adam) denied; so do his offspring. Adam forgot; so do his offspring; and Adam wronged; so do his offspring -- **FA JAHAD FA JAHADAT DHURRIYATUHU, WA NASIA ADAM FA-NASIYAT DHURRIYATUHU, WA KHATIYA ADAM FA-KHATIAT DHURRIYATUHU (See IS-B,1:26-9).**

A final word about the real meaning of **KHALIFAH** in Q2:30 ("And when your Lord said to the angels: 'I am about to place a **KHALIFAH** on earth'"). A.J. Arberry translates **KHALIFAH** as "viceroys," M. Muhammad Ali as "ruler," Abdullah Yusuf Ali as "vicegerent" and Muhammad Asad as "one who inherits rightful supremacy." All these translations connote a

sense of grandeur, respect and high status for the **KHALIFA**, i.e. human being. Tabari's (and other Traditional) definitions and explanations reject such connotations. As usual on such occasions, Tabari explains the word grammatically. **KHALIFA**, Tabari says, is the objective case of

KHALAFA meaning to take someone's place after him in some matter, as His words (in the Quran 10:14): "Then We appointed you **KHALIFAS** on earth after the jinn, that We might behold how you would do," meaning that He replaced them with you on earth and appointed you as Khalifas after them. Because of this, the supreme ruler... [in an Islamic country] is called the Khalifa (=Caliph), because he replaces the one who was before him, and takes his place in the affair, and is his successor (TC,1:208; brackets added).

In 2:30 Khalifah "means a successor to the jinn, to replace them on earth, to dwell there and reside there" (ibid:209)... "the Khalifas are successors who follow on from each other, i.e. that they are the children of Adam who succeed to their father Adam; and each generation succeeds to the generation before them" (ibid). "... the meaning of the **KHALIFA** which God mentioned was the succession of one generation of them after the other as we have described" (ibid:211).

Shakir and Shakir, Tabari's learned Muslim editors, agreeing with him, give additional information on the same line. They quote Umar, the second caliph (**KHALIFA**) using this word in the simple sense of "replacement." The Shakir brothers also refer to Ibn Kathir (d. 1373) who said that some other creatures inhabited the earth before Adam, and that Adam was called Khalifa because he was made a "substitute" - **BADAL**, for them (See TS,1:449-50, Notes 1 and 2).

Another series of reports which Tabari mentions and tolerates explains that to the extent any respect for Adam and "some" of his progeny is involved it has nothing to do with the word Khalifa. It is because Adam and some of his offspring were God's appointed Messengers and their true followers (see TC,1:218-9).

Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406 CE) confirms this Traditional definition of Khalifa. He considers that the use of the term "Khalifa of God" is impermissible. For him the use of the word Khalifa in the Quran does not justify calling someone Khalifa of God. Abu Bakr, the first caliph

(Khalifa) of Islam, Ibn Khaldun says, forbade the use of **KHALIFAT ALLAH** "caliph of God" "when he was thus addressed." Abu Bakr said

I am not the caliph of God, but the caliph of someone who is absent; but not of someone who is present (as God always is).⁹

Note that the Shiites who hesitate to accept Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, and Umayyad and Abbasid rulers as true believers and legitimate successors of Muhammad as leaders of Muslim community are not unwilling to call them Khalifas, reserving the titles **AMIR AL-MUMININ** (Commander of the Faithful) and **IMAM** which connote respect and divinity for Ali and his rightful successors (according to the Shiites). Had **KHALIFA** meant anything special and respectable the Shiites would not call Umar and others so.

Unlike humanist philosophy that allows man to seek solutions for whatever problems he confronts and improvement with the help of his own senses and capacities, God informs a Muslim that man per se is a doomed and damned loser, inherently deficient and imperfect. Salvation from this wretchedness comes not from asserting his rational autonomy and freedom of action but from making himself subservient to a supernatural Authority who reveals Himself to (or in the form of) particular individuals in a supernatural manner. This is the Divine message believers receive in the short Surah **AL-ASR** "The Afternoon":

By the afternoon!
Surely Man is in the state of loss, save those who believe, and do righteous deeds, and counsel each other unto the truth and counsel each other to be steadfast (103).

According to Tabari's detailed exegeses of this Sura man in God's eyes is doomed to **HALAKAT**, total loss, and suffers from **NUQSAN**, imperfection and deficiency, and will remain in this condition "till the end of the time." Only those who believe in Islam and act accordingly, i.e., receive (and act upon) Divine Guidance transmitted through Muhammad escape from this eternal "state of loss." As we will see in greater detail other parts of this study, "belief," "righteous deeds," "the truth" and "steadfastness" are defined in a particular Islamic

sense. The standard for these, Tabari tells us here, is to act "according to what God has revealed in His Book (the Quran)... the truth means the Book of God (the Quran) (T,30:289-91; parentheses added). This is where we resume our discussion of the Muslim concept of God as **AL-HADI**, the Guide, the Law-giver.

Whether man follows Divine Guidance is the central point which determines Muslim images and treatment of human beings. From a Muslim point of view, this has been the most important issue from the very beginning of human life. Just after their creation Adam and Eve were instructed to follow God's commandments when they were put in Paradise. God particularly told them not to approach a certain "tree" (2:35 passim). Misled by Satan, they violated the guideline. As punishment for disregarding the guidance, God exiled Adam and Eve, along with Satan, to the earth. Adam's progeny were to live in this world until the Day Hereafter. God forgave Adam, instructing him anew:

there shall come to you guidance from Me, and whosoever follows My guidance no fear shall be on them, neither shall they sorrow. As for the unbelievers who cry lies to our signs, those shall be the inhabitants of the Fire (2:37-9. For other points mentioned above see Q2:30-9; 7:15-25; 20:114-24).

Another Quranic passage mentions that God told Adam and Eve on their way to the earth

...if there comes to you from Me guidance, then whosoever follows my Guidance shall not go astray, neither shall he be unprosperous; but whosoever turns away from My remembrance, his shall be a life of narrowness and on the Resurrection Day We shall raise him blind (20:122-4).

The Quran and Tradition also talk of a covenant between God and the "seeds" of the Children of Adam. They solemnly undertook, long before they were born, to follow this Divine guidance. They were warned of harsh consequences for not doing so. (See, e.g. Q7:172-83 along with Tabari's detailed Tradition-based commentaries; also see K:63-70). The concept of Divine Guidance is emphasized throughout the Quran in various contexts.

God's (guidance) is the true guidance (2:120). The true guidance

is God's (guidance) (3:73; 6:71). Peace be upon them who follow the guidance (20:47). Thy Lord suffices as a guide (25:31). Whomsoever God guides, he is rightly guided (17:97; 18:17). God speaks the truth, and Guides on the way (33:4).

None other than God can guide; only God "guides to the truth (10:35). Those who do not follow Divine Guidance are condemned (7:193, 198).

They preferred blindness above guidance (41:17). And who is further astray than he who follows his caprice without guidance from God? (28:50). Those who turned back in their traces after the guidance has become clear to them... angels take them beating their faces and backs... (47:25-7).

So, God's attitude toward human beings is determined by the single criterion of conformity to His Guidance received through His Messengers in this world. He likes those who follow the Islamic version of Divine Guidance, and is wroth with others.

Muslims believe that they are the only recipients and followers of this Divine Guidance. This self-righteousness is internalized in many ways. As we will see in Part III, they are told that beginning with Adam all authentic Messengers of God before Muhammad received this Divine Guidance in the form of Islam. These Prophets also foretold of Muhammad to whom this Divine Guidance, i.e., Islam, was to be revealed in a final, comprehensive and perfect form. In the content of the Prophets' stories and elsewhere, Muslims read in the Quran about God's guidance in general and about His Guidance "to the truth," "on a straight path," "unto a straight path," "to the way of rectitude," "to the path of All-laudable," and about "the truly guided" or "rightly guided," in particular.¹⁰ The Quranic context of the passages as well as Tradition-based exegeses tell Muslims this Divine Guidance was and continues to be nothing but Islam. The Quran, however, is more specific. About itself, it tells believers that "this Quran guides to the Way" (17:9), "to the Path of Almighty" (34:6). It is "sent down to be a guidance" (2:185) "an exposition for mankind, and a guidance" (3:138), "a clear testimony from your Lord, guidance, and mercy" (7:203; 27:76-7; 31:2-3), a healing for what is in the breast, and a guidance

(10:57) a Book God revealed with truth to Muhammad "making clear everything, a guidance and good tidings for Muslims" (16:89, 101; 27:1-2). So does the Almighty tell Muslims specifically that His chosen creed embodying His Guidance was and continues to be Islam.

The true religion with God is Islam (3:19). Whoso desires another religion than Islam, it shall not be accepted of him (3:85). I have completed My blessing upon you, and I have approved Islam for your religion (5:3). Whomsoever God desires to guide, He expands his breast to Islam (6:125; also see 39:22).

Using various forms of the word "Islam" the Quran indicates more than sixty times in different ways that only Muslims are God's favored and chosen people. (See Kassis:1079-81). Only those who "become Muslims... are rightly guided" (3:20). God commands people to become Muslims (6:14; 6:71; 27:91; 39:12, e.g.,). The Almighty Himself named His chosen people "Muslims" (22:78). Those before Muhammad who followed God's Guidance were Muslims

Abraham in truth was not a Jew, neither a Christian; but he was a Muslim (3:67).

As in Q3:19, 5:3 and numerous other Quranic passages God makes it clear that by His chosen **DIN**, religion, creed, He means Islam. Muslims find that on about 50 separate occasions throughout the Quran God mentions their **DIN** favorably. [See Kassis:382-3]. Islam is a **DIN** the Almighty Himself has chosen for Muslims (2:132) and perfected it (5:3). It is the same religion God "charged Noah with" (42:13).

According to this Divine Guidance, the truth is indivisible; it can be only one, not the other. Muslim belief in this God does not leave a place for modern pluralism. God told the Prophet to tell the whole world that only his followers "are upon right guidance" and the rest are "in manifest error" (34:24; also see 17:84 cf. T). God sent Muhammad "to mankind entire, good tidings to bear, and warning, but most men do not know it" (34:28). In order "to be guided" one must obey Muhammad (24:54), not any other. Given the Almighty's repeated affirmation of Islam as His only favored creed, of the Quran as His last and most complete Book and of Muhammad as His last Messenger, a Muslim

knows the right answer when the Quran says:

Surely thy Lord knows very well those who have gone astray from His way, and He knows very well those who are guided (53:30; 68:7). What, is he who walks prone upon his face better guided than he who walks upright on a straight path? (67:22).

God warns a believer:

If thou obeyest the most part of those on earth they will lead thee astray from the path of God; they follow only surmise, merely conjecturing. Thy Lord knows very well who goes astray from His path; He knows very well the rightly-guided (6:116-7).

As the passage was originally addressed to the Prophet Muhammad, Tabari tells us that God forbade him from following others because in his time all other "children of Adam were grossly misguided heathens," i.e., non-Muslims (TS,12:64). That is to say none other than Muslims could be considered rightly-guided. The Quran repeatedly and specifically mentions all non-Muslim groups that Muhammad could perceive - the pagans, the People of the Book, i.e., Jews and Christians, and al-Munafiqun (nonconformist Muslims) - as "not rightly guided."¹¹ Sayyid Qutb, a famous ideologue of the modern Islamic revivalist movement, represents well Muslim thought on this subject when he declares

there are two parties in all the world: the Party of God and the Party of Satan. The Party of God which stands under the banner of God bears His insignia and the Party of Satan which includes every community, group, race and individual who do not stand under the banner of God.¹²

The consciousness of God's confirmation of Muslims as the only Divinely-guided people and of His disavowal of the rest of mankind leads the believers to disdain non-Muslims. This pattern of Muslim thought and behavior towards the world beyond Islam is further reinforced by the Almighty's explicit unfavorable portrayal of non-Muslims. Muslims find that the Almighty has not uttered a single kind word for non-Muslims. Indeed, "God does not know of any good in them" (8:23), the Quran tells the believers.¹⁴ Instead, God portrays a grim picture of non-Muslims for the believers, leaving no soft corner in the Muslim heart or possibility of respect in the Muslim mind for the heathen. Following are examples of items from a much longer Quranic charge-sheet against

non-Muslims. Most of these charges occur quite frequently in the Quran; the following Quranic references are merely examples.

The most important allegation, from a Muslim point of view is the message from God to Muslims that all those who deny the authenticity of Muhammad's Prophethood and act accordingly are, as a matter of fact, disbelievers in God. Non-Muslims disbelieve in God's signs (2:61; 62:5). They have rebelled against God (72:23) and mock Him (9:65). They speak blasphemy (5:61) and think of God in a blasphemous way (3:154). They are niggardly with the bounty God has given them (3:180) and are the enemy of God (9:60). They do not worship God (21:67), and ascribe to God associates (13:33) - a serious crime from a Muslim point of view. They swear falsely by God (5:106), and "say things against a God of which they know nothing" (2:80). "They measure not God with His true measure" (6:91). Actually, they forge against God lies (65:144; 42:24).

In various ways, Islamic teachings tell Muslims that without belief in the Islamic concept of Prophethood and Islamic Prophets, particularly Muhammad, belief in God does not make sense. God condemns this as making division between Him and His Messengers (4:150). Non-Muslims oppose and fight God's Messengers (58:5; 9:107). They are "averse to what God sent down" (47:26), i.e., to the Quran, having no divine authority for what they stand for (53:23). God encourages Muslims to look at non-Muslims with distrust: they trick God and the believers (2:9), try to "tempt away" Muslims from God's religion, Islam (5:49; 6:116) - bar from God's way (4:160) and conceal testimony received from God (2:140).

The third basic charge - after those of disbelief in God and His Messengers - concerns non-Muslims' disbelief in the Hereafter. God tells Muslims repeatedly that non-Muslims do not believe in - and have forgotten - the Afterlife (58:6). It is usually in such contexts that God tells Muslims that non-Muslims are deluded by this-worldly life (45:35) and condemns their this-worldliness (See Part IV). Non-Muslim

disbelief in the Hereafter and related concepts, Muslims are told, stems from their disbelief in God's attributes of categories I and II (which project God's omnipotence and ability to create ex nihilo whatever He wants, to destroy and recreate.)

They say, 'There is nothing but our present life; we die, and we live, and nothing but Time destroys us.' Of that they have no knowledge; they merely conjecture... they say, 'Bring us our fathers, if you speak truly.' Say: 'God gives you life, then makes you die, then He shall gather you to the Day of Resurrection, wherein no doubt, but most men do not know' (45:24-6).

Non-Muslims are lost for their unbelief in the Islamic belief system (6:31). God curses them for their disbelief in Islam (47:23; 2:88) and for "making a breach with God and with His Messenger" (8:13), i.e., Muhammad. They have forgotten God and God has forgotten them (9:67).

Along with disavowal and criticism of non-Muslims for ideological reasons, Muslims find the Almighty uses a stinging language to describe the heathen. God "loves not" these "aggressors" (2:190), "the worst of beasts in God's sight" (8:22), corrupt (2:205), "guilty ingrate" (2:276), "unbelievers" (3:57), "evildoers" (2:258; 3:140), ungodly (9:24), proud and boastful (4:36; 57:23), "guilty and ungrateful traitors" (4:107; 22:38), "transgressors" (5:87), "treacherous" (8:58) who are "abased" and "dishonored" by the Almighty (22:18).

And whom God abases, there is none to honor him (22:18).

Definitely a Muslim will not be such an abased person. Muslims are told not to give non-Muslims credit for their good works because "God has made their works to fail" (33:19); they are predestined to be wretched. (These last two points are discussed in detail in part VI.)

One method to ascertain God's likes and dislikes concerning Muslims and non-Muslims is to study the beneficiaries and victims of God's attributes of our category VI. The immediate context of the Quran where these attributes occur (frequently in the culminating parts of passages) - and Traditional explanations - tell Muslims that God's attributes connoting kindness, reward etc. are always related to Muslims

only, while the victims of the Almighty's harsh attributes are always non-Muslims and nonconformists. When it is said that God's blessings encompass all, believers and nonbelievers alike, it means that nonbelievers enjoy life, provisions and natural resources which are, anyhow, bestowed by God. In most cases, when the Quran refers to this sort of God's blessings for all including nonbelievers, it aims, directly or indirectly, to condemn them for their ingratitude symbolized by their rejection of God's guidance, Islam.

All Quranic chapters (sing: **SURAH**) begin with the **BASMALA**: "In the name of God, the Merciful -- **AR-RAHMAN**, the Compassionate, -- **AR-RAHIM**." About the attribute **AR-RAHIM**, Compassionate we are clearly told that it relates only to Muslims. God as **AR-RAHIM**

singles out His believing servants in this present world by the success He benevolently grants them for their obedience to Him, and their belief in Him and His Messenger, [i.e., Muhammad] following His commands and avoiding disobedience. He withholds this success from those who attribute partners to Him [i.e., from non-Muslims] who disbelieve, who go against His commands and engage in disobedience. Moreover, God... bestows the abiding bliss and clear triumph which He has promised in the next world, in His Gardens, on those who entirely believe in Him, who hold His Messenger [i.e., Muhammad] to be truthful, who act in obedience to Him, but not on those who attribute partners to, and disbelieve in, Him... He is **RAHIM** specifically towards His believers in both this world and the next (TC,1:56-7; brackets added).

The Quran 33:43 specifies that "He is All-Compassionate -- **RAHIM** -- to the believers." Similarly, other than **BASMALAS**, (about one hundred) verses (see Kassis:1006-8) in which God is mentioned as **AR-RAHIM**, the immediate contexts of the Quran or Traditional exegeses (as in Tabari) or both specify that only Muslims are the beneficiaries of God's Companion. As for **AR-RAHMAN**, "the Merciful," Tabari tells us the following:

Clearly, God [as **AR-RAHIM**, the Compassionate] singles out the believers for His mercy in this world and the next, just as he [as **AR-RAHMAN**, the Merciful] bestows favor and beneficence on both them and the unbelievers in this world in extending sustenance, providing (rain-giving) clouds for their succor, bringing forth plants from the earth, (giving them) healthy bodies and sound minds, and (bestowing) other innumerable bounties in which the believers and the unbelievers share. Our Lord is **RAHMAN** towards all His creatures in both this and the next world,... He is **RAHMAN** in this world as we have just mentioned... (and as He Himself said): "If you count God's blessing, you will never

number it" (Q14:34; 16:18)... And He is **RAHMAN** in the next world through His equal treatment for all with His Justice and Judgement (TC,1:56-7; brackets added. The Quran and Tradition make it obvious that the punishment of nonbelievers in the Hereafter for their disbelief in Islam symbolizes God's Justice).

The Quran 14:34 mentioned above by Tabari is the culminating verse of a long passage (14:24-34) which says of God's blessings, that

He created the heavens and the earth, causes water to descend from the sky, thereby producing fruits as food for (all), and makes the ships to be of service (for all), that they may run upon the sea at His Command, and has made of service unto (all) the rivers... and makes the sun and the moon, constant in their courses, to be of service unto... (all), and has made of service unto... (all) the night and the day...

Despite this, the passage remarks, some people refuse to believe in Islam. The Almighty counted these blessings to conclude that "Surely, man is sinful, unthankful" (14:34). Q16:3-18 also counts some of God's similar "unreckonable" blessings - which should have made people thank God (16:14) by becoming Muslim - to condemn the "open opponents" (16:4) of Islam for their ingratitude.

God is **GHAFUR**, "All-forgiving" in Q35:30 for those "who recite the Book of God sent down to Muhammad" (T,22:132-3). God is **GHAFUR** and **RAHIM**, "All-forgiving and All-compassionate" (2:173). What is the condition? God tells the readers in Tabari's words: "If you obey God in your (acceptance of) Islam" -- **IN ATATUM ALLAH FI ISLAMIKUM** (TS,3:327; parentheses added). "God is All-mighty, vengeful" (3:4) for those who disbelieve in God's signs, in this case, the Quran, as a decisive document that tells what is right and what is wrong (TS,6:163-5).

The attributes projecting God's omnipotence and resourcefulness always work in favor of Muslims and against non-Muslims. For example when the Quran asserts that "God is powerful over everything" (2:20), the preceding and following verses as well as Tabari's commentaries (TS,1:359-62) inform that the Almighty is hereby warning the nonconformists that He is powerful enough "to encompass them" and to take away their hearing and their sight -- **AL-MUNAFIQUN, AKHBARAHUM**

ANNAHU BIHIM MUHIT-UN WA ALA IDHHAB ASMAIHIM WA ABSARIHIM QADIR-UN

(ibid:362)¹⁴

Along with the portrayal of unfavorable images of non-Muslims, God also tells Muslims that He treats the former harshly. We have selected the following randomly. References to the Quran are for illustration. Most of these Divine verdicts, as usual, occur frequently in the Quran, sometimes repeated word for word. God "seizes" and "chastises" non-Muslims (3:11; 79:25). God humiliates them (6:124). The Almighty tells the believers: "I have forsaken the creed of people who believe not in God," i.e. non-Muslims (12:37). "God will not give them any good" (11:31). They are "laden with the burden of God's anger" (2:61). "... for them awaits a terrible chastisement; God is All-mighty vengeful" (3:4). God "'promises' them a painful doom" (3:21), and the fact that "God is Strong, severe in punishment (8:52). God "will make them taste great torment" (25:19). "God has prepared for the unbelievers a humbling chastisement" (4:102). God will take "retribution" against nonbelievers "terribly" (2:196; 59:7). God brings the works of non-Muslims to naught (10:81) God is wroth with them (4:93) and wrathful against them (58:14; 60:13). God will never forgive them (9:80). God destroys them (28:78). "(God mocks them) and shall lead them on blindly wandering in their insolence" (2:15), making "their works to fail" (33:19). "Surely God is an enemy to the unbelievers" (2:98) who hates them with a terrible hatred (40:10), forbids them charitable treatment (7:50), weakens their 'guile' (8:18) degrades (9:2) and divides them (9:79), assails them (9:30; 65:4), curses them (33:64), is angered against them (5:80) leads them astray (40:74), overthrows them (4:88) and "desires not to appoint for them a portion" (3:176) or purify their hearts (5:41).

It is not only by His harsh verdicts about non-Muslims and by a description of their dark images that God inspires Muslims to espouse an unfavorable attitude towards nonbelievers. The Almighty commands Muslims to adopt such a behavior. God is kind to Muslims for two main

reasons: 1) for adherence to the Islamic belief system and 2) for having a 'correct' pattern of thought and behavior concerning Muslims and non-Muslims. While this 'correct' pattern enjoins an affectionate attitude toward Muslims, it makes Muslims dutybound to be harsh towards non-Muslims (e.g., Q48:29). Along with the belief that the truth is indivisible, and that Islam represents the only truth, these Divine commandments oblige Muslims to act against humanistic principles of religio-ideological tolerance which pluralism and peaceful coexistence teach. Guided by God, Muslim conduct of relations with the world beyond Islam is governed by a **HIJRAH-JIHAD-QITAL-HIJRAH** model. **HIJRAH**, usually translated as "emigration" and (mistranslated as) "flight", connotes much more in Muslim thought. It signifies

cutting off friendly or loving communion or intercourse... forsaking or abandoning... with the body and with the tongue and with the heart or mind: it is with the first in the passage of the Quran (4:34)... It may be with any of the three (as) in the Quran 73:10 where it is said... 'avoid the associating with them or entertaining friendship for them in thy heart'... and it is with all the three in... the Quran 74:5... (**HIJRAH** signifies) to withdraw oneself to a distance... (Eventually it means) emigration from the territory of unbelievers.¹⁵

Keeping in consideration Traditional explanations of various Quranic exhortations (mentioned below) concerning believer-nonbeliever relations, we include in **HIJRAH** - in addition to "emigration" - other forms of segregationist, separatist, antagonistic and self-righteously exclusivist attitudes God obligates Muslims to adopt towards non-Muslims. **HIJRAH** signifies a general conscious state of cold war, unfriendliness and antagonism which Divine edicts want Muslims to maintain towards non-Muslims in all circumstances. This "cutting off friendly communion" takes various forms. It culminates in emigration from the land of nonbelievers and re-emerges in the form of imposing a distance between Muslims and non-Muslims even in a society dominated by Islam. While **JIHAD**, "struggle," "strife," signifies all-out action in various forms against non-Muslims, **QITAL** "fighting to slay" is its specific and ultimate form.

Following Divine edicts as practiced by the Prophet Muhammad,

Muslim conduct of relations with non-Muslims proceeds on the following line. After their declaration of faith in Islamic God Muslims believe they are enjoined by the Almighty to impose their faith on their society. Belief in God does not allow Muslims to attempt willingly the status of non-dominant group and peaceful coexistence with others. If unable to impose Islam and eliminate un-Islamic patterns, Muslims must "cut off friendly communion" with non-Muslims as long as they live in the same society, while continuing the effort to impose Islam. This kind of cold war within the "Domain of War" -- **DAR AL-HARB**, a society dominated by un-Islam, i.e., this kind of **HIJRAH** "with the tongue and with the heart or mind," if unsuccessful must culminate in the greatest form of **HIJRAH**, emigration from the **DAR AL-HARB** "with the body" in search of a land where Islam could rule exclusively. This would be a **DAR AL-ISLAM**, a "Domain of Islam." The God in whom Muslims believe does not allow them to content themselves with one particular **DAR AL-ISLAM**. Nor does He authorize peaceful coexistence with other non-Muslim lands and peoples. A **DAR AL-ISLAM**, Muslim belief in God demands, must carry out **JIHAD**, an all-out perpetual struggle, against all non-Muslims and nonconformists. If other methods and forms of **JIHAD** fail, Muslims must resort to **QITAL**, "fighting to kill." This process of **HIJRAH-JIHAD-QITAL** must continue until Islam prevails over all lands, creeds and worldviews. Even after Muslims dominate, God forbids friendly intercourse with non-Muslims allowed to live under Muslim domination. A form of **HIJRAH**, "cutting off friendly communion," is reimposed on relations between Muslims and non-Muslims. In brief, once Muslim believe in Islamic God, they can perceive no other state of relationship with non-Muslims than that of cold or hot war.

As basic modes of Muslim conduct of relations with non-Muslims, **HIJRA-JIHAD-QITAL**, and relevant Quranic passages will be further explained in various parts of this study when we see how and in what circumstances the followers of Divine Guidance, i.e., pre-Muhammad 'Muslims,' (according to the Islamic version of history), Muhammad and

His Companions practiced this pattern of thought and action. Here we give some examples of Quranic passages in the abstract as God's Commandments regarding each mode of Divinely enjoined behavior concerning non-Muslims.

A series of Divine Commandments in the Quran tells Muslims to adopt an unfriendly segregationist attitude towards non-Muslims while living in the same society. Muslims are, however, told that they must continue "admonishing" non-Muslims and "saying to them penetrating words," i.e., preaching Islam aggressively, using unflattering language.

... turn away from them, and admonish them, and say to them penetrating words about themselves. We sent not ever any Messenger, but that he should be obeyed, by the leave of God (4:63-4),

i.e., Islam is here to dominate, not just to be mentioned or practiced as one out of many other creeds. The passage refers to the nonconformists -- **AL-MUNAFIQUN** of Medina, a Muslim domain.¹⁶ As the second part of the passage and Tabari's explanations (TS,8:515-6) tell us, "turning away" was not a lesson for permanent peaceful coexistence. As willed by God Muhammad was to be obeyed, eventually by all. Until then, the believer is enjoined to warn these nonbelievers against their disgusting, **MAKRUH**, doubts about God's Commandment and about the Messengership of Muhammad (*ibid*:515). As the context and Traditional exegeses inform Muslims, numerous passages in the Quran (related to the Meccan period in which Muslims formed a minority as well as to the Medinan period when Muslims ruled) tell Muslims to "turn away from" -- **ARID**, **TAWALLA**, and "forsake" -- **UHJUR** disdainfully, non-Muslims of their society, maintaining an aggressive and unfriendly posture against them.¹⁷ God forbids and warns Muslims more specifically against friendship and intimate relations with non-Muslims and nonconformists:

you have none, apart from God, neither protector nor helper (2:107, 120, also see 4:173; frequent). Your friend is only God and His Messenger (5:55). Let not the believers take the unbelievers for friends (3:28; also see 4:89; 4:144). Give thou good tidings to the hypocrites that for them awaits a painful chastisement - those who take unbelievers for their friends... (4:138-9). Take not Jews and Christians as friends (5:512; also see 5:57). Take not your fathers and brothers to be your friends,

if they prefer unbelief (i.e. un-Islam) to belief (i.e. Islam); whosoever of you takes them for friends, those - they are the evildoers (9:23). Do you take him (Satan) and his seeds (non-Muslims) to be your friends? (18:50; parentheses added). Take not My enemy and your enemy (i.e. non-Muslims) for friends (60:1; parentheses added).

In about 25 different verses in the Quran Muslims find that God wants them to emigrate from a land dominated by non-Muslims to a land governed by Islam.¹⁸ In more than 30 verses God enjoins and appreciates **JIHAD**, Muslim struggle against non-Muslims.¹⁹ With reference to different kinds of non-Muslims and nonconformists the Commandments "slay them wherever you come upon them" (2:191) and "O believers, fight (to kill) the unbelievers" (9:123) are repeated in various forms on numerous occasions in the Quran.²⁰ God wants Muslims to fight for His **DIN**, Islam, until it dominates all other creeds - "till... religion is God's entirely" (2:193; also see 8:39; 9:5-33; 48:28). None is to be believed if not a Muslim (3:73). None who violates this religion is to be treated softly: "in the matter of God's religion let no tenderness for them seize you" (24:2).

Muslims read in the Quran God informing them

We appointed you a midmost nation that you might be witness to the people, and that the Messenger might be witness to you... God would never leave your faith to waste - truly, God is All-gentle with the people, All-compassionate (2:143).

According to Tabari God is hereby telling Muslims

O believers in Muhammad and in what he has brought to you... We have bestowed upon you superiority over all other nations. So, We have made you superior to the peoples of other religions by appointing you as the 'midmost nation' (TS,3:141).

Tabari quotes the Prophet Muhammad in detail (TS,3:146-52) explaining how Muslims are "witness to the people." According to these reports Muslims are Divinely appointed to censure other people and pass judgement on them openly. Muslims also work as God's ears and eyes in this world to report to Him in the Hereafter. The Prophet said it is a Divine obligation -- **WAJABAT** that Muslims act in this manner, i.e., to announce in this world who is good and who is evil. The Prophet

reminded that the verse "say: work; and God will surely see your work, and His Messenger and the believers..." (Q9:105) also has a similar meaning. The Prophet further told Muslims: "the angels are God's witnesses in the heavens and you are God's witnesses in the earth" (ibid:148-9). Another report explaining Q2:143 asks Muslims to keep an eye on behalf of the Prophet on the actions of others such as the Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians -- **TAKUNU SHUHADA LI-MUHAMMAD ALA'L-UMAM, AL-YAHUD WA'N-NASARA WA'L-MAJUS** (ibid:150). How Muslims as God's watchdogs in this world will influence in the Hereafter the fate of others, even of pre-Muhammad Prophets, is indicated by the following story told by Muhammad, explaining Q2:143.

When God gathers His servants in the Day of Resurrection, Israfil (an angel) will be called first. God will ask him: "What did you do with my Testament? Did you convey it? He will say, 'Yes my Lord, I did convey it to Gabriel.' Then Gabriel will be called and said to him, 'Did Israfil convey to you my Testament? He will say, 'Yes my Lord, he did so.' Then Israfil will be released - and Gabriel will be asked: 'Did you convey my Testament?' He will say, 'Yes, I conveyed it to the Prophets,' Then Gabriel will be released and the Prophets will be called and asked, 'What did you do with my Testament?' They will say, 'We conveyed it to our peoples.' Then the peoples will be called and asked (by the Almighty),: 'did the Prophets convey to you my Testament?' Then there will be some who will deny and some who will testify. Then the Prophets will say: 'We do hereby have witnesses who (are ready to) testify that we indeed conveyed (the Divine messages) along with you as witness'. Then He will say, 'Who will testify in your favor?' They will say, "The community of Muhammad". Then the Community of Muhammad will be called and asked by the Almighty, 'Do you testify as witnesses that these, my Prophets, have indeed conveyed my Testament to those to whom they were sent?' They will say, 'Our Lord, we do testify that they indeed did so.' Then those nations would say, 'How do you testify against us while you even did not exist in our time?' Then His Grace and Highness, the Lord will ask them, "(Right,) how do you testify against those in whose time you did not exist?' They will say, 'Our Lord, you sent a Messenger to us, and you sent down your testament and your Book to us, and you told us the stories confirming that they (the Prophet) did indeed convey (your messages; so, we testify on the bases of Your Testament to us.' Then the Lord will say, 'They have told the truth.' This is the meaning of the Word of God when He says (in the Quran) that the believers will be witness to the people (TS,3:151-2 cf. Q2:143; parentheses added. For similar stories about Muslims superiority to others in God's eyes see also TS,9:386-8 cf. Q4:159; T,24:74-5 cf. Q40:51; T,29:41 cf. Q68:42-3).

Also in Q3:110-12 Muslims hear God confirming their superiority, sanctifying them as divine censors, promising them victory and expressing His wrath against non-Muslims. Addressing Muslims, God says

You are the best nation ever brought forth to men, bidding honor (**AL-MARUF** which is also translated as "right," "good") and forbidding dishonor (**AL-MUNKAR**: "wrong," "evil") and believing in God... (Be assured that non-Muslims) will not (be able to) harm you...; if they fight you, they will turn on their backs; ...they will not be helped (by God). Abasement shall be pitched on them... they will be laden with the burden of God's anger and poverty shall be pitched on them... (3:110-12; parentheses added).

Note that "bidding to **AL-MARUF**, honor/right/good" means "to command the people to obey Muhammad and follow his religion which has come from God" and "forbidding **AL-MUNKAR**, dishonor/wrong/evil" means "to forbid disbelief in God and denial of Muhammad and what he has brought from God... (This forbidding is to be demonstrated by Muslims) by fighting against those (who disbelieve in Muhammad and Islam) with hands (i.e., physically) until they (i.e., non-Muslims) declare their obedience to the believers" (TS,7:90-1; parentheses added). Explaining **KHAYR UMMAH** "the best nation" in Q3:110-2, the Prophet told Muslims:

You are the last of them (i.e., communities) but God considers you the best and the most honored -- **ANTUM AKHIRUHA... WA KHAYRUHA WA AKRAMUHA ALA'LLAH** (ibid:105).

As God's best people, another Tradition asserts, Muslims are obligated to "bring (other) peoples in chains (forcing them) to accept Islam" -- **KUNTUM KHAYR AN-NAS LIN-NAS, TAJIUN BIHIM FI'S-SALASIL, TUDKHILUNAHUM FI'L-ISLAM** (ibid:104; parentheses added).

Ibn Abbas, the Prophet's cousin, further explains Q3:110-2.

Interpreting the phrases **AMR BI'L-MARUF** "to bid honor/right/good" and **NAHY AN AL-MUNKAR** "to forbid dishonor/evil/wrong" in Q3:110-2, Ibn Abbas says

Muslims are under obligation to force nonbelievers to acknowledge and declare the **KALIMA**, "the Word," (i.e., confess that) 'there is no god but God,' and accept what has been revealed by God (to Muhammad) and (if they refuse to do so) fight to kill them. (This is what the Quran means when it tells Muslims to bid honor/good/right. Because to say "there is no god but God" is the most sublime honor or good deed -- **HUA AZAM AL-MARUF**... (TS,7:105-7; parentheses added).

(Similarly), Ibn Abbas tells us that the worst kind of **AL-MUNKAR** "dishonor/wrong deed/evil" is the denial of the divine authenticity of

Muhammad and Islam (ibid).

We have already seen that God's appointment of Muslims as His inquisitors and executors of His will is accompanied with promises that He "would never leave (their) faith to waste" (2:143), that nonbelievers will never be able to "harm" Muslims and that in confrontations with Muslims non-Muslims will definitely "turn on ...their backs" (3:111). Faith in this pro-Muslim Divine partisanship is fixed in the Muslim mind when they declare "there is no god but God" and "I believe in God."

Explaining the Quranic passage

Surely We shall help Our Messengers and those who believed, in the present life, and upon the day when the witnesses arise... (40:51),

Tabari maintains that, in the past God helped the Prophets and their believing followers, in one of the two ways or in both ways: some of them such as David and Solomon were given Kingdom, sovereignty and power to overwhelm and subjugate all nonbelievers. Others, such as Noah and Moses were helped by God by drowning and annihilating their adversaries while protecting the Prophets and their followers from the destruction that befell the nonbelievers. Or, as in the case of some Israelite Prophets who were slain by their unbelieving peoples, God's help to these Prophets came in the form of imposing alien rulers such as Nebuchadnezzar on the culprits until they were destroyed. As far as the Prophet Muhammad and his followers are concerned, Tabari maintains, they were indeed given victory by God over the nonbelieving Arabs during the Prophet's lifetime and for the following periods God's promise stands operative as follows: We shall indeed help our Prophet Muhammad and those who believe (in him) in this world and in the world to come (T,24:74-5).

Referring to the Quran and Quranic teachings in general and according to Tabari (T,7:232), to fighting non-Muslims, the enemies of God and of Muslims, -- **JIHAD ADAIHI WA ADAIHIM** as mentioned in the preceding passages, God tells Muslims

This is an exposition for mankind, and a guidance, and an

admonition for such as are godfearing. Faint not, neither sorrow; you shall be the upper ones if you are believers (3:138-9).

Hereby God encourages Muslims to fight "their enemies", i.e., non-Muslims forbidding Muslims to show any weakness, assuring them final victory (TS,7:234-6).

So do not faint and call for peace; you shall be the upper ones, and God is with you, and will not deprive you of your words (47:35).

God has indeed promised Muslims to "make them successors in the land... and establish their religion for them that He has approved for them" (24:55) which means

God will indeed make them inherit the land of Arab and non-Arab polytheists and make them kings and leaders of these (lands) as He did this (favor) before to the children of Israel: He destroyed the non-Muslim rulers of Syria and made them (i.e. the Israelites) its kings and dwellers. (Similarly, God) will indeed make their religion, i.e., creed (sic), dominant which He is pleased with for them and which He commanded them to follow (T,18:158-9 cf. Q24:55; also see Q14:14 cf. T,13:191-2).

Q61:8-9 alleges that non-Muslims "desire to extinguish the light of God," i.e., Islam, and reassures Muslims that "God will perfect His light. He will help the followers of His "religion of truth" to overwhelm and subdue followers of all other creeds (T,28:88).

It is He who has sent His Messenger with the guidance and the religion of truth, that He may uplift it above every religion. God suffices as a witness. Muhammad is the Messenger of God and those who are with him are hard against the unbelievers, merciful one to another (Q48:28-9).

As usual, "the guidance and the religion of truth" in the above passage, Tabari tells us, is Islam -- **HU AL-ISLAM**. "To uplift it above every religion" means God nullifies all other religions replacing them with Islam only. There will come a time when there will be none but the religion God sent through Muhammad. "He will make Islam victorious over all other creeds" -- **HINAIDH-IN TUBTAL AL-ADYAN KULLUHA, GHAYR DIN ALLAH ALLADHI BAATH BIHI MUHAMMAD WA YUZHIR AL-ISLAM ALA'L-ADYAN KULLIHA** (T,26:109 passim). Tradition informs Muslims that God promised the treasures of Iran and Rome and the leadership of Arabs and non-Arabs to

the Prophet Muhammad and his followers (1.1:113). The Prophet asked God to bestow Iranian and Roman empires on his community. [Apparently, the Prophet was not certain if any other worthy land existed in the world!]. God responded positively -- **HADHIHI'L-AYAT NAZALAT ALA RASUL ALLAH JAWAB-AN LI MASALATIHI RABBAHU AN YAJAL MULK FARS WA'R-RUM LI UMMATIHI** (TS,6:300). The following passage, according to Tabari (TS,6:300) was the Almighty's response to Muhammad's prayer.

Say: 'O God, Master of the Kingdom, Thou givest the Kingdom to whom Thou wilt, and seizest the Kingdom from whom Thou wilt, Thou exaltest whom Thou wilt, and Thou abasest whom Thou wilt; in Thy hand is the good; Thou art powerful over everything. Thou makest the night to enter into the day and Thou makest the day to enter into the night, Thou bringest forth the living from the dead and Thou bringest forth the dead from the living, and Thou providest whomsoever Thou wilt without reckoning' (3:26-7).

This is a reminder that faith in God's attributes of categories I and II many of which are mentioned in the above passage - should lead them to believe that the Almighty is able to do anything for them. Tabari implies that God accepted Muhammad's request. Divine reassurances of succor for Muslims against non-Muslims abound in the Quran and Tradition.²¹

What about situations in which non-Muslims may seem to be victorious and prosperous and the believers in difficulties? Should such situations create doubt in a Muslim mind about the promised Divine help to Muslims and about the belief that God is angry with non-Muslims? No. Because the All-knowing God has already explained why it is so when it happens to be so. First it simply shows how ungrateful non-Muslims are to the All-provider of everything. The Quran (e.g., 7:10 passim) frequently mentions the worldly comforts non-Muslims enjoy emphasizing the point that God is the real source and provider of all these comforts; yet non-Muslims show their ingratitude by refusing to acknowledge His last Messenger. Once the 'fact' that God is the Creator and All-provider is fixed in Muslim minds they entertain no doubt about the consequent 'fact': that these unthankful creatures will definitely be punished in the future - definitely in the Afterlife if not in this

life.

Second, God tells Muslims that by allowing non-Muslims worldly success and prosperity the Almighty is playing a Divine ruse (7:183; 68:45) - to allow non-Muslims to persist in their wickedness so that their eventual destruction and punishment are justified. This is what God did in the past.

I respited the unbelievers, then I seized them; and how was My horror! How many a city We have destroyed in its evildoing, and now it is fallen down upon its turrets! How many a ruined well, a tall palace! (22:44-5; also see 22:48). Satan it was that tempted them, and God respited them (47:25).

In any case, God tells Muslims about non-Muslims who may seem to be in a better situation:

let not the unbelievers suppose that the indulgence We grant them is better for them; we grant them indulgence only that they may increase in sin; and there awaits them a humbling chastisement (3:178).

Non-Muslims survive and are apparently successful because, God says, "We draw them on little by little whence they know not. I respite them - assuredly My guile is sure" (7:182-3; 68:44-5).

There is a third reason: God also tests Muslim persistence in their faith in hardship, assuring them that He

will not leave the believers in the state in which (they) are, till He shall distinguish the corrupt from the good, (i.e., non-Muslims from Muslims) (3:179).

So, belief in a unique, Omnipotent Creator-Nourisher Sovereign Lord leads the believers to think of all human beings - except Muslims who follow Divine Guidance, i.e., Islam - as miserable creatures, guilty of transgression against God for not following Islam which is the only genuine divine Guidance. When Muslims think of God as the Judge, they know of His judgment in their favor and against non-Muslims. Similarly, only Muslims are the recipients of God's mercy, kindness, succor and rewards. The rest of humanity is the target of His wrath. The non-Muslims' apparent successes are nothing but a Divine ruse. As God's chosen and Divinely Guided people, Muslims are obligated (by the Divine

Guidance they have received) to adopt an antagonistic attitude towards the world beyond Islam.

.

ENDNOTESPart I: Belief in God

- ¹ For the chronological order and details of creation see TT-1,1:9-136; K:5-62. Both at-Tabari and al-Kisai frequently refer to the Quran and Tradition to authenticate their stories.
- ² See Maududi, Meaning..., 1:7-8. Here we disregard the contradictions concerning predestination and the Free Will which we discuss in Part V of this study.
- ³ For a brief introduction to this Islamic concept of "Divine Guidance" see Maududi, Meaning..., 1:7-9, 21-5; also see Charles J. Adams, "Maududi and the Islamic State" in J.L. Esposito (ed.), Voices of Resurgent Islam., 1983, pp. 111-3 passim.
- ⁴ L. Gardet, "Allah," El², 1:406.
- ⁵ Maududi, The Meaning..., 1:45-6; parentheses in the text.
- ⁶ See Mohammad Khalifa, The Sublime Quran and Orientalism, Longman: London and New York (1983):226.
- ⁷ I have adopted L. Gardet's translation "preach" for IQRA which makes much more sense than "Read" or "Recite" in most of the Quran's translations in English. See L. Gardet, "ALLAH," El², 1:406. Also note that the Arabic-Quranic word for "man" here and elsewhere in our following discussion is INSAN which more correctly means "human being," man as well as woman. As Tabari tells us in his explanation of INSAN in Q103:2, though singular in form, it is used as a collective noun for all human beings. (See T,30:289-91 cf. Q103:2).
- ⁸ See TC,1:212 passim cf. Q2:30-6; parentheses added. The full story is in Part II of this study.
- ⁹ Ibn Khaldun, Muqaddimah (Tr. Franz Rosenthal), 1Z:389; parentheses by Rosenthal.
- ¹⁰ See, e.g., 1:6; 2:137, 157; 3:8, 20, 101; 4:68; 6:80-90, 161; 18:57; 22:24, 67; 28:22; 31:5; 32:24; 38:22; 40:29, 38: 42:52; 45:11; 72:213.
- ¹¹ See, e.g., 2:16, 134, 27:24; 43:37. The misguidedness of these groups is discussed in detail in Part III, Sections 8 and 9.
- ¹² Yvonne Y. Haddad, "Sayyid Qutb: Ideologue of Islamic Revival," in Johan L. Esposito (ed.), Voices of Resurgent Islam, Oxford University Press, 1983, p. 90.
- ¹³ For an appropriate understanding of some apparently 'soft verses' in the Quran see our discussion in Part III Section 8 and 9 (Segment I).
- ¹⁴ These modes of God's expression of His favors for Muslims and wrath and power against non-Muslims is so frequent in the Quran that we refer the reader to see also the following for example. 2:54 cf. TS,2:79; 2:95 cf. TS,2:369; 2:106 cf. TS,2:484; 2:115 cf. TS,2:526-37; 2:120 cf. TS,2:563-4; 2:127 cf. TS,3:73; 2:128 cf. TS,3:260; 2:143 cf. TS,3:171; 2:165 cf. TS,3:281-6; 2:202 cf. TS,4:206-8; 2:207 cf. TS,4:246-51; 2:209 cf. TS,4:259-60; 2:220 cf. TS,4:361; 2:246 cf.

TS,5:291-306; 2:284 cf. TS,6:123; 6:54 cf. TS,11:390-4; 6:165 cf. TS,12:289.

¹⁵Edward W. Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon (Henceforward AEL), 1/8:2879-80; parentheses added.

¹⁶See TS,8:515 passim. For AL-MUNAFIQUN, the so-called Hypocrites, see Part III, Section 9, Segment 3 of this study.

¹⁷See, e.g. (along with Tabari's commentaries) Q4:81, 5:42; 6:68, 106; 7:199; 9:95; 15:94; 32:30; 37:178; 51:54; 53:29; 73:10; 74:5. For a full discussion of these passages see Part III, Section 9, Segments 1 and 2 of this study.

¹⁸See Kassis:490.

¹⁹Ibid:587-8.

²⁰Ibid:929-33.

²¹ For example, God assures Muslims in the Quran that He helps and protects them in struggle against non-Muslims regardless of discrepancies in material resources. "... how often a little company has overcome a numerous company by God's leave (2:249) ...and they routed them, by the leave of God" (2:251). For example, twenty Muslims "will overcome 200... or at least "1000 will overcome two thousand by the leave of God" (8:65-6). In difficult circumstances Muslims need not "sorrow; surely God is with (them)" (9:40) who has promised Muslims: "You shall be the upper ones, and God is with you" (47:35). Muslims need not and should not "take protector other than God" (6:14) nor should they "seek after any judge but God" (6:114), nor should they "seek after a Lord other than God" (6:164). As in the case of helping the Prophet Joseph, Muslims know that "God prevails in His purpose (though) most of mankind know not" (12:21). As Moses did, Muslims must commit their "affair to God" (40:44 passim) and remember the Almighty's assurance:

Lo! We verily do help Our Messengers, and those who believe, in the life of the world and on the day (Hereafter) 40;51).

As the Prophet Shuayb did, believers seek succor only with God and trust Him (11:88) "God suffices for a guardian" and a source of "trust" (4:81, 132, 171; 7:89; 10:71, 85; 11:12, 56; 12:66; 28:28; 33:3, 48). In almost all cases it is in the contexts of confrontations and controversies with nonbelievers that believers are exhorted to put their trust in God for succor. See, e.g, T . . . God commands the Prophet Muhammad (and Muslims) to continue preaching Islam with the promise that "God will protect (them) from men" (5:67). Muslims know well that God is their friend, sufficient protector and helper (2:107, 257; 3:68, 122, 150; 4:45; 5:55; 7:196; 8:40; 42:9; 47:11; 66:2, 4). As "God's friends, no fear shall be on them" (10:62). God is their only defender (33:17); only with Him the believers should "take refuge" as Moses did (2:67 passim). "Help comes only from God, the All-mighty, the All-wise" (3:126). Muslims must believe that "God is sufficient" for them (3:173; 8:62-4; 9:59, 129; 39:38). "Assuredly God will defend the believers against the "treacherous ingrate" non-Muslims (22:38); "God is indeed able to give (Muslims) victory" (22:39). Muslims must remember that "God will not give the disbelievers any way (of success) over the believers" (4:141). The doubters and wavers are doomed to regret and be embarrassed to see the materialization of the victory for Muslims brought by God (5:52). Indeed, as "the party of God -- HIZB ALLAH, they are the victors... and prosperers" (5:56; 58:22). Encouraging Muslims to engage in jihad against non-Muslims even in arduous conditions God

reminded them (in a warning tone) of His help to the Prophet when he left Mecca with a single companion in difficult circumstances.

If you help him not, still Allah helped him when those who disbelieve drove him forth, the second of two; when... (Muhammad) said unto his comrade: Grieve not. Lo! Allah is with us. Then Allah caused His peace of reassurance to descend upon him and supported him with hosts ye cannot see, and made word of those who disbelieved the nethermost, while Allah's Word was that became the uppermost. Allah is Mighty, Wise (9:30-40).

Muslims are also reminded of a similar Divine moral support at the time of Hudaibia when Muslims could not enter Mecca but eventually the Prophet conquered the city with God's help (48:26-7 cf. T. Discussed in Part III, Section 9, Segment 2: Muhammad at Medina). Muslims cause is God's cause and He will "assuredly be the victor" (58:21). "God refuses but to perfect His light" (9:32; 61:8), i.e., make Muslims prevail against non-Muslims. When the Quran repeatedly assures that "God is with the patient" (2:153, 249; 8:46, 66) it means whatever the present circumstances, the Almighty will eventually help Muslims against non-Muslims. "Know that God is with the godfearing (2:192), i.e., Muslims. The oft-repeated short sura 112 (in daily prayers) reassures the believers that "God is the Everlasting Refuge" (112:2) for them.

Part II: BELIEF IN THE EXISTENCE OF ANGELS

'Believe in God and His Messengers and the Book He has sent down His Messenger and the Book(s) which He sent down before. Whoso disbelieves in God and His Angels and His Books, and His Messengers, and the Last Day, has surely gone astray into far error. (The Almighty in Q4:136.) God leads astray whomsoever He will, and He guides whomsoever He will (The Almighty in Q14:4).

'You should believe in God, His Angels, His Books, His Messengers, and the Last Day, and in Decreeing of both good and evil. (Muhammad in Mu.,1:1,5,7, e.g.)

'Muhammad has spoken the truth. (Gabriel in ibid.)

The jinn and Satan, also called **IBILIS** (as extranatural or supernatural creatures of God), belong to the general category of angels, **MALAIKAH** (sing: **MALAIKAH**). Hence, they are treated together. In his description of the beginning of creation by God, Tabari does not mention the jinn and Satan or satans as a category separate from that of angels. As Tabari's elaborations reveal, angels, as a unique species of God's creatures, include the jinn and **IBILIS**, (**Satan or the Devil**).¹ The Quran mentions **IBILIS** as a jinn -- **KAN MIN AL-JINN** (18:50) as well as an angel (2:34). The Muslim Tradition considers the jinn as a particular species of angels. So, the required Muslim credal belief in the existence of angels -- **IMAN BI'L MALAIKAH** implies belief in the existence of the jinn and a particular being, **IBILIS**.

In order to relate Islamic concepts of angels, jinn and **IBILIS** to Muslim self-images and Muslim images and treatment of non-Muslims, the following analysis is divided into four sections: 1) the Islamic images of angels, jinn and **IBILIS** up to the time of the creation of Adam and Eve, which we call the pre-Adam era; 2) Muslim images of the Devil after the creation of Adam and descent to earth; 3) Islamic images of the jinn after the creation of Adam; 4) Muslim images of the (non-jinn or "pure") angels.

1. The Pre-Adam Era

Muslims believe in the existence of a pre-Adam era of universal history. The angels (including the jinn and Iblis) were the intelligent beings of God's creatures during this phase of Islamic sacred history. God had created the angels after creating the visible and invisible parts of the physical universe.² Islamic Tradition portrays an angelic confederation consisting mainly of two factions of the jinn and non-jinn angels. After a certain point of sacred history, as perceived by Islam and explained below, the non-jinn elements of these beings became known simply as angels; we may call them ordinary or "pure" angels. The jinn-angels are called simply the jinn after that certain point in time.

Iblis belonged to the jinn tribe of the angelic confederation -- **INNA MIN AL-MALAIKAT QABILAT-UN MIN AL-JINN, WA KAN IBLIS MINHA.**³ Of the differences between these two tribes of angels we are told that the jinn were created from smokeless blazing fire and the non-jinn angels were, apparently, created by ordinary fire or, according to the Tradition, from light.⁴ The non-jinn angels were created on Wednesday and the jinn on Thursday.⁵ Seemingly, the jinn were, initially, superior to the "pure" angels. The former were among the nobility of the angels and indeed formed their highest and most respected class -- **MIN ASHRAF AL-MALAIKAT WA AKRAMUHUM QABILAT-AN.**⁶

Most of the jinn were settled in the lower heaven surrounding the earth -- **SAMA AD-DUNYA** which may be called "this worldly" heaven close to earth, and also on the earth. The rest of the jinn including their most important personality, Iblis, remained close to the center of Divine authority as keepers of the seals of Paradise, **KHUZZAN AL-JANNAH.** Another reason for the jinn nomenclature is etymological, according to Tabari: they are called jinn because of their above-mentioned close relationship to **AL-JANNAH**, Paradise (TT-1,1:84).

The jinn dwelling in the "lower heaven" and on the earth, it seems, became independent-minded and somewhat autonomy-seeking. They are specifically charged with having engaged in "corruption" and bloodshed -- **AFSADU FIHA, WA SAFAKU'D-DIMA.** They are more seriously charged with **KUFR** (transgression in the sense of disbelief in God) and disobedience towards God and rebellion against their Lord -- **FA KAFAR QAWM-UN MIN AL-JINN... WA ASAU RABBAHUM.**⁷

A Tradition also relates the jinn rebellion to their refusal to admire a new creature, Adam, whom God was in the process of making; the jinn refusal to bow to the new creature infuriated God.⁸ The Almighty's response to this rebellion was swift. Under the command of Iblis God sent an army consisting of troops from the loyal members of the jinn-angelic tribe to crush the rebellion on the earth and adjacent

"heavens."⁹ Obviously, these loyalist jinn-angel troops and their divinely appointed commander, Iblis, were among those who resided close to the center of God's authority, the heavenly Dar al-Islam, and served as Paradise-keepers --**KHUZZAN AL-JANNAH**.

Upon descending to the earth, Iblis, the loyalist jinn-angel general, and his elite jinn-angel troops massacred the rebel jinn. Those who survived ran for their lives, hiding in far-off islands in the oceans and in mountain ranges.¹⁰ The renegade jinn were also set on fire and burned, obviously alive, by the Almighty --**FA BAATH ALLAH ALAAYHIM NAR-AN TAHARRAQAHUM** ¹¹ It is to be noted that up to this point Iblis was among the loyalists.

This part of the story reinforces Muslim belief in the division of God's creatures into the two segments of believers and non-believers. It also provides the foundation and an original explanation for this belief. Most of the jinn angels committed "rebellion" and thus became the non-Muslims of their time. The "pure" angels and a segment of jinn angels remained obedient to the Almighty. They were the Muslims of the period. Muslims identify with that segment of angel-jinn who remained obedient and loyal to the Almighty and consequently escaped His anger and punishment and earned His favor. The renegade jinn were the nonbelievers, i.e., non-Muslims of their time. These non-Muslim jinn were not cursed and punished, Muslims realize, for any ethical misconduct. They were treated so for their refusal to obey God's commandment (TT-1,1:86) and for defying their Lord --**ASAU RABBAHUM** (ibid:87). Tabari (ibid:86-7 passim) and Kisai (K:21) mention that the jinn engaged in bloodshed -- **SAFK AD-DIMA** and in corruption -- **FASAD**. Our sources do not tell us that the jinn had engaged in "bloodshed" violating any specific existing Divine commandment against it. Like the charges against Meccan nonbelievers of killing their baby girls or against Jews charged with assassinating "many" Prophets (Q3:181), the charge of "bloodshed" against the jinn has a rhetorical tone which does

not attract Muslim attention against bloodshed per se seriously. Tabari's sentence "FA AMARAHUM BI AMR-IN FA ABAU -- They refused a certain commandment that God had issued" (TT-1,1:86) indicates Tabari's uncertainty about the specific content of the commandment defied by the jinn. Al-Kisai is specific about the 'fact' that these jinn had refused to obey the three Prophets God had sent to them (K:21). We also know that (as explained in Appendix III and elsewhere in this study), **KUFR** (transgression), **FASAD** (corruption) and **ISYAN** (rebellion), which are ascribed to the jinn, are translated in Islamic terminology into refusal to accept Divine guidance and revelation received through particular channels. The **KAFIR** (transgressor or disbeliever), **FASID** (corrupt) and **ASI** (rebellious) are those, according to the Quran and Tradition, who refuse to surrender to the Divine authority of the Islamic Prophets, particularly that of the Prophet Muhammad. So, a Muslim reader finds the non-Muslims (of Muhammad's time and after) and the pre-Adam rebel jinn being charged with similar allegations.

Just like those who denied the Prophets in human history, the **KAFIR** jinn deserved punishment for preferring self-rule to dependence on Divine guidance. They had indulged in what non-Muslims are condemned for in the Quran: by thinking themselves independent (of Divine guidance) they, like the non-Muslims mentioned in the Quran, had committed rebellion (Q96:6-7). Hence, Muslims are likely to equate the pre-Adam jinn rebellion with the refusal by non-Muslims to acknowledge Islam as being the perfect, authentic and last message of God. Those who do not care for the Divine guidance (Islam), and think themselves **MUSTAGHNI**, "self-sufficient", and independent in this regard are rebels and renegades.

Those among the jinn who rebelled, the non-Muslims of their time, incurred God's wrath. Burning the rebel jinn and their massacre, enslavement and dispersion from their dwelling places by the obedient jinn and angels had the Divine sanction. In other words, the

institution of waging **JIHAD** (holy war) against perceived non-believers has its roots, from a Muslim point of view, in pre-Adam history. Being the counterparts of the obedient and loyal angels, Muslims are divinely ordained and duty-bound to treat contemporary non-Muslims, the perceived equals of the renegade jinn, accordingly. What God and His obedient jinn and angels did with the disobedient remains a source of inspiration and imitation for the formation of similar images and attitudes involving non-Muslims.

We are particularly told that the jinn who incurred Divine punishment were originally among "the nobility of the angels and indeed formed their highest and most respected class." This however, could not save them from being cursed and debased by God. This precedent confirms, in the Muslim mind, the Islamic belief that after the emergence of Islam the People of the Book, the previously chosen and favored people (such as Jews and Christians), lost their unique status in favor of Muslims, in the eyes of God.

The condemnation of the jinn for their resentment against the creation of Adam has also a particular meaning in the Muslim mind. Adam does not necessarily symbolize the greatness and superiority of mankind per se. The jinn were condemned for their interference with the operation of the absolute and arbitrary will of God. It was God's will to create a new creature, Adam, just as it was the Almighty's will to choose Muhammad as His last Messenger, **KHATAM AN-NABIYYN**, Seal of the Prophets, and Muslims as **KHAYR UMMAH**, the best community. Moreover, Adam was important because he was destined to become the first human Messenger of God and the great- great-grandfather of the last and perfect Messenger, Muhammad. The jinns' refusal to bow to Adam parallels the non-Muslim refusal to acknowledge Muhammad as the leader of the most favored Divine religion, Islam. Note that the story of Iblis and Adam in the Quran is usually told in the context of the Prophets rejection by his contemporaries.

2. Islamic Images of the Devil

The Islamic Devil, an angel belonging to the jinn section of the angelic confederation, was known before his fall as **AL-HARITH** (a common Arab name) and also as **AZAZIL** and **AL-HAKAM** (the Judge). He enjoyed a prominent position among angels. After his fall, this angel, condemned by God, is mostly given derogatory names: Iblis (the one who has nothing to expect from the mercy of God, according to Tabari and other Islamic-Arabic philologists), **ASH-SHAYTAN** (Satan/the Devil), **AL-GHARUR** (the stoned, i.e., accursed one), **AL-GHARUR** (the Deluder), **ADUWW ALLAH** (the Enemy of God), and **AL-ALUWW** (the Enemy).¹²

Before his fall, Iblis was the Paradise-Keeper --**KHAZIN ALA'L-JANAN**. He belonged to the noblest of the angels, being the foremost scholar and the most learned among them --**ASHADD AL-MALAIKAT IJTIHAD-AN WA AKRAMUHUM ILM-AN**.¹³ After his show of loyalty and successful jihad against the non-Muslim renegade jinn, Iblis was appointed by God as a proconsul having authority on the earth and surrounding "heavens." This was in addition to his post as the Keeper of the Privy Seal to Paradise.¹⁴

Of the causes of Satan's subsequent fall from a high position, the Quran mentions his refusal to prostrate himself before a new creature, Adam. The Tradition has explained the full story in two ways. Ibn Masud's version implies a rejection of earlier suggestions that Satan had led the jinn-angel forces against the rebellious jinn on the earth. Ibn Masud believes that during the angelic onslaught against the rebel jinn, Iblis was a minor child of the rebellious jinn; he was taken as a prisoner of war to the "upper heavens" and was forced to worship God in the manner of obedient (i.e., Muslim) angels. According to this version, the "pure" angels, not the obedient jinn-angels, had fought the rebellious jinn on the earth.¹⁵ This version of Satan's story justifies the imprisonment of this non-Muslim jinn child, his abduction to the "upper heavens" being the Dar al-Islam of its time, and enforced worship

of the God of Islam.

Tabari is more inclined to accept the Ibn Abbas version of Satan's story related to this phase of Satan's career.¹⁶ According to this version, after successful completion of Satan's expedition against his rebel jinn brethren, Iblis was appointed by God as a sort of Martial Law Administrator General and Proconsul having jurisdiction and sovereignty -- **SULTAN** on the earth and surrounding "lower heavens."¹⁷ It is emphasized that Iblis was the first upon whom Allah bestowed kingship, and thus endowed with His bounties.

Iblis is charged with overweening pride -- **IGHTARR FI NAFSIHI** -- and "thought none could accomplish what he had done", thus "he demonstrated ingratitude for the bounties God had bestowed upon him". The Devil's alleged self-confidence is interpreted as his repudiation of God's overlordship and rebellion against the Almighty. However, "God knew how Iblis was thinking" -- **FA'T-TALA'ALLAH ALA DHALIK MIN QALBIHI**. God did not like his creature's self-confidence. It was on this occasion that the Almighty decided to get rid of Satan and his jinn constituents on earth.¹⁹ It seems that Allah skillfully called Satan back to the upper heavens before the latter could execute his alleged plans; it was also at this point that the Almighty thought of a new creature (human beings) as a replacement, **KHALIFA**, for the jinn on the earth. Apparently, Satan was under surveillance when Adam and Eve were created. The story of the final fall of Iblis and his expulsion to the earth is well-documented by the Quran and Tradition.²⁰

Satan is shown to have expressed his dislike of the new creature from the very beginning. He is blamed for mischievous and insulting activities against Adam when the latter was being made. Satan used to hit the half-made clay of Adam; and before it came to full life, Iblis used to kick him, enter his mouth and come out from his backside and vice versa, and then tell Adam-in-making: "You are a dummy", a "thing of naught" -- **LASTA SHAY-AN**. The Devil also vowed that he would destroy

Adam and rebel against him.²¹ This would have the effect of inciting Muslims against Satan as a staunch nonbeliever.

According to the Quran 15:26-45, after God breathed His spirit into Adam, He asked the angels to bow before him. The angels obeyed but Iblis "refused to be among those bowing," arguing that Adam was just a mortal and his inferior. God cursed Satan who threatened to mislead Adam and his children. God in turn told Satan that in the "Day of Doom" "Gehenna shall be... the promised land of Satan and of his followers among human beings."²² In the Quranic (2:30-4) version of the same story, Satan's pride and refusal to prostrate himself before Adam are called acts of **KUFR**, unbelief, with which non-Muslims are charged by Islam.²³ The Q7:10-25 version of the story finally expels Iblis from the "upper heaven" as an enemy of God and mankind. Apparently, the accursed Satan lingered around Paradise in which Adam and Eve were settled by God. Satan trickfully entered paradise²⁴ and lured Adam and Eve to touch the "forbidden tree." Satan told them, "Your Lord has only prohibited you from this tree lest you become angels, or lest you become immortals." It was a "delusion" anyhow. After Adam and Eve touched the "forbidden tree," they along with Satan were expelled to the earth to remain therein as "enemy to each other" until the Day Hereafter.

As requested by Satan, he was permitted to co-exist on the earth with Adam and his progeny until the Day of Doom, Hereafter. The Almighty decreed that during the life on earth Adam and his progeny would receive Divine guidance from Him. Those who follow the Divine guidance (the last and perfect version of which is Islam) will have no cause for fear and grief. Those who reject the Divine guidance, Islam, will be sent to Hell to abide therein forever (Q2:38-9).

Satan, the enemy of God, however, is determined to use all methods to mislead mankind in order to make them reject the Divine guidance and thus lead them to Hell (Q7:17-8). The Quran warns against being misled by Satan by rejecting Islam; those who do so are called the friends of

Satan (7:27,30).

Satan is labeled as an enemy of God. Before the creation of Adam he became too proud of his self-sufficiency and thus was dubbed as a rebel against God. For this, he was recalled to the "upper heavens" as punishment and, along with his jinn constituents, was replaced by a successor, a Khalifa: Adam and his progeny. Obviously in this context, Muslims take into consideration that the nobility and "foremost knowledge and scholarship" of the former "Judge" (**al-Hakam**), (Satan) were of no importance for the Almighty when He decided to demote him. It is the self-effacing submission to the absolute authority of God that is critically important.

The condemnation of Satan in this context implies the devaluation of knowledge not based on Revelation. This implication is consistent with the Almighty's culminating decree that only the followers of Divine revelation received by the prophets including the Prophet Muhammad will be rewarded.²⁵ Satan was doomed to condemnation because instead of dependence on Divine guidance he depended on his own capacities. From a Muslim point of view, the followers of other creeds, by rejecting Islam, are guilty of a similar Satanic behavior; their intellectual and rational sciences, **AL-ULUM AL-AQLIYYAH**, not being based on the final Divine revelation, i.e., Islam, become automatically a thing of naught.

In his open refusal to bow to Adam Satan engaged in a sort of rationalization; having been created of fire he claimed superiority to Adam who was created of clay. This was another demonstration of individualism against the absolute and arbitrary authority of God. It was like questioning God's authority to select the Prophet Muhammad as His last Messenger. The consequences of Satan's engagement in rationalization were clear: his arrogance was ridiculed and he was expelled from heaven with the mark of humiliation.²⁶ Iblis is charged with disbelief, false pride, and ingratitude toward God. For these

crimes Satan is cursed by God until the Day of Judgment whence obviously he will be sent to Hell²⁷ and will be "the first to be clad with the garment of fire".²⁸ Satan's disobedience of God is explicitly equal to the non-Muslims' rejection of the Prophet Muhammad as the last and perfect Messenger of the Almighty (TS,1:511 cf. Q2:34).

In Tradition, Satan's continued enmity and jealousy of God is depicted in various ways. For example the Prophet told the believers that Satan withdraws weeping in disappointment when he finds human beings - obviously Muslims - prostrating themselves before God²⁹; he becomes jealous when he hears Allah's name mentioned over food, etc.³⁰ Satan loathes the Word of God, the Quran, and is driven away when it is recited.³¹ So, dislike of Islamic rituals and lack of enthusiasm about them constitute Satanic behavior.

The Enemy of God is also depicted as the enemy of mankind. Recalling Satan's legacy of bad feeling and vendetta against Adam, the Quran maintains that Iblis is determined to mislead humankind to catastrophe here and hereafter.³² "Satan is the same manifest enemy to human beings," the Almighty reminds us (in Tabari's words), "who out of jealousy refused to bow to your father, Adam, and then by deception caused his and his wife's expulsion from Paradise, and thus made obvious his animosity to you (human beings)."³³

Satan's misleading of human beings is translated into their rejection of Islam.³⁴ Those who refuse to convert wholly to Islam and thus follow the footsteps of Satan have fallen prey to the deception of their own enemy.³⁵ These themes are constantly repeated in the Quran. Q7:27 reminds us that it was Satan who refused to bow to Adam and then caused the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise. Adam's progeny are told those who reject Islam are, as a matter of fact, seduced and duped by Satan.

And when We said to the angels, 'Bow yourself to Adam;' so they bowed themselves, save Iblis; he was one of the jinn, and committed ungodliness against his Lord's command. What, and do

you take him and his seed to be your friends, apart from Me, and they an enemy to you. How evil is that exchange for the evildoers! (Q18:50-1).

Before their expulsion to the earth, Adam was told by God of the Devil's obvious hatred for him and his wife, God warned him not to let Satan drive the two out of the Garden and thus make them unhappy (20:117). This was exactly what Satan did (Q2:35; Q7:20-22). In the afterlife, men would realize what a great betrayer of men Satan has been (Q25:29).

O men, God's promise is true; so let not the present life delude you, and let not the Deluder delude you concerning God. Surely Satan is an enemy to you; so take him for an enemy (35:5-6).

The "delusion" in this passage as usual means the rejection of Muhammad as the Messenger of God. In other words, those who do not have faith in Muhammad and Islam are deluded by Satan (T,22:78). Human beings are reminded that they are under covenant with God not to worship their open enemy, Satan (Q36:59-65): "Let not Satan bar you; he is for you a manifest foe" (Q13:61-62; cf. Q17:53).

The Enemy of God and mankind is also the worst enemy of Muslims and Islam. Muslims are cautioned that Satan is their sworn enemy and his enmity must be taken seriously (Q2:208); indications of any weakness and reservations in performing Islamic deeds are related to Satan's provocations and mischiefs. Commitment to any un-Islamic action is considered as following the footsteps of Satan.³⁶ Those who fail to mend their un-Islamic ways stand the risk of being called the "brothers and friends of the ungrateful and accursed Satan" (Q17:26-7).

Satan demonstrates his scorn for Islam and Islamic rites in different ways; he is driven away by the Islamic call to prayer, **ADHAN**.³⁷ He makes Muslims forget their prayers.³⁸ Sometimes this Enemy of God does nasty things to keep people away from Islamic religious observations: he urinates in their ears, so that they forget Islamic prayer.³⁹

Obviously, the non-Muslims with their dislike for Islam and Islamic rites are considered to be overwhelmed by Satan as above. Such exhortations are also meant to make Muslims firmer observants of Islam and degrade non-Muslims and nonconformist Muslims who do not perform Islamic rites.

In a battle between Muslims and non-Muslims, some among the former who were alleged to have demonstrated cowardice instead of the valor of a holy warrior were labeled the comrades of Satan (Q3:173-5). This Quranic passage and Traditional exegeses (TS,7404-17) tells us that they were called comrades -- **AULIYA** of Satan because of their moderation and realism. Such a moderate attitude is not rewarded with appreciation in Islam; it runs the risk of being labeled as comradeship with the Devil. Warning those who might foresee material losses during Jihad, it is asserted that indeed it is the Devil who threatens with poverty (Q2:268). The Muslims are expected to respond to the cause of Islam; otherwise they might be suspected of being influenced by Satan. During war between Muslims and non-Muslims, Satan causes the Muslims to make a slip, **IZTAZALLAHUM**, in the form of doing what they are not supposed to do. The believers are likely to be pardoned by God (in case they repent and do not repeat the same behavior) (Q3:154).

Muslims are warned against any bad faith and loose talk about the Prophet Muhammad. This kind of thought and behavior towards the Prophet is "of Satan" who, by encouraging people to "conspire" against the Prophet of Islam, leads them to disastrous consequences for themselves (Q58:9-10). Any deviation from the teachings of the Prophet will be considered inspired by Satan. Those who "turn back on their heels" after they have accepted Islam as their creed are likened to those who are "turned to bewilderment in the earth by Satan" (Q6:71). Related to this is the Tradition believers receive that during a battle Satan spread the rumor Muhammad was killed -- **SAH ASH-SHAYTAN: QUTIL MUHAMMAD** (AbH,1:288). The lesson: only Satan or his likes could be happy with

any harm to the Prophet.

Given these warnings, Muslims are likely to equate any divergence from Islam with following the footsteps of Satan. Obviously, such warnings provide another mechanism for the reinforcement of Muslim self-righteousness, and another reason to look down upon non-Muslims as the followers of the Devil.

Some occasional lapses of the believers and problems they cause are ascribed to the mischievous activities of the Devil. In the past, the Islamic Prophet Joseph besought a fellow prisoner to free him from prison; but Satan caused Joseph's fellow prisoner to forget; so Joseph remained in prison a few more years (Q12:42; cf. T). Thus Joseph's dependence for relief on someone other than God was censured and punished. Similarly, Joseph's ill-treatment by his brothers is said to have been caused by Satan (Q12:5, 100). The same Devil once had led Moses astray, inciting him to commit murder (Q28:15). For the Prophet Job it was the Devil who made him conscious of the weight of toil and weariness (Q38:41). Thus, believers are cautioned against non-Islamic acts which are caused by the Devil.

Even the Prophet Muhammad was occasionally a target of Satan's mischiefs. The most important lapse of the Prophet related to his demonstration of a tolerant attitude towards the traditions of the non-Muslims. As discussed in Part III, Section I, Segment I in detail, the Prophet had mistaken some verses superimposed deceptively by Satan onto a part of Divine revelation. These so-called Satanic Verses encouraged reconciliation with non-Muslims. However, the Almighty opposed reconciliation with non-Muslims, and soon abrogated the Satanic Verses.⁴⁰ In other words, it is the Devil who may mislead Muslims into reconciliation with any non-Muslim worldview, while the Lord of Islam is opposed to such tolerant attitude towards non-Muslims and their traditions. Readiness for reconciliation with non-Muslims is a Satanic approach rather than an ideal Muslim pattern of relationship with

non-Muslims.^{40a}

After non-Muslims' disagreements with Islam have been called "ignorant Satanic provocations," believers are advised to abhor any discourse with non-Muslims and to shun them. A Muslim must not communicate with the comrades of Satan.⁴¹

Most of the Meccan Quranic verses which required the Muslims simply to shun non-Muslims, who were alleged to be provoked by Satan in their opposition to Islam, were finally abrogated by the suras, e.g., 8 and 9 of the Quran. After the revelation of the jihad-related verses of the above suras, the new decrees required the believers to fight to the death such "ignorant Satanic provocateurs" rather than simply abhor them.⁴²

So far we have concentrated mostly on those passages of the Quran and Tradition which depict Iblis as an enemy of God, human beings, Islam and Muslims. For our purpose the most important passages of the Quran and Tradition are those which establish a direct relationship between non-Muslims and the accursed Satan. Based on these divine verdicts Muslims see non-Muslims as the blind followers, comrades, brothers and "party" of Satan; Satan has gained mastery over them, wittingly or unwittingly. From a Muslim point of view, the non-Muslims are living and fighting for the cause of the great Deluder and the Enemy of God and Muslims (Q22:3-4; Q2:102; Q4:1126-7; Q43:36-9). This motif is asserted in different ways in the Quran and Tradition. "In the eyes of Abraham, his father's worship of un-Islamic gods was equal to becoming a friend of the rebellious Devil and his worshipper" (Q19:44-5). Satan is an intimate, though dreadful, friend of non-Muslims (Q4:37-8). God has made the Devil to be the comrade and leader of non-believers, i.e., non-Muslims (Q7-27; Q43:36; Q34:20). In particular those who dispute with Muhammad (and his followers) are inspired by Satan (Q6:122). The believers fight for God, the non-believers fight for the Devil. It is incumbent upon the believers to fight these comrades of the Devil, and

ensure that the Devil is too weak to overcome the believers (Q4:76).

Satan exercises no authority over the believers; only those under the sway of the Devil befriend him and indulge in non-Islamic deeds. Satan has gained authority over such people; they are **HIZB ASH-SHAYTAN**, Satan's party, and, of course, eventual losers.⁴³

In a series of Traditions the believers are told that all creeds other than Islam and all non-Islamic modes of thought are Satan's intrigues and contrivances: God had created all people to be Muslims; it is Satan who has misled them to other creeds (Mu, 5:63). Satan sends his troops to convert people to non-Islam (Mu, 50:67-8); and it is Satan who has spread paganism (Bu, 65:s71, 1). Those who speculate about God and godhood (instead of following the) Islamic version of the same are actually inspired by the Devil (Mu, 60:213-5). Referring to the non-Muslims who are doomed to go to Hell, the Almighty declares:

Surely, they are the liars! Satan has gained mastery over them... those are Satan's party; why Satan's party, surely, they are the losers (Q58:18-19).

Those who believe in others than God, i.e., adopt a creed other than Islam, are, as a matter of fact, "lured to bewilderment... by Satan... " (Q6:71; cf. Q19:83-4).

Hast thou not seen how We sent the Satans against the unbelievers, to prick them? (Q19:83)

The squanderers (obviously the non-Muslims) are brothers of Satan (Q17:27).

In order to explain to Muslims why the non-Muslims refused to accept Islam, the Quran provides, for the satisfaction of the believers, three explanations: 1) the non-Muslims are predestined to remain so. (We have discussed in Part V of this study the effects of such a belief on Muslim images and treatment of non-Muslims); 2) the Almighty wants thus to distinguish the Muslims from non-Muslims so that He may reward the former and chastise the latter; and 3) Satan, following his

determination to mislead humankind (Q4:118- 20), adopts various ways to fulfill his ungodly mission. One of the ways adopted by the Enemy is to "deck out fair" to non-Muslims their un-Islamic faiths and ways of life. In other words, for a Muslim believer, the non-Muslims have simply fallen prey to Satan's deceptions. Obviously this Divine explanation leaves Muslim minds no room to reconsider their belief in Islam and their perceptions of what is beyond their creed. For example, one's appreciation of a certain non-Islamic faith, philosophy or way of life, does not stem, a Muslim would think, from any positive and genuine value and attraction inherent in such non-Islamic faiths, philosophies and ways. The adherents of such faiths, philosophies and ways are simply, as seen by Muslims, bewildered and bewitched by Iblis. Consequently, there is no reason for any rethinking, revision and reformation of Muslim self-images and their images and treatment of the world beyond Islam. Given the Muslim belief that they by God's grace are immune from following the Devil (Q4:83) and thus cannot fall prey to his deceptions, Muslims may only look down upon non-Islamic "fancies" and misbeliefs."

Muslims remember Satan's declaration at the dawn of human life on earth when he said to God:

Assuredly, I will take unto myself a portion appointed of thy servants, and I will lead them astray and fill them with fancies... I will command them and they will alter God's creation (Q4:118- 120).

From a Muslim point of view, these are the ones who rejected the creed of the past prophets and, eventually, that of the Prophet Muhammad (TS,9:213-26). The verse that follows the above passage reassures Muslims:

Whoso takes Satan to him for a friend, instead of God, has surely suffered a manifest loss (4:118- 20).

These are the ones who have distressed God and the Prophet by their rejection of Divine guidance, Islam (TS,9:224). The non-believers'

refusal to surrender to the creed of the Prophets and particularly to that of the Prophet Muhammad, and their perseverance in their own un-Islamic ways, result from the 'facts' that "their hearts were hard, and Satan decked out [i.e., made seem] fair to them what they were doing" (6:42-3 cf. 22:3-4).

By God, assuredly We sent Messengers to nations before thee, but Satan decked out fair to them their deeds; he is their protector today, and there yet awaits them a painful chastisement (16:63).

An Old World bird, the hoopoe, brought his master, Solomon, news of the Queen of Sheba and her people who worshipped the sun. The reason for this un-Islamic practice, the hoopoe maintained, was because Satan had "decked out fair their deeds to them and he [had] barred them from the way" of God making them unable to see the right path (i.e. Islam) (Q27:23-4). The same had happened with other non-Muslim peoples of the past such as those of Ad and Thamud (Q29:38, cf. Q41:25).

The non-Muslims have not any genuine cause or reason for their confrontations and disagreements with the Muslims; the former are simply Satan's dupes and puppets. The Devil encourages the enemies of the believers to fight the latter; he makes their actions in this respect fair-seeming and assures them victory over the believers. This is what Satan did during a battle between the Prophet Muhammad and his adversaries.⁴⁴ It is Satan who inspires and incites his non-Muslim friends to dispute with the Prophet Muhammad (and his followers).⁴⁵

From a Muslim point of view the non-Muslim unawareness of the 'fact' that the latter are deceived by Satan is contemptible. Muslims are convinced that non-Muslims by following Satan are doomed here and hereafter to failure, defeat and destruction. Muslims can rest assured that non-Muslims as the followers of Satan are approaching a coup de grace; there is no need for Muslims to worry about the transitory superiority and gains of non-Muslims, if any. They are simply being given some time by the Almighty to be trapped by Satan's vicious circle.

Non-Muslims are incited and helped by Satan to remain what they are or to fight Muslims. However, they are too weak to overcome the believers; non-Muslims will eventually be humiliated and defeated. These themes are projected repeatedly in the Quran.⁴⁶ Non-Muslims are "Satan's party" and are sure losers (Q58:19). Satan finally betrays his comrades and leaves them in the lurch when the decisive moment comes (Q14:22).

In the afterlife, if not here, it will become evident how non-Muslims were deceived by the great Deluder. Satan has called his party, i.e., the non-Muslims, to un-Islam, only that they may be among the inhabitants of the Blaze (Q34:5-6).

Like Satan, when he said to man, 'Disbelieve' [Islam]; then, when he disbelieved, he said, 'surely I am quite of you. Surely I fear God, the Lord of all Being. Their end is, both are in Fire, there dwelling forever; that is the recompense of the evildoer (Q59:16-7; brackets added).

As informed by the Divine Word, the Quran, Muslims are confident that non-Muslims will bewail in the afterlife what they are now. Although non-Muslims have been kept away from Islam in this world by Satan, having seen the consequences in the life hereafter, they will say, addressing the Devil:

Would there had been between me and thee the distance of the two Easts! An evil comrade!

It will be too late; the deluded non-Muslims shall share eternal chastisement with the Deluder in Hell.⁴⁷ The Almighty will remind the non-Muslims disparagingly:

Now keep yourselves apart, you sinners, upon this day! Made I not Covenant with you, children of Adam, that you should not serve Satan -- surely he is manifest foe to you -- and that you should serve Me? He led astray many a throng of you; did you not understand? This is Gehenna, then, the same that you were promised; roast well in it today for that you were unbelievers (Q36:59-65, cf. 4:37-8).

3. The Jinn After the Fall

The material in the Quran and Tradition on the fallen jinn and Muslim self-images and Muslim images and treatment of non-Muslims, related descriptions may be best understood if treated under the following headings: a) Muslim images of the jinn in general; b) the jinn as undesirable activists against the Divine order and against Muslims, c) the jinns' link to un-Islamic faiths and their collaboration with non-Muslims, d) the voluntary and involuntary surrender of the jinn to the Prophet Muhammad and Islam. In the material used for this section, most of the above themes overlap.

The jinn, Muslims believe, are real beings. They are bodies (AJSAM) composed of vapor or flame, intelligent, imperceptible to our senses, capable of appearing, under different forms and of carrying out heavy labour... They are capable of salvation; Muhammad was sent to them as well as to mankind; some will enter paradise while others will be cast into the fire of hell... In official Islam the existence of the jinn was completely accepted as it is to this day, and the full consequences implied by their existence were worked out... Some jurists have, despite their belief in the supernatural character of the jinn, considered them so real as to deal with hypothetical problems arising out of human marriages with jinns.⁴⁸

The attempts by some modern Muslim scholars to divest the jinn of their "reality" and interpret the term metaphorically have been "subjected to criticism by the ulama."⁴⁹ So, taking into consideration the bulk of the material in the Quran and Tradition, the jinn, like Satan and "pure angels," though supernatural and mysterious, are real to a Muslim believer. In this section, we have considered Satans (SHAYATIN), when mentioned in plural in the Quran and Traditions, as jinn.

The remnant of the renegade jinn, after their defeat by the loyalist angelic forces, ran for their lives, hiding in distant islands in the ocean and mountain ranges.⁵⁰ The descriptions in the Quran and Tradition of the post-Adam jinn life and activities are quite consistent with the above picture. They continued to exist on earth and surrounding heavens as mysterious beings. Being replaced by the progeny of Adam, the jinn remain in their demoted position. They remain

extraordinary, however, and capable of performing unusual acts. Usually, they are portrayed as non-believers engaged in mischievous activities against the desire of the Almighty. The jinn, because of their extraordinary qualities, try surreptitiously to provide non-Muslims with information about the 'reality.' Eventually, they are driven away by Divine forces. These collaborators with non-Muslims were rendered ineffective by God, particularly after the emergence of Islam. Some of them surrender to Islam, willingly or unwillingly. That such extraordinary creatures are overwhelmed by Islam is an evidence, for the believer, of the authenticity of Muhammad and his creed. That the jinn were aware of Islam's and Muhammad's sublime position also reinforces Muslim belief in their creed.

A group of the jinn who finally surrendered to Islam confessed that they in the past were engaged in ungodly and mischievous activities against the Divine order; they also referred to their collaboration with non-Muslims:

...The fools among us spoke against God -- outrage, and we had thought that men and jinn would never speak against God a lie. But there were certain men of mankind who would take refuge with certain men of jinn, and they increased them in vileness, and they thought, that God would never raise up anyone. And we stretched toward heaven, but we found it filled with terrible guards and meteors. Who would sit there on seats to hear; but any listening now, finds a meteor in wait for him. And so we know not whether evil is intended for those in the earth, or whether the Lord intends for them rectitude (Q72:5-10).

The Quran 15:16-8 asserts that the "heavenly constellations" are guarded against the accursed satans, "excepting such as listens by stealth -- and he is pursued by a manifest flame." As explained by the Prophet Muhammad, when God makes a decision the news is spread among angels in the celestial realm. The jinn begin to eavesdrop in order to know about these heavenly decrees and then whisper the information to their friends, i.e., non-Muslims. But the jinn are struck with shooting stars. Sometimes, they succeed in bringing some correct news which is, however, usually distorted and mingled with lies by the jinn -- **YAQRIFUN**

FIHI WA YAZIDUN.⁵¹

The overwhelming influence of Islam on the jinn is demonstrated in two ways: 1) It is shown that a number of even these extraordinary beings acknowledged the authenticity of Islam, became Muslims, and serve the cause of Islam. 2) The jinn, even these supernatural creatures, who refused to convert to Islam voluntarily, found themselves ineffective, particularly after the advent of Muhammad; their collaboration with non-Muslims came to naught. In both cases, it is the authenticity, superiority and force of Islam, and the idea of the wretchedness of non-Muslims for dependence on the jinn for the knowledge of the invisible world, that are reinforced in the Muslim mind.

Muslims believe that the advent of the Prophet Muhammad created a grave and tormenting crisis for the jinn and their non-Muslim followers. In the heavens, their intrusions were further blocked and on the earth they began to lose human clients.

The Tradition informs us that after the appearance of the Prophet as the last Messenger of God, the jinn were expelled from the lower worldly heavens and the shooting stars began to strike them, apparently, more than before; being completely barred from contact with the celestial realm, they were no longer able to engage in soothsaying. The jinn used to hide behind the false deities sending distorted news to their non-Muslim worshipers (IS-MH,1:110-1).

Before Muhammad had declared his Prophethood, the non-Muslims of Taif realized that their deities were no longer answering their prayers. They approached Iblis (with whom apparently they had close connections) in order to determine the cause. Iblis asked them to "bring a handful of earth from every land; it was brought to him; he smelt (the earth of various places) and cast it down, till that of Tihama (Muhammad's birth place) was brought; he smelt it and said: Here it has happened", meaning that the emergence of Muhammad had rendered the non-Muslim deities ineffective. At this point the jinn hiding behind the idols

lamented

Wonder! Wonder! All Wonder! The emergence of a prophet between mountains (i.e., in Mecca)... the heavens are guarded and we are smitten with meteors (Ibid, 191-3).

Some of the jinn, after hearing of the Prophet's emergence, went to find him reciting the Quran. So moved were they that they converted to Islam (Bu65, S72, 1).

An Arab took his two hundred goats which had suffered from itching to the idol Suwa at Mecca, and prayed for their recovery. The Arab heard only a jinn voice from inside the idol confessing: "the tricks of the jinn have disappeared and we are smitten with meteors because of a prophet whose name is Ahmad (another name for the Prophet Muhammad).⁵²

The lovers among the jinn who had girlfriends in Arabia were particularly in difficulty. When the Prophet emigrated to Medina the jinn lover of Fatima, daughter of An-Numan of the Banu Najjar tribe, stopped visiting her. One day this lover jinn appeared on the wall of the house of his girlfriend, perhaps to peek. Fatima complained: "What is the matter? You do not come as you were wont to do" He said: "The Prophet who has prohibited adultery and wine has come." Another lover jinn had a lady friend from the Banu Asad tribe. "He came one day to her crying," that an affair had taken place which the jinn were unable to anticipate. He told his Banu Asad girlfriend, perhaps regretfully, that Ahmad had prohibited such contacts. Trying to explain why the jinn could not know beforehand about such a great event, that is, the emergence of Islam, he told his girlfriend frankly, "When Allah was promulgating Islam, they [the jinn] could not overhear."⁵³

Many of the jinn, however, began to surrender to Islam, some voluntarily, convinced of the authority of Muhammad's call, and others forced by circumstances and changing signs of the heavens created by the emergence of Muhammad. Those who remained non-Muslim were occasionally overwhelmed and humiliated by the Prophet. Suras 46:29-31 and 72 refer

to the jinn's conversion to Islam.

We turned to thee a company of jinn giving ear to the Koran; and when they were in its presence they said, 'Be silent!' Then when it was finished, they turned back to their people, warning. They said, 'Our people, we have heard a Book that was sent down after Moses confirming what was before it, guiding to the truth and to [the] straight path. Our people, answer God's summoner [Muhammad] and believe in Him, and He will forgive you some of your sins, and protect you from a painful chastisement. Whosoever answers not God's summoner [Muhammad] cannot frustrate God in the earth, and he has no protectors apart from Him; those are in manifest error' [Q46:29-51].

After listening to the Quran the jinn exclaimed: "We have indeed heard a Koran wonderful, guiding to rectitude." The passage repeats most of 46:29-31.⁵⁴ These jinn declared their belief in Muhammad and his creed. Some jinn, the passage says, continued to disbelieve in Islam; they however, will become "firewood for Gehenna."

These conversions of the jinn to Islam took place during the Meccan phase of the Prophet's life when most of the Arabs had refused to join Islam. During the same period, we are told by Tradition reports, representatives of the jinn used to come to the Prophet and take him to their dwelling places in order to preach Islam.^{54a} Once, after his mysterious disappearances, the Prophet told his worried companions: "there came to me an inviter on behalf of the jinn and I went along with him and recited to them the Quran." The prophet called these jinn who had converted to Islam the "brothers" of other Muslims.⁵⁵

As we know from Q72:1-15, some of the jinn surrendered to Islam after they realized resistance was futile. According to the Tradition, after the jinn found an "obstruction" had risen between them and "the news from the Heavens and that they were the target of celestial 'flames,'" they told their people of the "strange" power of the Quran and then surrendered to Islam.⁵⁶ Those among the jinn who continued their mischiefs against the Prophet were physically overwhelmed by him. Once a highly wicked jinn tried to interrupt the Prophet's prayer. The Prophet seized the jinn and went to tie him to one of the pillars of the

mosque so that "everyone could see the wicked jinn. However, the Prophet, remembering the jinn's service to his brother Solomon" let the humiliated, wicked one go without showing him to his companions.⁵⁷ The Prophet had done the same with the great Satan, Iblis, on a similar occasion (Mu,5:40).

Finally, the Prophet told the believers that some of the jinn of Medina were converted to Islam. About those jinn whose Islam was uncertain, the Prophet asked the believers to give the demurring and non-Muslim jinn three days notice to leave, or they would be killed by Muslims - - **INN BI'L MADINAT JINN-AN QAD ASLAMU. FA IN RAAYTUM MINHUM SHAY-AN FADHANUHU THALATHAT AYYAM. FA IN BADA'A LAKUM BAD DHALIK FA'QTULUH/FA-IN DHAHAB WA ILLA FA'QTULUH FA INNAHU KAFIR.**⁵⁸

In order to relate Islamic material on the jinn to Muslim self-images and Muslim images and treatment of non-Muslims, we may reconstruct the Muslim thought-process concerning the jinn as follows. The jinn, though extraordinary, are among those cursed and punished by the Almighty. Following their defeat and dispersal by the divine forces, the jinn remain demeaned. They are fallen angels and, excepting those who convert to Islam, are among those deprived of God's blessing. Such non-Muslim jinn had to be expelled from Muslim territory or be killed. The jinn continue to be treated by God as rebels, i.e., non-Muslims. Nevertheless, the jinn continue their unauthorized and mischievous activities against the Divine order. The jinn try to intrude into the celestial realms to purloin heavenly information and then slip it to non-Muslims. Like Iblis, the jinn are the enemies of God. Muslim understanding of the jinn obviously implies that not only any reliance on advice from the jinn but also comradeship with them is undesirable and condemnable.

This undesirable link, however, is established between the jinn and non-Muslims. "Certain men of mankind," i.e. the non-Muslims, the **Quran** tells the believers, "take refuge with certain men of jinn, and

they increase them in vileness."⁵⁹ In other words, the non-Muslim beliefs received through such ungodly sources are unauthentic. Divine and authentic knowledge comes only through proper channels: the Prophets, and finally through the Prophet Muhammad.

Muslims are also assured that, after the emergence of Islam, the jinn are completely barred from secret contact with the authentic and genuine sources of Divine knowledge; only Muslims through their faith in Muhammad possess this superior knowledge and, consequently, are rightly guided. The non-Muslim faiths, beliefs and knowledge are defective and scandalous. A reading of Q37:6-10, 52:37-8 and 67:5-6 along with 26:210 (which asserts that the Quran has not been brought by the satans nor it is in their power to do so) reinforces this comparative perspective in the Muslim mind. Q6:100 ("yet they ascribe to God, as associates, the jinn, though He created them") and Q34:41 ("they were serving the jinn; most of them believed in them") repeat the allegation that non-Muslims worship the jinn and depend on them for guidance. The impotence of the jinn after the emergence of Islam also subtly reinforces the claim of superiority of the Prophet Muhammad and Islam to the previous Prophets and their creeds. Muslims believe it was only the advent of Muhammad - and not that of Moses or Jesus Christ, for example - that rendered the rebel and notorious jinn powerless.

The belief in the conversion of the jinn to Islam is reassuring to Muslims in adverse circumstances. The Quranic passages and the Traditions about the jinns' conversion to Islam belong to the Meccan period. Sura 72 was reportedly revealed after the Prophet was cast out by the people of Taif. The Prophet had not yet found the Medinans who eventually gave him a base to launch the rise of Islam through means other than mere preaching. It was the most frustrating phase of the Prophet's career. Probably the idea of the conversion of the supernatural jinn, along with the idea of some other extraordinary happenings such as the half-night return journey from Mecca to Jerusalem

and Heaven and other celestial realms, came to him to combat the frustration of his few Meccan followers and reinforce the authenticity of his call. By tall-talking of the conversion of the extraordinary jinn the Prophet was also, in a way, belittling his rejection by ordinary human beings.

This strategy seems to have worked as far as the majority of his few Meccan followers were concerned. The subsequent rise of Islam fixed the belief in the "reality" of the conversion of the jinn in Muslim consciousness -- along with its consequences as, perhaps, intended by the Prophet. From a Muslim believer's point of view the conversion of the supernatural jinn to Islam is a proof of the authenticity of Islam; it confirms, in the Muslim mind, the truthfulness of Islam regardless of the non-Muslim rejection. Keeping in mind the fact of the acceptance of Islam by the extraordinary jinn, a Muslim is likely to ascribe the rejection of Islam by non-Muslims to their perversity and wretchedness rather than to a genuine reason. At a Meccan-like time when Islam fails to attract non-Muslims, the believers may find solace in such beliefs and denigrate non-Muslims rather than question the authenticity and superiority of their own faith.^{59a} In other words, whatever the present adversities, Islam is destined to triumph and non-Muslims will finally be convinced of the authenticity of Islam. As long as they do not do so, they are to be considered wretched followers of the accursed jinn and treated accordingly.

In brief, the belief in the existence of the jinn with their two basic attributes - their supernatural character and accursed state - reinforces Muslim self-righteousness on the one hand, and on the other, becomes a justification for disparaging non-Muslims and their faiths. The conversion of the supernatural jinn proves, for a Muslim, the authenticity of Islam. Non-Muslim human beings are likely to have been duped by the accursed and renegade jinn who provide the former with defective and scandalous knowledge, being unaware that these renegade

jinn are barred from celestial realms, particularly after the emergence of Islam.

The decree that the non-Muslim jinn had to be expelled from Medina or killed reinforces the Muslim sense of justification for similar treatment of non-Muslims in the domain of Islam, **Dar al-Islam**.

4. The 'Pure' Angels

The material on angels in the Quran and Tradition is extensive and widespread. For the purpose of this study we have selected only some examples of those texts which deal with a general description of the angels and with their perceived attitude towards Muslims and non-Muslims.

The angels are mighty supernatural and pious beings capable of performing extraordinary deeds; they have "wings two, three or four" or more as God wills.⁶⁰ They are capable of covering a distance of fifty thousand years in one day. This is the distance between the "lowest seventh earth, the one end of the Divine realm, and the highest seventh heaven, the other end of His domain."⁶¹

The angels are generally invisible except to the Prophets and high-ranking Muslims; however, they might appear occasionally in human or some other form in order to verify Islamic teachings, to reassure Muslims of their assistance and to attack and terrorize non-Muslim adversaries.⁶²

The angels' extraordinary qualities, such as their knowledge of right and wrong, are bestowed upon them by the Almighty (2:32); they are not to be worshipped (3:80). They are simply vehicles for conveying Divine revelation and are messengers of God to the prophets.⁶³

The numerous angels are among the most obedient servants of God and are always engaged in celebrating the praise of the Lord. Their obedience to God is repeatedly mentioned in the Quranic passages related to the creation of Adam. Unlike Iblis and some of the jinn, the angels

bowed to Adam as commanded by God.⁶⁴ They are the Muslims, the believers, of the non-human world. The angels' engagement in extolling God's glory is contrasted to the non-Muslims' stubbornness and argumentation against Islam which symbolize disobedience to God (Q13:13). The angels bear the throne of God, have faith in Him and sing His glory and praise.⁶⁵ They perform, as commanded by God, this-worldly as well as celestial and otherworldly duties.

The angels are functionaries for surveillance over human beings, particularly non-Muslims. "Over every soul there is a watcher" (86:4). Every human being is constantly and silently watched by two guardian angels "sitting one on the right and one on the left," keeping a record of their deeds ready for the Day of Judgment. Based on this record, Muslims will be sent to Paradise and non-Muslims to Hell.⁶⁶ The angels record everything that non-Muslims might have devised against Muslims and Islam (10:21). For example, the angels will give testimony that non-Muslims (by rejecting Islam) had been worshipping the jinn (34:40-1).

The relationship of these extraordinary servants of God with Muslims and non-Muslims is described in various ways; obviously, they are friends, helpers and wellwishers of the believers and Islam and are the adversaries of non-Muslims. Muslims see these supernatural beings always on their side and opposed to non-Muslims. This reinforces Muslim confidence in their creed and their images of non-Muslims as wretched.

The most important function of the angels is their role as messengers of the Almighty to the Prophets, e.g., Muhammad. The Quran and other teachings of Islam have been conveyed and verified by these extraordinary beings to the Prophet and consequently to Muslims. Given the basic belief in the existence of these powerful beings and in their position as the liaison between God and Muhammad, the authenticity of Islam and falsehood of other creeds is thus fixed in the minds of Muslim believers. In the Quran and Tradition there are extensive reports

verifying the link between the angel Gabriel and other angels and the Prophet Muhammad. We know that the Quran was mostly revealed by Gabriel to the Prophet.⁶⁶ The angels are reported to have taught and verified various Muslim religious observances, thus authenticating Muslim ways of thought and action as having Divine sanction.⁶⁷

Muslims believe that these mighty beings, the angels, remain actively involved in Muslim-non-Muslim affairs. As long as Muslims persevere in Islam, they have a guarantee of assistance by these extraordinary beings against non-Muslims -- in this life and afterlife.

Those who have said, 'Our Lord is God,' then have gone straight, upon them the angels descend, saying, 'Fear not, neither sorrow; rejoice in paradise that you were promised. We are your friends in the present life and in the world to come; therein you shall have all that your souls desire, all that you call for, as hospitality from One All-forgiving, One All-compassionate (41:30- 2).

According to Tabari, as usual, by "those who say our Lord is God" is meant Muslims, those who declare "there is no God but God, Muhammad is the Messenger of God." Tabari also maintains that the ones who go straight -- **ISTAQAMU** - mentioned above are those whose faith in Islam is constant.⁶⁸

In this world, angels support Muslims actively, as they did during the lifetime of the Prophet, in their struggle against non-Muslims. Muslims are exhorted to have trust in God's help in this way. With reference to the battle of Badr against non-Muslims, who outnumbered Muslims, the Prophet (and Muslims) was told to remember that God helped the Muslims during the battle of Badr with three thousand angels and promised further reinforcement with "five thousand swooping angels..." to cut off a part of the unbelievers or frustrate them, so that they turned their tracks disappointed.⁶⁹ Muslims believe that some believers as well as non-Muslims saw these angels actively fighting for the cause of Islam against non-Muslims during Badr.⁷⁰ The Prophet told a Muslim

that a noble angel had helped him during the taking of a non-Muslim as a prisoner of war -- **LAQAD AANAK ALAYH MALAK KARIM**.⁷¹ One thousand angels rode behind the Prophet during the battle of Badr in order to "confirm" and help Muslims "terrorize" and "smite" the "necks and fingers" of the non-Muslims. Five hundred of these elite angelic troops were commanded by Gabriel, the other five hundred by the angel Mikal (Michael).⁷² Muslim adherence to Islam and their distance from un-Islam (**AL-KUFR**) enjoy, along with that of God, the blessing of the angels (Q233:43 cf. T22:17). The angels demonstrate their blessings and solidarity in this world with Muslims in various ways. They encourage inter-Muslim solidarity and brotherhood and their adherence to Islamic learning and teachings. For example they spread their wings to take the seekers of Islamic knowledge under their protection and bless them with tranquillity, **SAKINAH**, when they recite the Quran.⁷³ "The believers continue to enjoy the blessings of the angels as long as they are in the mosque."⁷⁴

The believers who support and protect other believers against non-Muslims will be protected by the angels from the fire of Gehenna.⁷⁵ "The angels of the mountains" were ready to destroy the whole city of Taif for its rejection of the Prophet Muhammad.⁷⁶ The Prophet told the believers that had a certain adversary of Islam (**ABU JAHL**) approached him with evil intentions, the angels would have seized him and cut him to pieces.⁷⁷ Had the non-Muslims killed the Prophet, the whole neighborhood of his non-Muslim adversaries involved would have been banished by the angels, said a contemporary supporter of the Prophet with certainty.⁷⁸ Those who eulogize him are indeed blessed by the angels, the Prophet told the believers.⁷⁹ Muslims are assured that the angels will always protect Medina and other Islamic lands and places of worship.⁸⁰ Muslims continue to enjoy the blessings of the angels as they die. The wounded and fallen Muslims during the holy war against non-Muslims are protected by the angels, and martyrs' souls are raised

by them to heaven with complete respect and care.⁸¹

The summons of death for a Muslim is accompanied by merciful, compassionate and kind angels who receive the expiring Muslim soul with dignity.⁸² The angels of death draw out the soul "gently." This may be compared with the angels' harsh attitude toward non-Muslims: they "tear out the souls of non-Muslims violently."⁸³ Muslim-angel solidarity extends to the afterlife. "So God recompenses the God-fearing (i.e. the Muslims) whom the angels take while they are goodly," saying, "Peace be on you! Enter Paradise for that you were doing."⁸⁴ Tabari, as usual, has explained the "goodliness," **TAYYIBIN**, of the ones received by the angels with such dignity in terms of their "purity of Islam during this life" -- **TAHAR AL-ISLAM FI HAL HAYATIHIM**. He has also explained "god-fearing," **TAQWA**, in terms of obedience to God, obviously as outlined by Islam.⁸⁵ Similarly, for angels, appreciation of Muslim patience, **SABR**, in this world is related to their persistence in Islam.⁸⁶

In the afterlife, the angels intercede in favor of Muslims (AbH,5:43) and "ask forgiveness for those who believe" and ask the Lord to "forgive those who have repented" by converting from other faiths to Islam -- **AD DUKHUL FI'L-ISLAM**.⁸⁷ The angels' prayer for the "forgiveness for those on earth" in Q42:5 is also related exclusively to Muslims.⁸⁸ As discussed in detail in Part IV of this study, Muslim believers are eventually forgiven in the afterlife for their misdeeds during this life as long as they keep in tact their faith in the authenticity of Islam as the only acceptable creed to God. As for the Islamic images of the angels' attitudes towards non-Muslims, these extraordinary creatures of God and non-Muslims have a mutual dislike for each other. Q2:97-8, for example, and the related Tradition teach Muslims that non-Muslims, particularly the Jews, harbor animosity toward God, His Messengers and the angels. Of course the Almighty is the enemy of such angel-haters.⁹⁰ The Islamic archangel, Gabriel, is particularly the enemy of the Jews --

INNA JIBRIL ADUWW AL-YAHUD MIN AL- MALAIKAH.⁹¹ The angels demonstrate their dislike of non-Muslims in various ways. We already know that these supernatural beings fight against non-Muslims on behalf of the believers in Islam.

In some cases the angels demonstrated a harsher attitude towards the non-Muslims. For example, angels incited the Prophet to take arms against the Jews of Medina. The angels told the Prophet that he could not lay down his arms while they (the angels) were armed and ready to fight the non-Muslims.⁹² Obviously, the Prophet followed suit because the angels were the messengers of God. A Companion of the Prophet reported: "God helped us that day with three thousand angels and (so) gave us an easy victory (over the Jews)."⁹³

The Jews, Christians and all other groups of people who disbelieve in the authenticity of Muhammad's prophethood are cursed by God, Muslim believers, and by the angels.⁹⁴ As mentioned in Part III of this study, the angels are Divine tools for the eventual destruction of non-Muslims in this world. In the past the angels as commanded by God destroyed the disbelievers in Abraham, Hud and other Islamic prophets.⁹⁵ They might do the same to non-Muslims when so commanded by God.⁹⁶ Angels come to the earth either to convey God's message to the prophets or to chastise non-Muslims.⁹⁷

In a series of Traditions, angels are reported to show their dislike of symbols, customs and habits usually identified with non-Muslims. For example, the angels do not enter places and houses where images, (church-) bells and pictures are kept.⁹⁸ The angels humiliate and torture dying non-Muslims and persecute them in the afterlife. When non-Muslims are "in the agonies of death, the angels appear to them stretching out their hands for their souls in an unkind manner, telling them that the moment of 'chastisement' and humiliation as punishment for their rejection of Islam has come" (Q6:93). We know from 79:1-2 that angels "tear out" the souls of non-Muslims in a violent

manner. "Indeed, the angels do not approach the corpse of a non-Muslim with good intention" -- **INN AL-MALAIKAT LA TAHDUR JANAZAT AL-KAFIR BI KHAYR** - (they are there to chastise and torture the deceased).⁹⁹ The angels of death tell the dying non-Muslims that they will be punished for their rejection of Islam (32:11). "The angels of torture appear as soon as the non-Muslim is confronted with the agonies of death."¹⁰⁰ The day when non-Muslims so confront the angels will indeed be a "harsh day for the unbelievers."¹⁰¹

The angels work as hell-keepers to deal out various kinds of torture and punishment to non-Muslims.¹⁰² As a part of the afterlife punishment of non-Muslims for their rejection of Islam, the angels will take the unbelievers, "beating their faces and their backs" deriding them: "Taste the chastisement of the burning" in Hell.¹⁰³ The Chief Hell-Keeper, Malik, will be particularly cruel and harsh to non-Muslims. The suffering non-Muslims in Hell will ask Malik, the angel, to take their lives once and for all so that they may escape the ongoing sufferings and torture. Malik will ignore the non-Muslims' plea for "one thousand years" until they are completely exhausted and unable to utter a word; then the angel will address them in sarcasm: "Why are you quiet?...; are you not the ones who disliked the Truth (i.e., Islam) Muhammad had brought you?"¹⁰⁴

The Muslims who refuse to migrate from a non-Muslim-dominated land to the Muslim-dominated land (**DAR AL-ISLAM**), particularly at a time of hostilities, and fight on the side of non-Muslims against Muslims are no longer considered as Muslims. Similarly those "apparent" Muslims, the so-called Hypocrites who dislike the Muslim fight-to-the-death against non-Muslims, are treated as non-Muslims, and will go to Hell. The angels will rebuke such apostates after death and "beat their faces and backs."¹⁰⁵

We may summarize the influence of the descriptions of angels in sacred Muslim sources on the Muslim thought process. The angels are

real and mighty, supernatural and mysterious beings, obedient to God, with direct access to the Almighty. They carry God's authentic message to human beings. The teachings of Islam have been conveyed to Muslims through these extraordinary beings. These angels have told the Muslims through the Prophet Muhammad that the only creed acceptable to God is Islam. Even the details of the Islamic religion have been verified by the angels. Thus the belief in the existence of angels and their position as a liaison between God and the Prophet Muhammad authenticates Islam's unique and superior status in the eyes of the believers. The reports related to angel solidarity with Muslims reinforce the Muslim sense of self-righteousness. As assured by God and demonstrated by past "events," Muslims may always hope for invisible assistance from these extraordinary beings, particularly in a time of confrontation against non-Muslims. Once it is 'proved' in the Muslim mind, that the well-informed and supernatural angels bear witness to the inauthenticity of non-Muslim creeds and thoughts, there remains no need for their objective consideration. The certainty that non-Muslims will be punished by the angels either in this world or in the world to come or in both reassures Muslims. The angels' harsh attitude toward non-Muslims is less likely to encourage a better attitude among Muslims towards non-Muslims. The angels' hatred of non-Muslims becomes a source of imitation and inspiration. Muslims read that the angel Gabriel, the messenger of God, and not any "this-worldly" particular evidence, authenticated the unprovoked Muslim massacre of the Baunu Qurayza Jews of Medina.¹⁰⁶

Muslims know that any non-adherence to the cause of Islam, such as refusing to help financially or to fight to the death for Islam against non-Muslims, is looked down upon and punished by the angels. With the concept of the guardian angels who diligently record the Islam and un-Islam of each individual, it becomes impossible for the believer to think of any dissent from Islam, particularly in favor of non-Muslims.

These believers are exhorted to remember that **MAN HAMA MUMIN-AN MIN MUNAFIQ-
IN BAATH ALLAH MALAK-AN YAHMI LAHMAH-U YAUM AL-QIYAMAT MIN NAR JAHANNAM** -- those who support the believers against the non-Muslims are protected by the angels from the fire of Gehenna.¹⁰⁷

In brief, the angel-related descriptions in sacred Islamic sources reinforce Muslim self-righteousness and their negative images of non-Muslims. These descriptions also encourage Muslims to adopt a harsh attitude toward non-Muslims. In times of confrontation with non-Muslims, the believers may hope for Divine support through these extraordinary beings and thus strike against non-Muslims zealously if not fanatically. The afterlife punishment of non-Muslims by the angels, however, is a matter of fact, for a Muslim believer. Thus, the worldly success of non-Muslims does not necessarily encourage Muslims to revise their behavior toward non-Muslims, or have second thoughts about their own performance.

ENDNOTESPART II: Belief in the Existence of Angels.

- ¹TT-U, 1:34-8 passim.
- ²Ibid:34 passim.
- ³TT-I, 1:81.
- ⁴Ibid:84; Q55:15. See also P. Voohoeve, "Djinn" E1²:547.
- ⁵TT-I, 1:84; -U, 1:57.
- ⁶TT-I, 1:81.
- ⁷TT-U, 1:57-9.
- ⁸TT-I, 1:86-7.
- ⁹Ibid:84 = FA BAATH ALLAH ILAYHIM IBILIS FI JUND-IN MIN AL-MALAIKAT, WA HUM HADHA'L-HAYY AL-LADHIN YUQAL LAHUM AL-JINN.
- ¹⁰ Ibid:84 = FA QA ALAHUM IBILIS WA MAN MAAHU HA A ILHAQAHUM BI JAZAIR AL-BUHUR WA ATRAF AL-JIBAL.
- ¹¹ TT-U, 1:58.
- ¹² For the above and most of the following story of Satan's career just before the creation of Adam, his refusal to bow to Adam and his expulsion and descent to earth see TS, 1:439-49 cf. Q2:30-9; -I, 1:83-8; A.J. Wensinck [L. Gardet], "Iblis, E1², 3:668-9. For example, see TS, 1:455 for the Tradition report that Satan's name was al-Harith before his fall.
- ¹³ TS, 1:502; -I, 1:79-84.
- ¹⁴ KAN KHAZIN ALA'L-JANAN WA KAN LAHU SULTAN SAMA AD- DUNYA WA KAN LAHU SULTAN AL-ARD (TT-I, 1:81-2, 86-8; also see Q2:30-9 cf. TS, 1:439-552).
- ¹⁵ KAN AL-MALAIKAT TUQATIL AL-JINN, FA SUBIYA IBILIS WA KAN SAGHIR-AN, WA KAN MAAL-MALAIKAT YATABBAD HAAHUM (TT- I, 1:86-7).
- ¹⁶ TT-I, 1:88.
- ¹⁷ KAN YASUS BAYN AS-SAMA WA'L-ARD... WA KAN LAHU SULTAN AS-SAMAI D-DUNYA WA KAN LAHU SULTAN AL-ARD (-I, 1:81-2).
- ¹⁸ Ibid:79.
- ¹⁹ TS, 1:476-7.
- ²⁰ See the Quran, e.g., 2:30-9; 7:10-25; 15:26-50, and related parts of Tabari's Tafsir; also see Bu., 8:1, 60:31, 65 sura 20, b.1, 3. 75:1, 79:1, 82:11, 87:2, 96:15, 97:37; Mu., 1:259, 17:17-8, 28:27, 46:16-5, 50:27, 51:28, IM, Intr:b.10, 5:76; 6:64, 21:1. AD, 2:200, 39:16. 4:1-2, 30:2, 44 sura 2t, 1; sura 7, t.2-3. N 5:1, 14:4- 5, 45; -I, 1:89-136.
- ²¹ TS, 1:456 = FA KAN IBILIS YATIH FA YADRIBUH BI RIJLIHI... THUMM

YADKHUL FI FIH WA YAKHRUJ MIN DUBURIH WA YADKHUL MIN DUBURIH WA
 YAKHURUJ MIN FIH, THUMM YAQUL: LAST SHAY-AN... LAIN SULLI ALAYKA
 LAHLAKANNAK, WA LAIN SULLI ALAYY LA-ASIYANNAK. See also -
 I,1:62;15.

- ²² One of the several passages of the Quran related to the creation of Adam is as follows:

Surely, we created man of a clay
 of mud moulded,
 and the jinn created We before
 of fire flaming.
 And when thy Lord said to the angels,
 'See I am creating a mortal of a clay
 of mud moulded,
 When I have shaped him, and breathed My
 spirit in him, fall you down, bowing
 before him!"
 Then the angels bowed themselves all
 together,
 save Iblis; he refused to be among
 those bowing.
 Said He, "What ails thee, Iblis, that
 thou are not among those bowing?
 Said he, I would never bow myself
 before a mortal
 whom Thou hast created of a clay
 of a mud moulded.'
 Said He, 'Then go thou forth hence;
 thou are accursed.
 Upon thee shall rest the curse, till
 the Day of Doom.'
 Said he, 'My Lord, respite me till the day
 they shall be raised.'
 Said He, 'Thou are among the ones
 that are respited unto the day
 of a known time.'
 Said he, 'My Lord, for Thy perverting me
 I shall deck all fair
 to them in the earth,
 and I shall pervert them, all together,
 excepting those Thy servants among them
 that are devoted.'
 Said He, 'This is for Me a straight path:
 over My servants
 thou shalt have no authority, except those
 that follow thee,
 being perverse;
 Gehenna shall be their promised land
 all together.
 Seven gates it has, and unto each gate
 a set portion
 of them belongs.'
 But the godfearing shall be amidst gardens
 and fountains: (Q15:26-45).

Also see Q2:30-9 and 7:1-25. According to a Tradition, in the Last Day, Iblis will be the first to be clad with a garment of fire (AbH,3:152-3 Sq., 249).

- ²³ "Satan refused and waxed proud and so he became one of the unbelievers" (Q2:33-4).

²⁴TT-I, 1:106-12.

²⁵cf. Q2:38-9.

²⁶7:12-3.

²⁷ Q2:34; 7:11-3; 17:27, 61-2; 18:50; 19:44; 20:116-23; 38:73-8...

²⁸AbH, 3:152-3.

²⁹Mu, 1:35, 133.

³⁰Mu, 36:103.

³¹Mu, 6:212, AbH, 2:443.

³²4:118-20; 31:21, 36:60-2.

³³T, 23:16 cf. Q4:37-8.

³⁴See, e.g., T, 22:78, cf. 35:5-6, T, 23:16 cf. 4:37-8).

³⁵cf. 2:168, 208; 4:60; 47:25

³⁶2:208; 5:904; 24:21.

³⁷Bu, 10:4, 59:11.

³⁸Bu, 22:7; AbH, 2:204.

³⁹Bu, 19:13.

⁴⁰ "Never did We send an apostle or a Prophet before thee, but, when he framed a desire, Satan threw some vanity into his desire: but God will cancel anything (vain) that Satan throws in... That He may make the suggestions thrown in by Satan, but a trial for those in whose hearts is a disease and who are hardened of heart..." (Q22:52-3).

^{40a}For the above explanation of the abrogated 'Satanic Verses' related to the Quranic passage, 22:52-3 see T, 17:186-91 and our detailed discussion in Part III, Section 9, Segment 1: Muhammad at Mecca.

⁴¹"If you call them to the guidance, they do not hear; and thou seest them looking at thee, unperceiving. Take the abundance, and bid to what is honorable and turn away from the ignorant. If a provocation from Satan should provoke thee, seek refuge in God; He is all-hearing, All-seeing. The god-fearing, when a visitation of Satan troubles them, remember and then see clearly" (7:198-201, cf. Q16:98, Q23:97-8; Q41:36).

⁴²e.g., Q9:1-29.

⁴³16:98-100; 34:21; 58:19; cf. 35:5-6.

⁴⁴Q8:48; 59:16-7; 35:6; 22:3-4.

⁴⁵Q6:122; 19:83-4; 59:16.

⁴⁶ 4:37-8, 76; 14:22; 16:63; 19:66-70; 26:90-5; 35:56; 36:59-65; 43:36-9; 58:19; 59:16-7.

⁴⁷43:36-9; cf. 26:90-5, 19:66-70.

⁴⁸p. Vochoere, "Djinn," *EI*², 3:546-9.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰TT-I, 1:84; also see TS, 1 cf. Q2:30-9.

⁵¹ Mu, 39:124, Bu65, Sura 15, b.1, Sura 34 b.1. For more Tradition reports about the surreptitious information of the jinn concerning God's decrees and revelation see Bu, 65, sura 15, b.1; sura 34, b.1; 97:32; Mu, 39:124; Tir., 44, sura 34, t.3; cf. 2; sura 72, t.2.

⁵²IS-MH, 1/1:110-11.

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴72:1-15; Bu, 65:S 72.

^{54a}Bu, 63:32; 65 S 17, b:7-8; AD, 1:20; Mu, 4:150-3; Tir, 44: sura 46, t.3.

⁵⁵Mu, 4:150-3; Mu-AHS, 1:244.

⁵⁶Mu, 4:149; Mu-AHS, 1:243-4.

⁵⁷Mu, 5:39, Mu-AHS, 1:273.

⁵⁸Mu, 39:139-41 cf. MM, 54:33.

⁵⁹Also see Bu, 65:S17, 7-8, Mu, 54:29-30.

^{59a}Muhammad Iqbal, a staunch believer of our time from Muslim India, was perhaps inspired by such an outlook when he said: **PASBAN MIL GAI KABE KO SANAM KHANE SE** (the Kaba, i.e., Islam, found protectors, i.e., adherents, from the house of idols, i.e. non-Muslims).

⁶⁰Q35:1 cf. T, 22:114.

⁶¹ **KANA MIQDAR SUUDIHIM DHALIK FI YAUM-IN LIGHAYRIHIM MIN AL- KHALQ, KHAM SIN ALF SANAH; WA DHALIK ANNAHA TASUD MIN MUNTAHA AMRIHIX MIN ASFAL AL-ARD AS-SABIA ILA MUNTAHA AMRIHI MIN FAUQ AS-SAMAWAT AS-SAB'** (T, 29:70-2; cf. Q70:4).

⁶² Mu, 1:1, 49:46; Bu, 64:11, 67:35; TS, 7:173-92. See also sections about the battles of Badr and Qurayza in 1.1; W, and TT.

⁶³Q22:75 cf. T, 27:204; Q16:2 cf. T, 14:67; Q35:1 cf. T, 22:114; also see AbH, 1:274; IM, intr:11; N, intr:25.

⁶⁴Q2:34; 7:11; 15:28-30; 16:49.

⁶⁵40:7, cf. T, 24:43-4; Q42:5; 69:17.

⁶⁶50:17-25; T26:158-62; 82:10-2; T, 30:88-9; cf. Q6:61; IM, 25:5; AbH, 5:195, 6:452.

^{66a}Bu, 1; Mu, 1; AbH, 1:274...; N, intr.:25...; 1M, intr.:11.

⁶⁷Bu, 1:28:10:126; 60:9; 66:15; Mu, 1:1, 23; T:87-8; AD, 2:45, 93, 95, 119; 40:110, Tir, 6:67, N, intr.: 36: 25:28; IM, 7:46; MM, 15:25.

⁶⁸T,24:114-7.

⁶⁹"When thou wentest forth at dawn from thy people to lodge the believers in their pitches for the battle... when two parties of you were about to lose heart, though God was their protector -- and in God let the believers put all their trust -- and God most surely helped you at Badr, when you were utterly abject... When you saidst to the believers, 'Is it not enough for you that your Lord should reinforce you with three thousand angels sent down upon you? Yea; if you are patient and Godfearing, and the foe comes against you, instantly your Lord will reinforce you with five thousand swooping angels.'... as good tidings to you..., help comes only from God the All-mighty, and All-wise; and that he might cut off a part of the unbelievers or frustrate them, so that they turned in their tracks disappointed" (Q3:121-7, cf. TS, 7:173-92).

⁷⁰Ibid. Also see 1.1.; W and on the battle of Badr.

⁷¹TS,7:177. Also see 1.1.; W. as above.

⁷²8:9, 12 cf. TS, 13:419-32; Bu,64:11; IM, intr.: 21.

⁷³IM, intr.: 17, AbH,2:224, 293; Bu,66:15; Mu,45:12:38; 48:87-8...

⁷⁴Bu,10:3, 36; Tir., 2:128; MM,9:51, 54.

⁷⁵MAN HAMA MUMIN AN MIN MUNAFIQ-IN BAATH ALLAH MALAK-AN YAHMI LAHMAHU YAUM AL-QIAMAT MIN NAR JAHANNAM (AD,40 vol. 4, p. 271, no. 4883).

⁷⁶Mu,32:39:111.

⁷⁷LAW DANA MINNI L'AKHATAFATHU'L-MALAIKAT UDWAN UDWAN (Mu,50:38).

⁷⁸FA WA'LLAH, LAIN QATALTUMUH-U LATATRAUDANN JIRANAKUM AL- MALAIKAH (Tir.,46:36).

⁷⁹MAN SALLA ALAYY ILLA SALLAT ALAYH AL-MALAIKAH (IM,5:25 cf. AbH2:172, 187).

⁸⁰Bu,59:7; 1:6; 92:26; Mu,7:24, 25; 52:119; IM,5:82, AbH,2:483, 512; 5:184.

⁸¹Bu,23:3, 35; 56:20, 26: Mu,44:129-30.

⁸²IDHA HADAR/HUDIR AL-MUMIN ATATHU MALAIKAT AR-RAHMA... N,21:9. IDHA UKHRIJAT RUH AL-MUMIN TALAQQAHA MALIK (Mu,51:70, 75. Also see N,21:9; AD,39:24, IM,37:31; 24:10; Tir., 8:70; AbH,3:126, 234).

⁸³79:1-5; cf. T,30:27-30.

⁸⁴Q16:31-2; cf. T,14:101-2. Also see Q13:23-4; cf. T,13:12-14.

⁸⁵T,14:101-2.

⁸⁶TS,13:141-2.

⁸⁷Q40:7; cf. T,24:43-4.

⁸⁸T,25:7-8.

⁸⁹

⁹⁰TS, 2:377-97.

⁹¹Bu, 59:6; 60:1.

⁹² IDH JAA JIBRIL FAQAL: YA MUHAMMAD WADATUM ASLIHATAKUM WA LAM TADA
AL-MALAIKAT AWZARAHA... (TS, 7:178-9 cf. W:360).

⁹³Ibid.

⁹⁴Q2:161; cf. TS, 3:261-2.

⁹⁵ See e.q., the Surahs HUD and Anbiya (Prophets) in the Quran.

⁹⁶

⁹⁷Q15:7-8 cf. T, 14:7 cf. Q2:210.

⁹⁸Bu, 34:40; 59:17; 67:76; 64:12; 77:77:88, 92, 94, 95;
Mu, 37:81-2; AD, 1:89; 31:45; 33:6; Tir. 41:4; 21:25; IM, 32:44,
MM, 54:6, 8.

⁹⁹AD, 32:8.

¹⁰⁰AL-KAFIR IDHA' ADAR ATATHU MALAIKAT AL-ADHAB. N 21:9...

¹⁰¹Q25:21-5, cf. 16:28; T, 14:99.

¹⁰²Q74:30-1; Mu, 51:12:29.

¹⁰³Q8:50-1 cf. T, 10:22-3.

¹⁰⁴WALAKIN AKTHARUKUM LAMMA JAA BIHI MUHAMMAD MIN AL-HAQQ
KARIHUN. T, 25:98-9; cf. Q43:77.

¹⁰⁵TS, 9:100-12; cf. Q4:97. T, 26:60; cf. Q47:27.

¹⁰⁶W:360; TS, 7:178-93.

¹⁰⁷AD, 40, (vol. 4, p. 271, no. 4883).

FOUNDATIONS OF MUSLIM IMAGES AND TREATMENT
OF THE WORLD BEYOND ISLAM

Volume II

By

Malek Muhammad Towghi

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History

1991

PART III : BELIEF IN THE BOOKS AND MESSENGERS

Section 1: THE CONCEPT (of Prophethood and Revelation)

*We elected them and We guided them to a straight path... Those are they to whom We gave the Book, the Judgment,... the Prophethood;... Those are they whom God has guided; so follow their guidance (Q6:87-90).

*And We sent Noah... Then sent We Our Messengers successively... Moses and his brother Aaron... We gave Moses the Book... We made Mary's son... a sign... Surely this community of yours is one community (Q23:20-55).

*You should believe in... His Books and Messengers... (Muhammad)

Adam, with Eve and Satan, was expelled from Heaven to earth. Satan was cursed by God forever and Adam was forgiven for his first disobedience of God's order against approaching a certain tree in Paradise. The rules for the game of life on the earth were fixed by the Almighty as follows: The span of life for individuals on the earth and for mankind will be fixed and temporary; at a certain date in the unknowable future the universe and all life will be terminated. Thereafter the angels, the jinn along with Satan, and all human beings will be resurrected. This will be the Day of Judgment by God; Satan, most of the jinn and one segment of humanity will go to Hell, suffering forever. The other group of human beings, and, apparently, a few jinn will go to Paradise enjoying an eternal life of comfort.

The Almighty's judgment will rest on the criteria of rejection or acceptance by humans and the jinn in this life of God's guidance, **HUDA**, received through His **RUSUL** (sing **RASUL**), Messengers/Apostles and **ANBIYA** (sing: **NABIY**), Prophets (2:38-9 cf. TS,1:548-52; 7:35-6; 16:36). In some cases, as in the era of Adam and his sons, divine guidance was conveyed through the "executioners of divine will", **AWSIYA** (sing: **WASIY**). The **AWSIYA** were those to whom the Islamic spiritual-cum-social-political leadership was bequeathed by an earlier Prophet or Messenger. As we will see in the following section, some of the **AWSIYA** of the era of Adam and his sons later received direct revelation from God through the angels and thus could be called **AWSIYA-cum-Prophets**.

Given the Quranic assertions in, e.g., 4:152 and 23:52, Thackston (K:xii) has correctly pointed out that the attempts by some dogmatic Muslim theologians to differentiate between the function of a Prophet and a Messenger make no sense. About Ishmael and Moses the Quran asserts that they were Messengers-Prophets -- **KAN RASUL-AN NABIY-AN** (19:51, 54). The only meaningful difference as implied by the Quran and Tradition is between what may be called the lesser Prophets-Messengers and the great epoch-making Prophet-Messengers such as Adam, Noah,

Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muhammad. However, except for Muhammad, whose superiority to all others is made obvious by Islamic sources, all Islamic Prophets and/or Messengers are considered, in principle, as equal members of a divine order and brotherhood (e.g., Q4:152; 23:52).

Some shiite sources equating perhaps, the concept of **WASIY** with that of an **IMAM** have mentioned the following confusing differences between a Prophet, a Messenger (Apostle) and a **WASIY**:

...The Prophet is one who has visions..., hears the voice but does not see the angel... while the apostle hears the voice, sees the vision and sees the angel. The Imam, in contrast hears the voice but neither has (the vision) nor sees the angel...the difference between the apostle, the prophet and the imam is that Gabriel descends to the apostle, who sees him and hears his words, and communicates the inspiration; the apostle may also have visions like Abraham's. The prophet may hear the words (of Gabriel) and may also see (his) form without hearing the words, while the imam hears the words but does not see the form (K:xxvii: with reference to Abu Jafar Muhammad al-Kulayni, al-Usul, I, in W.M. Thackston, Jr, Introduction to The Tales of the Prophets of al-Kisai).

Except for the use of the term "**WASIY**" in the following section, these differences do not concern us in this study. Whatever the form, Islamic **MESSENGERS**, **PROPHETS** and **AWSIYA** are believed by Muslims to have received Divine guidance, **HUDA**. In the Afterlife, the condemned jinn and human beings will be those considered to have refused to acknowledge, obey and follow the Messengers of God during this worldly life; by rejecting the Prophets, the jinn and humans are alleged to have followed Satan. Those granted Paradise have acknowledged the Messengership of the Prophets and have obeyed and followed them in this life. When Adam arrived on earth God told him of the rule:

There shall come to you guidance from Me, and whosoever follow my guidance no fear shall be on them, neither shall they sorrow. As for the unbelievers who cry lies to our signs, those shall be the inhabitants of fire, therein dwelling forever!

The Prophets-Messengers were the links for conveying the Divine guidance to mankind. God revealed His commandments, likes and dislikes to the Messengers. The collections of these revelations are "the Books" mentioned in the Iman Mujmal and throughout the Quran and Tradition. All such Prophet-Messengers were human and spoke the

languages of the peoples they first encountered.² God sent Messengers to all peoples of the world.³ Adam was the first, Muhammad was the last Messenger of God. God emphasizes His sovereignty and imperiousness in the selection of certain men as His Messengers. He "knows best where to put His Messengership" (6:124). None can suggest who should be the recipient of this "grace of the Lord" (43:32; 6:88).

Although ordinary men, the Messengers were inspired by God and received revelation, **WAHY**, from Him.⁴ They were Divinely guided and appointed leaders of mankind: "...and every one made We righteous and appointed them to be leaders guiding by our command, and We revealed to them..." (21:72-3). This Divine link made them superior to mankind.

That is our argument, which We bestowed upon Abraham as against his people. We raise up in degrees whom We will; surely Thy Lord is All-wise, All-knowing. And We gave to him Isaac and Jacob -- each one We guided, and Noah We guided before; and Solomon, Job and Joseph, Moses and Aaron -- even so We recompense the good-doers -- Zakaraiah and John, Jesus and Elias; each was of the righteous; Ishmael and Elisha, Jonah and Lot -- each one We preferred above all beings; and of their fathers and of their seed, and of their brothers; and we elected them, and We guided them to a straight path that is God's guidance; He guides by it whom He will of His servants;... Those are they to whom We gave the Book, the Judgment,... the Prophethood;... Those are they whom God has guided; so follow their guidance... (6:83-90).

Believing in their Divine connections, the Messengers and Prophets were confident that only theirs was the "right way," **SIRAT AL-MUSTAQIM**. They were genuine and trustworthy Messengers, **RASUL AMIN**, of God, hence had the right to judge and guide, the Prophets asserted. They were the voice of God whose **SULTAN**, authority and sovereignty, they projected and represented on the earth. Hence, opposing them was opposing God. The Prophets warned repeatedly of the disastrous consequences of disobeying them.⁵

Along with their Divine authenticity the Messengers of God were given by the Almighty extraordinary "signs" and power. They performed miracles. God acted miraculously to help His Messengers and their followers; their opponents (i.e. the non-Muslims of their times), as we will see below, were chastised and punished in extraordinary ways. As desired by Noah, the Deluge destroyed all but him and his followers (Q71

cf. T). Abraham escaped persecution: the fire in which he was put became comfortable rather than burning him. Abraham and Lot were saved from disasters confronting their adversaries.⁶ Moses was saved miraculously in his childhood from being killed by the non-believing Pharaoh, and from being drowned in the Nile.⁷ The nine extraordinary "signs" given to Moses by God could surpass all ordinary magic and overcome natural forces in an unusual way.⁸ With the help of Divine "signs" such as widespread death, locusts, lice, frogs and blood, Moses brought havoc to the unbelievers. He could change his staff into a serpent that could devour all other serpents produced by ordinary magicians. God opened the sea for him and his followers. David could hear and see the mountains and the birds sing the glory of the Lord and join him in prayer.⁹ To Solomon were submitted violent winds, the jinn, birds, and various kinds of natural and supernatural elements.¹⁰ Both David and Solomon could understand the language of birds, ants and animals and could communicate with them. On Solomon's order some of them would perform extraordinary deeds such as taking his letter to the queen of a non-believing nation in a far-off land and bringing back her throne in a trice -- "in the twinkling of an eye."¹¹ The birth of Jesus Christ by the Virgin Mary itself is considered by the Prophet Muhammad a Divine Miracle.¹² The infant Jesus was able to speak to the people and declare his Prophethood.¹³ Jesus Christ is said to have breathed life into clay moulded in the form of a bird; he healed the blind and the leprous and even raised the dead to life (Q5:113). When thought by the non-believers to be dead after crucifixion, Jesus was taken up and kept alive by God to return in the future as a Muslim leader.¹⁴ Similar extraordinary events and qualities are related by the Quran and the Tradition to the Prophet Muhammad. We have already referred to the Quranic passages concerning the presence of angels during the Prophet's battles against non-Muslims. The miracles ascribed to Muhammad by Islamic sources will further be discussed in the section on Islamic images of the Prophet.

There is no indication by the Quran and Tradition that the extraordinary events and qualities attributed to the Messengers of God are meant for figurative interpretation. The accompanying Tradition-based explanations of the Quranic passages indicate Muslim belief in the descriptions in a literal sense. For example, the Quran (34:12) says that God made the winds subservient to Solomon so he could complete a month's journey in half-a-day. The same passage tells the believers "the fount of molten brass... could flow for him;" and that the jinn worked for him. Tabari's exegeses project and sharpen the literal sense of the Quranic passage. For example, quoting Tradition, he tells the believers that Solomon, "along with his jinn and human troops could leave 'Istakhr' (in south Iran) in the morning and reach Syria the evening of the same day. Tabari also tells us of Solomon's air ship that had one thousand sections; each section had one thousand apartments occupied by Solomon's jinn and human troops and courtiers. One thousand devils (satans) were engaged to propel each section of the ship; after take-off the wind would do its duty as desired by the Islamic Prophet, Solomon.¹⁵

The Islamic version of Prophetic history emphasizes three interrelated points: 1) the Prophets and their followers were Muslims and their creed was Islam; 2) the Prophets and Books had foretold the appearance of Muhammad as the last and perfect Messenger of God. All human beings, particularly the Prophets and their followers, were covenanted by God to follow Muhammad and his creed; and 3) Muslims are encouraged to follow the model of the Prophets (Q6:87-90), obviously, as described by the Quran and Tradition.

Muslims are told that all the past Prophets preached Islam, the religion Muhammad was sent by God to revive and perfect. The opponents of the Prophets are likened to non-Muslims. The **SIRAT MUSTAQIM**, the "straight path" to which the past Prophets were guided (Q6:87) "was Islam, the undistorted religion of God which our Lord God was pleased to choose for his Prophets and command His servants (the people) to

(adopt)".¹⁶ Islam alleges that the People of the Book, the Jews and Christians, have betrayed the Prophets' religion that was purely Islam.

Explaining Q4:150-2, Tabari asserts:

...They are enemies of God... the Jews and Christians who disbelieve in the Quran and Muhammad and have adopted Judaism and Christianity -- both of which are nothing but (undesirable and unauthorized) innovations, **BID'A**, of their own, and not from God -- have left Islam which is (was) the creed of God sent through His Messengers.¹⁷

The Muslim belief that Muhammad, as the last Messenger of God, was foretold by the Prophets is related to the concept of the existence of a Divine Covenant here. This eternal covenant between God and human beings is mentioned in the Quran.

And when thy Lord took from the Children of Adam, from their loins, their seed, and made them testify touching themselves, 'Am I not your Lord?' They said, 'Yes, we testify' - lest you should say in the Day of Resurrection, 'As for us, we were unaware of this', or lest you say, 'our fathers were idolators aforetime and we were seed after them' (Q7:172-3).

Tabari and Ibn Sad explain the above passage as follows: all human beings (or their souls) were created temporarily by God and assembled in one place for the promulgation of a Covenant and Compact, **AL-AHD WA'L- MITHAQ**, between the Almighty and mankind. According to Ibn Sad this grand general assembly of mankind took place at Naman, beyond Arafat (near Mecca in Arabia). The first and second clauses of the Iman, Mujmal, i.e., belief in God and belief in His Messengers and Books, formed the content of the Covenant. All human beings were thus covenanted "to be witness for one another to the fact that here is no God but He... and that no partner must be set by men for Him." They were further told that God "will soon send Messengers who will warn and remind them of the pledge and Covenant... and that soon will God reveal His Books to mankind." All human beings thus created temporarily pledged they will follow the Covenant.¹⁸ Based on another Quranic passage, Tabari also tells of a separate similar compact between God and the Prophets including Muhammad (T,9:115). The detailed

explanations given by Tabari imply that human beings were covenanted by God to follow Islam in all respects. Adam on his way to earth was told by God of the Divine institution of Prophethood, and that the believers will be rewarded and the non-believers punished (2:38-9). The warning included the prediction about the Prophethood of Muhammad (TS,1:551).

In 2:26-7 the Almighty condemns "the ungodly such as break the covenant of God after its solemn binding, and such as cut what God has commanded should be joined...". For the believers the passage implies the acknowledgment of Muhammad's Prophethood as part of the Divine pledge. It was particularly mentioned in the Torah, Tabari maintains, that the People of the Book were obliged according to the terms of the Divine covenant to acknowledge the authenticity of Muhammad and the Quran - **HUA MA AKHADHAHULLAH ALAYHIM FI'T-TAWRAT MIN AL-AMAL BIMA FIHA WA'T-TIBA MUHAMMAD IDHA BUIHA, WA'T- TASDIQ BIHI WA BIMA JAA BIHI MIN IND RABBIHIM.** However, the People of the Book have violated this part of the contract and have distorted the Torah in order to conceal the Divine prediction about Muhammad and Islam (TS,1:410-7). Some Quranic passages mention a specific covenant God made with the Prophets. The central point of the compact in 3:80-1 is the Messengership of Muhammad. Based on their compact with God, the Prophets told their followers to acknowledge Muhammad, on his appearance, as the true Messenger of God; this was mentioned in the Torah:

And God took compact with the Prophets. That I have given you of Book and Wisdom; then there shall come to you a Messenger confirming what is with you -- you shall believe in him and you shall help him; do you agree? He said, 'and do you take My load on you on that condition?' They said, 'We do agree.' God said 'Bear witness so, and I shall be with you among the witnesses.' Then whoever turns his back after that - they are the ungodly (Q3:80-81).

As usual, Tabari quotes several reports ascribed to the Prophet Muhammad and his companions to prove the Messenger mentioned in 3:80-81 by the Almighty is none but Muhammad.¹⁹ One of these reports says God never sent Prophets from the time of Noah without binding them through a compact to believe in Muhammad and help him on appearance during their

lifetime; otherwise (i.e., if Muhammad did not appear during their lifetime,) the Prophets were told by God to take a pledge from their people to believe in and help him (Muhammad) on his appearance.²⁰

And when We took compact from the Prophets, and from Noah, and Abraham, Moses, and Jesus, Mary's son. We took from them a solemn compact, that He might question the truthful concerning their truthfulness; and He has prepared for the unbelievers a painful chastisement (33:7-8).

The solemn oath is explained in terms of the Prophets telling their people about the future prophets, particularly Muhammad, who would come after them.

The Prophets' truthfulness according to Tabari depended on whether they told their followers about Muhammad or not. Tabari quotes the Prophet Muhammad saying that he indeed was the first created among the Prophets and the last of them raised as the Messenger of God.²¹ The Prophets (such as Abraham and Ishmael) were also covenanted by God to serve the Kaba, the most holy shrine of Islam.²²

Most of the Quranic passages mentioning a covenant between God and men relate to the Jews and the Christians:

And when God took compact with those who had been given the Book: 'You shall make it clear unto the people and not conceal it.' But they rejected it behind their backs and sold it for a small price -- how evil was that their selling! (3:187).

In Tabari's words

God revealed (the passage above) to say the following: "and tell them, the Jews and the People of the Book, O Muhammad, that God had taken a pledge from them to tell the people about you; the pledge is mentioned in their Book (sic) being the Torah and the Gospel, which they possess, that you are indeed a truthful Messenger of God, a sent one, with truth and (they were told) not to conceal it. But they rejected it behind their backs, i.e., they shunned God's commandment and wasted it; and they violated the covenant that He had taken with them, and they concealed your affair (Prophethood) and belied you; and they sold it for a small price, i.e. they sold it by concealing the subject of your Prophethood mentioned in the compact for small and meager worldly sums" (TS,7:458-9).

Other reports in the context of Q3:187 assert that God had commanded the people of the Book, particularly the Jews, to follow the

"untutored Prophet -- **NABIYY AL-UMMI** (Muhammad), whenever he was raised.

It was mentioned in their Book "that indeed Islam is the religion of God which He has made binding for His servants (all human beings)"; the Jews and Christians know well, it is asserted, that "Muhammad is written with them in the Torah and the Gospel."²³ Another Quranic passage asserts:

God took compact with the Children of Israel, promising to be with them as long as they "performed (Islamic prayer), **SALAT**, paid (Islamic tax) **ZAKAT**, and believed in His Messengers (including Muhammad) and succored them and lent to God a good loan." (In turn, God had promised to) acquit them of their evil deeds, (and admit them to Paradise) (Q5:12-3; parentheses added; cf. TS,10:108-135).

But, the Quran adds, the Children of Israel have violated the pledge.

So, for their breaking their compact We cursed them and made their hearts hard, they perverting words from their meanings; and they have forgotten a portion of that they were reminded of [ibid].

The passage, finally, calls the Jews "treacherous." Tabari's traditional sources enumerate the alleged treacheries of the Jews. "Lending to God a good loan" means the Jews were bound according to the compact to spend their resources for the jihad against the enemies of God (TS,10:121); in other words, they were covenanted to support, financially, Muslim holy war against the non-believers, for example, during the Prophet's struggle against his adversaries. The charge in the Quranic passage that they "are perverting words from their meanings" means the Jews have corrupted and changed the "Torah" (Ibid:129).

In Q2:40-4, the Jews are reminded again of the covenant with God to believe in what He has "sent down" and are warned against disbelief in it, against "selling His signs for a little price" and against "concealing the Truth wittingly." After quoting numerous Hadith reports, Tabari tells the believers the covenant mentioned above was related to Muhammad's prophethood. "Allah had taken pledge from the Children of Israel in the Torah to tell the people about Muhammad -- that he is a Prophet - as they see it written in the Torah with

them... and that Islam is God's chosen religion which the Children of Israel are obliged by the compact to follow."²⁴

Q2:83-6 and Tabari's Tradition-based exegeses (TS,2:288-318) repeat the above theme in greater detail. According to the Quranic passage the Jews were under pledge by God "to speak good to man." This means, according to the Tradition, "to command the people to say 'there is no God but God,' " i.e., declare the Islamic Shahadah. "The best way of "speaking good," Tabari argues, "is to say something which is liked by God and which pleases Him... Commanding others to (declare the Shahadah)... is the best way of 'speaking good'." The Jews were covenanted "to speak good" also in the sense, Tabari adds, that they should "tell the truth about Muhammad -- **SIDQ-AN FI SHAN MUHAMMAD** (ibid:296).

In his detailed explanations of Q2:100-1 Tabari asserts again that God had foretold to the Jews the imminent appearance of the Prophet Muhammad and had put them under pledge to follow the creed of Muhammad (TS,2:399-404).

The Christians are also guilty of breaking the covenant with God regarding Muhammad. Tabari relates the following Quranic passage with the Muslim belief that Christians, among others, were foretold of the Prophet and Islam. The Christians were obliged according to this compact to believe in all the Prophets including, obviously, Muhammad.

And those who say, 'We are Christians,' We took compact; and they have forgotten a portion of that they were reminded of. So We have stirred up among them enmity and hatred, till the Day of Resurrection; and God will assuredly tell them of the things they wrought (5:14 cf. TS,10:135-43).

The Christians are told that by rejecting Muhammad and Islam, they have violated the Covenant with God and thus, have "followed the misguided Jewish nation" -- **FA SALAKU FI MITHAQI ALLADHI AKHADHTUH ALAYHIM MINHAJ AL- UMMAT AD-DALLAH MIN AL-YAHUD**. As punishment for the violation of the solemn Divine compact, God has sown hatred and enmity among various Christian sects and also between the Jews and Christians. God will further punish the Jews and Christians for violating the

covenant which is manifested in their "bad intentions" about Muhammad.²⁵

Q7:169 also implies the Islam of Muhammad was foretold; referring to the Divine Covenant, the verse asserts God had asked the People of the Book to follow Islamic teachings.

The disbelief of the People of the Book in Muhammad as the true, last and perfect Messenger of God, however, does not change favorable Muslim images of the past Prophets. The Islamic Prophets and their true followers continue in the Muslim mind to be heroes. Obviously, their true stories, for a Muslim, are told only by the Quran and Tradition. According to the Quranic decree Muslims are bound to follow the Divinely guided model of the Prophets. "God has guided them; **SO FOLLOW THEIR GUIDANCE**" (6:90 cf. 6:83-90, cf. TS,11:517-9). The believers are told by God that Muslims and the Prophets share the same brotherhood and community -- **INNA HADHIHI UMMATUKUM UMMAT WAHIDAH** (23:52).

A significant portion of the Quran consists of the stories of the Prophets; the Tradition has built upon them in great detail. These stories variously make and reinforce the Muslim belief system and, consequently, shape Muslim behavior. Abu Ishaq Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Tha'labi (d. 1036 A.D.) in his Arais al-Majalis: Qisas al-Anbiya (Brides of the Sessions: Tales of the Prophets), enumerates five "wisdoms" taught by such stories. According to one of these five "wisdoms," descriptions of the lives of Islamic Prophets are meant to improve "the character and mind of the community." Thalabi continues:

Since in many places in the prophetic tales there is mentioned not only the heavenly reward that accrued to the prophets and righteous but also the torment of the enemies of religion, all the people could derive spiritual benefit by meditating upon the meaning of these stories, as is written (in the Quran) 'Surely in the history of Joseph and his brethren there are signs of God's providence to the inquisitive' (Q12:7) and (as in another Quranic verse) 'verily in the histories of the prophets and their people, there is an instructive example unto those who are endued with understanding' (Q12:111).

According to another "wisdom" related by Thalabi,

the histories of the prophets were revealed to resurrect the memory of God's prophets, as Abraham prayed, 'Grant that I may be spoken of with honour among the latest posterity'

(Q26:84).²⁶

Borrowing Thalabi's terms, this part of our study about "the Books and Messengers" of Allah is aimed, in part, at "resurrecting" the Islamic sacred "pre-history" as it has been called by Thackston, in order to see, from a Muslim point of view, "the heavenly reward that accrued to the prophets" and, more importantly, "the torment of the (pre-Muhammad) enemies of religion" of Islam. In other words, as a part of our understanding of the full meaning of Islamic belief in the Books and Messengers, we will explore the self-images of the pre-Islam Muslims and their images and treatment of the pre-Islam non-Muslims. The descriptions (or "instructive examples") of the stories of these Muslim heroes, their thoughts, words, actions and desires are supposed to inspire and guide Muslims in their conduct of relations with non-Muslims. The self-images of Islamic Prophets became the ideal Muslim self-images. The past Prophets' treatment of their contemporary nonbelievers becomes an ideal Muslim treatment of the world beyond Islam. The prophets were Divinely guided; Muslims are commanded by the Almighty to follow their model (Q6:90). The believers of the past - the Prophets, the divine heirs and executors of their will (sing: **WASIY**), and their followers - were the Muslim heroes of their time whose model is to be honored and imitated by Muslims. The past believers' images and treatment of their adversaries is supposed to influence Muslim thought and behavior accordingly.

The Islamic version of pre-Muhammad human history on earth begins with Adam and ends with Jesus Christ as Messengers of God. Islamic sources have offered a tentative chronology of the pre-Muhammad history (of course, for these Muslim authors the chronology is almost exact). The Quranic descriptions of the Prophets do not necessarily suggest an exact chronology, but there are hints in the Quran which have helped the Traditionists to formulate an "exact historical" order of the appearances of various Prophets. Ibn Sad, in brief, and Tabari, in his Tarikh ar-Rusul wa'l-Muluk (History of Messengers and Kings) in detail,

have offered an exact timetable. Most of the later authors of Islamic "pre-history" have followed the guidelines established by Ibn Sad and Tabari.

Following Ibn Sad's genealogical discussion (1/1:26- 27) and Tabari's descriptions in general (,1:passim) along with a reading of the relevant material in the Quran and Tradition, we may reconstruct the main phases of pre-Muhammad history as follows:

- 1) The Age of Prophet Adam followed by his first (or so) generations (sic).
- 2) The Age of Prophet Idris or Hanukh (Enoch?) followed by his two generations. (In this study the age of Idris is treated as a part of the era of Adam and his sons.)
- 3) The Age of Prophet Nuh (Noah) followed by about nine generations before Abraham.
- 4) The Age of Prophet Ibrahim (Abraham) followed by four (sic) generations before Moses.
- 5) The Age of Prophet Musa (Moses) followed by many generations before Jesus Christ. (Ibn Sad's genealogical descriptions are too confused for a correct calculation.)

According to Ibn Sad there was a gap of ten centuries (sing: **QARN**) between Adam and Noah and another gap of ten centuries between Noah and Abraham. Ten more centuries passed after Abraham before Moses appeared. The period between Moses and Jesus Christ became shorter: 900 years.

The Prophet Muhammad was born, according to Ibn Sad, 569 years after the birth of Jesus Christ. The parentage of all Prophets and Mary, mother of Jesus, is minutely linked to Abraham and then to Sam (Shem) son of Noah. Almost all post-Abraham prophets except Muhammad descend from the Prophet Isaac, son of Abraham; Muhammad's paternal line is linked to the Prophet Ismail (Ishmael), son of Abraham.

There were many Prophets during the ages or eras theorized above. The number of Prophets usually increased in every age after Abraham. According to Ibn Sad there were one thousand Prophets for the Children

of Israel. During the first part of the period between Jesus and Muhammad three Prophets, including Shamun, were raised; he was one of the twelve disciples of Jesus Christ, Ibn Sad maintains. A duration of four hundred and thirty four years before Muhammad formed a period of **FATRAH**, ("suspension") in which no Prophets existed (IS,1/1:26).

On a certain level, four models of believer-nonbeliever confrontation emerge for Muslims in Islamic Prophetic history. The first model, which includes Adam and post-Deluge Noah, tells the believers that the whole human world was the domain of Islam and the whole existing population of the world followed the Prophets' creed, Islam. Later, a part of the population violated the Messengers' creed and/or developed a society independent of Divine Guidance. In Islamic terms, the whole world was a Dar al-Islam and its whole existing population Muslim. Later, some were dubbed non-Muslims thus giving rise to a non-Muslim population within a Dar al-Islam. Also, the existence of one or more autonomous non-Muslim societies (sing: Dar al- Harb) is reported. Muslims are told the Prophets and the believers responded in certain ways to such nonbelievers within the Dar al-Islam and to the non-Muslim societies abroad.

The second model describes a situation in which the Prophets and the believers, e.g., David, Solomon and Dhu'l- Qarnayn, possessed worldly power and ruled over a Dar-al- Islam from the beginning of their careers. A number of nonconformists to the Prophetic creed and nonbelievers might have existed in such "domains of Islam". Meanwhile, beyond the boundaries of these "domains of Islam" there existed independent and autonomous societies which did not follow Islamic Prophetic creed.

The third model is represented by the careers of pre-Deluge Noah, Hud, Salih et al. These Prophets were raised in non-muslim societies at times when no Dar al- Islam existed somewhere else. The Prophets and their few followers in this model failed to transform their own lands or any other society in the world into domains of Islam.

The fourth model is that of the Prophet Muhammad which contains features of both the second and third models. The Prophet was raised in a world-wide Dar al- Harb. Though he converted some individuals of his home-town, Mecca, he could not gain exclusive leadership of the town; Mecca remained a Dar al-harb. Later, the Prophet established a Dar al-Islam in a different place, Medina. The following reconstruction of Islamic Prophetic history from Adam to Muhammad will examine various aspects and modes of the Prophets' (and believers') images and treatment of nonbelievers in all the above situations. For us, it will be an Islamic version of hisotry of Muslim conduct of relations with non-Muslims. For the believers, it will be a guide for their fulfillment of the Divine commandment:

We elected them and We guided them to a straight path... Those are they to whom We gave the Book, the Judgment,... the Prophethood;... Those are they whom God has guided; **SO FOLLOW THEIR GUIDANCE** [i.e., exemplary model of these Prophets] (6:87-90;brackets added).

ENDNOTESPart III (BELIEF IN THE BOOKS AND MESSENGERS).
Section I (THE CONCEPT)

¹Q2:38-9; cf. TS,1:548-52 for the explanation preceding the Quranic passage; also see Q7:35-6; Q16:36.

²12:109; 14:4; 17:64-5; 25:20.

³10:47; 13:7; 16:36, 84, 89.

⁴12:109; 16:43-4; 21:78

⁵7:104-5 passim; 13:38 passim; 14:9-15; 26:16-21, 107-84 passim; 36:16 passim; 46:22-5 passim.

⁶Q21:68-71.

⁷Q20:38-41; 28:7-13.

⁸Q7:133; 17:101.

⁹Q21:79; T,17:54.

¹⁰Q21:81-82; T,17:55-56.

¹¹Q27:15-40; T,19:140-165 cf. Q34:12-13.

¹²Q3:45-47, 59; 19:16-36.

¹³Q3:45; 19:29-31.

¹⁴Q3:55-58; Q4:157-159; TS,6:455-473; TS,9:367-390.

¹⁵KAN LAHU MARKAB MIN AL-KHASHAB, WA KAN FIH ALF RUKN, FI KULL RUKN ALF BAYT TARKAB FIH AL-JINN WA'L-INS, TAHT KULL RUKN ALF SHAYTAN, YARFAUN DHALIK AL-MARKAB...FA IDHA IRTAFA ATAT-HUR-RIH...TASARAT BIHI...(T,22:68-9).

¹⁶SIRAT MUSTAQUIM: WA DHALIK DIN ALLAH ALLADHI LA IWAJ FIH, WA HU AL-ISLAM ALLADHI IRTADAH ALLAH RABBUNA LI ANBIYAIH WA AMAR BIH IBADAH. TS,11:513. Also see Q16:43-4 passim, 35:24-6, cf. T,22:130; Q38: passim, cf. T,23:538 passim; Q51:36 passim; Q69:1-10; Q16:43-4 passim. The above corollaries to the belief in "the Books and Prophets" are repeatedly emphasized by the Quran and reinforced by the Tradition; more will be said in our following detailed treatment of the past Prophets.

¹⁷TS,9:354 cf. pp 352-5. Also see Q2:134 cf TS,3:100-1; Q57:25-7 cf. T,27:236-9.

¹⁸T,9:114-5; IS, 1/1:7-8; cf. Q36:60-1; T,23:23. o9o5

¹⁹TS,3:353-61.

²⁰LAM YABATH ALLAH AZZA WA JALL NABIYYAN QA MIN LADUN NUH, ILLA AKHADH MITHAQAHU LA-YUMINANN BI MUHAMMAD WA LA- YANSURANNAHU IN KHARAJ WA HUA HAYY, WA ILLA AKHADHA ALA QAWMIHI AN YUMINU BIHI WA LA-YANSURANNAHU IN KHARAJA WA HUM AHYA (TS,6:556).

²¹T,21:125-6...KUNT AWWAL AL-ANBIYA FI'L-KHALQ WA AKHIRAHUM FI'L-BATH...

²²Q2:125-6 cf. TS,3:38-73.

²³TS,7:460 ...WA KANA FIHI ANN AL-ISLAM DIN ALLAH ALLADHI IFTARADAHU
ALA IBADIHI WA ANN MUHAMMADAN YAJIDUNAHU MAKTUB-AN INDAHUM FI' AWRAT
WA'L-INJIL.

²⁴TS,1:557-8.

²⁵TS,10:135-140.

²⁶Thalabi, Arais al-Majalis, p. 2f. In W.M. Thackston, Jr.,
"Introduction:" to The Tales of the Prophets of al-Kisai, translated
from the Arabic with notes by W.M. Thackston, Jr., (Boston: Twayne
Publishers, a Division of C.K. Hall and Co., 1978), p. xvii.

Part III: Belief In The Books And Messengers

Section 2: THE ERA OF THE PROPHET ADAM AND HIS SONS: A FORMATIVE PERIOD.

- * The Almighty will torture and punish those engaged in social intercourse with nonbelievers and those who sympathize with and are favorably disposed to them (The Prophet Idris)
- * God commanded Seth [Shith] to fight his brother Cain [Qabil], who had withdrawn to another region of the earth and built it up. He had taken one of his sisters, named Lebuda, Whom he loved, and had by her many children, whom God wanted to make Seth's slaves. So, accompanied by all his children, Seth went out, girt with a sword... Before him the angels carried ruby staffs... Iblis hastened to Cain to inform him and order him to beware... Cain met him with his children and progeny... Cain was overthrown in battle and Seth took him prisoner along with a number of his children... The angels came to Cain and fettered him with black chains from Gehenna, bound his hands to his neck and drove him in disgrace to his brother Seth. Cain said, 'Seth, remember the bond of kinship between us!' But his brother reviled him and said, 'There exists no bond between us after you killed your brother unfairly!' So saying Seth kept him in his domicile before delivering him in bondage to the angels, who took him to the sun's well in the west where he remained facing the sun until death took him, and he died an infidel, his offspring passing into bondage to Seth and his children (K:85-6).

Although the amount of Quranic material concerning the era of the Prophet Adam and sons, the earliest part of Muslim sacred history, is less than that which describes the later periods, the Tradition-based elaborations are consistent with the more extensive Quranic treatment of the periods which followed. The Tradition-based portrayal of the believers of the era and of their reported images and treatment of nonbelievers has demonstrated appreciable consistency with the spirit and letter of the Quran and Sunnah. Apparently, in their reconstruction of an Islamic picture of the era of Adam and his sons, our sources have been conscious of the formative nature of the period; hence, they have ascribed most of the fundamental features of believer-nonbeliever relations to this period, which are then replicated in various forms during the later parts of Prophetic history and finally confirmed and adopted by the Quran and Muhammad. Based on Islamic sources, the story of Adam and sons is reconstructed as follows.¹

In this reconstruction of the Islamic story of the era of Adam and sons we have tried to articulate those aspects of the story which relate to the world view and self-images of the believers and to their images and treatment of non-believers of the period. The believers, i.e., the Prophets, the divine heirs and executors of their will (**AWSIYA**, sing: **WASIY**), and their followers were the Muslim heroes of the time, whose model is to be honored and imitated by Muslims. According to the Quranic (6:90) decree "follow their guidance" the past believers' images and treatment of their adversaries must influence Muslim thought and behavior accordingly.

Adam was descended in India, Eve at Jidda in Arabia and Satan in what is now south Iraq. The reunion of Adam and Eve took place at Arafat near Mecca. Apparently, Adam took her back to India. After his descent to the earth, Adam's attention remained fixed on Heaven. He was tall enough to smell the air of Paradise and listen to the heavenly songs of angels glorifying God. Adam enjoyed the heavenly contact and paid no

attention to his abode of descent. However, the angels objected to this intrusion of the fallen Adam; consequently, Adam's height was shortened (sic). He was no longer able to enjoy himself by listening to the heavenly songs in praise of God. His link to the heavenly world of God and paradise was completely disconnected. On the other hand, there was nothing worthwhile in this earth to attract Adam's attention and please him. As warned, life on earth was to be a toilsome "unprosperous" life of "narrowness" (Q20:117, 124). Adam felt empty; he missed Paradise and longed for return to it. He calmed down only when God promised to return him after he pledged to "repent" and "reform" --QAL ARAAYT IN AN TUBT WA ASLAHT, A RAJII ANT ILA'L JANNAH? QAL NAAM.² In order to overcome his intense yearning for Paradise, Adam nevertheless needed some heavenly symbols on earth. The Almighty had already thought of it; the Kaba was descended from Paradise to Mecca. It was as sacred as God's Throne in Heaven. Adam was told by God to pay homage to it and was also told that all the Prophets after him will do the same.

...And when Adam lost and missed the sounds of the angels and their glorification (of God), he prayed to God (for some alternative on the earth). So, God said: 'O Adam, I have descended for you a House which is (to be) circumambulated just like My Throne (in Heaven) is circumambulated, and which is (consecrated) for prayer therein just like the surroundings of My Throne are (consecrated) for prayer. So, go to it.' And Adam left (India) for (Mecca to find) it... and Adam, and the Prophets (who were raised) after him circumambulated it. (T,17:142-3 cf. Q22:26)

An angel was sent along with some heavenly material from paradise to build the Kaba. The angel, Gabriel, escorted Adam to Mecca where he taught Adam all Islamic rituals including those related to the obligatory pilgrimage to Mecca (TT-U,1:83-4 passim). (Of course they reached Mecca from India with a miraculously fast speed).

The angel ordered them to cleanse themselves with clay and to wash. He taught them ablutions and they performed them in the Islamic manner. Then he commanded them to pray, and the first prayer Adam made was the noon prayer, just as it was the first prayer our Prophet Muhammad made when he was divinely called in Mecca (K:70). The angels told Adam that they had been paying homage to this House (the Kaba) one thousand years before he was created. Adam was very

pleased and satisfied to hear that (TT-U,1:84).

Thus performance of Islamic rites and pilgrimage to Mecca during this life provided an alternative to the life in Paradise. As a Messenger of God, Adam was commanded by the Almighty to work for the prosperity of the "First House of God" established on earth at Mecca. God told Adam that all the nations and Prophets in the future would do the same (TT-1,1:131).

Thus the first village to be built was Mecca and the first house was the Glorious Kaaba. Gabriel placed the House at the Kaaba, and there were seventy thousand angels with him that day. The world shone in splendor from the light of the House (K:62, 66).

The Black Stone was brought from Paradise and fixed at the Kaba. Originally the Stone was as transparent and white (sic) as ice -- **THALJ**; being touched later by unclean women it turned black. The holy Zamzam well at Mecca burst forth miraculously for Adam as arranged by Gabriel. Adam was also provided by the angels with various necessary tools, seeds and plants brought from Paradise. Occasionally, Adam used to long for Paradise's products; God sent oil and olives from Paradise. An Islamic veil was also brought for Eve by an angel from Paradise (K:65).

Adam's descent and settlement in India do not imply any sacred status for the land. It seems to have been an accident. Perhaps it was instructive to keep Adam so far from Mecca in order to emphasize the importance and value of pilgrimage to the First House of God. The scents and various kinds of perfumes found in India, we are told, are the ones brought from Paradise by Adam; he brought some perfumed branches from Paradise trees. As a former resident of Paradise, Adam's perfumed smell spread in India during his stay in the country. Only Arabia, and particularly Mecca, the birthplace of the Prophet Muhammad had intrinsic sacred and Divine value. God declared:

Adam, today have I sanctified Mecca and all that surrounds it, and it shall be sacred until the Day of Resurrection (that i s ,

those who enter therein become so sanctified that they will not burn in Hell) (K:65; also see Q3:96).

It was during Adam's stay at Mecca that mankind undertook the Covenant mentioned in part III Section 1 of this study.³ God created Adam's progeny from his loins, temporarily, to make the Covenant. The terms of this Covenant between God and mankind are mentioned in such a way that they verify elements of Islamic faith and practice. The proceedings of the first general assembly of mankind also project and affirm the superiority of the Prophet Muhammad and Islam. When God asked the assembly "Am I not your Lord?" (Q7:172),

The first to appear was our Prophet Muhammad, who advanced rapidly and said, "Here am I, O Lord." Then he stood to the right, saying "I am the first to testify to Thy Oneness and to confirm my obedient service to thee; and I testify that Thou alone art God, there is no God but thee; and I testify that I am thy servant and thine apostle. The the second rank of apostles replied, one after another, in all their splendor. They hastened to the right side and stood below our Prophet Muhammad... (K:63).

It was also during this primeval general assembly of mankind that all human beings were predestined by God to eternal damnation or salvation and their destinies were fixed. God touched the right side of Adam's loins with His right hand and took out a portion of his progeny. Showing them to Adam, the Lord said to those in His right hand "With my mercy you shall enter Paradise." And then He touched the left part of Adam's loins with His left hand, taking out the remaining part of Adam's descendants and said, "You shall enter Hell and I do not care." That is why, Tabari tells us, God has called (in the Quran [56:8, 27, 41]) the Paradise dwellers the People of the Right [or the Rightists!] and those of Hell, the People of the Left [or Leftists!]." We are also told that the color of the souls of those doomed to Hell was "dark black," **SUD/SAWDA**, and of those predestined to Paradise was "white as pearls" -- **BAYDA MITHL AL-LULU**."⁴

According to one report Adam and Eve had two hundred and thirty-nine children. Except for Shith they were born as twins, a male and a female

(TT-1, 1:98). For our purpose three of his sons, Habil (Abel), Qabil (Cain) and Shith (Seth) are important. Before Adam died, his children and grandchildren were divided into believers (Muslims) and nonbelievers. Habil and, then, Shith emerged as God's favored ones, and Qabil, "the heathen"--**DHALIK AL-KAFIR** and his progeny formed the community of nonbelievers (IS-B, 1:33); they remained deprived of Divine knowledge and guidance (TT-1,1:158).

Qabil was charged with (apparently predestined) disbelief, first, when he refused to respect his Prophet father's desire. Adam wanted Habil to marry Qabil's twin sister, Lebud (Lebuda), who was very beautiful, and Qabil to marry Habil's twin sister, Iqlima (Kelimath?) who was ugly. Qabil refused; he wanted to take the beautiful Lebud as his wife. The issue was referred to God. Habil, a shepherd, offered the best of his products as sacrifice; Qabil, a farmer, offered the worst of his agricultural produce -- **QARRABA SHARR HARTHIHI**; the predestined heathen was so ill behaved (TS,10:203). The heavenly fire consumed Habil's offering thus expressing the Almighty's acceptance and blessing for him. Qabil's offering remained untouched: his desire to marry the beautiful Lebud was frustrated. Qabil, the divinely doomed **KAFIR**, however, remained adamant. Finally, he killed Habil, the Almighty's chosen one. This happened at a time when Adam was on a pilgrimage to Mecca. On his return Adam excommunicated Qabil and, later, his children. They formed the first community of nonbelievers, i.e., non-Muslims of the era of Adam and his sons. Adam did not allow his believing children and grandchildren to live together with Qabil and his family who were declared nonbelievers. As ordered by the Prophet Adam, the two communities of believers and nonbelievers were segregated. According to al-Kisai, Qabil eventually married Lebud and was declared by Adam an apostate. All the nonbelievers, i.e. non-Muslims, who were finally destroyed by the Deluge in Noah's time were the descendants of Qabil, our sources remind us in this context.

After Habil's death, Adam nominated one of his younger sons, Shith,

as the **WASIY** to receive divine guidance and to lead the community of believers after Adam's death. Adam transferred the one hundred and twenty Booklets (**SUHUF**, sing.: **SAHIFAH**) of revelation and divine secret teachings to Shith. On his deathbed, Adam advised Shith to keep the divine knowledge away from Qabil and his children. Shith later received direct divine revelations in the form of fifty holy Booklets (**SUHUF**). "When God commanded Adam to make his bequest" to Shith, he (Adam) told his Wasiy:

My son... see that you do not turn loose of the firm handhold, which is the act of witnessing that there is no god but God, and affirming in Muhammad, the Lord of the ancients and of those yet to come, prince of prophets. Thus I saw [Adam continued] written on the Canopy of the Throne and the gates of Paradise (and) the layers of the heavens..." (K:81-2).

God had commanded Adam to show a white cloth to Shith which the Almighty had sent for Adam from Paradise along with his coffer. Upon the heavenly shroud "were the forms of the Prophets... the first of the Prophets (after Adam) was Seth and the last Muhammad." The white cloth also showed the "forms" of all future nonbelievers, "all of whom descended from Cain's [Qabil's] seed, while the best, the Prophets and the pious, were from Seth's seed" (K:82). Adam also told Shith to "wage war" against Qabil and assured Shith that God will grant him victory against Qabil.

The first Prophet of Islam also left a legacy of sexism to inspire the believers of all times. Just before he took his last breath, Adam raged against Eve: when Eve saw the angels of death at the door along with the heavenly coffer and shroud brought from Paradise, she realized that Adam's last moment had come. In order to have a last glimpse of her beloved companion, Eve rushed in, bypassing the angels; she became an obstruction between the angels and the old man. Adam had no urge to say good-bye to a lifelong companion; nor did he think it necessary to be polite to his wife. The delay caused by Eve annoyed Adam who was so eagerly waiting for the return to Paradise wherein, among other luxuries, "wide-eyed, pearl-like houris" await the believers. Giving vent to his

real feelings about the now-old woman, Adam yelled, "Get off me and get off (the way between me and) the Messengers of my Lord" -- **KHALLI ANNI WA AN RUSUL RABBI**. And then, grumbling at Eve, Adam blamed her for being responsible for his expulsion from Paradise and for all his consequent troubles (TT-U,1:109; 1S-B, 1:33).

Adam died. The angels taught Shith the burial rituals and participated in the burial prayers for Adam under the leadership of Shith. The burial rites and ceremonies happened to be the same prescribed by Islam (TT-U, 1:108-9; IS-B, 1:33). The preserved corpses of Adam and Eve were eventually taken by Shith for reburial in the Abi Qubays or al-Kanz cave in Mecca.

Shith kept his loyalty to Mecca intact. He performed regular pilgrimages to Mecca and finally settled permanently in the Muslim holy city. Shith rebuilt the Kaba with "stones and clay" (TT-U, 1:110). God alone knows what had happened to the Kaba previously built with heavenly material! Shith also built lighthouses "on which were emblazoned the words 'There is no god but God' Adam is the Chosen of God; Muhammad is the Beloved of God'" (K:86). Shith died in Mecca and was "buried beside his parents in the cavern of Mount Abi Qubays" near the Muslim holy city ("Shith," El²,4:385).

In his treatment of Qabil and his progeny, the "misguided party and followers of Satan" --**SHIAT IBLIS WA'L-MUTAQIDIN BIHI FI DALALATI**H -- (TT-U, 1:110), Shith followed the Prophet Adam's recommendations and most probably the newly received divine guidance. Shith and his Divinely ordained successors continued to boycott the Qabilian nonbelievers. The Prophet Shith continued the segregationist policy. The Muslim community and land, the **Dar al-Islam** of the time, had to have no friendly relations with the community and land of nonbelievers, **Dar al-Harb**. Shith prohibited intermarriage and intermingling between his followers and the Qabilians; he also denied Qabilians the right to see Adam's coffin (IS-B, 1:39). Perhaps expelled by the believers or perhaps in order to

escape their humiliation or perhaps to avoid a clash, the Qabilians migrated "to another region of the earth and built it up" (K:85). Our sources mention Yaman or south Arabia as their destination. Apparently, the Qabilian nonbelievers had no hard feelings toward the believers; they are not charged with any aggressive or unfriendly attitude concerning the Dar al-Islam. The nonbelievers simply engaged themselves in worldly creativity and prospered. Compared to the believing community of Shith and his successors who lived in AL- JABAL, rugged mountainous places, the Qabilians inhabited AS-SAHL, comfortable and rich plains. Our sources mention, with obvious disappointment and disgust, the prosperity, joyous habits and this-worldly orientations of the Qabilian nonbelievers. We are particularly told, of course with disapproval, about the appreciation of the Qabilians for music and joyous festivals. The children of Qabil, we are told, "became absorbed in (this kind of) nonsense and frivolous activity -- FA'NHAMAK WALAD QAYIN (sic) FIL- LAHV" (TT-U,1:113). Qabilian women are portrayed as very comely, beautiful and graceful, **SIBAH**, but also seductive and alluring; their men were ugly with repulsive appearances (**DAMAMAH**). Compared to this the men among the believers were handsome while their women were ugly. The Qabilian women demonstrated their fancy ornaments and costumes. Apparently, Qabilian men did not object. Quoting Tradition, as usual, Tabari tells us that the condemnation of this kind of festive habits in the Quran (33:33) refers also to these Qabilian women (TT-1,1:167-8). All this had happened because Qabil and his sons had become the followers of Satan. It was Satan who encouraged Qabil and his children to start the tradition of fire worship and idolatry (TT-U,1:112).

As long as complete segregation was maintained between Qabilian nonbelievers and the believers under Shith and his Wasiy successors, the desired Islamic harmony was maintained. From the point of view of our Islamic sources, **AL-FASAD FI'L-ARD**, "corruption on earth" was the result of the friendly contact between the believers and nonbelievers.

Our sources inform us remorsefully that some inhabitants of the **DAR AL-ISLAM**, the believing children and grandchildren of Shith, wondered what the other segment of Adam's family, the Qabilian nonbelievers, were doing. They, perhaps, missed their human cousins who were segregated by divine orders for such a long time (or, perhaps, the imposed puritanical life in the Dar al-Islam had become boring; or maybe, the handsome believers had heard of the beautiful heathen Qabilian ladies). Anyhow, one hundred men, violating their own Islamic segregationist regulations, left the domain of belief for the Qabilian heathen region. The believers found Qabilian men and women celebrating a festival. Obviously, the nonbelieving beautiful women must have become more exciting and alluring during the festival. They seduced, our sources report, and engaged their visiting cousins from among the believers who forgot to return; the disgusting land of nonbelievers was very attractive! Another group of believers left to look for their missing comrades. The outcome was the same: the nonbelieving beautiful Qabilian ladies proved to be more attractive than the veiled ugly believing women of the Dar al-Islam. (We may surmise that the female children and followers of Shith must have continued the tradition of wearing veils, the prototype of which was sent from Paradise for Eve). Our sources repeat that the Qabilian women continued to seduce and engage their Shithian visiting male cousins -- **FA'HTABASAHUM AN-NISA...** (TT-U,1:113-4 passim). More and more Shithian believers and Qabilian nonbelievers intermarried and intermingled, Tabari tells us with disapproval. From an Islamic point of view social intercourse and intermarriages between believers and nonbelievers ushered in an era of sin and sedition -- **FA JAAT AL-MASIYAT WA TANAKAHU FA'KHTALATU**. "The children of Qabil increased so much," Tabari adds grudgingly, "that they filled the whole earth." However, trying to console the believers, Tabari concluded with obvious pleasure "these were the people who were drowned in the days of Noah" (TT-1,1:167-8; TT-U,1:113-4).

The Almighty, however, did not wait until then. Regardless of its

unprovocative and peaceful policy the Dar al-Harb, the un-Islamic land, had to be invaded by the believers. The Dar al-Islam could not coexist peacefully with a Dar al-Harb. The latter had to be humiliated and subjugated; its leaders had to be tortured to death and its inhabitants enslaved by the believers. The angels, as expected, were to support the believers against the followers of Satan, i.e., the nonbelievers.

God commanded Seth [Shith] to fight his brother Cain [Qabil], who had withdrawn to another region of the earth and built it up. He had taken one of his sisters, named Lebuda, whom he loved, and had by her many children, whom God wanted to make Seth's slaves. So, accompanied by all his children, Seth went out, girt with a sword... Before him the angels carried ruby staffs... Iblis hastened to Cain to inform him and order him to beware... Cain met him with his children and progeny... Cain was overthrown in battle and Seth took him prisoner along with a number of his children... The angels came to Cain and fettered him with black chains from Gehenna, bound his hands to his neck and drove him in disgrace to his brother Seth. Cain said, 'Seth, remember the bond of kinship between us!' But his brother reviled him and said, 'There exists no bond between us after you killed your brother unfairly!' So saying Seth kept him in his domicile before delivering him in bondage to the angels, who took him to the sun's well in the west where he remained facing the sun until death took him, and he died an infidel, his offspring passing into bondage to Seth and his children (K:85-6).

According to Tabari, after Qabil was declared apostate he was killed by one of his own sons. As we will see in the section on the Prophet Muhammad and the battle of Badr, however, from a Muslim point of view the killing of such a nonbeliever as a joint venture of the believers and the angels is not unlikely.

Apparently, the Qabilians were not routed completely. Many of them survived. Before his death Shith charged his WASIY, Qaynan, with fighting Qabil's children (K:87). The Divine successors (AWSIYA) of Shith, such as Anush and Yarid, continued to oppose any integration and friendly contact between the believers and nonbelievers (TT-U,1:110, 113). However, the trend of social intercourse with nonbelievers continued; this was loathsome from an Islamic point of view, our sources imply. In order to re-establish complete segregation or to invade and occupy the vast and prosperous domain of nonbelievers, the Almighty had to raise a full-fledged Prophet: Idris, also called Hanukh or Khanukh (Enoch?).⁵

The Prophet Idris was raised by God at a critical time. He received thirty Divine booklets (TT-1,1:170; IS-B, 1:40). The main problem, as seen by our sources was the increasing intermingling and intimate social intercourse -- **MUKHALITA, MULABISAH** -- between the believing children of Shith and the nonbelieving Qabilians (TT-U, 1:116-7). Distinctions between the believers and nonbelievers were disappearing. Idris was sent by God to re-establish apartheid, the regime of Islam. The Prophet Idris asked the children of Shith to stop intermingling and intermarrying with the children of Qabil; they did not obey the Prophet. Intermingling and intimate association grew more and more between the children of Shith and Qayin (sic) -- **KANAT AL-ISABAT BAD AL-ISABAT MIN WALAD SHITH, TANZIL ILA WALAD QAYIN** -- our sources tell the believers disapprovingly. Eventually "idols were made and they left Islam" -- **UMILAT AL-ASNAM WA RAJAA MAN RAJAA AN AL-ISLAM**" (ibid).

In order to stop the decline of Islam and the growing congress with the nonbelievers, Idris waged holy war, **JIHAD**, for God against the Qabilians' children, some of whom he captured and enslaved -- **JAHAD FI SABIL ALLAH... SABA WALAD QABIL FA'STRAQQ MINAHUM** (TT-1,170-3). Apparently, he failed to bring back his people to the folds of Islam. Perhaps in order to save him from the spiritual discomfort of living in an un-Islamic society, Idris was miraculously raised alive by God to live in a "high place" in Heaven.⁶

Before his ascension to Paradise, Idris told his wasiy son Matushalakh (Methuselah) that

God will soon punish and torture -- **YUADHDHIB** -- the children of Qabil and those who mix with them and (also) those who are favorably disposed to them -- **MAL ILAYHIM** -- and (in brief) he prohibited them from mixing with (the nonbelievers) (TT-U,1:173).

The **WASIY** of Idris maintained his father's tradition of a perpetual holy war against the nonbelievers -- **IQTAFI RASM ABIH FIL-JIHAD** (ibid). Lamak, the succeeding **WASIY**, strove in vain to cordon off his people and restrain contacts with the Qabilian nonbelievers (ibid:118). The unaccomplished mission of the Prophet Idris and his believing sons was to be resumed by

the epoch-making Islamic Prophet, Noah.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Muslims are informed that the world of Adam and his sons was divided into the two communities of believers and nonbelievers. The believers of the era guided by the Prophet Adam and his divine successors were Muslims; their creed was Islam. In this story Muslims find evidence for the antiquity, authenticity and superiority of Islam and Muhammad. The coming and highest status of the Prophet Muhammad were foretold by God and the Prophets of the era. The Islamic creed, Islamic rites and religious observances, Islamic sacred places, and, in sum, the whole Islamic way of thought and life are those indeed confirmed by the angels to the first Prophet, Adam and his divinely guided successors and acknowledged and observed by them. Islam's sacred language, Arabic, was God's favored language. A reader gets the impression that Adam composed poetry in Arabic (T,10:209; TT-U,1:98; K:78).

Muslims see themselves as the true inheritors of the earliest Muslim generations. Muslims find that the Islamic concept of Prophethood, intervention by the Almighty in history through His Messengers, has been an age-old way of God. The God who finally appointed Muhammad as his last Messenger is the same who had raised Adam, Shith and Idris as Prophets. All this reinforces the Muslim sense of self-righteousness. The concept of predestination in this context tells Muslims they are among the chosen and blessed ones, and those who refuse to acknowledge Islam are the ones cursed by God: the nonbelievers are born wretched. Consequently, Muslims have only to look down upon them rather than question the authenticity of Islam or think of the likelihood of anything good in un-Islam.

Muslims find that self-images of the past believers, as the sole possessors of divine guidance, and their images of non-Muslims of the period as possessed and led by Satan, culminated in two principal patterns of behavior toward the nonbelievers: 1) **HIJRAH** in its comprehensive sense

(as explained in Part I and elsewhere in this study) and/or 2) **JIHAD**, holy war, undertaken by the believers with the help of God's extrahuman forces or, as desired by the believers, undertaken directly by the Almighty against nonbelievers. These two fundamental modes of the past Muslim treatment of non-Muslims, **HIJRAH** and **JIHAD**, along with their corollaries, persisted, as we will see, in Islamic sacred history in various forms and, finally, were confirmed by the Quran and the Sunnah of the Prophet Muhammad.

HIJRAH, as defined by Edward Lane (AEL, 1/8:2879-81) signifies "cutting of from friendly or loving communion or intercourse... forsaking or abandoning". It also means "ceasing to speak to... or to associate with". It means "holding discourse... deserting... neglecting... avoiding... aversion from... withdrawing to a distance... abstaining from... with the body and with the tongue and with the heart or mind". As used in the Quran 73:10 **HIJRAH** may mean avoiding association with non-Muslims "in person, or speaking to them or entertaining friendship of them in... heart". It also means emigration from the territory of the unbelievers to the territory of believers" (ibid). W. Montgomery Watt ("HIDJRA," *El*², 3:366) has correctly noted that **HIJRAH** "means to cut someone off from friendly association as used in the Quran 4:34, or to avoid association with" as in Q73:10. It "connotes primarily the breaking of the ties of kinship or association", Watt adds.

HIJRAH as practiced by Adam and his sons is a form of apartheid in practice. Muslims, however, need not apologize; the **HIJRAH**-based attitude toward nonbelievers was divinely decreed and sanctioned. Muslims learn from the sunnah of the Prophets Adam, Shith, Idris and their divine successors, the rightly-guided caliphs and imams, i.e., the **AWSIYA**, the undesirability and divinely decreed prohibition of pluralism. The Prophets and the believers of the era rejected reconciliation and peaceful coexistence with nonbelievers. The Prophets and their divine successors enjoined "cutting off friendly communion with nonbelievers - in mind and

in body." Toleration and respect for an un-Islamic social formation were discouraged and condemned by the Prophets and their awsiya. There was to be no **MAYL**, reconciling, sympathetic and favorable disposition toward nonbelievers, and no **MULABISAH**, friendly contact, no **MUKHALITAH**, social intercourse, and no **MUNAKIHAH**, intermarriage, between believers and nonbelievers. The ideal society of the believers of the era, Muslims learn, was strictly, self-righteously and arrogantly isolationist and segregationist. First, Adam imposed segregation on those declared nonbelievers living in his jurisdiction, the Dar al-Islam. These nonbelievers were the equivalents of **DHIMMIs**, non-Muslims living in a society controlled by Muslims. The segregation was obviously aimed at nonbelievers' humiliation. Then, apparently the nonbelievers were expelled. After their expulsion or migration to another land Adam declared the nonbelievers unsociable, persona non grata. Shith followed the sunnah. The Prophet Idris warned nonconformist believers that the Almighty will torture and punish those engaged in social intercourse with nonbelievers and those who sympathize with and are favorably disposed to the nonbelievers - **WA ALAMAHUM ANN ALLAH... SA-YUADH-DHIB... MAN KHALATAHUM WA MAL ILAYHIM** (TT-1, 1:173). The maintenance of a sacred iron-curtain between the believers and nonbelievers was the prime concern of Idris's divine successors -- **FA LAMMA HADARAT MATUSHALAKH AL-WAFAT, ISTAKHLAF LAMAK ALA AMRIHI WA AWSAHU BI MITHL MA KAN ABAUHU YUSUN BIHI:...** **WA KAN LAMAK YAIZ QAWMAHU, WA YANHAHUM ANI'N NUZUL ILA WALAD QAIN** (ibid). The non-Muslims of the era were considered as sources of corruption and misguidance, and hence cursed by God and put outside the pale by the Prophets. The ascension of Idris was another mode of **HIJRAH** from a world dominated by nonbelievers. It was an aversion to the world beyond Islam. It was an act to cease association with the heathen land and emigrate to Heaven, the archetype of Dar al-Islam.

The concept of **HIJRAH** as manifested in Islamic Prophetic history and, finally, articulated by the Prophet Muhammad's career, anticipates war on

nonbelievers. Such a holy war is to be undertaken by the believers or by the Almighty directly. **HIJRAH**, Islamic apartheid, must be followed by **JIHAD** in one way or other. The world of nonbelievers, in any case, is not to be left in peace. Islamic **HIJRA** is not a peaceful boycott; it is an open declaration of cold war or of a state of war preceding an imminent hot war. The divinely ordained iron curtain could be lifted only for an onslaught on the domain of nonbelievers. The preferable alternative to maintaining a self-righteous apartheid is to invade, humiliate, subjugate or annihilate the world beyond Islam.

Muslims find that the segregationist and isolationist policy of the Dar al-Islam of Adam and his sons was not passive and complacent; it was ruthlessly aggressive, expansionist, colonialist and extirpating. Muslim heroes of the period were under divine obligation to wage unprovoked war against the Qabilian nonbelievers. Adam had told Shith to wage war against Qabil. The Almighty commanded him to do so. Shith did likewise and charged his successor to continue the holy war against remaining Qabilians. Idris **JAHAD FI SABIL ALLAH**, "fought for God," against Satan and his followers, i.e., the non-Muslims of his time) (TT-U,1:110, 116). Idris' ascension into Heaven was not a mere isolationist act. Nor was it a recognition of the Dar al-Harb's right to exist. On his way to the archetype Dar al-Islam, Heaven, Idris, anticipating the Deluge, reassured his son that God will soon torment and annihilate the nonbelievers (TT-1,1:173). This was to be a direct action, **JIHAD**, by the Omnipotent - and a terrible one - against the heathen. Idris' son, meanwhile, **IQTAFARASM ABIH FI'L-JIHAD**, "maintained his father's tradition of **JIHAD**" against nonbelievers (TT-1,1:173).

Muslims also learn that the angels assisted the past Muslims against non-Muslims; the angels fought for Shith against the Qabilians. So will they always do. Muslims are also assured that when the believers are unable to punish the nonbelievers, the Almighty's direct intervention to annihilate the heathens is guaranteed, sooner or later.

As a corollary to the concept of **JIHAD** the story of Adam and sons also signifies that the believers were entitled by the Almighty to possess the best of this world, without necessarily working for it; the persons and property of nonbelievers could be captured as booty. It was a gift of God to the believers. Along with other-worldly rewards they were predestined to this-worldly benefits. They were above any man-made regulation of equal opportunity and accountability. As willed by God and desired by His Prophet, Habil should have possessed the beautiful Lebud. Shith the believer and his progeny were affirmed by God as superior and leaders of mankind. The Qabilians might have worked for the prosperity of their land, but God wanted the believers to invade and capture the land; He also wanted to make the children of the apparently peaceful and hard-working Qabilians the slaves of Shith and the believers. In brief, Muslims find in the past evidence for their divine right to this-worldly benefits at the cost of nonbelievers.

The drive for occupation and capturing booty, however, is not accompanied with an urge for reconstruction and development. Worldliness is looked down upon by the believers. The sunnah of the Prophet Adam and his sons tells the believers that this world is an Abode of Impermanence, and life in it is devoid of any intrinsic value. Human beings are here for a short and fixed duration -- **AJAL MUSAMMA**. The descent of Adam and Eve to this world was a punishment for their disobedience of the Almighty. The desire for return to Paradise never escaped Adam and his divinely ordained successors. Only the nonbelievers engaged themselves with agriculture and other this-worldly developmental and creative activities. Habil, the first believer after Adam, was a simple proto-nomad. The Qabilians are portrayed to have built what we call civilization; it was looked down upon.

In their portrayal of a perpetual, irreconcilable state of cold and hot war between the Muslim and non-Muslim communities of the era of Adam and his sons, our sources have reported approvingly certain specific modes

of behavior towards the nonbelievers. Those labeled nonbelievers and declared apostates lost, automatically, their social rights and the right to life and freedom. The revelation received by Adam in the form of holy Books was a form of public documents for his children. However, he advised Shith to keep the divine knowledge away from Qabil and his children. Similarly, the Qabilians were never allowed to see and pay homage to Adam's coffer, which was a kind of public institution. The Qabilian nonbelievers were treated as "untouchables" in all respects by the Muslim "Brahmins" of their time. This sunnah of Adam and his sons is comparable to Islamic traditions denying non-Muslims access to Muslim holy places; non-Muslims are not to be allowed to touch the Quran -- **LA YAMSSUHU ILL'AL-MUTAHHARUN** (Q56:79). Muslims have also been discouraged from taking the Quran to the Dar al-Harb.

Muslims are told with great satisfaction that Qabil the excommunicated was lynched by his own son or tortured to death by the angels. The Prophet Shith rebuked the helpless and tortured nonbeliever's appeal for mercy. The enslavement of the nonbelievers, particularly their children, is mentioned as a fitting and divinely sanctioned act. The prosperity and glee of the nonbelievers is mentioned with obvious grudge and spite. (See TT-1:167-8, e.g., quoted above). On the other hand, their misfortunes are stated with an icy tone of jubilation close to sadism (see K:85-6 quoted above in this Part). This is comparable to what Muslims wish non-Muslims in an oft-repeated prayer during Friday congregations and other occasions: **ALLAHUMMA SHA IT SHAMLAHUM, ALLAHUMMA MAZZIQ/FARRIQ JAMAHUM, ALLAHUMMA DAMMIR DIYARAHUM...** "O God break up their gathering; O God, rip apart/disperse their unity; O God, annihilate their lands...".

The belief in predestination obviously contradicts Muslim belief in the necessity of conversion of non-Muslims to Islam. There are other contradictory elements in Islamic descriptions concerning the period under discussion. For example, while the predestined believers are first

portrayed as white and beautiful and the nonbelievers as black and ugly, the Qabilian women emerge in the story as the most comely and the believing women repulsive. In such a way, however, Muslims are obliged, if not trained, to live with contradictions. They are, in a way, instructed to believe that the ends justify the means. It is not important for a Muslim reader to know whether Qabil was in fact stoned to death by his own son or tortured to death by the angels while in fetters or burning. The moral is to see the heathen punished some way or other, preferably in the worst imaginable way. It is also interesting to note that, rather than indulging in self-criticism, the nonbelievers are blamed for the perceived "moral crisis" in the Muslim community. It is not the intruding "handsome" believer but the seductive comely ladies of the nonbelievers who were mainly responsible for the corruption and the consequent disintegration of the ideal Muslim society.⁷

The story of the era provides some ground for the justification and reinforcement of what we have learned to call ethnocentric, racist, sexist, male-chauvinistic and narcissistic attitudes; it also encourages the idea of perpetual and collective punishment on the basis of the alleged sin of an ancestor or a member of a particular group. The predestination to damnation and condemnation of the nonbelievers is generally related to their ethnicity rather than being linked to their individual sins, presumably acts of will ; they were all the progeny of Qabil who is blamed for committing the "original sin" of disobedience to the Prophet Adam and the murder of Habil. The fact that Qabil was excommunicated, disgraced and tortured to death was apparently not enough compensation. His whole 'race' had to bear the stigma in perpetuity until annihilated. Likewise, the color black is portrayed as undesirable, symbolizing damnation and reflecting God's wrath, while white, especially tawny white color, emerges as something heavenly, sightly and desirable. The change of Kaba's sacred and heavenly stone from white to black is mentioned with regret.⁸ Women in general such as Eve, the mother of

humankind, and nonbelieving women, in particular, such as the Qabilians, are blamed for the troubles and corruption of the believers. The assertions that the men among the believers were handsome while their women were ugly, and that these handsome believers were sought for, seduced and allured by the comely beautiful Qabilian ladies also reinforce Muslim male-chauvinistic narcissism.

ENDNOTES

Part III: Belief In The Books And Messengers

Section 2: THE ERA OF ADAM AND HIS SONS

¹The following description of the era of Adam and sons and of the Prophet Idris is based on Q2:36-7, 213 cf. TS,1:534- 52; TS,4:275-80; Q5:27-32 cf. TS,10:201-42; Q7:172-3, 189- 90 cf. 5,9:110-8, 143-50; Q19:56-7 cf. T,16:96-7; Q20:117- 26 cf. T,16:222-30; Q21:85-6; Q33:33, 72 cf. T,22:4-5, 53- 0; Q22:26 cf. T,17:142-3; Q87:18-9 cf. T,30:157-9; Bu.,6:4; 8:1; 60:1; 79:1; Mu,1:259, 51:28; Tir.,44:s7, t2-3; s19, t.3; N,5: 1; IS 1/1:9-27 (DSB)1:10-40; 1:121-78, (1939)1:92-123; K:43-91; A.J. Wensinck, "Idris", EI, 2:449-50; CL Huart, "Shith," EI,4:385; C. Vajda, "Idris", EI²,3:1030-1.

²TS,1:542 passim cf. Q2:37. Also see T,17:142-3, cf. Q22:26.

³See Q7:172-3; 13:15; 37:171; 56:8; T,13:223; TT-1,1:134- 6; K:63-7.

⁴For the concept and full story of this primeval covenant, predestination, general assembly at Mecca, and related above descriptions, see TT-U,1:90-2 passim; 1S-B,1:26-30 passim; Q7:172 cf. T,9:110-19; K:63-5.

⁵Idris is mentioned twice (19:56-7; 21:85-6) in the Quran as a Prophet.

⁶Q19:56-7; T,16:96-7; TT-1,1:73; also see Bu.,8:1; Mu.,1:259; N,55:1.

⁷Now, Western civilization is made responsible for all the ills of the Third World, though most of the Third Worlders including Muslims would prefer residence in the West, the domain of modern Qabilians!

⁸As we will see further examples of ethno-color based preferences in subsequent sections of Islamic Prophetic history black color is mentioned repeatedly as an undesirable and divinely-cursed color while the white, especially "tawny white", color enjoys divine appreciation and preference. Similar attitudes are expressed about certain alleged "ethnicities" and races. In Islamic literature and traditions a preference of white to black is expressed in various ways. We are aware of some Quranic assertions -- **INN AKRAMAKUM IND ALLAH ATQAKUM** [the most honored among you before God are those who fear (God) the most] -- and of the sayings ascribed to the Prophet Muhammad supposed to teach racial equality among Muslims. At the very least, it is another example of the existence of contradictory orientations in Islam. The Prophet Muhammad and the Almighty are also reported to have confirmed the superiority of Arab "race" and the Quraysh clan as well as Arabic language. We are also aware of the historical fact that "Bilal" the "Nigger" -- **AL-HABASHI** -- who is portrayed by contemporary Muslim writers as an example of complete racial equality in Islam, was never treated by the Prophet's Companion as more than an "Uncle Tom". The utmost honor conferred on him by the Prophet was to make him his own cook, waiter, harem guard, and **MUADHDHIN**, the caller for prayers. The post of muadhdhin has never enjoyed a socially enviable status among Muslims. Even among the Muslim clergy the muadhdhin belongs to the bottom of clerical hierarchy. As for the women, their inferior status was confirmed by the Quran and the sunnah in many ways; (see, e.g., Q4:34). Also see Bernard Lewis, "Race and Color in Islam," Encounter, London, Vol. 35, No. 2 (August 1970):18-36 discussed in footnote No. 8a of Part III, Section 3 (The Era of Noah and his Sons) of this study.

Part III : Belief In The Books And Messengers

Section 3: The ERA OF NUH (NOAH) AND HIS SONS

- * ISLAM KI GAR TUJH KO FAZA RAS NA AEY
AEY MERE WATAN KOI TUJHE AG LARGAEY
- * "O my land, if the climate of Islam does not suit you, let someone set you on fire." (A contemporary Pakistani fundamentalist Muslim poet, [Naim Siddiqui?]).
- * NISAR MEN TIRI GALYUN KE AEY WATAN KEH JAHAN
CHALI HAY RASM KE KOI NA SAR UTHA KE CHALE
- * "O my land, it is now the norm that none can walk with raised head in your alleys [-all are humiliated-]. Yet, [I love you so much that] I am ready to sacrifice myself for them (i.e., the alleys). (Faiz Ahmad Faiz, a contemporary Pakistani humanist-Marxist poet).¹
- * My Lord, ... increase (the nonbelievers) only in loss, in ruin. My Lord, leave Thou not upon the earth of the unbelievers even one. (Noah of the Quran)

The reason for the self-righteous rage of the contemporary Muslim poet and that of the Islamic Noah is the same. Both came to the conclusion that the people who rejected them deserved annihilation. After the people rejected his creed and ideological leadership, Islamic Noah prayed for the destruction of all mankind. In his extreme antagonism to a secular, non-Islamic Pakistan, our Pakistani fundamentalist poet imitates Noah and other Islamic Prophets - who never reconciled themselves with societies which refused to believe in them as Messengers of God and acknowledge their overall leadership unconditionally. The Quran and Tradition repeatedly relate their descriptions of the past to the present and the future. The believers are reassured that the adversaries of the creed of the Prophet Muhammad shall certainly meet the fate of those who rejected the call of the past Prophets: they will in time be overwhelmed by Islam, or be wiped off the surface of the earth, only to face perpetual torture hereafter. Obviously, the Muslim fundamentalists of our time hold this faith unflinchingly. Inspired by the Divine Commandment in Q6:90 our Pakistani Muslim poet was merely following the **HUDA**, "guidance," and **SUNNAH**, "model" of a great Prophet, Noah. After his **ISLAMI NIZAM**, Islamic regime, was rejected by the people, Noah had vehemently asked the Almighty:

My Lord, I have called my people by night and by day but my calling has only increased them in flight...My Lord, they have rebelled against me, and followed him whose wealth and children increase him only in loss...Increase Thou not the evildoers...My Lord, leave not upon the earth of the unbelievers even one. Surely, if Thou leavest them they will lead thy servants astray and will beget none but unbelieving libertines. My Lord, ... do Thou not increase the evildoers save in ruin (Q71:5-28).

In our reconstruction of the Islamic story of the era of Noah and his sons, we may divide it into four phases: 1) the pre-Deluge phase, 2) the Deluge, 3) the immediate post-Deluge phase and 4) the end of the era leading to another epoch-making Messenger of God, Abraham.²

Before the Deluge

The world the Prophet Idris left was awaiting a Messenger of God to end the domination of non-Muslim Qabilians. This undesirable situation, the story tells the Muslims, had to be corrected in one of two ways: 1) by converting the existing Dar al-Harb to a Dar al-Islam governed by the worldview of an Islamic Prophet, or 2) by punishing those who resisted the Prophet's creed and refused to obey him. This Islamic mission was to be accomplished by the Prophet Noah. Muslims know Islamic Noah's story, and of the people he confronted, as follows.

Noah's father was from the progeny of Shith and his mother a beautiful Qabilian. Noah's father resembled Adam and was extraordinarily powerful and handsome, from whose face "the light of our Prophet Muhammad shone" (K:91-3). According to our sources' portrayal the people among whom Noah was born were happy with their lot. They were prosperous, producing iron, brass, lead and beautiful cloths; they were fond of festivals. They engaged in gambling and drinking wine. They loved worldly prosperity and their growing number of children ... their greed for this world had overwhelmed them -- **QAWM-UN YUHIBBUN AL-AMWAL WA'L-AWLAD ... QAWM-UN-TAJAZZAAT ANAQUHUM HIRS-AN ALA'D-DUNYA** (T,29:94 cf. Q71:12; K:93). This love for transitory worldly life -- **AL-AJILAH** is, however condemned and is contrasted with the blessings of the Day Hereafter enjoyed by the believers (Q17:16-8).

Articulating the reasons for the confrontation between Noah and his people, Tabari mentions along with their idolatry, their "engagement in indecencies", their "use of alcoholic drinks" and their "entertaining amusements," -- **RUKUB AL-FAWAHISH WA SHURB AL-KHUMUR WA'L-ISHTIGHAL BI'L-MALAH** (TT,1:179). According to Ibn Sad "there was no one in that age to forbid **MUNKAR**" (IS,1/1:16) i.e., un-Islamic beliefs and actions. Our sources associate the cheerful worldliness of Noah's people with their non-Islamic creed.

Noah's images and treatment of the nonbelievers were exemplary. Even before he was granted Prophethood, Noah

"despised his people" (K:91).

When Noah saw all that, he hated to be near them and withdrew into the wilderness. He did not mingle with them or go among them during their festivals until the time known to God arrived for sending Noah as a Prophet to his people (K:93 cf. 91-2).

Finally, Noah received revelation from the Almighty. Now, he was the Messenger of God. Like other Islamic Prophets, he was superior to the rest of mankind. Like all other Islamic Messengers of God, the Quran and Tradition emphasize, Noah followed Islam, God's only creed. All creeds other than Islam were rejected by God-- **FADDALA-HUM ALA'L-ALAMIN ... KANU AHL AL-ISLAM ... INN DINA-HUM WAHIDAH ... FA AKHBAR ALLAH ANNA-HU IKHTAR DIN MAN DHAKARNA ALA SAIR AL-ADYAN ...** (TS,6:326 cf. Q3:33-4). Noah's Islamic credentials are emphasized repeatedly; the "Right Path" -- **SIRAT MUSTAQIM** -- to which Noah and other Prophets were guided by God was the path of Islam chosen by God for His Prophets and commanded by Him to be followed by all people -- **HU AL-ISLAM ALLADHI IRTADAH ALLAH RABBUNA LI ANBIYAIHI WA AMAR BIHI IBADAHU.**³

Noah began his mission by asking the people to acknowledge him as the authentic Messenger of God -- **INNI LAKUM RASUL AMIN**; he asked them to fear God and obey him -- **ITTAQU'LLAH WA ATIUNI**. The central point of the Prophet's demand was **ATIUNI**, "obey me," because it was he who, having the exclusive link to God, would determine the ways and norms of fearing and obeying. Noah continuously warned the nonbelievers of the chastisement of a "dreadful day" if they rejected his call (Q11:25-6; 26:105-10 passim). The nonbelievers thought Noah was a self-styled Messenger of God; they rejected his claim. They also rejected his demand for the acceptance of his supreme authority over the rest of mankind. "Noah is domineering over us" -- **YATAFADDAL ALAYNA**, they remarked sarcastically(Q33:24). Of course, for the believers and for Noah, his superiority was divinely sanctioned (Q3:33-4 cf. TS,6:326).

Along with his disapproval of the people's enthusiastic engagement in worldly affairs, Noah was mainly concerned with what he claimed to be the

right faith and the right way of worship. The right faith, according to him, consisted of 1) acknowledgment of his Prophethood and consequent obedience to him, and 2) worshipping only the one God who had revealed Himself to Noah. Obviously he, as the only link to God, was to prescribe ways of fearing and worshipping the Almighty. A Muslim believer comes to the conclusion that Noah had no other concerns; the Islamic story of Noah indicates that he was not interested in social, economic and political problems of his time. His exhortations and condemnations of the people do not refer to the right or wrong of inter-human relationships and social systems of his time. There is no reference in Noah's concerns to any temporal iniquity, grievance or to any problematic aspect of the economic social and political structure. Noah's only concern was centered in the right faith, summarized in his demand for obedience to him and acceptance of his concept of godhood and of the institution of revelation. Not unlike most of the Quranic-Islamic Prophets, Noah's charges against the people he confronted of **ISTIKBAR** (waxing proud), **JURM** (sinfulness, crime), **JAHL**(ignorance), **ZULM** (evildoing, wrongdoing), **FISQ** (licentiousness), **JABR** (tyranny, oppression), **ITIDA** (transgression) etc., as explained by Tabari and all other Traditional Islamic sources, have no worldly humanistic connotation. For example, it was not the "tyranny" or "wrongdoing" of the rulers or a group of people against people that Noah was talking about. Nor it was the moral and social licentiousness (**FISQ**) that Noah meant when he called them **QAWM FASIQIN**, "a licentious people" (Q51:46). The condemnatory terms used by the Quran and Tradition against the adversaries of Noah and other Islamic Prophets related to the people's rejection of the Prophets' claim to be the Messengers of God and to their refusal to acknowledge, respect and obey the Prophets. It is only the alleged idolatry of the Prophets' adversaries and their rejection of Noah's claim to Prophethood and superiority which are specifically referred to in these Quranic-Islamic terms.

Noah is reported to have preached Islam, for many centuries; he was 950

years old when he died. Excepting eighty or so including his family, the people remained averse to his call (Q11:28; T,12:28; passim). Apparently, they did not basically challenge the concept of fearing or obeying God; their main objection was directed against Noah's claim of having unique status and an exclusive link to the Almighty. They were particularly resisting the idea of absolute obedience to him. Noah was just an ordinary man, they thought. As for Noah's claim to superiority and authority on the basis of Prophethood and having a special link to God, the people thought he was either a liar or insane or just an idiot (Q7:62; 11:27; 23:24; 54:9). As to Noah's criticism of their creed and world view, they argued they were practicing the accumulated traditions of their ancestors from whom they had never heard what Noah was telling them. (That God revealed Himself through a particular person for the guidance of the rest of mankind). They wondered why God should have concealed the angels from them who, as Noah claimed, had brought Divine revelation to him (Q23:24). These arguments did not make sense to Noah. Nor do they to the believers. Such arguments are mentioned in Islamic sources to be ignored and ridiculed rather than seriously considered by the believers. Muslims find similarities between the arguments of the adversaries of Noah and other past Prophets and the criticism directed against the Prophet Muhammad by nonbelievers. [In this study we do not discuss the fact that Muhammad reconstructed the past in his own image and in the image of interaction with his contemporaries. We simply follow the stories as internalized by the believers.]

Noah's adversaries objected to the abject character and questionable past of some of the Prophet's followers. They asked Noah to disassociate himself from the "lowest"--AL-ARDHALUN of the people (26:111) and from the "most abject of (them)" -- ARADHILUNA (11:27). It is obvious from Noah's response that his adversaries did not object to the lower-class, ethnic or socio-economic status of his followers. (Tabari and other early Muslim exegetes would have mentioned these reasons, had it been so). Noah's

adversaries were referring, apparently, to the believers' hooliganism and past questionable character; they were objecting to their sub-standard personal character. They saw some of Noah's followers as uncouth hoodlums -- **ARADHIL**. (The Meccans, as we will see, had similar observations about Muhammad's followers.) Noah's response was evasive and crafty. Noah needed the help of these disreputable characters (as his adversaries saw them) for the fulfillment of his mission. He remarked:

What knowledge have I of what they have been doing? Their account falls only upon my Lord, were you but aware. I would not drive away the believers; I am not but a plain warner (Q26:111-5. Also see 11:29-30 cf. T,19:90-1).

Thus, Muslims learn that concern for the dubious social image of the believers and for their infamous past is unessential. Noah's methods of preaching which ignored social etiquette, his insulting and sabotaging attitude toward the deities of his people and his discomfiting and quarrelsome engagements are mentioned approvingly. There is no appreciation for the people's expression of their irritation resulting from Noah's argumentative preaching and from his repetitious warning of Divine chastisement. It is rather Noah's strong language and incriminating response to the nonbelievers' polite protests which is applauded by the believers.

They said, 'Noah, thou has disputed with us and make much disputation with us. Then bring us that thou promisest us, if thou speakest truly.' He said 'God will bring you it if He will; you cannot frustrate Him. And my sincere council will not profit you... if God desires to pervert you (Q11:32-4).

During the people's solemn occasion of worship, Noah used to sneak into their assemblies praying silently to God to grant him victory over them.

He pushed them until he stood in their midst and, as they were about to bow down before the idols, put his fingers in his ears and cried out, "O people, I have come to you with advice from your Lord: I call upon you to worship and obey him!" As his voice pierced the hearing of all from east to west, the idols toppled from their pedestals... (K:94).

Apparently, the people ignored the nuisance, thinking Noah was possessed

by some evil spirit and gave him time to come to his senses and behave properly (Q23:25). Noah continued his Islamic sabotage until the people reacted more strongly. However, the purpose of our sources is to appreciate Noah's persistence and the reported suffering he incurred for the sake of Islam; there is no appreciation for the nonbelievers' show of toleration. Rather

By night Noah would stand before the idols and cry out at the top of his voice, saying, "O people, say that there is no god but God and that I, Noah, am God's Prophet and apostle. Leave your idolatry!" And the idols would topple over on their heads. Thereupon the people would come and beat Noah...⁴

When the situation reaches such a point, something miraculous should happen from an Islamic point of view. Either the Prophet and the faithful should be able to wage jihad and overwhelm the world of nonbelievers, or nonbelievers should be punished by other Divine means. Noah's story was not to teach forgiveness, nonviolence and toleration to the believers. Instead, the nonbelievers must confront a sacred rage.

Then the earth set up a great clamor before the Lord, saying, "My God, what makes thee tolerate such corrupt people to walk upon me, to eat the fruits of thy trees, and to worship other than thee?" The birds and beasts also said, "Our god, were thou to command us, we would pluck them out and destroy them!" And every living thing cried out to the Lord in complaint of their haughtiness, disbelief and tyranny. And Noah called on his Lord to destroy them (K:97).

No peaceful cooperation with nonbelievers and no comforts to them were to be allowed. All nature went on strike against the nonbelievers: "neither would the cocks crow for them nor would the doves brood on their eggs" (ibid). Also as punishment, God rendered the nonbelieving women sterile so that they were no more able to bear children -- **WA A'QAM ALLAH ARHAM AN-NISA, FA LA YULAD LAHUM** (TT-U,1:126). The believers were to see more of the nonbelievers' sufferings during the Deluge - and rejoice - before their final annihilation. We know of Noah's vengeful and frenzied prayer (Q71:5-28). Like our Pakistani Muslim, Noah wanted the complete "ruin" of the world beyond Islam. "My Lord, leave not upon the earth of the unbelievers even one," our old wrathful Prophet said. The Almighty acted

promptly and accordingly.

They cried to him lies; so We delivered him, and those with him, in the Ark and We drowned those who cried lies to our signs; assuredly they were a blind people (Q7:64). But they cried lies; so We delivered him, and those with him, in the Ark, and We appointed them as viceroys, and We drowned those who cried lies to Our signs; then behold how was the end of them that were warned (Q10:73). [After telling the story in detail of the rejection of Noah by the people and of their consequent annihilation by the universal Deluge, the Almighty exclaims:] 'Away with the people of the evildoers!' (11:25-49). So the Flood seized them while they were evildoers (29:14). Then We opened the gates of heaven unto water torrential, and made the earth to gush with fountains, and the waters met for a matter decreed. And We bore him upon a well-planked vessel, well-caulked, running before Our eyes - a recompense for him who denied. And We left it for a sign. Is there any that will remember? How then were My chastisement and My warning? (54:9-16). And because of their transgressions they were drowned and admitted to the Fire (71:25).

Muslims read further in Tradition, with satisfaction, that it was a universal holocaust; all the descendants of Qabil, i.e., all non-Muslims of the time, were drowned -- FA GHARIQ BANU QABIL KULLUHUM (TT-U,1:130). None but Noah's faithful followers - his family and the progeny of Shith - survived the Deluge. The world was to be repopulated only by Noah's descendants -- FA'N-NAS KULLU- HUM MIN DHURRIYAT NUH (TT-U,1:129,132, passim).

The Deluge.

The Deluge was God's justified response to the people's rejection of His Messenger and creed, Islam; it symbolized jihād, holy war, against the nonbeliever - perhaps the most awesome the Almighty and the believers could imagine: the whole world was drowned for their sin of rejecting Islam.

Before it happened, Noah was asked by God to build the Ark under His direct supervision and embark on it along with the eighty or so believers; this was an act of segregating the believers and of preparing for hijra, migrating from the land of nonbelievers, anticipating its conquest or destruction. Reconciliation with un-Islam and peaceful coexistence with the nonbelievers were not to be considered by the Islamic Messenger of God.

However, Noah requested God to postpone the Deluge - for a different purpose: to perform pilgrimage to Mecca before the world was destroyed. The Almighty granted the request:

When Noah completed the pilgrimage rites, he turned and saw Adam's kiln to the right of the Kaba and asked God if it could be moved to his house. God told the angels to carry it to Noah's house, which was then where the mosque of Kufa stands now (K:99- 100).

It was perhaps during this pilgrimage to Mecca that Noah also took Adam's coffin in the Ark during the Deluge which Noah used as a barrier to segregate, according to Islamic norms, the women of his party from men --
WA HAMAL MAAHU JASAD ADAM, FA JAALA-HU HAJIZ-AN BAYN AN-NISA WA'R RIJAL
 (TT-U,1:128).

During the preparation of the Ark under God's direct guidance (Q11:37)
 Noah

sawed wood into planks and pegs, on each of which was the name of one of the Prophets, and they shone like the stars, except for the one with the name of Muhammad, which shone as brightly as the sun and the moon together (K:98).

The Deluge continued for six months to be sure no non-Muslim anywhere on the earth could survive, as Noah had desired (Q71:26). The Ark floated around the world. At one point, however, it could not enter a certain circle; the circle happened to be right above the space where the Kaba at Mecca was built. It was too sacred for God to allow the Ark to pass above the empty space where the Kaba had stood; the Kaba that Adam (and Shith) had built, along with the Black Stone and other sacred contents, was lifted to Heaven by God. However, the Ark performed the Islamic rite of circumambulation, **TAWAF**, around the circle honoring the sacred space.⁵ Noah and the faithful in the Ark are also reported to have performed Islamic fasting, **SAWM**.

In the context of the Deluge the believers are told that the demands of faith are above any humanitarian concerns. Noah prayed for his nonbelieving son's rescue, but was told sternly by God that the non-Muslim

son belonged no more to the Prophet's family; he was excommunicated and drowned. Noah and the faithful were warned against showing any sympathy for the nonbelieving son; he was a **KAFIR**, a nonbeliever - a heathen -- **WA KAN KAFIR-AN** (Q11:46 cf. T,12; TT-U,1:126-7). No mercy was shown to the wife of Noah who had joined the Prophet's adversaries in calling him insane, **MAJNUN**; she was drowned and sent to Hell (Q66:10; T,28:169). In order to emphasize the point, the Prophet Muhammad used to tell the story of a heathen woman's child whom the mother loved very much -- **KANAT TUHIBBUHU HUBB-AN SHADID-AN** -- and wanted in vain to save him from drowning during the Deluge. God's wrath against the nonbelieving people of Noah was too powerful to allow mercy toward the apparently innocent child -- **ANN RASUL ALLAH QAL LAU RAHIM ALLAH AHAD-AN MIN QAWM NUH LA-RAHIM UMM AS-SABIY** (TT-U,1:123-4). The Prophet Muhammad was not only justifying the Islamic Divine concept of world-wide collective punishment, but was also telling believers that on such occasions an expectation of leniency in favor of even innocent children of the nonbelievers was nonsense. Another Islamic rationale for such ruthlessness was already provided by the Prophet Noah:

My Lord, leave not upon the earth of the unbelievers even one. Surely if Thou leavest them, they will lead Thy servants astray, and will beget none but unbelieving libertines (Q71:26-7).

Once the believers are convinced that children are destined to become libertines, i.e., non-Muslims, their annihilation is justified; there is no need for a believer to show mercy toward such would-be-libertine children.

The Quran and higher Tradition have paved the way for the lesser Tradition to depict the sufferings of the nonbelievers sadistically. As Q11:36-7 tells, God told Noah not to care about the sufferings and destruction of the nonbelievers because He had "known from all time, a thousand years before creating heaven and earth, that (He) would destroy the earth by flood" (K:98) Any show of mercy would be an intervention

against the Divine scheme. An ideal believer is to rejoice in the nonbelievers' agonies. During the Deluge

The devils had hidden themselves inside idols and seduced the people by speaking with the idols' tongues. They began to crawl out when they saw the deluge coming but the angels smote them with their wings and prevented them from escaping so that they drowned along with the idols (K:102). Then the Ark passed on. Whenever it stopped it would say, "This is such and such..." then headed back to the region of Noah's people. When it stopped it said [with obvious pleasure], "O Prophet of God, do you not hear the rattling of chains on the neck, of your people?" (K:103; brackets added). Noah opened the doors in the Ark, looked at the earth and saw that it was white. He asked God what the whiteness was and was told, "It is the bones of your people who denied me" (K:104). [Obviously, for a Muslim it was not a demonstration of sadism by God and Noah; it was imitable sacred rage.]

Ironically, our Great Satan, Iblis, survived the Deluge. It was perhaps necessary to save Satan in order to re-divide the future world into Dar al-Islam and Dar al-Harb. The Great Deluder, the Enemy of God and Muslims, however, is shown to have entered the Ark through an artifice outwitting the Messenger of God. Noah was told by God to take two of every species aboard the Ark. He found the donkey slow in going aboard; Satan, whom Noah could not see, was hanging onto its tail. Noah was outraged by the apparent hesitation of the donkey and called out impatiently, "Get in even if Satan is with you" -- **UDKHUL WA IN KAN ASH-SHAYTAN MAAK**. Satan loosened his grip on the animal's tail and entered the Ark along with the donkey. Noah was surprised and asked Satan who let him in. (Apparently, the Almighty had forgotten to reveal to Noah that He had promised Satan's survival as long as humans lived on the earth. For his survival, the Great Deluder had to depend on a less divine promise.) Satan reminded Noah of the words just uttered. Though Noah had spoken idiomatically and, as Tabari tells us, it was just a slip of tongue -- **KALIMAT ZALLAT AN LISANIHI** -- he had to keep his words. [By concocting this rationale to help the Devil escape the destruction, seemingly, Tabari or his sources had also forgotten that according to Islamic sacred historiography Satan was promised survival by God until the Last Day.] So Satan was allowed to sit at the Ark's tiller (TT-U,1:126-7; K:101). The

Enemy of God was not to be allowed any comfort beyond mere survival.

After the Deluge.

After the Deluge subsided Noah found the Ark rested at Mt. Judi; the nearby region, Al-Jazira, became the first place of settlement.⁶ For each of the eighty faithful a house was built and thus the new settlement was called **SUQ ATH-THAMANIN**, "The Street or Lane of the Eighty." After the population reached one hundred thousand, they moved eastward building a city called by Ibn Sad **MAALNUR** and by Tabari (Tarikh) **MALUN**, and southward where they built Babylon.

SAM, **HAM** and **YAFITH**, three of Noah's five sons, survived the Deluge; **KANAN** was drowned as a nonbeliever and **ABIR** was dead beforehand. After the Deluge Noah married at **MAALNUR** a Qabilian (sic) woman who bore him a fourth surviving son, **BUNAZAR** (TT-1,1:208). In Ibn Sad this fourth son is named **YUNATAN** (IS,1/1:18). Later, we are told that some of Noah's sons married Qabilian women, though we were told before that none but Noah's believing sons and some faithful descendants of Shith could survive the Deluge.⁷ Noah divided the world among his four sons, Sam, Ham, Yafith and Bunazar (Yunatan). The lines of division eventually set the boundaries between belief and disbelief, i.e., Islam and un-Islam. Believers and nonbelievers were not to live together; they had to be separated and maintain this segregation by force -- **WA QASAD KULL FARIQ MIN HAULA... ARD-AN, FA SAKANUHA WA DAFU GHAYRAHUM ANHA** (TT-1,1:142). Obviously, these **GHAYR**, "others" who were **DUFU**, "fended off", were nonbelievers. Sacred Islamic historiography seems to be less interested in maintaining a united universal Islamic society and more interested in seeing the world divided into domains of believers and nonbelievers. This gives an opportunity to materialize believers' images and treatment of nonbelievers.

The apparently predestined division was also according to the Prophet Noah's wishes. Before leaving the Ark, Noah had prayed to God to raise all future Prophets and Apostles from the descendants of Sam. The

offspring of other sons had to be nonbelievers or inferior or both. The impatient Ham was easy to deal with; violating the continence ordered by the Prophet, Ham had carnal relations with his own wife. Noah cursed him and prayed to God to make the color of Ham's descendants black as punishment (TT-1,1:188). Noah also cursed Ham's offspring to be the slaves of the progeny of Sam and Yafith (ibid:204-5). Ham's impatience proved to be so costly for his descendants. The children of Yafith, Noah cursed to become JABABIRAH, "tyrants," i.e., nonbelieving rulers (ibid). Later we find growing intermarriages between the progeny of Ham and Yafith, ancestors of the two inferior-nonbelieving groups. Up to the time of Abraham most of the nonbelieving rulers -- **FARAANAH WA JABABIRAH** -- "Pharaohs and tyrants," and most of heathen nations are reported to be the progeny of Yafith and Ham.

Noah's division of the post-Deluge world reflected his preferences. To Sam and his posterity went the best central zone of the earth -- **SURRAT AL-ARD** -- "the navel of the earth." In Muslim geography, it is the region between the Nile, Euphrates-Tigris and Oxus-Jaxartes: the present Muslim Near East, roughly. To Ham and his progeny fell the "Southern-cum-Western zone," apparently all of Africa (excepting Egypt east of the Nile), southern India and the coastal regions of west Asia. To Yafith and his children was awarded the "northern Zone" -- **MAJRA ASH-SHAMAL** -- which seems to encompass all the regions north of the Muslim empire during the ninth and early tenth century. Bunazar or Yunatan and his children were awarded the "East," which seems to denote China and the Far East in general.⁸

Noah had appointed Sam his **WASIY**, his successor as the spiritual-political head of the community of believers. Sam lived in Mecca; thus it was the center of the Dar al-Islam during his lifetime. In response to Noah's prayer God awarded Sam's descendants Prophethood, nobility and a tawny white color which seems to be preferable and the most desirable. Later the **MULK**, "kingdom," is also assigned to the Samites.

The Prophet Muhammad would eventually emerge from the progeny of Sam. This is what the historiography of Ibn Sad, Tabari and of other Islamic sources aims at.

The children of Ham, as cursed by Noah, remained black with curly hair -- ASWAD, JA'D ASH-SHA'R and are depicted as morally inferior. Ham's complexion had turned instantly black after Noah had cursed him (K:105).
Ham's wife

conceived a black boy and girl. Ham despised them and said to his wife, "they are not mine!" "They are yours!" said his wife "for the curse of your father is upon us." After that he did not approach her until the children had grown, when he again lay with her, and she bore two more black children, male and female. Ham knew that they were his, therefore he left his wife and fled. [He was so embarrassed to have black children.] When the first two children grew up they went out in search of their father; but when they reached a village by the edge of the sea, they stayed there. God sent desire to the boy so that he lay with his sister, and she conceived... Then she gave birth to her brother's children, a black boy and a girl... The other two children set out in search of their brother and sister... Then they joined the other two along with their own two children... each brother lay with his sister, begetting black male and female children until they multiplied and spread along the shore. Among them are the Nubians, Negroes, the Berbers, the Sindhis, the Indians and all the blacks: they are the children of Ham (K:107-8; brackets added).⁹

Thus Islamic sacred historiography portrays all 'black' peoples including the Berbers, Sindhis and Indians as indecent immoral bastards. As a result of some of Ham's children's service and obedience to Noah, the old man showed some compassion and prayed for the good health and abundance of food for some of their progeny and for the demonstration of kindness from the progeny of Sam and Yafith to their Hamite slaves (TT-U,1:141; 1S,1:44).

Reddish color -- AL-HUMRA/ASH-SHUQRA is assigned to the posterity of Yafith. As reflected by our sources' tone it does not seem to be a desirable skin color; as if to say the descendants of Yafith were "rednecks." Though some earlier Tradition reports predestine the Yafithites as rulers, they are gradually demoted and they are replaced as kings and rulers by the children of Sam.

Another series of reports reinforces Muslim positive images of the past

destined believers and Muslim negative images of perceived nonbelievers of the past and of their lands. Within the family of Sam Muslims and their lands in general and Arabs in particular emerge as the best. The Prophet Muhammad's understanding of ethnography and anthropology were simple and straightforward; he thought Sam was the ancestor of the Arabs; "the Negroes" -- **AL-HABASH** were the progeny of Ham; and the RUM, i.e., the Greeks and Romans, the Turks, the Gog and Magog were descendants of Yafith (IS,1/1:18; TT -1,1:202-3). The Gog and Magog -- **AL-YAJUJ WA'L - MAJUJ** remain somewhat mysterious in traditional Muslim sources which make them re-emerge as an evil force in the Last Days (see A.J. Wensinck, "Yadjudj wa Madjudj," El,4:1142). For curious imaginative readers, by Yajuj and Majuj, our sources seem to allude to the "North-Eastern" particularly Central Asian, Mongoloid and Chinese peoples (see ibid; also see T on Q21:96).

Apparently, with the expansion of Islam toward Iran, India, central Asia, southern parts of the Byzantine empire and north Africa, early Islamic Tradition made some adjustments in Muslim ethnographical-anthropological theories. These revised concepts were destined to permeate and persist in Muslim literature and thought for ages. These adjustments have followed three lines: 1) to the extent possible, descent from Sam is ascribed to most of the peoples who lived within the boundaries of the tenth-century Muslim domain. They include some of the RUM and the Turks, apparently those who were conquered by Islam by the tenth century. Following the Quranic treatment of the Jews as the Children of Israel (**BANU ISRAIL**) who obviously descended from the past Islamic Prophets, they were awarded descent from Sam. 2) With the conversion, subordination and enslavement of a growing number of black peoples, particularly Africans, the growth of Islamic uncle-Tomism becomes obvious in our sources. 3) the Yafithites, those in the northwest and their **IQLIM**, region, emerge as the worst in Muslim eyes. Thanks, perhaps, to the Byzantine-Carolingian resistance which was to be associated,

obviously, with "redneckness," **HUMRAH- SHUQRAH**, as well as Christianity.

A Tradition report asserts: the Arabs, the Persians and the Rum are the descendants of Sam. The Tradition adds definitively "there is good in all of them" -- **FI KULL HAULAI KHAYR**. They are the best and most excellent (IS,1/1:18; TT ,1:210). "The Turks, the Slavs -- **SAQALIBA** and the Gog and Magog" the report adds "are the descendants of Yafith and there is not good in any one of them (all are evil)" -- **LAYS FI WAHID MIN HAULAI KHAYR**. The Copts, the Blacks and the Berbers are mentioned by the same report, with no further comment, as the descendants of Ham. A succeeding report maintains, with no further comment, that all blacks with curly hair are Hamites. This report ascribes big ugly faces and small eyes to the Yafithites. All of the descendants of Sam have pretty faces and beautiful hair, it is asserted -- **KULL-UN HASAN AL-WAJH, HASAN ASH-SHA'R** (TT-1,1:210). The 'handsome tawny white' world of the Samites expands further. The Almighty in Person had told Moses that his people (the Jews), the people of al-Jazirah, the people of al-Al, the Arabs, the Persians, the Nabtaeans, the peoples of India, Sind and Bund (Baluchistan?) are the descendants of Sam (IS,1/1:18; TT-U,1:143). We may speculate that the Almighty's, i.e. later Muslim anthropologists', change of mind about the last three regions was influenced by the Muslim occupation of Baluchistan and Indus River Valley during the 8th century and after, and by their consequent awareness about the presence of the so-called Aryans and Bactrians in north India with a fairer color than those of Daravidians in south India with whom the Arabs through their sea-trade linkis were more familiar before Islam's expansion to the subcontinent. The Africans were, perhaps, too black with curly hair, and the Berbers (like the Kurds) too problematic to have the honor; they remained as the progeny of Ham. Indians, Sindis and the inhabitants of the (south Asio-African?) and coastal areas of "the East and West" are occasionally relegated to the Hamites (TT-1,1:205). Perhaps they were too black to be absorbed in the

melting pot of the 'pure' tawny white Samites (Semites).

In conclusion, we mention a comparatively more detailed version of the world supposedly left by the children of Noah. This report, ascribed to Ibn Abbas, the dean of Muslim scholars, **AHL AL-ILM**, seems to have continued in later ages to influence Islamic anthropology, historiography and geography and, consequently, Muslim images and treatment of the world.¹⁰

Noah married a woman from the children of Qabil who bore him a son whom he named Bunazar. Bunazar was born in a city in the East called Malun. The children of Sam moved to **MAJDAL**, the navel (center) of the earth -- **SURRAT AL-ARD**. It lies between **SATIDAMA** and the ocean and between Yaman and Syria. Allah bestowed on them Prophethood, the Book, beauty and tawny white color. And the children of Ham went to the Southern zone -- **MAJRA AL-JUNUB** -- and to that of **AD-DABUR** (waspland?) called **AD-DARUM**; Allah gave them little (no) tawny white color but populated and flourished their lands and skies [with abundance of rain] and took away plague and pestilence from them and created in their lands tamarisk, arak, ushar (laurel trees?), and palm trees, and paraded the sun and the moon in their skies. The children of Yafith settled in **SAFFUN**(?) rocky places in the Northern zone, the target of Northern-cum-Eastern winds; they are "rednecks" in color. Allah has emptied their sky. None of the seven moving stars passes from above them because they have fallen under Ursa Minor and Ursa Major (the Bear), the Capricorn and two Pointers; they are doomed to suffer from plague and pestilence (TT- 1,1:208; cf. IS,1/1:19-20).

The End of an Era

After dealing out different regions and attributes to the progeny of the four sons of Noah, Islamic sources do not concern themselves much with the descendants and the allotted regions of Ham, Yafith and Bunazar. It is the offspring and land of Sam which remain as centers of attention. The descendants of Bunazar, the East, along with the Eastern City, **MAALNUR**, and the Eastern people are soon forgotten completely and left in oblivion. The progeny of Ham and Yafith emerge continuously only as pharaohs and **JABABIRAH**, nonbelieving rulers, and as heathen nations to play the role of villains. Within the domain of the children of Sam, however, a sifting process is carried out. The progeny of Sam, shown to have inhabited the present Muslim Middle East, particularly the Arabian peninsula, succumbed repeatedly to disbelief, justifying the emergence of Messengers of God in order to bring the people back to the fold of Islam.

The continuously differentiating and sifting Muslim historiography basically aims at moving toward the emergence of the Prophet Muhammad and his people to project them as the best of the progeny of Sam: Muhammad was to be the final and perfect Messenger -- **KHATAM AL- ANBIYA, SAYYID AL-MURSALIN** -- and his followers, the best of the peoples -- **KHAYR UMMAH**.

Sam had six sons, but no daughters, apparently. Three of the sons, Arfakhshad, Lawidh and Iram are most- discussed in Tabari. "Arfakhshad was the progenitor of the Prophets, Messengers and of the best of the people including all Arabs and also of the Pharaohs of Egypt" -- **WALAD ARFAKSHAD AL-ANBIYA WA'R-RUSUL WA KHIYAR AN-NAS, WA'L-ARAB KULLAHA WA'L-FARAANAH BI MISR** (TT-U,141). Most of the peoples of Arabia, Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Egypt (including their rulers) are also shown to be the descendants of the other two sons of Noah: Lawidh and Iram. Iram was headquartered at Mecca -- **KAN MAQAMUHU MAKKAH** (ibid:141, passim). Most probably it is about the children of Sam when we are told that (up to a certain time) all of them continued to follow Islam, **KULL HAULAI KAN ALA'L-ISLAM** (ibid). However, the crisis of un-Islam finally engulfed them; we are told two things which earned them God's wrath: idolatry and self-dependence - a kind of humanistic and existentialist approach toward the solution of human problems. This approach was reflected in their engagement in worldly activities.

The offspring of Sam were all Muslims until Namrud, a descendant of Ham and Yafith became their King at Babil (Babylon) (ibid:143). Namrud called them to worship idols and graven images; they did. They spoke one language: **SURYANI**, Syriac (which had made them a united people). Now, as a curse, God confused their language: they started overnight speaking strange languages; God made it so they could not understand one another's language. However in this context we are told that God taught many of them the Arabic language -- **FA FAHHAMAHUM ALLAH AL- ARABIYAH**. This is to tell the believers that the Almighty had a special interest in - and concern for - the sacred language of Islam.

The downfall of Sam's descendants is also related to their growing population and dependence on their man-power and human expertise, (rather than on God). They no longer looked for Divine guidance and Divine guarantees for the management of their affairs and for their security. We know that even the Prophet Noah had to build the Ark under the Almighty's direct supervision -- **BI A'YUNINA**. The descendants of Sam had forgotten that Noah, just before his death, had advised his **WASIY**, the spiritual-political successor, Sam, to shun two things: polytheism and a reliance on anything other than God (K:106). Relating God's wrath to the growing populace and its prosperity, Tabari states that the descendants of Sam had increased in number and multiplied their property and, thus, had become wicked -- **WA KANU QAD KATHARU BIHA WA RABALU (TT-U,1:140)**. Thus catastrophe and God's wrath fell on them and they were annihilated because of the sin they had committed -- **FA ASABAT-HUM MIN ALLAH... NAQAMAT MIN MASIYAT-IN ASABUHA** (ibid). We are not told, as usual, of their special sins other than alleged idolatry, their increased population and their prosperity. The following report, incorporated by Tabari, approvingly makes a Muslim understanding of the causes of the downfall of the children of Sam more clear; it was their self-reliance which brought God's punishment. They should have depended on the Almighty for their protection rather than take human actions and plan their own future. After the Deluge

when the number of the people increased, they began to build a city to contain them in it so that they do not disperse... and they built a high dam to protect them from the flood in case it happened again, but the Almighty and Exalted God decided to frustrate their efforts, repudiate their intentions and teach them that might and power belonged only to Him; so he dispersed them, shattered their union, scattered their assembly and diversified their languages.¹¹.

Discussion and Conclusions

Noah was among those Islamic Prophets who were rejected by all but a few of their peoples. Noah did not wage jihad against them because he could not do so; the Almighty, as desired by Noah, took direct action.

Thus it is not the apparent failure of such Prophets that engages Muslim thoughts; rather it is the reassuring belief (which dominates Muslim consciousness) that those in the past who rejected the Prophets' creed were finally destroyed. They had to be destroyed. Muslims are also told that on such occasions the faithful were always protected by God. The nonbelievers' rejection of Islam, as it happened during Noah's time, need not disappoint the believers. In case they do not have the means to combat and overwhelm the heathen, Muslims may rest assured that God will eventually declare war by other means annihilating the nonbelievers.

The story of Noah and his sons is a means to reinforce Muslim belief in the authenticity and superiority of the Prophet Muhammad, Islam, Islamic rituals and sacred places. The believers are told that Noah was appointed Prophet by the same God who chose Muhammad as His last Messenger and that Noah preached Islam, God's favorite creed. Showing Muhammad's name on a peg of the Ark "which shone as brightly as the sun and the moon together" tells the believers that his emergence and superiority were foretold. By showing Noah performing the pilgrimage to Mecca, observing a fast, and segregating men from women, Muslims learn of the antiquity of Islamic rites and of the Kaba's sacredness to God's chosen people of all times. It is particularly Mecca along with the Kaba, which are mentioned repeatedly as the most sacred places. During the most devastating Flood, only the Kaba and related sacred elements were protected miraculously. The most-discussed of Sam's descendants are those who settled in Arabia (TT-U,1:140-7). Sam and his son Iram resided at Mecca. Arabic is mentioned as God's favorite language. Jerusalem is mentioned only once wherein Noah put Adam's coffer to rest after the Flood. The allotment of what is now, roughly, the Muslim Near East to Noah's most favored son, Sam, enhances the sacred nature of the region in the Muslim mind. As the believing descendants of Sam, Muslims consider themselves the most entitled to occupy the region.

The wrongs of the people confronted by Noah are to be loathed by the

believers of all times. The concerns and interests of Noah and his divinely-guided sons along with their lack of concern about other phenomena are to be internalized accordingly by the Muslims. Muslims find that the rise of a great Islamic Prophet was brought on by a wrong faith, idolatry, and by the self-reliance and enthusiasm for worldly life. The same reasons are blamed for the end of the post-Deluge Islamic era requiring the appearance of other Messengers of God. In sum, the nonbelieving societies were bad for a Muslim because they worshipped idols and were worldly. The nonbelievers' interest in this impermanent and transient world is condemned and the believers are advised to make the blessings of the Hereafter their focus of attention (Q17:16- 7). Thus, materialistic and this-worldly tendencies are quoted with unbelief. No worldly concerns interested Noah and his faithful progeny. It is of no interest for a Muslim to look for a genuine worldly grievance justifying Prophetic intervention. That the people of Noah were happy and satisfied with what they had does not convince a believer that the intervention of the Prophet was apparently unnecessary. They were a "blind people." It was only through a Messenger of God that the people should have sought Divine guidance. By rejecting the Prophet's claim of having a unique link to God, the people were following Satan. The Quran does tell the believers about the nonbelievers' objection to Noah's claim of having a unique link to God through revelation; they refused to acknowledge the Prophet's superiority on this basis of his unprovable claims. However, no effort is made to address such objection seriously. The nonbelievers' rationalistic criticism of the Prophet's claim is mentioned only to be ridiculed and ignored. A Muslim mind is thus programmed to reject similar objections to the Prophet Muhammad's claim of having the final exclusive link to the Almighty. Noah and other Islamic Prophets' response to such questions was to refer to God's absolute authority; it was up to Him to select whomsoever He chose as His Messengers. The authenticity of Islamic Prophets' claims is taken for granted. Any doubt of this is

tantamount to apostasy.

A Muslim reading of the story of Noah does not encourage a policy of peaceful coexistence and cooperation between Muslims and non-Muslims, nor does it leave room for reconciliation short of complete surrender to the creed and authority of Islamic Prophets. As Noah did during his long life, all believers must assert the superiority of their creed and work for its domination. The sunnah of Noah inspires Muslims to "despise" other religions and use reviling language about the nonbelievers; Noah called them "perverts" (Q11:34). For the fulfillment of the mission, the believers may go beyond what may be perceived by the nonbelievers as limits of decency, and may also engage in what may be seen by others as covert or overt acts of sabotage and nuisance. Noah's sneaking into the places nonbelievers worshipped, his making a hue and cry therein and causing the toppling over of what they venerated are mentioned as exemplary behavior. The believers' disreputable past and their present questionable behavior toward nonbelievers are to be ignored. My believers, right or wrong!

Noah's story reinforces a tendency of self-righteous isolationism among Muslims leading to complete segregation from non-Muslims, particularly when the believers find themselves unable to transform the society into a Dar al-Islam. Noah "hated to be near them [nonbelievers] and withdrew into the wilderness. He did not mingle with them or go among them during their festival..." (K:93). The faithfuls' boarding the Ark was also a gesture of self-righteous isolation from the community of nonbelievers; its moving away and the eventual settlement of the believers elsewhere was an act of hijra (migration) from a Dar al-Harb. The post-Deluge demarcation of boundaries between believing descendants of Sam and the predestined disbelieving progeny of Noah's other sons also confirms the idea of segregation between Muslims and non-Muslims. It also explains the legacy of disinterest in non-Muslim lands and peoples. After assigning poor, execrable, and mysterious lands to the Bunazarites, Hamites and

Yafithites, Tabari leaves them in oblivion. They appear occasionally in the historical picture only when they are needed as foils for the Islamic heroes of the past or when their female descendants are needed for the harem of some important Samites who are mostly shown to have no daughters. Sam was married to a Qabilian woman; his sons and grandsons to the female offspring of Yafith and Ham. Otherwise it is the progeny of Sam and their lands, that engage the attention of traditional historiography. This might provide an answer to the question of why Muslim historians and geographers in general, have remained unconcerned with the world beyond Islam.¹²

Isolation and segregation did not mean recognition, though grudgingly, of the nonbelievers' right to exist. It symbolized a state of cold war. After migration, hijra, it had to be followed by hot war, jihad, carried out either by the believers or directly by the Almighty. The nonbelievers who could neither be converted nor subjugated had to be annihilated. The Deluge served the purpose. The believers must demonstrate a tough, ruthless attitude toward the nonbelievers. In Noah's story, the punishment and destruction of the nonbelievers are described with no regret or expression of mercy for the victims. The sufferings of the nonbelievers during the Deluge are described with a sense of rejoicing and satisfaction (Q11:25-49; 54:9-16). During the deluge God gave Noah joy by letting him hear "the rattling of the chains on the necks of (nonbelievers)" (K:103-4). The idea, perhaps, is that the angels had put chains on these drowning nonbelievers' necks so that they could not float or swim or escape. It also implies that while being devastated by the Flood, the nonbelievers were further tortured by various means - like putting chains on their necks. After the Deluge subsided, God showed Noah, obviously for enjoyment, "the whiteness of the bones of (nonbelievers)" which had covered the whole earth (ibid). Would Hitler - had he won the war - take his Nazi disciples for a tour of Auschwitz to show them boastfully the remains of his victims? We do not know. The

Islamic God, however, as Kisai (p. 103) tells us, took His Messenger and the believers on such a tour. After the whole of humanity, except a few believers, was done away with, He exclaimed: "Away with the people of the evildoers" (11:44); "... behold how is the end of them" (10:73).

The Muslims must not express sympathy for the nonbelievers; their disbelief in Islam cuts off even the most natural bond. God "admonished" Noah for asking Him to save his son who was a nonbeliever. The Almighty told Noah that a nonbelieving son did no longer belong to the family. He was excommunicated and sentenced to die. Noah regretted his ignorance and asked for God's forgiveness (Q11:45-7). In their hatred of nonbelievers, the believers must imitate the attitude of other creatures of God; "the earth" pleaded to God not to tolerate such corrupt people to walk on (it). The birds and beasts also said, "Our God, were thou to command us, we would pluck them out and destroy them!" And every living thing cried out to the Lord in complaint of their haughtiness, disbelief and tyranny. And Noah called on his lord to destroy them (K:197).

The post-Deluge Islamic story of Noah and sons reinforces Muslim self-images and their images and treatment of the world along credal as well as certain racial and regional lines. The sexist orientations mentioned in the preceding section also continue in a subtle way. The ethnocentricity and color orientations of our sources become more articulated in this part of the Islamic story of the past, influencing the Muslim mind. Certain desired qualities and advantages are assigned to the progeny and the allotted region of a particular son, Sam. The descendants of the other sons, Ham, Yafith and Bunazar, and their perceived lands, are doomed to inferiority or left in oblivion. Criticism of such Divinely ordained racism and regionalism becomes difficult for the believers. Muslims are obliged to give credibility to the concept of the division of mankind on "racial" and regional lines, perceiving some to be Divinely (and as such, inherently) superior and the rest inferior.

All the Prophets and the best of the people, particularly the Arabs,

joined occasionally by the Persians and Turks, were predestined to be the progeny of Noah's most favored son and WASIY, Sam. They were also allotted nobility, the most favored and desired tawny white skin, beauty and finally the right to worldly rule and supremacy. Geographically, the zone of the earth bestowed upon them is perceived to be the best, SURRAT AL-ARD. It happens to be the Muslim Near East. Mecca in particular, and Arabia in general, maintained their spiritual and sometimes political centrality. The Prophet Muhammad finally emerged from the Arab progeny of Sam at Mecca in Arabia. Thus the concept of the superiority of the Arab branch of Sam's progeny and that of the Arab region of the Samite lands is fixed in Muslim consciousness.

As Divine and Prophetic punishment, a black skin, slavery and unbecoming behavior, such as incest are attributed to the children of Ham. We also find the emergence of JABABIRAH such as NAMRUD, the perceived rival of the Prophet Abraham, from the descendants of Ham. Whatever the historical reasons, the Prophet Noah's reported belated and calculated show of kindness to a number of black sons of Ham has left the possibility of occasional and selective uncle-Tomism. However, the clarity and abundance of reports pointing to the inferiority of a black skin based on God's will and His Messenger's curse do not allow the believers to restore complete equality between the perceived Hamites and Samites. A cursory study of medieval Muslim literature and perceptions as reflected in their traditions and folk-lore will indicate that despite the occasional patronization and lip-service to a few uncle Toms of Muslim history, a black skin has continued to represent inferiority, disgrace and loathsomeness. (See B. Lewis, "Race and Color in Islam," *idem*.)

As G. Vajda ("Ham," El²,3:104) has alluded to correctly, in the final four-fold division of humanity by Islamic sources the Yafithites emerge as the worst in the Muslim consciousness. They were destined to be JABABIRA and heathen nations. A third color, SHUQRA-HUMRAH, that of "rednecks" is attributed to them in order to establish their loathsomeness and

inferiority to the "tawny white handsome Samites." Compared to the Hamites, some of whom might become faithful servants of the Samites, "none of the Yafithites is good" -- **LAYS FI WAHID MIN HAULAI KHAYR** -- the believers are told. The lands allotted to the Yafithites are portrayed to be the worst: "Allah has emptied their land and intensified its coldness... they are doomed to suffer from plague and pestilence."

Who could be these wretched Yafithites for a Muslim reader of Ibn Sad and Tabari in the tenth century and after? In the beginning, perhaps, a reader would think of all the peoples and regions north of the tenth-century Muslim empire (or northeast of Muslim Spain) as Yafithites. They would include Europeans, Slavic, Khazar, Turkic and Mongoloid peoples. We may think of northwestern Yafithites, i.e., the Rum of the Byzantine empire and beyond northward, and the northeastern Yafithites, i.e. the Turkic and Mongoloid peoples of central Asia plus the so-called Gog and Magog. As the reader proceeds through the passages on Noah's descendants, the Tradition reports tend to convert most of the "northeastern Yafithites" into Samites - thanks to the extension of Islam by the tenth century to central Asia. The Gog and Magog change into mysterious creatures and join their Bunazarite cousins in oblivion. The result of these confusing and contradictory reports is an ambivalent attitude toward the northeastern Yafithites, i.e. the "ruddy-yellow races," which has persisted among those (the Arabs, the Arabized and Iranian Muslims) certain of their Samite blood!

On the other hand, this would leave the reader only with northwestern Yafithites, the Rum of the seventh-tenth centuries and the Slavs as the real Yafithites set in Europe. Traditions in Ibn Sad and Tabari ascribed to the Prophet Muhammad help the reader to think so. The Prophet called the Rum the descendants of Yafith, the Blacks of Ham and the Arabs of Sam. A tenth century Muslim knew well that Rum of the Prophet's time was mainly what we now call a Western or European power. The Byzantine Carolingian and European groups' resistance to Islam must have enhanced

the Yafithite nature of European **JABABIRAH**, 'tyrants,' and of their **HUMRAH-SHUQRAH**, 'redneck' masses.

Let this proposal be set forth: the worst of Noah's offspring, the **HUMRAH-SHUQRAH** Yafithites of the **MAJRA ASH- SHAMAL**, northern zone, are more likely to be associated in the Muslim mind with the peoples of the present North - those of European descent. Their equation with Christianity, their Medieval resistance to Islam, their Crusades, their perceived "heathen" ways and, finally, their domination of the Muslim world in modern times must have enhanced their image as the worst enemies of the heritage of Sam, Islam. Remember too that in most Muslim languages Europeans are referred to as "red," **HUMRAH**, with a negative connotation rather than white, **BID**. Hammal, a nineteenth century Baluch poet boasted of his dislike of **FARANGI** i.e. European women -- **JAN FARANGANI HAMMAL-A PASSUND NA BANT**. One of the many reasons for his abhorrence of European women was: "their kids look like piglets" -- **CHUKK-ISH CHO HUKK-I GULLUR-ANT**. Hammal was referring to the "piglet-like" blond -- **HUMRAH-SHUQRAH** color of our northwestern Yafithites. In this regard, however, the Muslim holy warriors of the past and their descendants have been more consistent than our Baluch purist with the inconsistencies of Islamic images of Qabilian-Yafithite heathens; their women folk continue to be welcome in Muslim harems.

ENDNOTESPart III: Belief In His Books And Messengers Endnotes

Section 3: THE ERA OF NOAH AND HIS SONS

¹I am uncertain whether the first Urdu couplet is from a poem by Naim Siddiqui, the member of the Central Committee (MARKAZI SHURA) of Islamic Party (JAMAAT-I-ISLAMI) of Pakistan, or by another Muslim fundamentalist poet of the Islamic Literary Circle (HALQA-I-ADAB-I-ISLAMI) attached to the JAMAAT. The poem was one of the collected Islamic poems published by the HALQA during the 1950s. The second couplet is from an Urdu poem by Faiz Ahmad Faiz. Faiz is a renowned contemporary poet-journalist of Pakistan. He also taught in some colleges in India and Pakistan. Ideologically, Faiz was affiliated with the secular-liberal-progressive circles of India and Pakistan. During the 1950s when our two poets composed the above two couplets Pakistan's ideological and constitutional fate was yet to be decided. The Islamic fundamentalist movement spearheaded by the JAMAAT-I-ISLAMI campaigned for the establishment of a centerist Islamic theocracy -- ISLAMI NIZAM AN-NIZAM AL-ISLAMI while the secular liberal progressive elements wanted to lead Pakistan towards federal parliamentary democracy. Both sides were uncertain about Pakistan's future. Our Muslim poet, reflecting the mood of the Islamic side, was, however, sure of his response to an un-Islamic Pakistan: he would set it afire.

Faiz, who dreamed of a secular democratic progressive Pakistan, was also complaining. [He wrote the poem while he was imprisoned for five years for his political activities]. Compared to our blustering Islamic poet, however, Faiz maintained his usual mellow tone. He simply grumbled in affectionate words about the uncertain and unkind mood of his beloved land. Contrary to the fury of the Muslim poet, our humanist Faiz was ready to sacrifice and suffer himself rather than put on fire the whole country which was rejecting his humanistic ideals.

²On Noah and sons see Q3:33-4 cf. TS,6:326-8; Q4:163-5 cf. TS,9:399-408; Q6:84 cf. TS,11:570; Q7:59-64 cf. TS,12:498-502; Q10:1-4 cf. T,11:141-5; Q11:25-49 cf. T,12:26-56; Q14:9-12 cf. T,13:187-92; Q17:3 cf. T,15:18-20, 57-9; Q21:76-7 cf. T,17:50; Q23:23-31 cf. T,18:16-8; Q25:37 cf. T,19:13; Q26:105-22 cf. T,19:90-2; Q29:14-5 cf. T,20:135-6; Q33:7-8; cf. T,21; Q37:75-83 cf. T,23:67-9; Q38:11-4 cf. T,23:129-31; Q40:5-6 cf. T,24:42-3; Q51:46 cf. T,27:6; Q53:52 cf. T,27:78-9; Q54:9-16; Q66:10 cf. T,28:169-71; Q69:11-2; Q71:1-28 cf. T,29:90-102; Bu,60:3, 96:18; AbH,2:169 sq 225; 1S,1/1:10-20, (IS-B,1:40-5); TT-U,1:179-232; TT-1,1:123-49; K:91-109; B. Heller, "Nuh," El¹,3:948-9; B. Joel, "Sam," El¹,4:120; M. Cohen, "Ham," El²,3:104. The Quran and Tabari's Tradition based exegeses in his Tafsir and Tarikh are the principal sources of information for our reconstruction of the era of Noah and sons. The Traditions quoted by Tabari are mostly ascribed to the Prophet Muhammad and his cousin, Ibn Abbas. Al-Kisai's further elaborations and the information provided by El agree with the general outlines provided by the Quran and Tradition reports.

³TS,11:513 passim. cf. Q6:84-8; also TS,3:68; TS,9:399-408 cf. Q4:163-5.

⁴K:97. Al-Kisai described how Noah was beaten almost to death, though he was always saved miraculously. This tradition of trying to convince the audience of the authenticity of the creed through the graphic description of the persecution of the believers, rather than by rational argument, becomes popular among Muslims during their conduct of discourse.

⁵ TT-U,1:128; for most of the above and following details see also T,12:26-56 and Tabari's other exegeses in conjunction with the aforementioned Quranic passages of this section.

⁶In Muslim geography Al-Jazirah denotes the northern part of the region situated between and across the Tigris and the Euphrates.

⁷Our Islamic sources are not scrupulous about such contradictions. Perhaps, it was more important not to ascribe daughters to the faithful. Males continue to be more desirable children than females in Muslim society. The Prophet Muhammad is reported to have grieved about his lack of surviving male children. It may also be speculated that having nonbelieving pretty Qabilian wives in the harem of the faithful symbolized their domination over the nonbelievers and the notion that believers deserved the best of this world including the beautiful women of nonbelievers. It is also implied that these beautiful Qabilians were converted to Islam before they entered the harem.

⁸For the assignment of different parts of the earth along with their perceived features and of various qualities to the above four groups of Noah's children see 1:188-210, esp. 188, 191-3, 204-5, 208, 210; IS,1/1:18-20; "Nuh," EL¹3:948-9; "Sam," EL¹,4:120; Ham," EL²,3:104.

⁹For persistent prejudice against black - particularly African black - color and 'race' in Islamic societies through ages see Bernard Lewis, "Race and Color in Islam", Encounter, London, Vol. 35, No. 2 (August 1970):18-36. With reference to Islamic history and Islamic sources, Lewis has correctly noted that "Even religious groups with what some would nowadays call radical and progressive ideals seem to have accepted the slavery of the black man as natural." Bernard Lewis's restrained treatment of the Quran and the Siunnah of the Prophet Muhammad concerning race and color is understandable. It may, however, create the wrong impression that the contents of the Quran, and the Prophet's own practice are entirely unrelated to the historical Muslim bias against black color and 'race'. After quoting the Quran 3:106 which says that the faces of believers "will become white" (as reward) and those of nonbelievers "will become black... (as) punishment for the unbelief" in the Hereafter, Lewis remarks that "no reference to black and white races is intended in this passage" (p. 33). Of course the Almighty did not intend to write a systematic essay on the issue of race and color. In any case, once Muslims hear God telling them in this and other Quranic passages (e.g., 16:58; 39:60; 43:17) that blackness of faces reflects Divine punishment it cannot but degrade black human skin in the eyes of believers.

As for the Prophet's treatment of African blacks, Bilal's example is projected to prove Muhammad's liberal attitude. This is, however, done beyond what facts permit. Bilal, a black slave of African origin, converted to Islam at Mecca during the Prophet's time. Bilal's Meccan master mistreated him for this conversion. Abu Bakr, a Companion of the Prophet, bought and freed Bilal. Though Bilal had suffered much more than many other Companions for Islam and accompanied the Prophet in most of his holy wars, his social and political status was never raised beyond that of an ordinary black freed slave. The Prophet assured Bilal that he would go to Paradise (e.g., Bu.19:17; 62:23; MU.44:108) - as all other believers are assured - but in this world Bilal remained no more than the Prophet's household servant, caterer and waiter (e.g., W:968,1015, 1017) watchman and orderly (e.g., 1.1:446, 517; W:944-8, 975, 890), errand boy and callboy (e.g., 1.1:681; W:334, 497, 645, 917; 1.1:681) and trusted harem-keeper (e.g., W:673; 1.1:515). Though the Prophet once called Bilal "nothing but the Devil" -- MA HADHA ILLA'SH-SHAYTAN (W:674), generally, he treated the pious servant kindly. Bilal was also the Prophet's MUADH-DHIN, one who performs ADHAN, the ritual calling aloud the believers for the five-time daily prayers. The position of a

MUADH-DHIN in Islamic societies is not coveted. **ADHAN** is usually performed by the most inferior member of the mosque's personnel. About the story that Bilal's desire to marry an Arab woman was refused by her family and that the Prophet, then, sent a personal message to the family recommending Bilal for the relationship, Lewis remarks that "the story is probably not authentic since it deals with a prejudice which does not seem to have existed in the Prophet's lifetime" (ibid:32). Such a sweeping statement needs evidence. It is perhaps the same story mentioned by Ibn Sad (IS-B,3:237). According to Ibn Sad, members of a certain clan, **BANU ABI'L-BUKAYR** went to the Prophet three times imploring the Prophet to find a husband for a certain woman of their clan. Twice, the Prophet proposed Bilal but they rejected. They accepted only after they approached the Prophet for a third time. Ibn Sad does not mention particulars of this woman for whom her clan was so desperately in search of a husband. Apparently, being not much in demand, she was dumped on our pious Bilal. We have another report about Bilal's brother who had to claim Arab pedigree in order to marry an Arab woman -- **INN AKH-AN LI-BILAL KAN YANTAMI ILA'L-ARAB WA YAZUM ANNAHU MINHUM KHATAB IMRAT-AN MIN AL-ARAB** (ibid).

As an evidence of the Prophet's "deploring prejudice" against the Black, Lewis mentions the phrase ascribed to the Prophet "I was sent to the red and black." Of course the Prophet wanted all to embrace his creed just like American plantation masters wanted their slaves also to be Christian. Had the Quran and Sunnah been unequivocally opposed to such prejudices, bias against black skin would not be so persistently rampant in Islamic societies - which Lewis has so succinctly documented. Throughout Islamic history, we know that for their alleged or real violations of the Quran and Sunnah thousands had to face death, ecommunication and **TAKFIR**, anathema. Had anti-black bias been such a sin, at least one of those many mentioned by Lewis would have been treated accordingly by the Sharia courts or the ulam for their anti-black utterances.

¹⁰In his "Race and Color in Islam," and The Muslim Discovery of Europe (p. 68), Bernard Lewis mentions the following report ascribed to Saïd al-Andalusi (1029-1070) of Toledo

For those who live furthest to the north, between the last of the seven climates and the limits of the inhabited world, the excessive distance of the sun in relation to the Zenith line makes the air cold and the atmosphere thick. their temperaments are therefore frigid, their humours raw, their bellies gross, their colour pale, their hair long and lank. Thus they lack keenness of understanding and clarity of intelligence, and are overcome by ignorance and dullness, lack of discernment, and stupidity. Such are the Slavs, the Bulgars, and their neighbours. For those peoples on the other hand who live near and beyond the equinoctial line to the limit of the inhabited world in the south, the long presence of the sun at the zenith makes the air hot and the atmosphere thin. Because of this their temperaments become hot and their humours fiery, their color black and their hair woolly. Thus they lack self-control and steadiness of mind and are overcome by fickleness, foolishness and ignorance. Such are the blacks, who live at the extremity of the land of Ethiopia, the Nubians, the Zanj and the like... ("Race and Color in Islam", idem:28).

Most probably, al-Andalusi was inspired by the earlier Traditions such as those in Ibn Sad we quoted.

¹¹**FALAMMA KATHUR AN-NAS BAD DHALIK MAA QURB AHDIHIM BI'T-T UFAN HAMMU BI BINA MADINAT TUJAMMIU-HUM FALA YATAFARRAQUN AW SARH-IN AL-IN YAHRUZU-HUM MIN AT-TUFAN IN KAN MARRAT-AN UKHRA FALA YAGHRUQUN. FA ARAD ALLAH AZZ WA JALL AN YUHIN AMRAHUM WA YAKHLUF ZANNAHUM WA YUALLIMAHUM ANN**

AL-HAWL WA'L-QUWWAT LAHU WA BADDADAHUM WA SHA ATA JAMAHUM WA FARRAQ
ALSINATAHUM (TT-1,1:210; TT-U,1:146).

¹²Such a question is raised and discussed, e.g., by Bernard Lewis in his
The Muslim Discovery of Europe (1982), p. 89 passim.

PART III: Belief In The Books And Messengers

Section 4: THE ERA OF HUD AND SALIH

The era of the Prophets Hud and Salih in traditional Islamic historiography follows the era of Noah and precedes the epoch-making age of Abraham. After dispersing Noah's progeny to various lands, our sources focus on the Arabian peninsula and its northern fringes. Related to this era, Islamic sources mention two peoples or nations, Ad and Thamud, and their remnants.¹ Hud, who confronted the Ad, and Salih, who confronted the Thamud, were the two great Messengers and Prophets of the time. The story is told by our sources in such a way that the world other than the Arabian peninsula was almost nonexistent during this conceptualized period. The peoples of Ad and Thamud were among the Arab descendants of Sam (TT-1,1:216). With the passage of time they had drifted to unbelief necessitating the emergence of new Messengers of God (*ibid*).

In their biographical sketches of Hud and Salih our sources treat their parents kindly. Readers see that though generations after Adam recurrently reverted to disbelief, a particular line among the progeny of Shith, and then of Sam, remained distinguished for its adherence, fully or in part, to the Islamic belief system. Most of the parents and direct ancestors of the Prophets, including Muhammad, Divinely destined to carry the seeds of the Prophets in their loins, always maintained their nobility and at least a degree of belief in Islam, sometimes in secret. In order to authenticate the truthfulness and uniqueness of Hud and Salih, miracles related to the two Prophets are a part of their Islamic story. Khulud, Hud's father, was "the noblest and best" courtier of his king. In a dream Khulud saw "a white chain, which had a light like the light of the sun" coming out of his loins. This was the seed of Hud. Khulud was divinely guided to marry his cousin. Hud was conceived.

The ponds and rivers, the birds and beasts, wild and tame, rejoiced at the conception of Hud. The trees of the tribe of Ad became green and brought forth fruit out of season by the blessing of Hud ... he was born on a Friday... (K:109-10).

The "black rock" on which baby Hud was put by his mother became "whiter than snow. Just after his birth, Hud was taken to heaven for purification

by angels "whose faces were white." The mother knowing all this approved of Hud's monotheism and his dislike of idol worship during his childhood (K:109-10). Hud was a born monotheist and a predestined Prophet.

When the prosperous Thamud took to idol-worship, Kanuh, "a man of the nobility of Thamud was consecrated to serve the idols" in the magnificent temple the king had built. "Salih's seed moved in Kanuh's loins and emitted a blinding light." A heavenly voice informed Kanuh that he would father a great Prophet. Hearing this the great idol toppled over on its face. "When news of this reached the King, he ordered Kanuh killed. However, God struck blind those charged to kill him and caused their hands to wither." God also sent an angel to bear Kanuh away "to a safe place where he was put to sleep for a hundred years" (118-9). Then God sent a bird to Kanuh's wife to lead her to the husband's hiding place. After his birth "on a Friday, ... even from his crib Salih never ceased to praise and glorify God" (K:120). Salih was also a born monotheist of Islamic traditions. Both Hud and Salih could foretell future events correctly (K:112, 121). Hud had predicted that "after him shall come Salih ... whose people shall be obstinate (and) the great Cry (explained below) shall take" and destroy them (K:117; parentheses added). The two Prophets' ministry began with their divine mission to right what they as Messengers of God thought was wrong with the Ad and Thamud. Hud and Salih demanded that people behave in certain ways: surrender to their creed which was Islam, as we will see. Along with depicting the concerns, likes and dislikes of the two Prophets, their story also tells Muslims how Hud, Salih and their followers treated nonbelievers on various occasions. As directed by the Quran, the model of Hud and Salih is to be a source of inspiration for Muslims in their images and treatment of the World beyond Islam and imitated accordingly.

The Ad and Thamud are depicted as disbelievers in the One God who had appointed Hud and Salih His Messengers. The two peoples are also charged with disbelief in the Afterlife and with enthusiastic engagement

in worldly life. The Ad and Thamud worshipped or venerated idols, **AUTHAN**, and various deities, **ALIHA**. In doing so they had committed the worst crime: **SHIRK**, polytheism, from Islam's point of view. Our sources do tell us that the people charged with **SHIRK** believed in the existence of a Supreme Being called Allah. They even went to Mecca to pray to Allah (TS,12:500). In this context Muslims are indirectly told that without belief in the authenticity of an Islamic Messenger, belief in God does not make sense. The Prophets Hud and Salih demanded that their peoples acknowledge them as Messengers of God and obey them. So, in practice, acknowledgment of their Prophethood and their obedience by the people was the main demand of Hud and Salih. Their call to fear God was repeatedly followed by a demand to obey them -- **ITTAQULLAH WA ATIUNI** (e.g., Q26:146-50). Thus they insisted that they were the only link between God and the people. Consequently, they were the only authentic sources to determine what the Supreme Being willed.

The Ad and Thamud did not acknowledge the Messengership of Hud and Salih. The two peoples wondered how one ordinary being like themselves could be uniquely linked with the invisible God. The Prophets claimed God had revealed himself to them through angels. Those addressed wondered why the Almighty did not make the angels visible. The Prophets replied it was because God was gracious unto them by appointing them as His Messengers (Q7:69, 75-6; 14:10-11; 26:154; 41:14). Hud and Salih, confirming themselves, insisted that they were conveying the Lord's Message truthfully -- **WA LAKINNI RASUL-UN MIN RABB AL-ALAMIN. UBALLIGHUKUM RISALAT RABBI WA ANA LAKUM NASIH-UN AMIN** (Q7:67-8) **INNI LAKUM RASUL-UN AMIN, FA'TTAQULLAH WAATIUNI** (Q26:143-4). They demanded complete obedience to themselves (Q26:144) and asked the people to withdraw their obedience from those who, they thought, were not guided by the Prophetic creed and called them "prodigal," **AL-MUSRIFIN**, engaged in "corruption," **FASAD**. As usual, Tabari explains the "prodigality" and corruption of the non-Muslims of our two Prophets' time in dogmatic terms, i.e., in terms of their

disbelief in God and in Divine punishment of nonbelievers. There is no mention of this-worldly "prodigality" or "corruption" in Tabari's exegesis. The Prophets were demanding unconditional obedience to and refusal to obey the nonbelievers -- **WA ATIUNI, WALA TUTIU AMR AL-MUSRIFIN** (Q26:150-2). **WA LA TUTIU AYYUHA'L-QAUM AL-MUSRIFIN 'ALA ANFUSIHIM FI TAMADIHIM FI MASIYAT ALLAH WA IJTIRAIHIM ALA SAKHATHIH** (TB,19:63 passim cf. Q26:150-2). From a Muslim point of view, these claims should have satisfied the people; the demand by the nonbelievers for rational proof was nonsense. The nonbelievers, however, were not convinced; they called the Prophets idiots, liars and bewitched (Q7:66; 26:152); they ignored the Prophets' warning of chastisement here and hereafter and refused to admit them as Messengers of God (Q26:138; 69:4-3). Hud, in turn called them "an ignorant people" -- **ARAKUM QAUM-AN TAJHALUN** (Q46:23).

The Thamud were fed up with the repeated predictions of doom by Salih and his followers when they said "we augur ill of thee and those that are with thee." For Salih it was an attack on God; he blamed them for "having augury with God" (Q27:46-7). Here and elsewhere Muslims learn a particular mode of prophetic communication best described in Urdu as **KAJ BAHSI**, tergiversation. Hud and Salih, as recorded in the Quran, tell the believers to ignore the nonbelievers' apparently rational questions and arguments, and ridicule them rather than make a serious effort to confront them. The opponents' objections to the Prophets and the faithful were arbitrarily dubbed as their objection and animosity to God. Muslims see that no effort was made to understand the nonbelievers' worldview or their ways of relating to the Supreme Being.

Along with their disbelief in the god of the Prophets and their refusal to obey the Prophets unconditionally, the worldliness of the Ad and Thamud are disapproved and condemned. The Quran's and the two Prophets' condemnation in this regard does not seem to be related to any social, political or economic problem in the society. Apparently there was none. The Prophet Muhammad told the believers that the Thamud had

been prosperous -- **KANU FI SIAT-IN MIN MAISHATIHM** (TT-U,1:159). This very prosperity and the people's joyful life seem to have displeased God and the Prophets. The Prophet Hud was unhappy to see his people "build on every high place a monument for vain delight" and to "seek everlasting strongholds to dwell therein forever" (Q26:128-9). Ad's construction of "many-columned" structures or buildings "the like of which were never created in the land" is ridiculed by the Almighty (Q89:6-12). Hud insisted that his people consider their "flocks and sons and gardens and fountains" the gifts of God (rather than as consequences of their own efforts) (Q26:133-4). The Quran mocks at the joyful approach of the Thamud toward the "transitory" life (Q51:43). Given the context of the passage, the Quran does not seem to compliment the people of Thamud when it talks of their "castle building" and of their "hewing the mountains into houses" (Q7:74); their alleged ingratitude to God, i.e., their refusal to acknowledge the Messengers and worship Him the way those Messengers chose, had doomed the fruits of their labors to destruction. The Prophet Salih's deprecation of such worldly engagements was obvious:

Will you be secure in this, here among gardens and fountains, sown fields and palms with slender spathes? Will you still skillfully hew houses out of the mountains? So fear you God, and obey you me (Q26:146- 50).

The Tradition, following the Quranic lead, as usual, elaborates on Islam's begrudging disapproval of the prosperity and worldliness of the Ad and Thamud. With obvious disapproval, Kisai mentions their

houses, each one hundred cubits long and one hundred cubits deep, hewn out of rocks in the mountains ... covered with plates of iron, riveted with nails of brass. (We are further told by Kisai that) they flourished and prospered ...(and) their livestock gave birth twice a year, and their trees bore fruit twice a year (K:111, 118).

These apparently creative and constructive deeds are not mentioned as models. The poetry frequently cited by Islamic sources in the context of our story "mentions the Thamud with the Ad as examples of the

transitoriness of worldly glory" (H.H. Brau, "Thamud", E1,4:736). Based on the Quran (41:15), F. Buhl has correctly noticed, from the Islamic point of view, the connection between the Ad's disbelief and their great worldly power and prosperity (F. Buhl, "Ad", E1²,1:169). While, occasionally, the Quran mentions the Ad's and Thamud's prosperity to call their attention to God-given benefits, generally their worldly power and prosperity are disparaged; they were destroyed because of their worldliness and despite their worldly prosperity (see note in this section).

Muslims find the two Prophets' concerns were limited to the necessity of belief in their Prophethood, in the Afterlife and in their version of monotheism. Perhaps as a corollary to belief in the Afterlife the Prophets de-emphasized and almost condemned enthusiastic engagement in worldly activities. Hud and Salih were, apparently, not interested in any other issue. In a passing solitary remark, Tabari mentions that Hud also called upon the people "to stop oppressing (or doing evil to) the people" -- **TARK ZULM AN-NAS** (TS,12:508; TT-U,1:150). The whole Islamic story of Hud and Salih, however, does not indicate the two Prophets' interest in any non-credal, this-worldly, affair. Nor does it allude to any internal confrontation or any oppression of some in the society by others. The Quranic charges of **ZULM** ("oppression"), **FASAD** ("corruption"), and **ISRAF** ("prodigality") against the Ad and Thamud are explained by Tabari, as usual, in terms of disbelief in God and the Prophets (see Appendix III on Islamic Lexicon). When the Quran (Q14:13-5), referring to the peoples of Noah, Hud and Salih, asserts that God will surely destroy "the oppressors" -- **AZ-ZALIMIN**, for Tabari these oppressors "are those who by their disbelief oppressed their own souls and thus earned the wrath of God; ... they were called oppressors because of their worship of idols and (other) deities" -- **ALLADHIN ZALAMU ANFUSAHUM FA AUJABU LAHA IQAB ALLAH BI-KUFRIHIM ... QIL LAHUM AZ-ZALIMUN LI-IBADATIHIM ... AL-AUTHAN WA'L-ALIHA...** (T,13:192). In Q27:52 the people of Thamud are blamed for

their **ZULM**, "oppression" or wrongdoing. For Tabari it means the Almighty was referring to their polytheism and to their rejection of His Prophet -- **BI-ZULMIHIM ANFUSAHUM BI-SHIRKIHIM BI'LLAH WA TAKDHIBIHIM RASULAHUM** (TB,19:109).

Similarly, in Q11:59 the Ad were called **JABBAR** (tyrants, oppressors etc.) for their "waxing proud" against God -- **MUTAKABBIR ALA'LLAH** --, and for their rejection of "The Truth" (of the Prophethood and creed of the Prophet) -- **HAIJ AN AL-HAQQ** (T,12:61). When Salih asked his people "to repent" (Q11:61), he was not condemning any worldly misdeeds of his people. "Repenting" for him meant the worship of the one God and obedience to His Prophet Salih. As a matter of fact, he was telling the people that by doing so God will ignore their (worldly?) sins -- **I'MALU 'AMAL-AN YAKUN LISITR ALLAH 'ALAYKUM DHUNUBAKUM WA DHALIK AL-IMAN BIHI WA IKHLAS AL-'IBADAT LAHU DUN MA SIWAH WA ITTIBA' RASULIHI SALIH** (T,12:63). The Thamud were called **AL-MUSRIFIN** (Q26:151) "prodigal" or "extravagant" in the sense that they were committing extravagance against their own souls by persisting in their disobedience of God and being presumptuous about Divine chastisement -- **AL-MUSRIFIN ALA ANFUSIHIM FI TAMADIHIM FI MASIYAT ALLAH WA IJTIRAIHIM ALA SAKHATIH** (TB,19:63). Likewise, when the Quran blames the Thamud for their "corruption in the land" -- **IFSAD FI'L-ARD** -- it is a reference to their disbelief in God and disobedience to Him (which, in practice means disobedience to the Prophet) -- **WA KAN IFSADUHUM FI'L-ARD KUFRUHUM BI'LLAH WA MASIATUHUM IYYAH** (TB,19:108 cf. Q27:48; Q26:152).

The Islamic story of the Prophets Hud and Salih reinforces in the Muslim mind the authenticity of what is sacred in Islam. First of all, it creates the impression that Arabia was the center of the universe. We are not told what had happened at that time with the progeny of Noah's other sons. The Arabic poetry ascribed implicitly to the people of this period makes the reader believe that the people of the peninsula spoke exactly the same style of literary Arabic in use during and after the seventh

century CE. Thus Muslims are indirectly told of the antiquity and sacred nature of the language of the Quran and Muhammad. Similarly, the believers are told the city of Mecca and the holiest Islamic sanctuary, the Kaba, enjoyed special respect and status during the period. The people used to approach Mecca and pray to Allah at the Kaba for relief from catastrophes and difficulties -- **WA KAN AN-NAS FI DHALIK AZ-ZAMAN IDHA NAZAL BIHIM BALA AU JAHD FA- TALABU ILLA'LLAH AL-FARAJ MINHU; KANAT TALIBATUHUM ILLA'LLAH BAYT AL-HARAM BI-MAKKAH** (TS,12:500). Our sources neglect to tell us how the Kaba was rebuilt after the Deluge and before Abraham and Ishmael are shown later to have reconstructed the sanctuary. The Prophet Hud is reported to have finally settled at Mecca, where he was buried (A.J. Wensinck, "Hud", EI²,3:537-8). So was Salih. (Tabari does not reject the report he mentions according to which Salih died in Mecca (TT-1,1:232). Al-Kisai:126 maintains Salih's grave is in Palestine.) Another Tradition, though locating Hud's coffin in south Arabia, finds evidence that the followers who buried Hud were aware of Muhammad's divine status. Obviously, Hud had foretold of Muhammad. Al-Kisai and Tabari tell the believers that during the caliphate of Uthman (r.644-656) a Muslim had seen the coffin and touched Hud's corpse. The Muslim had found that Hud's

eyes were large and his eyebrows met. He had a wide forehead, an oval face, fine feet and a large beard. He had never known affliction. Over his head was a rock shaped like a board, on which were written three lines ... the first of these said [basic Islamic credo:] "There is no God but God; Muhammad is God's Messenger." On the second was written "God has commanded that none be worshipped but He..." (K:117; also see TS,12:507 cf.Q7:69).

Ali, the Prophet Muhammad's son-in-law and cousin, confirmed the report and told the Muslim who related the story that he had "spoken the truth" (*ibid*). In the contexts of the story of Hud and Salih the readers are told definitively that the Prophets preached Islam. It was the only Right Path and God's chosen creed. The nonbelievers were told no other creed but the Right Path, Islam, was acceptable to God -- **SIRAT MUSTAQIM... LA YUQBAL MINHUM ILLA'L-ISLAM** (T,12:60 cf. Q11:61-8; TB,19:63). Those who believed in the two Prophets were Muslims (TT-U,1:152).

Along with this principal assertion Muslims also find Islamic rituals authenticated by these early Muslims. The two Prophets were born on Friday, Islam's weekly holy day (K:109-12). The two Prophets and their followers performed ablution and prayers the Islamic way (ibid). They also treated wine as unclean (K:113). They called, like the Muslims, their worship-places mosques (sing: **MASJID**). Gabriel helped Salih and provided him with some material brought from Paradise for the building of a "mosque" (T,12:66; K:120).

Muslims learn that Hud and Salih are among those Islamic Prophets who were rejected by almost all of their people. The Dar al-Harb refused to transform itself into a Dar al-Islam. The believers remained an insignificant minority in a non-Muslim society. The non-Muslims of the time were convinced the creed and the ways they had inherited were sound and, consequently, refused to adopt the Prophet's creed (Q7:70; 11:62; Q14:9- 10). When pushed too hard, the nonbelievers asked the Prophets to accept the existing system or be exiled (Q14:13). Hud and Salih refused (Q11:63; Q14:13). The nonbelievers' assertion, "we shall most certainly expel you from our land, unless you return forthwith to our ways" (Q14:13, tr. M. Asad), apparently meant that they were telling our Islamic Prophets to leave them and the society the believers disliked so much in peace or accept its norms rather than insist to impose their Islamic worldview on an unwilling majority. It is obvious for a reader of the Islamic sources that the nonbelievers were not necessarily asking the Prophets to change their beliefs. The nonbelievers simply wanted the Prophets not to impose their creed on others, when they asked the Prophets to return to their ways -- **TAUDUNN FI MILLANTINA** or be expelled. The sources tell the readers, however, the threat was not followed up by the nonbelievers. The Prophets remained in the nonbelievers' "land." When they left, as we will see, it was to accomplish another Prophetic purpose. [As believers do, here again we disregard the fact that the Prophet Muhammad was telling Hud's and Salih's story in his own image and that the Ad's and Thamud's

threat to expel the Prophets is as authentically reported in the Quran as the Meccans' reported threat to expel Muhammad. This is discussed in Part III, Section 9, Segment 1 (Muhammad at Mecca) of this study.]

For a Muslim the nonbelievers' call "to return forthwith to our ways" was blasphemy. Muslims find that in response to this call for peaceful coexistence the Prophets talked of divine **RIJS** "terror," **GHADAB** "wrath," **IHLAK** "destruction or annihilation" and of **TAKHSIR** "perdition" against the societies that rejected the Prophets' demand for complete **ITAAH**, "submission" (Q7:71; 11:63; 14:11). Moreover, Muslims find that the Almighty intervened directly, rejecting the nonbelievers' proposal. The nonbelievers were not to be left in peace. God told the Prophets of the annihilation of nonbelievers here and appropriation of their possessions for the believers. The nonbelievers' destruction 'here and now' was not enough, however; terrible eternal torture awaited them Hereafter. Quoting the nonbelievers' call "to return forthwith to our ways" the Quran immediately adds

Then did their Lord reveal unto them: 'We will surely destroy the evildoers, and We will surely make you to dwell in the land after them...' beyond him gehenna, and he is given to drink oozing pus, the which he gulps, and can scarce swallow, and death comes upon him from every side, yet he cannot die; and still beyond him is a harsh chastisement (Q14:13-7).

There was no need for reconciliation with the nonbelievers. Their final annihilation here was also to be preceded by "torment," various kinds of torture.

Muslims looking to Hud, Salih and their followers for an exemplary pattern see a repetition of Noah's model of treatment of the world beyond Islam. Because the Ad and Thamud had refused to surrender to the Prophets' creed, there was only one alternative: the annihilation of nonbelievers either through the believers' "sword" or through divinely wrought "terrible chastisement." In the context of this story the Quran describes the ultimate treatment of those who reject Islamic Prophets and refuse to obey them.

No city is there, but We shall destroy it before the Day of Resurrection, or We shall chastise it with terrible chastisement; that is in the Book inscribed (Q17:59).

This means, Tabari tells us, that all nonbelievers in God and His Messengers are doomed to one of two kinds of this-world Divine punishment: "either (directly) massacred with sword¹⁶² [obviously by the believers] or through various kinds of severe torturous chastisement (i.e. Divinely wrought disasters aimed at nonbelievers)" -- **MIN QATL BI'S-SAYF AU GHAYR DHALIK MIN SUNUF AL-ADHAB, ADHAB-AN SHADID...IDHA TARAKU AMRAHU WA KADHDHABU RUSULAHU**(T,15:106). As usual, Tabari tells the readers in this context that what was said and done to the Ad and Thamud is applicable to the adversaries of Muhammad and Islam. Commenting on other Quranic passages, e.g. 14:13-14, concerning Noah, Hud and Salih, Tabari maintains God has promised sustenance to believers and annihilation for nonbelievers. All this, Tabari adds, was a divine warning to the adversaries of Muhammad and a reassurance to him that those who disbelieve in Muhammad would eventually be exterminated and that Muhammad will finally be victorious--**WA KULL DHALIK MIN ALLAH WAID-AN WA TAHDID-AN LI-MUSHRIKI QAUM NABIYYINA MUHAMMAD ALA KUFRIHIM BIHI WA JARAATHIM ALA NABIYYIHI WA TATHBIT-AN LI-MUHAMMAD...WA MUARRIFUHU ANN AQIBAT AMR MAN KAFAR BIHI AL-HALAK WA AQIBAT AN-NASR ALAYHIM** (T,13:192; also see TB,19:11 cf. Q25:38-40; TB,19:64 cf. Q26:159; TB,19:109-10 cf. Q27:45-53).

Muslims find that the final annihilation of non-Muslims of their time was preceded by-and accompanied with - humiliation and physical and mental torture perpetrated by the Almighty for the satisfaction of - and in collaboration with - the Prophets and the faithful. After they realized the people would not surrender to their creed, Hud, Salih and their followers adopted a negative attitude toward the nonbelievers on all levels. The basic model was that of HIJRAH-JIHAD; the all out holy war in this case, however was carried out by God Himself through the angels and by other extraordinary means.

The Prophets' response to the nonbelievers' refusal to surrender to Islam started with the **ITIZAL** "seclusion" of the believers from the company and society of nonbelievers. It was hijra, segregation, anticipating or invoking God's wrath in various forms against the heathen. The Prophet Hud (who disliked the nonbelievers' tradition from childhood) and the faithful secluded themselves in a separate encampment - - **FATAZAL HUD... WA MAN MAAHU MIN AL-MUMININ FI HAZIRAT-IN** (TS,12:513 cf. Q7:65-79; also see TT-U,1:155).

Hud tried day and night to restrain his people, but they neither listened nor mended their ways. When he had thus passed a long time, he withdrew from among them and occupied himself with worshipping his Lord... He went out to the valley of Noah, performed ablution and prayed twenty rakas [units of prayer, following Islamic rites]; then lifted his gaze to heaven and said, "O God, I ask thee to strike them down..." God answered his prayer and commanded him and any who believed along with him to depart from the people (K:112; brackets added).

After the Thamud refused to accept Salih as a "sincere adviser" and rejected "the Message of his Lord," the Prophet "turned his back on them" (Q7:77-9). Salih never passed a night in the town among the nonbelievers; he had built his mosque away from the nonbelievers' town for evening retirement (T,12:66). The Prophet Salih and the faithful, anticipating the final disaster, left the land of nonbelievers (TS,12:536, 126). Salih warned that "those who remain in it will be destroyed and (assured) those who leave will be saved" -- **MAN AQAM FIH HALAK WA MAN KHARAJ MINH RAJA** (ibid).

Muslims see that the believers' stay among nonbelievers was marked by tension, a cold war. The Prophets did not hesitate to commit violence, including the massacre of children. Aggressive postures and violent actions of the Prophets and their followers are mentioned with approval, obviously as a source of inspiration for the believers of all times. Once in his youth Salih took direct action against a nonbelieving king who was raiding the community. Salih

girt himself with his father's sword and went out to the people and

shouted at them. God put such terror in their hearts that some died on the spot as a result of his cry and others turned and fled. Salih plundered their possessions and their livestock... (K:120)

In this episode it is the blustering, bullyboy image of our Prophet and his martial character which are projected for believers, rather than his concern for the defense of the community or for social justice. Throughout his Islamic story Salih concerns himself only with credal affairs such as the necessity to worship his one God and accept his Prophethood. However, the story justifies the Prophetic Sunnah of the terrorization of nonbelievers to death and of the plundering of nonbelievers. Moreover shouting and yelling that terrorized the nonbelievers, some of them even to death, is portrayed as an Islamic way for dealing with nonbelievers. During his discourses the Prophet Hud also used to "let out a great shout" to frighten the nonbelievers (K:111).

During his ministry when Salih spoke the idols would "topple down on their faces and the beasts spoke, saying, truth is come, and falsehood is vanished" (K:121). It is the Quranic verse 34:49 -- **JA AL-HAQQ WA ZAHAQ AL-BATIL** --pronounced by Salih. According to the Muslim rationale the Quran is an eternal Book known by all the past Prophets and God's creatures.

In order to prove his Prophethood Salih, miraculously, conjured up a she-camel out of a rock (TT-1,1:227-8 cf. Q7:73; Q26:154-5 passim). Salih had predicted that some particular nonbelievers would be born to kill the sacred she-camel. [As explained in Part V some are predestined to be nonbelievers.] In order to prevent this Salih ordered the massacre of apparently all the new born children of the nonbelievers. Salih's followers followed the order and killed their own newborn children. **QAL LAHUM SALIH INNAHU SAYULAD GHULAM-UN YAKUN HALAKUHUM ALA YADAYH. QALU KAYF TAMURUNA? QAL AMURUKUM BI QATLIHIM** (in TS = **AMARAHUM BI DHABH ABNAIHIM**). **FA QATALUHUM ILLA WAHID...** (TT-U,1:160; TS,12:526). After the massacre of their own children, some of the fathers had second thoughts about Salih; they are reported to have conspired to slay the Prophet. But

the Almighty (and the believers) who must have had great appreciation for the slaughter of the innocent children of the nonbelievers by their own fanatic fathers, would not allow His Prophet to be harmed by the grieving parents; they were stoned to death by the angels for harboring dangerous revisionist thoughts against the Messenger of God. (TT-U,1:160-1; TS,12:527, 535, passim. These reports in Tabari, and most other reports about Salih, are attributed directly to the Prophet Muhammad). We are also told that just before Salih brought about the final catastrophe to annihilate Thamud, some nonbelievers "set out to slay him, but Gabriel hurled a rock at each of them and killed them all" (K:125).

Muslims are told that the Prophets and the faithful helped by God used methods to force Islam on nonbelievers. The pressure techniques, though terrible, are obviously approved and admired by Muslim readers. In order to compel the nonbelievers to surrender to His Messenger "God caused the women's wombs to become barren, and not a single woman among them bore a son or daughter." Only the wives of the believers such as a certain Marthid were allowed to bear children predestined to become Muslims (K:111-2; also see T,12:58 cf. Q11:52). This Divinely enforced sterilization continued for years -- **INNAHU QAD KAN INQATA AN-NASL ANHUM SININ** (T, ibid). After praying to God "to strike (the nonbelievers) down with famine and drought," Hud confided "perhaps then, they will believe" (K:112). Hud told them God will rid them of the drought and bestow upon them children only after they believed -- **FA QAL HUD LAHUM IN AMANTUM BI'LLAH AHYA'LLAH BILADAKUM WA RAZAQAKUM AL-MAL WA'L-WALAD** (T,12:58 cf. Q11:52; also see K:113). Hud told them brusquely that nothing short of unconditional acceptance of Islam and faith in his Prophethood was acceptable to God for their salvation from their miseries and the final destruction. For the Islamic Prophet there was no room for compromise -- **WA LA YUQBAL MINHUM ILL'AL-ISLAM WA'L-IMAN BIHI** (T,12:60 cf. Q11:56). Marthid the Muslim, exploiting the agonizing situation of the thirsty nonbelievers, told them that their prayers were of no use; they would have

water to drink only if they obeyed the Prophet Hud -- **FA QAL MARTHID INNAKUM WA'LLAH LA TUSQUAN BI DUAIKUM WALAKIN IN ATATUM NABIYYAKUM WA ANABTUM ILAYHI SUQAYTUM** (TT-U,1:153; also K:115). At a time when Khaljan, the chief of Ad, was being tormented variously by the angels and by the Almighty, Hud told him: **ASLIM TASLIM** "surrender (to my creed, i.e., become a Muslim) and you will be saved (from those sufferings)." Hud also told Khaljan that after surrendering to Islam the same angels who were torturing him will treat him as a friend. Our stubborn heathen, however, refused "and," Tabari concludes jubilantly, **AHLAK ALLAH AL-KHALJAN** "God destroyed Kaljan" (TT-1,1:224). Hud had prayed to God

If they do not (believe), I ask thee to destroy them through torment such as no one has been destroyed before or will afterwards (K:112).

This was the voice of an enraged Islamic Prophet. Finally, the hour of extermination "through torment" came for the Ad as well as the Thamud. By the tone of Islamic descriptions in this regard, Muslims intimate that gusto over the sufferings of the nonbelievers, rather than regret and mercy, is the correct and desirable Islamic attitude. Similarly, Muslims find divine justification in seeing the nonbelievers suffer from torment and torture. Believers should rejoice in the sufferings of nonbelievers, the story teaches the Muslims.

Holy torment was unleashed against Ad in three stages. As desired by His Prophet it was the Almighty's way to torture the nonbelievers through various methods before certain death. First, by causing the "women's womb to become barren," God deprived the heathen of children for many years (T,12:58 cf. Q11:52; K:111-2). Second, for three years a terrible drought scourged Ad. It was the equivalent of a cruel food blockade. Even the beasts had to suffer along with their non-Muslim masters.

Then God took away the rain and caused the earth to shrivel up, and no green thing grew in their fields and their beasts died... [The nonbelievers wondered aloud and said;] If this suffering has

afflicted us because of the multitude of our sins, why then have the wild beasts and animals of burden, which have no sin, been afflicted as much as we" (K:112-3; also see TS,12:508 passim; TT-U,1:153 passim, cf. Q11:57-8; 46:23 passim; 54:19 passim; 69:7 passim).

By not responding to the objection our sources teach Muslims simply to ignore such nonsensical protestations by the suffering nonbelievers.

The third stage of holy war against Ad was the final destruction. **RIH SARSAR**, wind along with a fire rain, wiped out the whole population of the nonbelievers (Q7:65;41:16 passim). Even this was accompanied with a cruel joke played by the believers in collaboration with the Almighty. The Ad had sent a delegation to Mecca to pray to God for rain. Marthid, who secretly believed in Hud, was a member of this lobby. A true underground Muslim in the Dar al-Harb, uninterested in any relief for the nonbelievers, Marthid rejoiced in the heavenly voice that he heard ridiculing the desperate departing delegation.

Despair and misery for you, O House of Ad! You shall perish,
and a destructive, shifting, icy gale, turbulent with dust,
will descend upon you (K:113).

Marthid himself was also sarcastic. Rejoicing in their miseries and happily anticipating their imminent destruction, Marthid, our Muslim fifth columnist was humming, perhaps secretly, the following revolutionary poetry in Arabic:

And have disobeyed their Prophet and thirsted:
the sky gives them no rain.
Fate and affliction have arrived -
and the judgment of God:
passion has conquered Ad.
Verily Ad is the most evil people:
may they be destroyed
and may there remain no trace of them!
I shall not depart the religion of Hud... or annihilation will come
(K:113; see also TT-1,1:223-4).

From the nonbelievers' point of view it might have been called treason and treachery but Muslims consider this kind of disloyalty of the believer within his own non-Muslim society to be greatly encouraged and appreciated

by the angels. Marthid's treachery to his own nonbelieving people was upheld and rewarded by the angels as a heroic act. Marthid was awarded a flying camel, a free air ticket, a free ride!

Suddenly a host of angels greeted him and said, "Welcome O Marthid!" They took him down from his camel and seated him on another one they had with them. He rode with the angels through the sky until they reached the Sanctuary [the Kaba at Mecca], where they said, "Our God and Master, give thy prophet Hud victory over his people and hasten their destruction" (K:114, brackets added).

Apparently the rest of the deputation arrived later. To their prayer for rain a heavenly voice was heard saying:

May God vanquish the delegation of Ad. Ad is the most evil people of perdition. The delegation has traveled to pray for rain. May they quench their thirst with HOT WATER! (K:114).

Marthid continued to sabotage the nonbelievers' mission by his negative prayers. While the rest of the delegation was imploring Allah for rain, Marthid, the Muslim hero, was secretly asking the Almighty, taunting the nonbelievers:

O God, we do not come to thy Sanctuary but for an earth in need of water and a community in need of response from thee. Thou wilt not be niggardly in the providing. O God, send torment to those who believe not!" (ibid).

Though the non-Muslims of the time were praying to Him for rain, the Almighty was obviously on the side of His Messenger whom these non-Muslims had refused to obey. In response to the nonbelievers' prayer, led by one Qayl - and understanding what Marthid, His chosen believer wanted,

God commanded the angel of the clouds to spread over them three clouds, one white, one red and one black. On the black cloud was the angel entrusted with Barren Wind. When they saw these clouds they rejoiced but were told, "O Qayl, choose for your people one of these three clouds!" He chose the black cloud, [though the nonbelievers did not know that] in which are (were) ashes and lead (and that) Ad shall perish to the last from the heat!" The cloud moved until it ... (reached the Adites, and) ... when the people of Ad saw it, they said, "This cloud has come to give us rain!" [They did not know that the Almighty was playing a trick] Then God commanded the angel of the clouds to open a portion of that cloud for the Barren Wind by spreading a wing for each of the tribes of Ad. Gabriel then said, "O wind, be a torment to the people of Ad and a mercy to others!" On the first day the wind came so cold and

grey that it left nothing on the face of the earth unshattered. On the second day there was a yellow wind that touched nothing it did not tear up and throw into the air. On the third day a red wind left nothing undestroyed. And the wind kept on blowing over them for eight unhappy days and seven hapless nights... the wind ripped them apart and went into their clothing, raised them in to the air and cast them down on their heads, dead. The wind snatched their arrows and drew them in to their throats. Thus it continued until there was left of them only their king, who remained to be shown what had become of his people... Then the wind entered his mouth and came out his posterior, and he fell down dead. The wind hurled the palaces together and killed all the women and children that were in them. [The nonbelievers' prayer-delegation also was not allowed to escape the Divine wrath:] ("The roaring" wind) passed onto the Sanctuary and raised them into the air, and cast them down on their heads, dead... (K:115-6; brackets added; also see TT-1,1:219-25).

Even after their death the corpses of the nonbelievers, Muslims are told, were not left to rest; as a further humiliation they were dragged by "black birds" and thrown into the ocean (TT-U,1:157). As the Quran says it was a chastisement for degradation in the present life -- **AL-KHIZY FI'L-HAYAT AD-DUNYA** (41:16). Obviously, the Prophet Hud and the believers, anticipating the destruction of the nonbelievers and as guided by God, had left the cursed domain of nonbelievers for Mecca (TT-U,1:155; K:112; A.J. Wensinck, "Hud", *El*²,3:537), which escaped ruin except for the nonbelievers therein (TT-U,1:154).

We have seen that the Prophet Salih engaged personally in violence against some nonbelievers. The holocaust, however, was to be inflicted by the Almighty. Before the Thamud were destroyed by a combination of screaming fiery thunderbolts, storm -- **AS-SAIQA** and earthquake, they also underwent a series of tortures. Some of the nonbelievers opposed to the Prophet Salih suffered "a seizure of itching and pox" (K:124). For three days Thamud found their faces turning yellow, then red, and then "black as coal" (TT- U,1:158 passim, K:125; TS,12:536) obviously the worst color from a believer's point of view. Having accomplished this, Salih left the cursed land (TS,12:536)

On the fourth day God told Gabriel to command Malik, the warden of Hell, to send sparks from beneath the earth to burn and destroy their palaces and dwellings... Then Gabriel spread the Wing of Wrath and began to cast down upon them embers the size of

mountains, while the angels sang, "Holy! Holy!" He seized the extremities of the region of Thamud and shook it, with all its houses and palaces therein. The people felt the quake and the shock, but they still did not believe. Then Gabriel gave a great shout, and black clouds rolled in, pouring down torrents of fire on the houses. At the end of seven days, all was ashes (K:125-6; also see TT- 1,1:230 passim).²

Al-Kisai mentions the Divine punishment of two more groups before the era of Abraham. Both lived in Arabia. These were perhaps the progeny of believing Ad and Thamud who had later relapsed to disbelief. One was the people of Ar-Rass, twice mentioned in the Quran (2:38 cf. TB,19:10-1; Q50:12 cf. T,26:154). They

were believers and worshipped God, but Iblis diverted them from their worship of God and ordered them to worship idols and commit sodomy with women and children. When this abomination increased among them, God sent them an apostle called Safwan, who called them to obey God and warned of punishment... but they would not be preached to until God tormented them with famine and hunger. When the Prophet's words became too much for them, they killed him and burned him in a fire thereupon Gabriel gave forth a cry, and they all dried up; and no one remained in their land who did not turn into black rock (K:128).

Tabari does not mention sodomy as the crime for which the people of Ar-Rass were punished; he rather emphasizes the disbelief in the Prophet and his killing for which the nonbelievers were "utterly ruined" (see TB,19:10-1; T,26:154). The people of Hanzalah were punished because they had allowed themselves to be misled by Satan to worship idols. Hanzalah, a man among them from Salih's lineage adhered to Islam.

When he saw what they were doing, he left their country and went to Mecca where he worshipped his Lord. He heard a voice saying, "O Hanzala, go to your people, command them to worship God and forbid them to worship "idols"... but they rebuked him and killed him, whereupon God at once caused the well to cease functioning, and they could not find even a drop of water in it. Gabriel gave forth a Cry of Wrath, and they all died (K:127-8).

ENDNOTES

PART III: Belief in the Books and Messengers

Section 4: THE ERA OF HUD AND SALIH

¹For the Islamic story of the Prophets Hud and Salih, their nations, the Ad and Thamud, and their remnants see The Quran 2:38; 7:65-79; 11:50-70; 14:18; 15:80-6; 15:80-6; 17:59; 25:38-40; 26:123-59; 27:45-53; 29:38; 41:13-18; 46:21-7; 50:12; 51:41-5; 53:50-51; 54:23-31; 69:4-8; 85:17-8; 89:5-14; 91:11-15. Tabari, Tafsir: see relevant sections to above Quranic passages, e.g., TS,12:503-47 cf. Q7:65-79. Specific references to the Tafsir are mentioned in the text of this section. Also see TT-1, 1:216-32; TT-U, 1:150-62; K:109-28; Bu, 60:17; 64:80; 65:sura 15, b.2; Mu, 53:39-40; Tir, 44:sura 51; AbH, 2:9, 66, 72, 74, 91, 96, 113, 117, 137; 3:296, 481-2; F. Buhl, "Ad", El², 1:169; A.J. Wensinck [Ch. Pellat], "Hud", El², 3:537-8; F. Buhl, "Salih", El, 4:107; H.H. Brau, "Thamud", El, 4:736.

²A reading of the following Quranic passages about Ad and Thamud convinces a Muslim that Tradition-based details of the story, as Medieval Muslim exegetes have correctly assumed and asserted, are in line with the word, spirit and style of the Almighty.

So We delivered him [Hud], and those with him, by a mercy from Us; and We cut off the last remnant of those who cried lies to Our signs and were not believers (7:72). So the earthquake seized them [Thamud], and morning found them in their habitation fallen prostrate (7:78). And when Our command came, We delivered Hood and those who believed with him... and delivered them from a harsh chastisement. That was Ad; they denied the signs of their Lord, and rebelled against His Messengers... And there was sent following after them in this world a curse... so away with Ad... (11:57-60). And when our command came, We delivered Salih and those who believed with him a mercy from us, and from the degradation of that day;... And the evildoers were seized by the Cry, and morning found them in their habitations fallen prostrate as if they never dwelt there: surely Thamud disbelieved in their Lord, so away with Thamud (11:66-8). [An example of Tabari's Tradition-based commentaries: "When the Cry seized them God annihilated all of them between the East and the West save one man who was in the Sanctuary of God, **HARAM ALLAH** (T,12:67 cf. Q11:66-8). (It is not clear whether the Kaba here means the sanctuary of God or the Mosque of Salih; most probably it was the mosque. In any case, the lesson for the believers is that while all was destroyed the Muslim worship places were protected miraculously.)]

They were hewing the mountains into houses, therein dwelling securely; and the Cry seized them in morning; that they earned did not avail them (15:82-4). And Ad, and Thamud, and the men of Ar-Rass, and between that generations a many... each We ruined utterly. Surely they have come by the city that was rained on by an evil rain; what, have they not seen it? (25:38-40). So they cried him lies; then We destroyed them. Surely in that is a sign, yet most of them are not believers (26:138-9)... and in the morning they were remorseful, and the chastisement seized them. Surely in that is a sign, yet most of them are not believers. Surely thy Lord is the All-mighty, the All-compassionate (26:157-9). [Commenting on the last verse Tabari tells the readers that the Almighty is saying: "O Muhammad, your Lord is All-powerful in His revenge upon His enemies (i.e. non-Muslims), and He is compassionate for those of His creatures who believe in Him" (i.e., become Muslim) (T,19:64). [Explaining the verses in the Quran related to the two opposite dimensions of God's

qualities, wrath and kindness, Tabari and other traditional exegetes' always relate God's wrathful dimensions to nonbelievers and limit His kindness and forgiveness to Muslims. Thus God from an Islamic point of view may be kind only to Muslims, and His chastisement is reserved for the non-Muslims]. And they devised a device, and We likewise devised a device, while they were not aware; and behold how was the end of their device. For We destroyed them and their people all together. Those are their houses, all fallen down because of the evil they committed (27:50-2). But if they [non-Muslims] turn away [from Islam], then say, 'I warn you of a thunderbolt like to the thunderbolt of Ad and Thamud...' As for Ad... We loosed against them a wind clamorous in days of ill fortune, that We might let them taste the chastisement of degradation in the present life; and the chastisement of the world to come is even more degrading... As for Thamud... they preferred blindness to guidance [i.e. the Prophets' creed which was Islam], so the thunderbolt of the chastisement of humiliation seized them... And We delivered those who believed... (41:13-8).

Then, when they saw it was a sudden cloud coming towards their valleys, they said, 'this is a cloud, that shall give us rain!' Not so, rather it is that you sought to hasten - a wind wherein is a painful chastisement, destroying everything by the commandment of its Lord.' So in the morning there was naught to be seen but their dwelling places. Even so do We recompense the people of the sinners... And We destroyed the cities about you, ... and that was their calumny (46:24-8). And also in Ad, when We loosed against them the withering wind, that left nothing it came upon but made it as studd decayed. And also in Thamud, whom it was said to them, 'Take your enjoyment for a while! Then... the thunderbolt took them and they themselves beholding, and they were not able to stand upright, and were not helped (51:41-5). Thamud and Ad cried lies to the clatterer [the Day Hereafter]. As for Thamud, they were destroyed by the Screamer; and as for Ad, they were destroyed by a wind clamorous and violent that He compelled against them seven nights and eight days, uninterruptedly, and though mightest see the people laid prostrate in it as if they were the stumps of fallen palm trees. Now doest thou see any remnant of them? (69:4-12).

Hast thou not seen how thy Lord did with Ad, Iram of the pillars, the like of which was never created in the land, and Thamud, who hollowed the rocks in the valley, and Pharoah he of the tent-pegs, who all were insolent in the Land and worked much corruption [in the sense of its Quranic meaning emphasizing disbelief in God and His Messengers; see T30:175-80] therein? Thy Lord unleashed on them a scourge of chastisement; surely thy Lord is ever on the watch (89:5-14). Thamud cried lies in their insolence when the most wretched of them uprose [against Salih]... so their Lord crushed them for their sin, and leveled them; and He fears not the issue thereof (91:11-5).

Part III: Belief In The Books And Messengers

Section 5: THE ERA OF ABRAHAM AND HIS SONS

In this section the Islamic Prophets Ibrahim (Abraham), Lut (Lot), Ismail (Ishmael), Ishaq (Isaac), Yaqub (Jacob), Yusuf (Joseph), Ayyub (Job) and Shuayb will be prominent. After a general introduction our discussion will concentrate on 1) the relationship of these Prophets and their followers to Islam, 2) their main interests, concerns, likes and dislikes, and 3) God's, the Prophets' and their followers' treatment of nonbelievers.¹ According to sacred Islamic historiography, Ibrahim (Abraham) emerged as a third epoch-making Messenger of God one thousand years after Noah and two thousand years after Adam's arrival on earth. He era of Abraham and of his Prophet sons and descendants lasted one thousand years before the fourth epoch-making Messenger, Musa (Moses), appeared on the scene. Mesopotamia, vaguely some parts of Iran and Asia Minor, greater Syria, Egypt and the Arabian peninsula formed the world of Abraham and his line before Moses. According to at-Tabari either Al-Ahwaz in southwestern Iran or Babylon or Harran or Al-Warka in Mesopotamia was Abraham's birth place. Azar (also named arakh or erah), Abraham's father, is portrayed as an important figure in the court of Babylon's ruler, Namrud (Nimrod).

Whatever his place of birth, Abraham's Prophetic activities began in Mesopotamia (TT-1,1:233 passim). Abraham's Messengership and his confrontation with the nonbelieving Babylonians were predestined. Wonderful stories are told to convince the believers how Abraham was protected, guided and helped by God against the nonbelievers from his conception to the end (TT-1,1:233-50 passim; Q6:74-84 cf.T; Q11:69-76 cf.T; Q14:35-43 cf.T, 19:41-50 cf.T; Q21:51-73 cf.T; Q37:83-113 cf.; Q59:4 cf.T). After confrontations in Babylon, Abraham along with a few believers moved to Harran in northern Mesopotamia from where he reached a point in or near what is identified as the "Holy Land" within the Syrian-Jordanian region. After a brief sojourn in Egypt, Abraham returned to - and settled permanently in - a part of the "Holy Land." Commanded by the Almighty and guided by the angels, Abraham visited Arabia, particularly

Mecca, occasionally. Abraham died and was buried in Hebron (TT-1,1:313).

Abraham was a descendant of Sam, the favored son of Nuh (Noah). Abraham had four wives and thirteen sons. Apparently he had no daughter. Sarah, his beautiful cousin, was his first wife. She was among those few relatives who believed in Abraham before moving out of Mesopotamia (TT-1,1:244, passim). According to a report in Tabari, Sarah's father was the king of Harran (ibid). During his brief stay in Egypt Abraham introduced Sarah as his sister. Sarah was so beautiful that the Egyptian King intended to marry her. Sarah escaped the dishonor miraculously. The King apologized when he realized his mistake and presented Hajar (Hagar), a Coptic slave girl, as a gift or compensation to Sarah (TT-1,1:244-7). According to Kisai, this happened when Abraham reached Jordan from Mesopotamia, and it was the King of Jordan, Zadok, who summoned Abraham and

asked who he was. "I am Abraham, Friend of God," he said. Then the King asked who the woman was. "his is my sister" said Abraham. "Marry her to me!" commanded the King. "She is forbidden to marry an infidel," he said, "for she is a believer." "If you do not give her to me in marriage," said the King, "I shall take her from you by force!" And he ordered Sarah brought to him. Abraham prayed to God, and when the King stretched out his hand toward her it withered and struck to his neck (sic). "This is your just retribution," said Sarah, because you were wrathful toward the Friend of God and his wife," "Are you his wife?" asked Zadok. "Yes," she answered. "Then, I am sorry for what I have done," he said, "and am repentful. Ask Abraham to pray to his Lord to forgive me." Abraham prayed to his Lord and was told that the King would not be set free unless he submit his Kingdom to Abraham and depart. When told this, the King agreed and gave his land to Abraham. The King had an extremely beautiful daughter named Hagar, whom he gave to Sarah. At this time Gabriel came to Abraham and bore him tidings that God would bless him with two sons. One was to be born of Sarah, and from his loins would issue many Prophets; the other one was to be born of Hagar, and from his loins would issue one Prophet whose name would be Muhammad, the Seal of the Prophets. Now since Sarah was old and had never given birth, she gave her handmaiden Hagar to Abraham so that God might give him a child by her. Abraham lay with her, and she conceived (K:150-1).

Though Tabari and other Islamic sources including the Quran agree with most of the above details, they believe Hajar (Hagar) was an Egyptian

Coptic slave-girl bestowed upon Sarah by the Egyptian King.^{1a}

Hajar gave birth to Abraham's first child, Ishmael. hereafter Sarah mistreated Hajar to the extent that she (Sarah) wanted to cut off Hajar's nose and ears -- **FA QALA AQTA ANFAHA, AQTA UDHUNAHA** (TT-1,1:254 passim). God does not punish a believer, particularly a Prophet's wife, for being so unkind to another innocent human being. Instead, He asked to Abraham to take Hajar and Ishmael to Mecca which was a desolate place. Miraculously, Hajar and Ishmael survived and Mecca flourished (TT-1,1:252-9; Q14:37 cf.T). After a long time Abraham sought Sarah's permission to visit Hajar. Sarah permitted him on the condition that he would not enter Hajar's house or be close to her. When Abraham reached Mecca, Hajar was dead -- **FA'STADHAN IBRAHIM SARAH AN YATIYA HAJAR FA-ADHANA LAHU, WA SHARAA ALAYH A'LLA YANZIL. WA QADIM IBRAHIM WA QAD MATAT HAJAR** (TT-1, 1:258). After Sarah's death Abraham married, according to Tabari, two Arab women: Qantura (or Qatura) and Hajur. According to Kisai those two women, Zehorah and her sister Keturah, were Canaanites (K:162). Though Tabari has included a report about Qantura's Canaanite background, he, seemingly, prefers the reports that count her as an Arab (TT-1,1:308-11). Sarah had given birth to Abraham's second child, Isaac. It was a miracle because both Abraham and Sarah were too old to conceive children (Q11:71-3; Q14:39; also see TT-1,1:249 passim). From Qantura Abraham had six and from Hajur five sons.

Abraham was followed in the Prophethood by his eldest son Ishmael, who passed on the sacred institution to his brother Isaac. Isaac nominated his son Jacob as Wasiyy. Later, however, both Isaac and Jacob received direct revelations from God and thus became full Prophets. Jacob was followed by his youngest son, Joseph, as a great Messenger of God. Lot, Job and Shuayb are other known Islamic Prophets of the era.

Upon leaving Mesopotamia, Lot, Abraham's nephew and a believer, had accompanied him. After Abraham settled in Palestine (sic), he sent Lot to reside in Jordan. God appointed Lot a Messenger and sent him to the

people of the Mutafikat, "the Overturned Ones" (TT-1,1:293, K:155). "The Mutafikat" consisted of the five largest cities (sic; K:155) of that age situated, according to Tabari, (somewhere) between Syria and Medina (TT-1,1:306). Tabari calls the five cities **ABAH, SAARRAH, UMRAH or AMRAH, DUMA and SADUM** (*ibid*:307). For Al-Kisai they are: Hann, Sodom, Hamud, Zoar and Gomorrah (K:155).²

Tabari portrays Isaac and Jacob as autonomous Prophet- chieftains living with their close relatives mostly in Syria, "Jacob's ancestral homeland" (TT-1,1:319). Most of the known Islamic Prophets after Abraham were Isaac's progeny. Ishmael was destined to be the progenitor of only the last Prophet, Muhammad. Jacob died in Egypt where he had gone to see his son, Joseph. As willed by Jacob, he was buried in Syria (sic), "the Holy Land" (TT-1,1:364). Until the domination of the Persians (sic) and the Rum (Romans? Greeks?) after Yahya "John" (sic) and Jesus, Tabari maintains, Prophethood as well as kingdom in Syria and surrounding regions belonged to the children of Israel, i.e. Jacob son of Isaac -- **WA KANA AN-NUBUWWAT WA'L-MULK MUTTASILAYN LI-WALAD ISRAIL BIN ISHAQ ILA AN ZAL DHALIK BI'L-FURS WA'R-RUM BAD YAHYA BIN ZAKARIYYA WA BAD ISA BIN MARYAM** (TT-1,1:316). Al-Is (Esau), Jacob's twin brother, is described by our sources as a villain to the Prophet Jacob, though not necessarily as a nonbeliever. Is (Esau) was married to Ishmael's daughter, Basmah or Bismah (*ibid*: 317). The two had a son called Rum. All the Banu **AL-ASFAR** (the Greeks and Romans?) are Rum's progeny -- **FA WALADAT LAHU'R- RUM BIN IS, FA-KULL BANI'L-ASFAR MIN WALADIHI** (*ibid*:317). The many children of Al-Is and Basmah increased in number. After overwhelming the Canaanites in Syria they spread to the sea and the region of Alexandria (sic) and then to Rum (Rome?) (*ibid*: 319). Jacob's many children also spread to the coastal areas. Crossing the sea they settled in Rum and became Kings; they are the Greeks -- **HATTA SAR ILA'S- SAWAHIL. HUMM ABARA ILA'R-RUM FA-AUTANAHA WA SAR AL- MULUK MIN WALADIH WA HUM AL-YUNANIYAH.**³

Ishmael's descendants, other than his grandchildren from Basmah,

lived in Arabia - in and around Mecca. After his death he was buried near his mother's grave in Mecca. As a Prophet, Ishmael was particularly deputed by God to preach among the Amalekites and Yamanite tribes (TT-1,1:314). Ishmael married a Jurhumite Arab woman whom he later divorced on his father's order. During a visit Abraham thought the woman had not treated him well enough (TT- 1,1:258 passim, 314). Ishmael's second wife was also a Jurhumite Arab (ibid). Ishmael is portrayed to have lived as a typical autonomous Arab chieftain. Once Ishmael complained to God about Mecca's heat. The Almighty air conditioned the place promptly and permanently by connecting it with Paradise. God told Ishmael

I am indeed opening a gate from Paradise from which the air of Paradise will light upon (you on the very spot you are) till the Day of Resurrection, and in this very spot you shall be buried -- INNI FAIH-UN LAK BAB-AN MIN AL- JANNA, YAJRI ALAYK RAHUHA ILA YAUM AL-QIYAMA, WA FI DHALIK AL-MAKAN UDFAN (TT-1,1:315).

Abraham's children and descendants from the two Arab women, Qantura and Hajur settled mostly in northern Arabian deserts. Some of them moved to Mecca and Khurasan in northeastern Iran (ibid: 311).

The Prophet Joseph was mistreated and treacherously sold into slavery by his half-brothers. In Joseph's Islamic story his half-brothers are treated as the Prophet's adversaries. As a very handsome slave, Joseph finally reached the palace of an Egyptian nobleman. Zulaykha, the noble's wife, tried to seduce Joseph. After Joseph's refusal he was charged with assault and imprisoned. As a Divinely preordained Prophet, Joseph was innocent, however. The King, having come to know about Yusuf as an extraordinary dream-interpreter, and of his innocence in the Zulaykha affair, released Joseph and appointed him the highest-ranking official of the state. Joseph virtually ruled Egypt, our sources make us believe (Q12 cf.T;TT-1,1:330-64; K:167-91).

"After Joseph there was no Prophet until Job, the son of Amos son of Reuel son of Abraham" (K:192). In addition to the point that Job was a "man from Rum" -- RAJUL-AN MIN AR-RUM, Tabari, in one report, agrees with

the above genealogy except for the Arabization of the names (TT-1,1:323). Note that our sources have already asserted that the Romans (or Greeks or both) are the progeny of Al-Is (Esau) son of Isaac, and Basmah, daughter of Ishmael. There is some confusion about Job's time and relations in our sources. In one report Job's mother is described as Lot's daughter and he (Job) was married to Rahmah, daughter of Afraim son of Josph. According to another report Job was Jacob's son-in-law (ibid) and "was a Prophet in the age of Jacob" -- ANNAHU KAN NABIYYAN FI AHD YAQUB (ibid: 324). The Prophet Job was super-rich. He owned a whole region called Al-Bathaniyya near Damascus (ibid:323). Before his death God gave Job "dominion over all the land of Syria" (K:203). In addition to some points discussed in this section, Job's Islamic story is similar to that of the biblical Job (see T,17:56-73 cf. Q21:83-4; TT-1,1:322-9; K:192-204). The Almighty allowed Satan to inflict upon Job loss of property, children and health. As a whole, Job and his wife passed the terrible test. They remained patient, and faithful to God as true believers. Eventually, by God's grace, they gained more than they had lost, miraculously.

The Prophet Shuayb was a descendant of Abraham, according to one report in Tabari: he was the son of Sayfun/Sayghun son of Ifa son of Nabit son of Madyan son of Abraham (TT-1,1:325). Another report tells us that Shuayb was the progeny of a believer accompanying Abraham from Mesopotamia. This believer was married to Lot's daughter (ibid). For Al-Kisai Shuayb was son of Zion son of Anka son of Midian (Madyan) son of Abraham (K:205). Madyan was one of Abraham's six sons from Qantura or Qatura. According to the Quran 15:78 (as explained by Tradition) and 26:176-7, Shuayb was sent as a Messenger of God to "the people of the thicket" -- **ASHAB AL-AYKAH**. In the Quran 7:85 and 11:84 we are told he was sent to MADYAN (Midian?). Tabari tells us that **AYKAH** and **MADYAN** were two different places to which Shuayb was sent as a Messenger (T,14:48). Popular Muslim thought and literature with reference to the unnamed father-in-law of Moses in Q28:22-28 identify Shuayb with the biblical

Jethro.⁴.

Originally, Abraham spoke **SURYANI** (Syriac). During his flight from Babylon he was taught **IBRANI** (Hebrew) miraculously by God (TT-1,1:310). Apparently, the first language of his progeny, excepting the Ishmaelites, continued to be Hebrew which was considered to be a Divinely ordained sacred language (K:174). God through revelation taught Ishmael Arabic - henceforth the speech of his progeny.

It is in the story of this era that the concept of a "Holy Land" -- **ARD AL-MUQADDASAH**, in addition to the holy land of Mecca, is projected into the Muslim consciousness. The concept is based on the Quranic report about Abraham's migration from Mesopotamia "unto the land that We (God) had blessed" -- **ILA'L-ARD ALLATI BARAKNA FIHA** (Q21:71). For Tabari, this blessed land was Syria -- **WA HIYA ARD ASH-SHAM** (T,17:46). In descriptions related to the story of Abraham and his sons the boundaries of this Holy Land are not clear. Our sources define the boundaries more specifically in their story of Moses and his followers. Moses told his people to enter the Holy Land -- **AL-ARD AL-MUQADDASAH** that God had prescribed for them (Q5:21). It covered the region between the Euphrates, Al-Arish and Egypt -- **MA BAYN AL-FURAT WA'L- ARISH WA MISR** (TS,10:167- 8). In their descriptions of the story of Abraham, Lot, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Job and Shuayb both Tabari and Kisai call the land **ASH-SHAM** (Syria) and the Land of Kanaan more frequently than referring to it as "the Holy Land." Though Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and their descendants settled mostly in "the Holy Land", the Kaba and Mecca are projected as the most sacred places for the Prophets, particularly Abraham. Beyond Mecca and the vaguely defined "Holy Land," regions such as Iraq and Egypt, within the hemisphere of Abraham and descendants, were of no sacred and central importance to the House of Abraham. Generally they are treated as Dar al-Harb, Domain of Nonbelievers. For the reader of the Islamic story of Ibrahim/Abraham and his descendants, the world beyond parts of Iran, Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt, Arabia and vaguely the region north and east of

the Mediterranean, was almost non-existent.

Islamic Link

The Islamic story of the Prophets Abraham, Lot, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Job, Shuayb and their followers tells Muslims they also were Muslims and their creed was Islam. They were neither Jews nor Christians, the Quran and other Islamic sources emphasize. Q2:134-141 mentions Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, "Jacob and the ribes" by name emphasizing that their creed was exactly the same one "sent down to us." Those who say "they were Jews, or they were Christians" are deprived of Divine knowledge or are "concealing the testimony received from God." Tabari's commentaries (TS,3:116 passim) on the above Quranic passage further augment the same points. God has told Muhammad that those who think these Prophets and their true followers were not Muslim are AL-MILAL AD-DALLAH "misguided nations in error" (ibid). Explaining Q2:140 "and who does greater evil than he who conceals a testimony received from God...", Tabari asserts that the People of the Book, i.e., Jews and Christians, conceal the fact that Islam was mentioned in their original sacred Books as the true religion of God, that all the above Prophets were Muslims, and that Muhammad was foretold in these Books (TS,3:125-7). The Prophet Muhammad is reported to have said

Yes, I am the one for whom my father Abraham prayed... (TS,3:82 or 83).

As mentioned above Gabriel had told Abraham that one of his offspring from Ismail's line would be a "Prophet whose name would be Muhammad, the Seal of the Prophets" (K:151).

The Kaba's reconstruction by Abraham and Ishmael is an important part of their Islamic story. In the context of Abraham's story, Tabari has assigned more than fifty pages in his afsir and twenty pages in his

arikh to convince the believers that the Kaba and Mecca, Muhammad's place of birth, were (and will remain) important for God and the Prophets from the day of creation to the Last Day. Of course these descriptions, repeated elsewhere in Tabari and other Islamic sources, are based on specific and general Quranic passages (e.g. Q2:125-41). The stories are so told that the link between these Prophets and Islamic sacred places and religious rites becomes a matter of fact in the Muslim mind. In light of these stories Muslims repeatedly see the eternal sacred nature of the Kaba. The Kaba at Mecca was the first sacred and blessed House established as a place of worship and as a place of Divine guidance for mankind (Q3:96). Muhammad told the believers that the Mosque of the Sanctuary -- **AL-MASJID AL-HARAM**, i.e. the Kaba, at Mecca was the first built on earth, and the second was the **MASJID AL-AQSA** "the Farthest Mosque" built in Jerusalem (TS,7:22). In a detailed report Tabari tells us

AL-BAYT, "The House" (the Kaba) descended, along with Adam (from Heaven God telling him) "Take down my House along with you so that people circumambulate it with respect and devotion just as My throne is circumambulated." There after Adam and the believers after him circumambulated it until the time of the Deluge when God drowned the nation of Noah. When the Deluge came, God raised it, purified it, and kept it safe from the chastising disaster -- **UQUBAH** -- that had overtaken the people of the earth. It continued to prosper in the heaven. Then, indeed, Abraham pursued and found some of its signs and (re)constructed it on its old foundation (TS,7:21).

God bade Abraham and Ishmael to rebuild His House -- **BAYT ALLAH** at Mecca; after reconstructing the Kaba, they performed and taught typical Islamic prayer, **SALAT**, and pilgrimage, **HAJJ**, rituals (Q2:124-137 cf. TS,3:7-116; also see TT-1,1:251-71; K:153-4). In great and interesting detail the believers are told that Gabriel, clouds and the winds, miraculously guided and accompanied Abraham and Ishmael during the search for just where the Kaba had stood. The sacred Black Stone, taken to Heaven during the Deluge for protection, was brought back by Gabriel and was fixed by Abraham in its present rightful place on the wall of the Kaba. After the reconstruction of the Kaba Abraham announced it was the duty of all

mankind to go on the pilgrimage of Mecca, obviously as Muslims. Those of his time and the souls of all to be born pledged to do so (Q22:26-9 cf.T; TT,1:60-1 passim). It was like the earlier pledge of mankind given in the presence of Adam to act as Muslims. So, those who do not believe in the sacred nature of the pilgrimage to Mecca are, to Muslims, violating the call of Abraham as well as their own covenant. The Quran asserts in this context:

There are clear signs - the station of Abraham, and whosoever enters it is in security. It is the duty of all men towards God to come to the House a pilgrim if he is able to make his way there. As for the unbelievers, God is All-sufficient nor needs any being (Q3:97).

In order to reinforce their faith in Abraham's link to the Kaba and Mecca, the believers are told with reference to Q3:97 that "clear signs" of the connection have existed in and around Mecca; the place where Abraham stood, **MAQAM IBRAHIM**, within the Sanctuary and the signs of his footsteps therein -- **ATHAR QADAMAYH FI'L-MAQAM** are among the evidences of Abraham's presence in Mecca and of his involvement in the reconstruction of the Kaba (TS,7:26-9). Those who do not believe in these (facts), God is not in need of them, Muslims are told (Q3:97 cf.). According to the Quran Abraham prayed to God to make the city of Mecca, where the House of God stood, a place of peace and a source of fruitful sustenance for the believers (Q2:126). This, for Tabari means that, as Abraham desired, Mecca would forever be safe from the domination of the 'tyrants,' i.e., non-Muslim rulers, and from disasters caused by God such as those that befall other countries in various forms (T,3:44-5). While building the Kaba, Abraham and Ishmael prayed to God to be Muslims (sic) and to learn Islamic rituals. They particularly prayed for a Muslim nation, **UMMAH MUSLIMAH**, (sic) to emerge from their progeny, and for a Messenger from amongst themselves, a Messenger who would convey His Messages, teach them the Book which is the Quran, and Wisdom, which means the Way (Sunnah) of this awaited Messenger (Muhammad) to purify them. Tabari reminds the readers that this was the religion adopted by Muhammad and his community (TS,3:82

passim; cf. Q2:124-9). As Abraham advised, his sons and grandsons including Jacob continued to follow Islam, the religion selected for them by God. They were pledged to live and die as Muslims (sic) (Q2:132; TS,3:93-96). Jacob and his children remained loyal. The Quran reminds the Jews and Christians and reassures Muslims that Jacob on his death bed renewed the message to his children to follow Islam. He asked his children

'What will you serve after me?' They said 'We will serve thy God and the God of thy fathers Abraham, Ishmael and Isaac, One God; to Him we surrender' [become Muslims] (2:133; cf. T,3:97-9).

The preceding and following explanations in Tabari make it clear for the reader that the God of Abraham, Ishmael and Isaac was the God of Islam⁵.

Along with the Quran's assertions the great similarities between the principal elements of the Prophets' call and those of the Prophet Muhammad make Muslims believe that these Messengers of God stood for Islam and for whatever is sacred in the creed of Muhammad. In the detailed Islamic stories, their creed is taken for granted to be Islam. Nevertheless, there are repeated references to the words "Islam," "Muslim" and other known symbols of Islam. The Prophets Abraham and Lot told people to become believers by saying **LA ILAH ILL'ALLAH** (TT,1:309). In his commentary on Q2:124-37, Tabari maintains that the "**KALIMAT** (Words)" that God wanted Abraham to fulfill were the rituals and rules and regulations of Islam, **SHARAI' AL-ISLAM**. Tabari mentions a large number of Islamic rites related to Islamic prayer, pilgrimage, hijra etc. (TS,3:7-116; also see TT-1,1:251-71, 278-87). About Q16:120-3 Tabari tells the believers that the meaning of "Abraham was... a man of pure faith" is that he persevered firmly in the creed of Islam -- **MUSTAQIM-AN ALA DIN AL-ISLAM** --, and that "the straight path" -- **SIRAT MUSTAQIM** -- to which God had guided Abraham was "this very creed of Islam, not Judaism nor Christianity" -- **WA DHALIK DIN AL-ISLAM LA'L-YAHUDIYYAT WA**

LA'N-NASRANIYYAH (T,14:190- 1). The meaning of SILM "mercy" in Q21:75 to which Abraham was admitted is "the Islam," (T,17:49). The "Lasting Word" -- **KALIMA BAQIYA** left by Abraham was none but **LA ILAH ILL-ALLAH** and **AL-ISLAM** (T,25:63-4 cf. Q43:28). Ishmael used to command his people to perform Islamic prayers and pay Islamic taxes -- **KAN YAMUR AHLAHU BI'S-SALAT WA'Z-ZAKA** (T,16:89-93 cf. Q19:54-5). Joseph called the non-Muslim King of Egypt to "Islam" -- **KAN KAFIR-AN FA DAAHU YUSUF ILA'L-ISLAM** (TT,1:336). Also, a parallel is drawn between the disbelievers in Muhammad and those who refused to believe in Lot, Shuayb and other Islamic Prophets (e.g., Q22:42-44 passim). Because their crime is the same - rejection of Islam - both groups shall be the inhabitants of Hell (Q22:51 passim cf. T,17:179-86; 19:18).

The Mission and Concerns

According to the Quranic injunction **BI HUDAHUM IQTADIH** "follow their guidance" (6:90), i.e., follow their model, the concerns, interests, likes and dislikes of the Prophets Abraham, Lot, Ishmael, Isaac, Joseph, Job and Shuayb, as described by Islamic sources must influence Muslims. Muslims find that excepting Lot and Shuayb (whose demands also had particular puritanic- moralistic dimensions) the Prophets were fundamentally interested in a dogma involving recognition of their supreme authority in abstract godhood and the afterlife, and in related rituals. These Prophets' mission did not relate much to this-worldly affairs. Their stories do not inspire a Muslim's concern for justice nor for social, political and economic betterment of the society. First and foremost, the dogma these Prophets projected emphasized the necessity for belief in their Prophethood- Messengership, i.e., paramount status demanding unconditional obedience to themselves -- **ATIUNI** (Q26:179, e.g.). The Prophets asserted their paramountcy and superiority. After offering a high position to Joseph, the Egyptian King told him not to expect to eat

on the same table because he (the King) disliked to eat with him, i.e., an inferior. Joseph is reported to have responded promptly: "I am worthier to disdain eating with you" -- **FA QAL YUSUF: ANA AHAQQ AN ANAF (AN TAKUL MAI)** (T,13:4; parentheses added; cf. Q12:54). Joseph had demonstrated a similar Prophetic arrogance toward his earlier Egyptian master (ibid). Implying that God spoke to the people only through these Prophets, their unique link to the Almighty justified for believers the Prophets' claims and demands. Beyond the fact that the Quran and Muhammad introduced these past figures as Messengers of God, the reported miracles are the only evidence of their authenticity for a Muslim. Through these miracles, Muslims see, the Prophets and their followers were helped and their adversaries punished. Muslims disregard internal inconsistencies and contradictions involved in the description of these miraculous events.

Muslims find that the necessity for belief in monotheism combined with worship of the One God and for belief in a Day Hereafter was the most important concern of these Prophets. The faith in this dogma was demonstrated in strong condemnation of polytheism and polytheists, in the performance of certain rituals and in adoption of certain ways to worship God as prescribed by the Prophets. Muslims learn that salvation and damnation here and Hereafter did not necessarily depend on action: good or bad deeds in a common sense. It was the declaration of faith in the dogma, performance of rituals (which happened to be Islamic ones such as **SALAT, ZAKAT, HAJJ**, ablution, circumambulation of the Kaba etc.) and the maintenance of a particular pattern of behavior toward nonbelievers that led to this-worldly victories and other-worldly rewards. Adoption of any other dogma and system of belief and action was to worship **ASH- SHAYTAN** "the Devil." The Prophets' mission was complete in a circle of dogma and rituals, each leading to the other. The Prophets' exhortations and the descriptions of their concerns and activities seldom relate to morality in its common sense or to social issues. It is the importance of the

above-mentioned dogma and rituals that is repeated throughout the Quranic story of our Prophets.⁶

One way to ascertain that the Prophets of the era under discussion had no basic concerns beyond those related to the acknowledgement of their paramouncy, rituals and faith in abstract terms, is to study with the help of Quranic contexts and Traditional exegeses those Quranic words and phrases which condemn nonbelievers and applaud the believers in the context of these Prophets' stories. In Q2:124; 6:82; 15:78; 22:45 and in 37:113, for example, the disbelievers in the Prophets including those in this section are charged with ZULM: wrongdoing, evildoing, sinfulness, injustice etc. The ZULM in these verses, according to Tabari, signifies polytheism and disbelief in the one God (TS,3:23-4; TS,13:493; T,17:179; T,14:48; T,23:89). They were ZALIMUN "evildoers" in the sense that HUM YABUDUN GHAYR MAN YANBAGHI AN YUBAD, WA YASUN MAN LA YANBAGHI AN YASUH "they worshipped other than the One they should worship and they disobeyed the one whom they should not have disobeyed" (T,17:179 cf. 22:44- 5). That is: they refused to obey the Prophets designated to tell the people how to worship God. In Quran 2:140 Jews and Christians are called AZLAM, "the worst, evildoers" not for any worldly wrongdoings, but for concealing the Divine 'fact' that Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob and the ribes were Muslims (sic) -- KATAMU SHAHADAT-AN INDAHUM MIN AMR ALLAH BI-AN IBRAHIM WA ISMAIL WA ISHAQ, WA YAQUB WA'L- ASBAT KANU MUSLIMIN (TS,3:124 cf. Q2:140). For Tabari, the ZULM in Q9:70 of the adversaries of Abraham, Lot and Shuayb was their disobedience of God and rejection of the Prophets as His Messengers (T,10:178).

In 2:258, the Quran ascribes ZULM to Namrud and his nonbelieving people (cf. TS,5:432-8). For the meaning of ZULM Tabari refers us to his commentaries on 2:254 and other passages, where he tells us that ZULM means rejection and denial of (the existence of) God and rejection of His Messengers (TS,5:384). Explaining the concept of ZULM in the Quranic context of the above-mentioned Prophets' story Muhammad made this

point more clear. When the Quranic passage

Those who believe and have not confounded their belief with evildoing (ZULM), -- to them belongs the true security; they are rightly guided (6:82)

was revealed, some Muslims became concerned, thinking that not only belief **IMAN**, but also refraining from all "evildoing," **ZULM**, in its general sense, was necessary for salvation. So, they told the Prophet frankly that all of them were likely to commit one or other kind of "evildoing" -- **MA MINNA AHAD ILLA WA HUA YAZLUM...** The Prophet told them their understanding of the word **ZULM** "evildoing" was wrong. Referring to the Quranic verse 31:13 "**ZULM**," he told them it "means **SHIRK**, (polytheism) associating partners, children, parents etc. with God." Along with this report, Tabari, as usual, quoted other Traditions, reassuring the believers that "evildoing" in 6:82 means **SHIRK**, **KUFR** (polytheism and disbelief in God and His Messengers) and **IBADAT AL-AWTHAN** "idol worship" (TS,11:492-504). Concluding the story of Joseph the Quran calls the nonbelievers **AL- MUJRIMIN**, the sinners and the guilty (Q12:110). These are those who "disbelieved in God, opposed His Messengers and rejected what was revealed by Him to them" -- **KAFARU BI'LLAH WA KHALAFU RUSULAHU WA MA ATAUHUM BIHI MIN INDIHI** (T,13:89). So the cause for the condemnation of the adversaries of these Prophets is their wrong belief and negative attitude toward the Prophets, not their immoral and unjust deeds in general. The Quranic content tells the reader that it was for their "worship of images" that, Abraham thought the people were in "manifest error" --**DALAL MUBIN** (Q21:52-4).

Similarly, the positive adjectives refer overwhelmingly to the right faith rather than good deeds in any general sense. For example **AS-SALIHUN** "the righteous" in Q2:130 are those who perform their duties toward God -- **AL-MUADDI HUQUQ ALLAH** (TS,3:91). Those familiar with Islamic terminology know well that the phrase **HUQUQ ALLAH** "duties toward God" is contrasted with **HUQUQ AL-IBAD** "duties toward humans." "Duties toward God" include

only the belief in Islamic dogma and performance of Islamic rituals. Abraham is praised for being a **SIDDIQ**, "a true man" "a saint" (Q19:41). This means, Tabari says, he was among the truthful in his talk, narrations and promises, not a liar (T,16:89). Tabari does not elaborate further. The Quranic verses immediately following inform the readers what kind of truths interested Abraham. It is a sermon to his father favoring Abraham's version of monotheism and worshipping of God, and condemning polytheism calling it Devil-worship (Q19:42-9). We will soon see that Abraham did not hesitate to lie for God -- **FI'LLAH** -- and for himself and his wife.

AL-MUHSININ, the good-doers in Q6:84, are called so "because of their obedience to Us" -- **BI HUSN ITAATHIHIM IYYANA** -- the Almighty informs us in Tabari's words (TS,13:508). The followers of Abraham's creed were **MUHSIN** "upright," "good-doers" (Q4:125) in the sense that they did what their Lord told them to do: "made impermissible His impermissibles and allowed what He had allowed to do" (TS,9:250). For an alim, a doctor of Islamic law, it is obvious that these "permissibles and impermissibles" -- **HALAL WA HARAM** refer to ritualistic and dietary rules and regulations. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, Solomon, Job, Joseph, Moses, Aaron and "all" other Prophets were **MUHSIN** (Q6:84) i.e., persevered in difficult times in calling people to God as Noah did and were the best in obedience of God's will (TS,11:507-8). According to Q21:71-7, Abraham, Lot, Isaac and Jacob were **SALIH** "righteous" and Divinely appointed **IMAM** "leaders" who guided people according to God's commandments; also, God revealed to them the "doing of good deeds" -- **FIL AL-KHAYRAT**, "the performance of Salat (Islamic prayer) and the payment of Zakat (Islamic alms or tax); they worshipped God". According to Tabari, their "righteousness" and their 'guiding people according to God's commands' signify their obedience to God and avoidance of the 'impermissibles.' As usual, no concrete examples of 'righteousness' and 'Divinely-guided action' beyond abstract obedience of God and performance of rituals are given. **FIL AL-KHAYRAT** "doing of

good deeds" or "good works" is a rare construction in the Quran (Q21:73). Our master of synonyms and detailed explanations, and guide to the Quran, Tabari, disappoints a curious reader; He literally repeats the phrase **AN AFILU'L-KHAYRAT** with no more elaborations (T,17:49). As if, having mastered the over-all context of the Quran, he knew well that there could be no good work worthy enough to be revealed by the Almighty to His Messengers.

The **KALIMAT** "certain Words" or "Commands" with which God "tested Abraham" and which he "fulfilled" successfully (2:124) were nothing but Islamic rituals including the verbal and formal glorification of God on certain definite occasions (see TS,3:1-17). Tabari prefers the Tradition according to which the demand for the "fulfillment of Certain Words", so important for God and Abraham, meant to chant twice a day two particular phrases exalting the Almighty (ibid: 17). God made Abraham an **IMAM** "leader" (2:124) in the sense that he was a leading figure in his belief in God and His Prophets and in his obedience to God's revealed commandments, and that other believers will follow him in the same (TS,3:18). Abraham prayed for Mecca to be "a land secure" or a "region of security" (2:126) in the sense that no nonbelieving ruler would ever rule in it and that it would escape Divine disasters that befall other lands (TS,3:44-5). As for the material betterment of Mecca's people, Abraham prayed only for the believers (2:126), "not for nonbelievers" -- **KHASS BI- MASALATIHI RABBAHU AN YARZUQ MIN ATH-THAMARAT MIN SUKKAN MAKKAH, AL-MUMIN MINHUM DUN AL-KAFIR** (TS,3:52). Abraham prayed for the emergence of Muhammad as the Messenger who shall teach "God's signs," "the Book and the Wisdom" and "purify" the people (2:129 cf. TS,3:82-8). While Tabari's translation of "signs," "the Book" and "Wisdom" into the Quran and Sunnah takes us back to a vague circle, "purification" more specifically means Muhammad shall rid the people of polytheism, make them pay Zakat and obey only the One God (TS: ibid). Abraham believed in God; he and Jacob told their sons to do the same and said "My sons, God has chosen for you

AD-DIN, the religion; see that you die not, save in surrender" (2:132; also see Q42:13; the Arabic word in the Quran for the one "in surrender" is **MUSLIM**, i.e., Abraham told his children to live and die as Muslims). Now, what does the **DIN**, religion, chosen by God mean? Tabari tells us it is Islam (TS,3:96); and that is all! The **DIN** God asked the Prophets to establish in Q42:13 also refers to correct Islamic dogma of Godhood and rites, contrasting them to polytheism (T,25:14-5).

God bestowed upon the House of Abraham a "mighty Kingdom" (Q4:54). What aspect of this 'Islamic state' could be important enough for the Traditionist Tabari to explain? Tabari has quoted four categories of explanatory Traditions explaining "the mighty Kingdom" as follows: 1) the "mighty Kingdom" means Prophethood, 2) it is called so because God made women lawful for the believers, i.e., they could have a great Kindom of women in the sense that they, including Muhammad, could have numerous regular and concubine wives. The reports give examples of the Prophet David who had 99 women and of the Prophet Solomon who had one hundred. Muhammad had Divine permission to do likewise, the reports of this category assert. 3) he Kingdom was mighty because it was helped by the angels. 4) Tabari favors the Tradition that interprets "the mighty Kingdom" by adding only "(such as) that of Solomon" (TS,8:480-2). Having said this, Tabari moves on to the next verse. In other words it is the mere possession of power by the believers and certain types of amenities for them that are important, not the features and qualities of the ideal Islamic state as they relate to its inhabitants.

It is the monotheism of the Prophets - contrasted with polytheism - that the Quran repeatedly mentions as the most noteworthy characteristic of the Prophets. Had they indulged in polytheism, their works would have become wasted efforts (Q6:88). Further depreciating good deeds, Tabari reminds us that good works of polytheists are unacceptable by God -- **ANN ALLAH LA YAQBIL MAASH-SHIRK AMAL-AN** (TS,11:514).

Of all the Quranic Prophets only three, Lot, Shuayb and Moses also

expressed their concerns about certain this- worldly issues. Lot spoke against sodomy and Shuayb against buying long and selling short. Lot's vehement criticism of alleged sodomy was puritanically oriented. It only teaches Muslims that any deviation from specific moralistic standards justifies the worst kind of punishment for nonconformists. The existence of sodomy was enough justification for the destruction of four million (sic) people. After having justified Joseph's hoarding (discussed below), a Muslim reader is less likely to take Shuayb's exhortations against questionable business practices seriously. Muslims understand well that Lot's and Shuayb's adversaries' actual crime was their refusal to believe in the dogma. his may be clarified by asking the following question: Should, for a Muslim, the peoples of Lot and Shuayb have escaped retribution after refusing to accept the Prophet's creed, even if they did not indulge in sodomy and did not buy long and sell short? Obviously not, if the Islamic logic of crime and punishment as a whole is followed. As discussed in Part IV, Muslims also know that the sins, worldly misdoings, of the believers are eventually forgiven. How some other aspects of Lot's and Shuayb's criticism of sodomy and questionable business practices are internalized by Muslims will be discussed in the section on Muhammad.

That the Prophets of the era were least interested in the worldly affairs of their societies, and that their mission was irrelevant to the people's concerns may be elaborated in some other ways. The irrelevance of the Prophetic call may be monitored by some heathen responses. For the nonbelievers, the Prophets were an unwanted and unneeded nuisance. here was nothing wrong in what they had inherited from their ancestors, they told Abraham (Q26:73). Shuayb talked nonsense, they told him frankly (Q11:91). As discussed below, the Egyptian King wondered why Joseph insisted on converting the unwilling people to Islam while they were otherwise happy. (Obviously, these responses are not recorded for appreciation. They simply reinforce the believers' estrangement from, if not abhorrence of, rational thought).

The Quran calls Azar (Abraham's father and the chief administrator of the heathen state) **ADUWW ALLAH** "God's enemy" (9:113-4) not because of his inefficiency or injustice, but because of his refusal to adopt his son's faith, i.e. acknowledgment of Abraham's special link to God (Prophethood), adoption of Abraham's version of monotheism, belief in the afterlife and condemnation of polytheism and polytheists. In some cases, like that of Abraham, the obedience of the people to their kings is contrasted to their obedience to the Prophets. In these descriptions, however, no desire for change in the existing social and political system is mentioned. Beyond their demand for recognition of their paramountcy per se and acceptance of their dogma and rituals, the Prophets did not ask for responsibility or accountability for any change affecting peoples' lives. This may be seen in Abraham's confrontation with Namrud of Babylon. Based on reports from the Companions of the Prophet Muhammad, our sources portray Namrud as the first of the four world-emperors who in their times ruled the whole world (sic). [Two of them, Namrud and Bakhtnassar (Nebuchadnezzar?) were nonbelievers; the other two, Sulayman (Solomon) and DHU'L-QARNAYN were believers -- **AN IBN MASUD, WA AN NAS-IN MIN ASHAB AN-NABIYY: INN AWWAL MALIK-IN MALAK FI'L-ARD SHARQAHA WA GHARBAHA NAMRUD BIN KANAAN IBN KUSH BIN SAM BIN NUH, WA KANAT AL-MULUK ALLADHIN MALAKU AL-ARD KULLAHA ARBAA: NAMRUD, WA SULAYMAN BIN DAWUD, WA DHU'L-QARNAYN, WA BAKHT NASSAR: MUMINAN WA KAFIRAN** (TT-1,1:234 passim.)

Namrud was a Samite, who along with his people had apparently relapsed into unbelief. In another report, Tabari calls Namrud an offspring of Ham (ibid:287). Al-Kisai counts Namrud among Ham's progeny (K:128). The very fact that Islamic sources differentiate these four pre-Muhammad empires only on the basis of the faith of the rulers demonstrates for a Muslim Islam's indifference to other issues.

For Abraham nothing was wrong except the idol-worship of the people. Had Namrud believed in the God of Abraham, acknowledging Abraham as His Messenger, Namrud's kingdom, MULK, would have been left to him intact.

This is exactly what God proposed three times through an angel to the world- emperor -- **BAATH ALLAH ILA'L-JABBAR MALAK-AN AN AMIN BI WA ATRUKUK ALA MULKIK... FA-JAAHU'TH-THANIYAH... THUMM ATAHU'TH-THALITHAH FA-ABA ALAYH** -- (TT-U,1:202). The Almighty made no more demands about the social, political and economic aspects of Namrud's rule. He was ready to leave the empire as it was. In the story of Abraham, Namrud is shown to have massacred thousands of innocent children. During his argument with Abraham, who projected God's omnipotence, Namrud is reported to have killed a man to demonstrate that he had the power of life and death. These massacres are mentioned not to be condemned. Namrud feared the birth of the child Abraham, who, as Namrud was threatened by Divine vision, was predestined to destroy him. For this reason, Namrud is shown to have killed very many newborn children and pregnant women. Our sources care only to show that on every occasion Abraham was saved miraculously. The destruction of the innocents is of no concern to a Muslim reader of the story. Why should a believer be concerned about the death of children other than the baby believer, Abraham? Muslim readers are led to rejoice in the miraculous survival of a great Muslim Prophet, rather than unnecessarily mourn the death of nonbelievers' children. As a matter of fact the descriptions of the massacre reinforce Muslim insensitivity toward the agonies of those beyond the circle of the Faith.

The concerns of Ishmael, Isaac and Jacob concentrate on the worship of the one God and on their respect for the Kaba and Islamic rituals. In the case of Isaac and his descendants it is the secondary status of the "Holy Land" as a sacred place which is projected in Muslim consciousness. Unflinching trust in God forms the only theme of Job's Islamic story. Joseph is shown preaching monotheism and belief in the afterlife in an Egyptian prison (Q12:37-41 cf.). The Egyptian King who appointed Joseph as the Chief Administrator of the country is shown to have become a Muslim (T,13:6 cf. Q12:56). Joseph's whole story tells the believers how God helped His Prophet during various difficult situations and raised him to

power and prosperity (Q12 cf.T). Our sources do not mention any changes in the economic and socio-political structure of Egypt after Joseph became the second-most powerful person, or after the King was converted to Islam. They are only concerned to show how superior in status Joseph was to the Egyptian King (T,13:4 passim cf. Q:12:54). God had given Joseph the miraculous power to foretell events. Knowing of a forthcoming seven-year drought, Joseph stored enough grain to tide him over. This theme, however, is not developed to project our Prophet-Governor as benevolent, but aims at demonstrating in action the basic Islamic faith that true believers are predestined to flourish automatically. Implied is the point that one should not work for this-worldly gains. As a matter of fact dependence on one's own work for results -- **ISTIGHNA** becomes blasphemy. Joseph's story also aims at showing up Joseph's half-brothers, the Prophet's adversaries, and at humiliating Zulaykha who, after failing to attract Joseph's love, had conspired to imprison him. Our sources have no scruples, but show Joseph using his position and Prophetic efficiency for his own gain. During the drought, his nonbelieving Egyptian subjects

gathered around Joseph and said to him "O Plenipotent, the food that was in our houses has gone, and we have sold what we possessed". In response to their plea, he sold them grain during the first year for dinars, the second year for jewels, the third year for mules and horses, the fourth for their houses, the fifth for their gardens and farms, the sixth for themselves (so they became his slaves), and then during the seventh year he fed them because they were his slaves. Zuleikha, who was as afflicted with hardship and hunger as the other people, sold everything she possessed for food and became one of Joseph's slaves. One day she came to Joseph and said, "O Joseph, praise be to him who has turned slaves into kings and made them masters because of their obedience. here is not god but God alone, who has no equal"... Joseph wept and said, "I shall send you all you require and shall restore to you all your former possessions and slaves, and you shall be a lady as you were." Then he married her, ... in the presence of the princes of Egypt. And God restored her beauty and youth (K:179-80; parentheses in the text).

From the Islamic story of the era Muslims assume the Prophets' appearance was not a response to any social, economic and political unrest in the society. Muslims see that the concepts of reform, development, social service and justice in general were irrelevant to the Prophets'

mission. Islamic sources portray the societies confronted by the Prophets not to have lacked anything - nor did they have any problem - in a worldly sense. Their problem was the lack of realization that they had a problem: wrong rituals and traditions based on wrong creeds and their very engrossment in worldliness and satisfaction with the results. The heathen societies of the era: Mesopotamia, Syria, "the Mutafikat," "Madyan," "**Al-Ayka**" and Egypt are generally described as prosperous, leading a happy life. No tension between the rulers and the ruled is reported. The fact that very few conversions to the Prophets' creed are reported indicates almost all, including Shuayb's people, were happy with what they had.

Of Babylon or Mesopotamia the believers are told that a heathen king built a new city; "Fine palaces and ornamented assembly halls were constructed." he king also "ordered... to make gardens and to channel rivers" (K:129). Namrud, the greatest enemy of God

summoned the master carpenter and architect erah (Abraham's father), and ordered him to build a magnificent house. Terah constructed for him a square palace, a thousand cubits in length and breadth. he walls he made of pearl and the floor of silver, the roof of sandal-wood and the gates of ivory. Inside he caused rivers of milk and honey, wine and water to flow, and trees of silver and gold were planted along the borders. He put many assembly-halls in it, in each of which was a portrait of Nimrod. When he had finished, Nimrod was so pleased with it that he made erah one of his boon companions and his grand vizier (K:131-2).

The Mesopotamian heathens loved festivals.

Each year (they) had a festival during which they went far out of the city... Afterwards they would return, and Nimrod would parade with the lords of the realm in magnificent array (K:146).

It was during one of these joyous festivals (sing: ID) that Abraham's father invited the problematic son affectionately to join them, haply to see what a wonderful creed or tradition they had -- **QAL ABUH YA IBRAHIM, INN LANA ID-AN LAU KHARAJT MAANA LA-AJABAK DINUNA** (TT-1,1:237-8). Our stiff-necked Propet, however, pretended to be ill -- **QAL INNI SAQIM** (Q7:89) -- and refused. As discussed below, he ws grinding his axe to spoil their temple while the joyful heathens were away (*ibid*; also see Q21:57 *passim*; Q37:89 *passim*). The booming nature of "the Mutafikat" of

Lot is made obvious by its population of four million (sic). The Quran refers, grudgingly, to the multitude of Shuyayb's people implying their prosperity also and, according to Tabari, to their boons and comforts (Q7:86; TS,12:560). That Egypt was prosperous and peaceful is implied throughout Joseph's story.

Material welfare and betterment - "blessings from heaven and earth" -- **BARAKAT MIN AS-SAMA WA'L-ARD** -- and "good in this world" -- **FI'D-DUNYA HASANAH** -- if enjoyed by the believers symbolized God's blessings (Q7:96; Q16:123; TT- 1,1:311) not the results of their own efforts. (Job's story is a prime example.) The same if enjoyed by nonbelievers - their prosperity, peace, harmony, joyousness and good fortune - are described not for appreciation, but to depreciate them in the eyes of believers. This is done in various ways. **FI'D-DUNYA HASANAH** "good in this world" of nonbelievers does not signify their achievement of God's blessings. It indicates their wretchedness; that by depriving them of faith in the Prophetic creed God sealed their hearts (7:101). Besides, their worldly achievements symbolized their imminent destruction (Q7:99 cf. T,9:9). God's bestowing worldly comforts on these past nonbelievers such as their "physical health, material abundance and happiness" was a Divine strategem of **ISTIDRAJ** "leading deceptively step by step to disaster" and of **IMLA** "false respite" -- **ISTIDRAJ ALLAH IYYAHUM BIMA ANAM BIHI ALAYHIM FI DUNYAHUM MIN SIHHAT AL-ABDAN WA RIKHA AL-AYSH KAMA ISTADRAJ ALLADHIN QABLAHUM** -- (T,9:9 cf. Q7:99. The concepts of **ISTIDRAJ** and **IMLA** are explained more fully below in this section.) About the transitory and deceptive nature of these past nonbelievers' worldly achievements the Quran informs Muhammad and the believers:

If they cry lies to thee, so too before them
the people of Noah cried lies, and Ad
and Hamood, and the people of Abraham,
the people of Lot, and the men of Midian; to
Moses also they cried lies. And I respited
the unbelievers, then I seized them; and
how was My horror!
How many a city We have destroyed
in its evildoing, and now it is fallen down
upon its turrets! How many a ruined well,

a tall palace!...
 How many a city I have respited
 in its evildoing; then I seized it, and to
 Me was the homecoming (22:42-8).

These were the people, Tabari tells us, who belied the Messengers of God and set up partners with Him, i.e., were polytheists -- **AL-MUKADH-DHIBAT RUSUL ALLAH, AL-MUSHRIKAT BI'LLAH** (T,17:179). What the unbelievers had was a mere respite, a Divine ruse. "Did I not (eventually) change their abundance to scarcity, their life to death and annihilation, their bustling civilization to ruination?" God informs Muhammad jubilantly tellinghimhow He did away with the worldly amenities the nonbelievers enjoyed -- **FA'NZUR YA MUHAMMAD KAYF KANY AGHYIRI MA KAN BIHIM MIN NIMAT... ALAM UBDILHUM/UBADDILHUM BI'L-KAHRAT QILLAT, WA BI'L-HAYAT MAUT-AN WA HALAK-AN WA BI'L-UMARAT KHARAB-AN?** (T,17:179). While they set up partners to God and opposed His will - and this was indeed their **ZULM**, Tabari reminds us again, God proceeded deliberately slow, delaying the nonbelievers' castigation; he did not rush to chastise them. However, His chastisement (eventually) "seized them" (by surprise) (T,17:184).

The Quran 9:69-70 ridicules the worldly strength, the abundance of wealth, the multitude of children and the enjoyment of material gains of these past nonbelievers. All this "engrossment" in worldly life is devalued and called, contemptuously, "prating" and "plunging" in trivialities -- **KHAUD**. The works of disbelievers are devalued. Addressing disbelievers in Muhammad the Quran says:

Like those before you, who were stronger than you in might, and more abundant in wealth and children; they took enjoyment in their share; so do you take enjoyment in their share. You have plunged as they plunged. Those - their works have failed in this world and in the world to come; those -

they are the losers.

Has there not come to you the tidings of those who were before you - the people of Noah, Ad, Hamood, the people of Abraham, the men of Midian and the subverted cities? Their Messengers came to them with the clear signs; (9:69-70 cf. T,10:175-7).

Elaborating on the phrase "their works have failed in this world" (9:69), Tabari tells us that their worldly activities (including the good works)

were wasted efforts and that "there is no reward for them except Hell," because all these were done in a state of disbelief in God and His Messengers, a state that God resents and hates. they are the losers, i.e., "their deal is defrauded" -- **DHAHABAT AMALUHUM BATIL-AN, FA LA THAWAB LAHA ILLA'N-NAR, LI-ANNAHA KANAT FIMA YASKHAT ALLAH WA YAKRAHUHU... HUM AL-MAGHBUNUN SAFQATAHUM (T,10:186).**

Prosperity, worldly dedications and materialistic preoccupations more often signified **KUFR** "disbelief" rather than **IMAN** "belief." It was Namrud's interest in "the knowledge of stars," building and public works that eventually led him to "sorcery and soothsaying" and to 'building idols' (K:131-2). Mysterious divine voices harassed Namrud, particularly at times when the enemy of God "contemplated the beauty of his palace" and enjoyed his other worldly possessions which, the mysterious voices said, were a source of deception (K:133).

The Treatment.

The following segment discusses patterns of the Prophets' and believers' relations with the nonbelievers and the believers' final response to the rejection of their call. The story of the era of Abraham and his descendants projects, once again, a perpetual Cold War - hijra-jihad- conquest - or - annihilation model for the Muslim conduct of their relations with non-Muslims. The story tells Muslims that the Almighty and these past herces whose ways and traditions are to be imitated 1) never reconciled themselves with other creeds and their followers, 2) terrorized the nonbelievers, justifying the use of force, torture and terror to impose the Faith, 3) demonstrating extreme insensitivity to others' feelings, adopted sabotage and a variety of deceptive, misleading and disingenuous methods in their dealings with others, 4) preferred hijrah, segregation and aggressive and self-righteous isolationism and exclusiveness, to peaceful coexistence on the basis of

equality with nonbelievers, 5) indulged in expansionism and jihad when possible, and 6) with Divine help, finally, desired and saw the destruction of the nonbelievers. In confrontation with nonbelievers, Divine help came in two ways: 1) During difficult times the Prophets and the faithful were helped through miracles by the Almighty's invisible forces; the apparently formidable material forces of the nonbelievers always came to naught; 2) God engaged in jihad and annihilated non-Muslims of their times by means other than the swords of the believers thus reinforcing Muslim belief in their eventual victory and in the certainty of non-Muslims' final destruction as it happened in the past repeatedly. The process of nonbelievers' annihilation, Muslims find, was always a process of collective punishment not sparing the 'noncombatants,' women, children, the elderly, nor even animals and plants. Muslims note that nonbelievers' annihilation was accompanied by harsh mental torment and physical torture. Muslims also find that the torments and destruction of the nonbelievers were rejoiced in by God, the Prophets and the faithful, and described by Islamic sources in a similar vein. No mercy or regrets were to be shown for the misfortunes of the nonbelievers.

The Quran and Tradition project Abraham as a prime example of irreconciliation between Muslims and non-Muslims, and exhort Muslims to follow Abraham's model in dealings with disbelievers in Islam. Q60:1-7 calls the non-Muslims the enemies of God and Muslims, forbidding Muslims to "offer love" to and have friendship -- **AL- MUADDAH** -- with non-Muslims. Muslims are warned against any secret friendly relations with nonbelievers. Those who do so are declared to have gone astray from the right path. Muslims are told that non-Muslims are the inherent enemies; they will certainly use Muslim friendship against Islam whenever they can. Muslims are not supposed to maintain sympathetic and amicable relations even with their non-Muslim children and blood-kin (cf. T, 28:57-63). In all this, Muslims are told to follow the model of Abraham:

You have had a good example in Abraham, and those with him, when they said to their people [nlm-Muslims], 'We are quit of you and that you serve, apart from God [i.e., any creed other than Islam]. We disbelieve in you, and between us and you enmity has shown itself, and hatred for ever, until you believe in God alone [Q60:4; brackes added].

In Tabari's words, God has commanded Muslims to follow "the auspicious and authentic model -- QUDWAH HASANAH of Abraham and other Prophets" (sic). It is applicable particularly in their dealings with non-Muslims. This is what Abraham and other Prophets told the nonbelievers:

We disassociate ourselves from you and from whatever you worship... We repudiate your disbelief in God... Permanent animosity and hatred between us and you has become manifest -- **ZAHAR BAYNANA WA BAYNAKUM AL-ADAWAT WA'L-BAGHDA ABAD-AN.** here will be no peace nor any reconciliation, clemency and mitigation between us until you believe in God only [i.e., until you accept Islam] -- **WA LA SULH BAYNANA WA LA HAWADAT HATTA TUMINU BI'LLAH** (T,28:62; brackets added).

What does the story of Abraham tell the Muslims about their attitude towards the 'good' non-Muslims? With reference to the peoples of Abraham, Shuayb and other Prophets, believers are told that the otherwise good deeds of the nonbelievers are nul and void in the eyes of God. The people of Noah, the Ad, the hamud, the people of Abraham, those of Midian and the Al-Mutafikat as well as those who do not acknowledge Muhammad as the Messenger of God, the Quran asserts, "are the losers" -- **HUM AL- KHASIRUN** (9:69-70). This means the good deeds of non-Muslims are wasted efforts -- **HABITAT AMALUHUM... DHAHABAT AMALUHUM BATIL-AN.** "Hell is the reward of their good works" -- **FA-LA THAWAB LAHA ILLA'N-NAR** (T,10:175-8 cf. Q9:69-70). Q9:114 mentioned above is made more clear with reference to a good non-Muslim of Muhammad's time i.e. Abu alib, the heathen uncle, supporter and protector of the Prophet and Muslims during the difficult Meccan phase of the Prophet's career. When Abu alib died the Quran forbade Muhammad, sternly, from prayer for this friendly heathen, and called Abu alib, unregretfully, an "inhabitant of Hell" (Q9:113). It is in this context that Abraham's desire to pray for forgiveness for his father (Q60:4) is explained by the Quran: Muslims are told that Abraham dissociated himself from his father after it was clear that he was an

"enemy of God," i.e., persisted in his un-Islamic creed (Q9:114). God is telling Muslims, Tabari repeats, to follow Abraham's example:

So, you who believe in God, dissociate yourselves from the enemies of God, from among those who set partners for God [are non-Muslims], and do not make friends with them until they believe in God [the way Muslims do]... (T,28:62; brackets added).

The dissociation from the nonbelievers should not be merely passive and quiet. Following Abraham's model Muslims are obliged to "expose," to demonstrate, their "animosity" and "hatred" toward non-Muslims -- **WA AZHIRU/IZHARU LAHUM AL-ADAWAT WA'L-BAGHDA** (ibid).

Abraham's Sunnah teaches the believers to disregard nonbelievers' conciliatory gestures. Despite Namrud's reconciliatory approach, Abraham remained adamant. After Abraham's proganda and his harsh attacks on the creed of his people were exposed, Namrud told Abraham's father:

This child of yours is young and does not know what he is saying. Take him and show him kindness. Perhaps he will recover his senses (K:140).

As a true believer, and Messenger of God, Abraham resisted 'the recovery of senses' the way Namrud expected. Abraham continued his Prophetic activities. Namrud also continued the appeasement. He offered Abraham a high position in the palace, and to marry him to his daughter (K:145). The King was apparently ready to respect the creed of Abraham without, of course, discarding his own when he proposed to slaughter four thousand cows as an offering to Abraham's God who, Namrud acknowledged, was an "excellent Lord" -- **NIM AR-RABB** and whose glory and power -- **IZZATUHU WA QUDRATUHU** were indeed great (TT-U,1:170). [It was not unlike a modern secular liberal government's toleration of other creeds through expressions of respect and the granting of subsidies to facilitate religious occasions.] A Muslim would think Nimrod was ready to pay his respect to the creed of Abraham and allow him to coexist peacefully. For the believers' guidance, however, our sources make Abraham reject the offer. They want to see him demand nothing less than a complete and

unconditional surrender to Abraham. The Prophets had to reject pluralism. Readers find Abraham doing exactly the same. Abraham told Nimrod

LA YAQBIL ALLAH MINK MA KUN ALA SHAY-IN MIN DINIK HADHA HATTA TUFARIQAHU ILA DINI. "(God) will not accept any offering from you as long as you remain (even) in part with your existing religion and as long as you do not part with it (completely) in favor of mine" (ibid).

Some non-representative modern reformist Muslims project Joseph as exemplifying the appropriateness--**JAWAZ** for a Muslim of peaceful coexistence, cooperation and reconciliation with a non-Muslim regime under a non-Muslim sovereign. Representative Muslim ulama from Tabari to Abu'l-Ala Maududi of our time, however, reject the idea vehemently. In his commentaries on the Quranic sura Joseph (12):55-7, Maududi (whose approach is consistent with the over-all concept of the Islamic Prophets and creed) has discussed the issue. He has correctly spoken for Tabari and other traditionalists

...according to the Quran... Prophet Joseph had been invested with the full powers and privileges of a ruler. That is why he sat on the throne (Q12:100) and they used the title of MALIK (King) for him. He himself was grateful to Allah for bestowing the Kingdom on Him (Q12:101). Above all, Allah Himself testifies to this fact: "Thus We gave power to Joseph in the land, so he had every right to take possession of any piece of it, if he so desired" (Q12:56)... Did he offer his services for the enforcement of the laws of a non-Muslim state? Or did he intend to establish the cultural, moral and political systems of Islam by taking the powers of Government in his own hands? As for its answer let us quote the comments on this verse (55) by Allamah Zamakhshari in his Kash-Shaf. He says, "When Prophet Joseph proposed 'Please place all the resources of the country under my trust,' he meant to get an opportunity to enforce the Commandments of Allah and for establishing truth and justice, and to gain that power which is essential for fulfilling the Mission for which the Messengers are sent..." Was Joseph a Prophet of Allah or not? If he was, does the Quran put forward such a conception of a Prophet that he himself should (as they allege Prophet Joseph did) offer his services to a system of unbelief to carry on its work on un-godly principles? Nay... could it ever be expected that he would (according to their interpretation,) practically accept the theory that sovereignty belongs to the King and not to Allah, whereas in the prison he preached, "Sovereignty belongs to none but Allah" (Q12:40)?... The King of Egypt was one of the "gods" they had set up, so to offer services to carry on the work of the un-Islamic system under the existing un-Islamic law would have been tantamount to acknowledging the King as his Lord. Are they prepared to place Prophet Joseph in that position? It is an irony that those Muslims who interpret this verse in this way, lower the character of Prophet Joseph. They have evinced the same mentality that the Jews had developed during the period of

their degeneration. When they became morally and mentally depraved, they deliberately began to represent their Prophets and saints as people of low character like themselves in order to justify their own degraded characters and to make room for excuses for going still lower. Likewise, when the Muslims came under the sway of non-Muslim governments, they wanted to serve under them, but the teachings of Islam and the patterns of their worthy forefathers stood in their way and they felt ashamed of this. So, in order to pacify their consciences, they sought refuge in this verse and by its misinterpretation thought that great Prophet had made an application for a post to serve under a non-Muslim under un-Islamic laws... [Referring to Q12:50 "Thus did We give power to Joseph in the land: he had every right to take possession of any piece of it that he desired" (Maududi's translation), Maududi maintains] this is to show that the whole land of Egypt was under his complete control, as if it belonged to him and he could claim any piece of it as his, and there were no pieces of it that could be withheld from him. The early commentators have also made the same comments on this verse. For instance Allama ["great alim/scholar"] Ibn Jarir Tabari, on the authority of Bin Zaid says that this verse means: "We made Joseph the owner of all those things that were in Egypt, and in this part of the world he could do whatever he liked and wherever he liked for he had been given complete authority over this land. So much so that he could bring Pharoah under his sway and become his master, if he so desired." He [Tabari] has quoted another thing from Mujahid, who is one of the most learned commentators, to the effect that the King of Egypt had embraced Islam through Prophet Joseph (Maududi, Meaning, 5:154-5; cf. T,13:6 cf. Q12:56; brackets added).

So even the nominal Pharoah was converted to Islam in order to justify, for a Muslim, the Prophet Joseph's peaceful residence in Egypt. Believers may live peacefully in a non-Muslim - majority country only when a Muslim sovereign rules and no limitations are put on Islam's expansion. With the change in this situation, Muslims find, Joseph's attitude also changed. After the death of the Muslim Pharoah of Egypt, a non-Muslim King succeeded him. Joseph asked him too to become a believer but he refused -- INN HADHA'L-MALIK AMAN THUMMA MAT THUMMA MALAK BADAHU QABUS... WA KAN KAFIR- AN. FA DAAHU YUSUF ILA'L- IMAN BI'LLAH FA LAM YASTAJIB ILAYH (TT-U,1:155). Joseph is shown to have continued his mission to convert the unwilling people to Islam. He preferred to leave the country instead of living there tolerantly, when the non-Muslim King reminded him politely of the people's uneasiness about his proselytism.

Joseph ceased not to call the people of Egypt to the faithful until many of them did believe. Some others, however, complained to their King, Rayyan, who called Joseph and said, "O Plenipotent, you know that the people of Egypt have loved you gratefully, but now they criticize you for calling them to Islam" (sic) (K:191).

A Muslim sees that the sovereign of Egypt had no objection to Joseph's faith in private and that the nonbelievers loved him as an official and as a human being regardless of his faith. However, the King was not a Muslim nor was he willing to allow Joseph, a high official of the state, to put pressure in order to convert an unwilling population to Islam. Joseph was told he could maintain a personal faith in his creed, but could no longer use his political status to propagate a particular creed. It was like asking a high official of a modern secular society to refrain from discriminating against other creeds favoring a particular religion. He was requested to recognize pluralism and non-problematic co-existence with those having different worldviews. His request was nonsense from a believer's point of view. Muslims are told a Messenger of God would never accept such a proposal. It implied recognition of pluralism and peaceful coexistence with nonbelievers of the society - particularly at a time when the sovereign was no more a believer. Joseph's response to the proposal indicates, to a Muslim, that there could be no reconciliation with a society that put limitations on the expansion of Islam. In principle, Joseph's response was in line with that of Noah and as much a source of inspiration for the Jamaat-i-Islami poet (whom we met in the section on Noah) who said, in our words "the hell with a country that does not recognize the supremacy of Islam."

"What you say has reached my ears," said Joseph. "herefore shall I depart your land for my own people." Joseph left Egypt and went to the land where his father had settled, and there he excavated a branch of the Nile and called it the Faiyum. On the banks of the river he built edifices and constructed two cities, which he called al-Haramayn. [Perhaps, anticipating the model of the two Muslim holy cities, Mecca and Medina which are called al-Haramayn, "the two Sanctuaries"]. Joseph moved about his people in the manner of a [King-] Prophet until he grew old. Having made his bequest to Ephraim to govern his people righteously and to strive truly to make the people of Egypt walk in the path of God [Islam], he died (K:191; brackets added).

The basic point our sources project is this: as soon as the Prophet's authority was limited, he refused to coexist with the society as an average citizen.

The Prophet Shuayb also rejected the reconciliatory approach of his people. Their representative King trying to rationalize their world view addressed Shuayb in a pacific tone:

Shuayb, if we are wrong, God would not have sustained us or caused us to multiply. Although, we do not deny that God, to whom you call us, is the Provider, still we worship idols as a means to draw us nearer to God. I considered those who worship the sun, the moon and the stars, but I saw that they had no religion, as they worship things occupied with themselves. Then I considered those who worship fire and animals, but I saw that they had no religion because they worship things that die. We worship these idols because they are free of all defects; and besides, God has no need of worship of creatures (K:207).

Here and elsewhere in Islamic sources such reconciliatory approaches by nonbelievers are not mentioned for appreciation. They are mentioned to be ridiculed and rejected. Shuayb's response to this proposal was terrible punishment wrought upon the non-believers. The proposal itself might seem reasonable from a modern rational humanistic point of view. Islamic sources, however, use it to demonstrate its absurdity to the believers. Any effort to recognize the Supreme Being, God, without the guidance of Islamic Prophets, and adoption of any way other than those prescribed by Islam to worship God, are unworthy and must be rejected as Shuayb did. Ludicrous is the idea that "God has no need of worship of creatures." That is why Shuayb rejected it so vehemently. Not unlike the ways of other Islamic Prophets, the Sunnah of Shuayb confirms once more to Muslims that nothing short of complete Islam was acceptable or tolerable to the true believers.

Terrorization of the adversaries of Islam (and its Prophets) was desirable. In this context and elsewhere the idea of the use of force, torture and terror to impose the faith is approvingly implied. The descriptions of the agonies and mental torture of the opponents elate the believers. Frightening things happened, Muslims are told, with desired effects: Namrud was terrified extremely -- **FA- FAZAA MIN DHALIK FAZ-AN SHADID-AN** (TT-1,1:236). The Almighty indulged in terrorizing the heathen world-emperor before and after the birth of Abraham. Namrud saw in a

dream his "neck being severed," and was told he was accursed and that his days were numbered (K:130). On various occasions Nimrod heard mysterious voices telling him,

Wretched be he who is ungrateful to Abraham's God... O Nimrod be not deceived by this palace of yours! Where shall you flee from Abraham and his God?--- O Nimrod, do not be deceived by the lions, elephants and weapons you have collected, for they will be first to be avenged of you... Despair, for Abraham will wrench your Kingdom from you, unless you believe in him and his Lord... You and your Kingdom are doomed... Abraham's God will destroy you by Abraham's hand (K:133).

Sometimes the angels would appear in person threatening Nimrod, declaring his Kingdom was doomed (K:135). Cows would start talking miraculously, threatening the heathen: "Enemy of God," one of them said, "I will gore you so that afterwards you would never be able to eat again" (K:142). Demonstrating his authenticity through miracles and in order to terrify Nimrod. Abraham once caused the coffin of a nonbeliever to be brought from the grave to the palace. The dead one "stepped forth, blazing in flame." Showing this to Nimrod and his courtiers, Abraham said, "this is the retribution of him who worshiped idols..." (K:144). By day and by night, terrible dreams, haunted Nimrod. He "dreamed of a man from whose eyes came forth a light as the sun kicking him and saying, "O Nimrod, which would you prefer: to believe in Abraham's Lord or to have me shatter your crown? Nimrod saw his right eye being plucked out and he began to cry for aid but no one came to his help" (K:133). In another dream Nimrod "saw a smokeless fire descend from heaven," bidding Nimrod to say: "there is no God but God; Abraham is the apostle of God!" "Otherwise I will burn you up," the fire said; then it approached Nimrod and "scorched" him (K:137). Nimrod was so haunted by these dreams and the fear of the imminent birth of Abraham that he ordered all newborns to be massacred; he slaughtered one hundred thousand babes. In desperation he cut even his own son's throat (K:135; also see TT-U,1:164-5 passim). Our sources mean no sympathy for the victims; rather they demonstrate to the believers how Nimrod was helpless where Abraham was concerned; the latter

was always protected by God. error was a part of Abraham's militant posture and preaching when he finally confronted Nimrod.

When Abraham had completed his fortieth year, Gabriel descended to him and said, "Your Lord has sent you to Nimrod the accursed. Fight him and fear him not, for I shall protect you and shall give you victory over him."... Abraham stood at Nimrod's gate and shouted at the top of his voice, "O people! say that there is no god but God and that I, Abraham, am God's apostle." Nimrod, was terrified and trembling with fright, called for his viziers and patriarchs... (K:141-2; also see- U,1:168-9).

Al-Kisai reports that the Prophet Jacob and his sons, during their holy wars against the nonbelievers, adopted terror. With the help of miraculous power given them by God, they caused the walls of an enemy fort to come

tumbling down, and all who were inside perished. When the news reached the people of Canaan, fear fell upon their hearts; and they came to Jacob and believed in him, all of them (K:167).

The Prophet Joseph did not hesitate to threaten his adversaries. To make his brothers confess their former crimes against him

Joseph said to his aides, "Erect ten poles on the city gate so I may bind them there by the neck and crucify them as an example..." And they trembled with fear (K:188).

Irreconciliation with non-Islamic creeds was not passive, nor always straight forward. Before it was demonstrated aggressively through 'hot war', i.e., jihad, various modes of a cold war governed the believers attitude toward nonbelievers. Disingenuousness, Muslims find, was one of the Divinely approved methods adopted by the Prophets and believers of the era against nonbelievers (TT-U,1:248). Related Tradition-based reports in this regard are, as usual, based on Quranic leads. The Almighty's ruse and the Prophets' subterfuge, Muslims find, are approvingly mentioned in the Quranic passages telling of God's and the Messengers' **KAYD** and **MAKR** in various forms. **KAYD** and **MAKR** are synonymous in meaning and connotation -- **AL-KAYD HUA'L- MAKR** (TS,13:288). As E.W. Lane (Arabic-English Lexicon [henceforth AEL, 1/7:2638-9) tells us, **KAYD** signifies the same as **KHUDAH**, deception, circumvention, foul play, an abominable and evil action carried out clandestinely. It implies acting deceitfully, mischievously, or

wickedly. It means "(practicing) evasion or elusion, a shift, a wile, an artifice, or artful contrivance or device, a plot, a stratagem, or an expedient... an ability to manage with subtlety according to (one's) own free will" (ibid). For some, **MAKR** has the additional implication of "the feigning of the contrary of one's real intention" (ibid). **MAKR** means "(the practice) of deceit, guile, or circumvention, desiring to do to another a foul, an abominable, or an evil action clandestinely, or without (one's) knowing whence it proceeded... (It signifies) evasion or elusion, a shift, an artifice, or artful contrivance or device, a machination, a trick, a plot, a stratagem, or an expedient... an ability to manage according to (one's) own free will" (ibid:2728).

While the Quran attacks the nonbelievers for alleged **KAYD** and **MAKR**,⁷ it informs Muslims unblushingly that similar **KAYD** and **MAKR** were adopted by the Almighty and by the faithful against others.⁸ Tabari and the Shakir brothers, Tabari's modern Muslim editors, do not differentiate between the meanings of **KAYD** and **MAKR** ascribed to God and the faithful and those to the nonbelievers in the Quran. For example, for the meaning of God's **KAYD** in Q7:183, Tabari and the Shakir brothers refer the reader to S,7:156 and S,8:547 -- **UNZUR TAFSIR AL-KAYD FI MA SALAF** in which **KAYD** is explained as it is/was allegedly practiced by nonbelievers. It is not the difference between the meaning of **MAKR** of **ALLAH** and **MAKR** of **AL-KUFFFAR** "the heathen" or **MAKR** of **ASH-SHAYTAN** "the Devil" that engages the Muslim mind. As long as the intent is to uphold the faith and assist the faithful against their opponents, the end justifies the means. For Al-Firuzabadi, a celebrated medieval Muslim lexicologist and grammarian, and the author of the dictionaries Al-Qamus and Al-Basair, "**MAKR** is praised and dispraised according to the nature of its object" (in Lane, AEL, 1/7:2728). The Quran and Tradition also emphasize that the Almighty and His Messengers outwitted the nonbelievers in **KAYD** and **MAKR**. As a matter of fact, the Almighty monopolizes **MAKR** -- **FA-LI'LLAH AL-MAKR JAMI-AN** (Q13:42); God told Muhammad to warn nonbelievers that He is more swift in

MAKR than others -- **QUL ALLAH ASRA MAKR-AN** (Q10:21) and that He is the best in **MAKR** -- **ALLAH KHAYR AL-MAKIRIN** (8:30). God's **KAYD** is superior to that of nonbelievers, and more effective.

They are devising guile (**KAYD**), and I am devising guile (Q86:15-6). And that God weakens the unbelievers' guile (Q8:18). And I respite them - assuredly My guile is sure (Q7:183; 68:45).

With reference to the adversaries of Shuayb and other past Prophets the Quran asserts that only those doomed to perish think of escaping the devastating effects of "Divine Deception" --**MAKR ALLAH** (Q7:99); it is overwhelming. This concept of Pious Fraud or Divine Deception, **KAYD ALLAH**, is occasionally reinforced and explained by two other terms in the Quran and Tradition: **IMLA** "to give rein (deceptively), to give (false respite [see Q3:178; 7:183; 13:32, 22:44, 48; 47:25 and 68:45] and **ISTIDRAJ** "to draw on gradually, to lead someone step by step (to a disaster unknown to the object)" as in Q7:182 and 68:44. **ISTIDRAJ** means

bestowing upon (someone) enjoyment, in which he delighted and on which he became familiar so as not to be mindful of death, and then taking him in his most heedless state: such is said to be the meaning in the Quran 7:182 and 68:44 (Lane, AEL, 1/3:868).

The main themes involved in **IMLA** and **ISTIDRAJ** are discussed in the sections on Muhammad and Predestination. However, Q7:183 (repeated in 68:45) "I respited (**IMLA**) them - assuredly my guile is sure" and Q22:42-4 quoted above about **ISTIDRAJ** confirm the idea of Divine Deception involved in the two terms: **IMLA** and **ISTIDRAJ**. So, **IMLA** and **ISTIDRAJ** are two forms of **MAKR** and **KAYD**. Quoting Lisan al-Arab and Az-Zajjaj, Lane tells us the meaning of Q86:15-6 in which God says: **YAKIDUN KAYD-AN WA AKID KAYD-AN** "they (nonbelievers) practice an artful device, and I will practice an artful device" is as follows

God's practicing an artful device toward the nonbelievers means his taking them unawares, so that they do not reckon upon it; bestowing upon them enjoyments in which they delight, and on which they place their reliance, and with which they become familiar so as not to be mindful of death, and then taking them in their most heedless state. (This is) their **ISTIDRAJ** "Overtaking them little and little "from where they do not know --**ISTIDRAJ-UHM MIN HAYTH-U LA YALAMUN** (Lane, Arabic - English Lexicon, 1/7:2639).

Similarly quoting Ar-Raghib, Taj al-Arus, Lane writes:

MAKR ALLAH signifies God's granting a man respite or delay, and enabling him to accomplish his worldly aims [so as to bring upon himself the punishment due to his evil actions]. According to the al-Athir al-Jiziri, Nihayah, God's causing his trials to befall his enemies, exclusively of his friends: or his taking men by little and little, so that they do not reckon upon it, bestowing upon them renewed favors for acts of obedience which are imagined to be accepted whereas they are rejected (ibid, 1/7:2729).

The Quran and Tradition tell the Muslims that God and His Prophets practiced **KAYD** and **MAKR** against the nonbelievers also in more mundane ways. Some of these Pious Frauds and Divine Deceptions belong to the era of Abraham and his descendants. It was wise for the mother of Abraham to conceal her pregnancy from her nonbelieving husband (TT-U,1:164). The young Abraham did not hesitate to sabotage his father's trade of making idols and selling some of them through his children. When Abraham was asked to sell what he despised, he instead sabotaged this un-Islamic creed and insulted its symbols:

He would go out... carry the idols and would say, "who will buy that which neither harms nor benefits?" And no one would take them from him. Then he would immerse the idols in water and say, "Drink!" and pull the ropes attached to their legs... the people would stare, but no one dared to say anything to him. When an old man came asking him to sell one of the idols..., Abraham said, "Old man, I have been sitting here scoffing at them. They are not to be worshiped"... then an old woman came to Abraham and asked him to sell her an idol. He took out two idols for her and said, "Take the big one. There is more of it for firewood and kindling." "I don't want it for kindling," she said. "I want it to worship." [then, Abraham argues at length with the old woman in favor of Islam, against the non-Islamic creed] (K:140-141; also see TT,1:235 passim).

The Quran mentions the Prophet Abraham's **KAYD** against nonbelievers (Q21:57-65; 37:89-96). Related events include two of the "three lies" of Abraham justified by the Prophet Muhammad because they were told, Muhammad said, **FI DHAT ALLAH** "for God's sake" -- **INN IBRAHIM LAM YAKDHIB ILLA THALAHAT KADHIBAT, KULLUHA FI'LLAH/FI DHAT ALLAH** (T,17:41; TT-U, 1:172-3). "The two lies," mentioned in the Quran, Tradition elaborates, were accompanied with a series of pious frauds aimed at insulting, humiliating and sabotaging the non-Muslims and their creeds encouraging, obviously, Muslims living in a non-Muslim society to carry out shadowy covert and overt activities disregarding the sensitivities of

nonbelievers.

Once when the townsfolk were leaving for an outdoor festival Abraham was asked to join but he refused, pretending to be sick. To frighten the people into leaving him alone, Abraham said he had the plague. This was the "first" pious lie mentioned in the Quran 37:89 (cf.T) - a "Divine Deception for the sake of God." The Prophet has a plan:

By Allah, I shall circumvent your idols after you have gone away
(Q21:57)

vowed Abraham "in secret," concealing his intentions from his people --
INN IBRAHIM HALAF BI-HADHA'L-YAMIN FI SIRR- IN MIN QAUMIHI WA KHAPA-IN
(T,17:38). After the people left the town Abraham entered their
worship-place. He insulted the deities of the nonbelievers in a variety
of ways, amusing himself and the believers who read the story, and then
broke the idols, saving the largest one on whose shoulders he hung an axe;
he mashed the food onto the face of the largest idol, before leaving the
temple. When accused, Abraham pleaded 'not guilty.' He told the
nonbelievers that the biggest god with the axe on his shoulder might have
become angry and broken... the other idols. (This was the "second" pious
lie, Tradition tells us.) Of course, in his own Islamic way, Abraham was
also trying to be sarcastic. There was no explanation why the largest god
had mashed food on his own face. (For the full story see Q37:83-113;
T,23:69-89; Q37:89-96 cf.T ; TT,1:236 passim; K:146).

The Prophet Muhammad justified Abraham's "third lie" because it was
told to save Sarah's honor (TT-U,1:172-3): Abraham misled the King by
introducing Sarah as his sister. The King who wanted to marry Sarah was
paralyzed miraculously in response to Abraham's prayers. On the King's
entreaty Abraham agreed to pray for his release from paralysis on the
condition that the King

submit his Kingdom to Abraham and depart. When told the King agreed
and gave his land to Abraham (K:150; also seeTT-U,1:171-3).

For a modern moralist it looks like Divine blackmail, but, obviously from a Muslim point of view it was justified. It was on this occasion that the King also gave Hajar (Hagar) to Sarah as a token of his regrets. The whole episode worked for Abraham. Tradition tells us that Abraham was afraid of being killed had he told the truth about Sarah. The believers are not supposed to wonder why the Almighty would not perform the same wonderful act of paralyzing the King even if Abraham had told the truth. Perhaps it was just another KAYD ALLAH to enable His Prophet to possess the King's land or his beautiful maiden, Hagar.

Jacob achieved Prophethood by default, a moralist would remark. For a Muslim this was proper because he was divinely predestined to be a Prophet. Moreover, the Prophet Isaac had no objections to the tricky methods of his wife and Jacob, his son. Both Tabari and Kisai cite approvingly the following story. Isaac was inclined to take his son al-Is (Esau) as successor. Isaac's wife favored their other son Jacob. Isaac was blind. Esau had a hairy body. The day Jacob was supposed to favor Esau, the mother slaughtered a kid

and placed its hide over Jacob's back and arms and said to him, "Go to your father. Perhaps he will give you his blessing." So Jacob came to his father; and Isaac touched him, felt his arms, found him hairy and said "the speech is that of Jacob, but the skin is that of Esau." [However, he gave him his blessing.] Esau, meantime, was in the pasture. And, when Isaac called for him, he came after Jacob and sat before his father, saying, "O father bless me as you promised." "My son," said Isaac, "were you not with me today? I have already given you my blessing" but Esau said he had not been there before. (K:163-4; also TT-U, 1"224-5).

Thanks to his mother, Jacob's application of KAYD ALLAH won the day, and there emerged Prophets and Kings from his progeny. Esau was furious. Instead of expressing sympathy for him and condemnation for Jacob, our sources portray Esau as a villain (*ibid*; *passim*). The Muslim author was obviously faithful to the Quranic injunction (e.g. 6:83-90) obliging Muslims to believe that Jacob, among others, was Divinely guided, and to follow his ways uncritically. Though Jacob's pious fraud is not mentioned in the Quran, Muslims unscrupulously accept traditions in line with similar

Divinely justified deeds of Abraham and Joseph recorded by the Quran.

The believers are told that the Prophet Joseph, during his boyhood used to steal the idols of his (dhimmi?) neighbors and destroy them (TT,1:354 cf. Q12). Our sources give the impression that Isaac and Jacob lived in independent domains (Dar al-Islam) in the Holy Land. Hence, a Muslim would think the idol-worshipping neighbors of Jacob must have been the DHIMMIS, non-Muslims in a Muslim-dominated society. Tabari's implied appreciation just referred to justifies activities like Joseph's against non-Muslims.

Two other actions attributed to Joseph are instructive. After God empowered Joseph in Egypt (Q12:56), the drought-stricken people of surrounding lands including Joseph's ten half-brothers went to Egypt to buy grain. Apparently Joseph expected his half-brothers and adversaries who, however, were unaware of what he had become or, indeed that he lived at all. Joseph recognized them when they reached Egypt. Without disclosing his identity he confronted them. To frighten them, Joseph charged them with espionage. Under pressure they talked of a half-brother Banyamin (Benjamin) who had remained with Jacob. That was exactly what Joseph wanted them to say. Joseph missed his brother, Benjamin, and longed to see him. Later Joseph treated his ten half-brothers generously and returned what they paid for the grain. This was to motivate them to bring Benjamin next time with them. To be sure of their return, Joseph kept one of the brothers as a RAHINAH, "hostage" (TT-U,1:244; passim). Unaware of Joseph's planned KAYD "plot," his adversary half-brothers return with Benjamin to Egypt to buy the much-needed grain. Joseph had planned to detain Benjamin. Egyptian law, the Quran and Tabari tell us, did not allow detention without cause. Our Prophet had to circumvent the law with a KAYD ALLAH. One wonders why he did not disclose his identity to his brother straight-forwardly. Perhaps he wanted to prolong their agony? After telling Benjamin confidentially of the scheme, Joseph and his son Ephraim hide a cup in Benjamin's saddlebag, then announced the cup

as missing. Joseph's brothers were detained and searched. The cup was found in Benjamin's saddlebag. The ten embarrassed brothers faced further embarrassment when they met Jacob whom they had promised the safe return of Benjamin (for the full story see Q12:58-84 cf. T,13:23-8 passim; TT-U,1:244-51; K:180-8). Thus, Muslims find another example of Divine Deception justified by the Quran. It was undertaken by an Islamic Prophet against his adversaries to embarrass, humiliate and torment them mentally. To curb any second thoughts about Joseph's over-craftiness the Almighty takes direct responsibility for His Messenger's deeds in this regard. It is He who did all this circumvention for Joseph,

Thus did We contrive for Joseph. He could not have taken his brother according to the King's law unless Allah willed (Q12:76).

The Almighty had to break the King's law only by circumvention! Perhaps, sensing the problematic nature of Joseph's (or the Almighty's) artful devices, **KAYD**, towards adversaries, Tabari engages in more problematic explanations.

If someone says: 'How could it be justified for Joseph to put the cup in his brother's saddlebag and then accuse innocent people of theft and announce: "O camel-riders! You are surely thieves (Q12:70)?"', it could be said that the (above) announcement, God informs, was made by an announcer, not by Joseph (himself). It is appropriate (to think) the announcer thought that the cup was really loot (i.e., stolen) not knowing of Joseph's action. And it is also appropriate (to think) that Joseph commanded the announcer to do so, knowing that they (Joseph's brothers) had committed theft on some other occasion. So the announcement was intended by Joseph to refer to that theft, not their theft of the cup (T,13:28).

In other words it was **JAIZ** "appropriate" for our Islamic Prophet 1) to let others do the 'dirty job,' and 2) to accuse others of a crime without giving them the benefit of knowing that he did not really mean it. The adversaries' agonies and unjust defamation are not Tabari's concern. As a believer, he has to justify as well as absolve the Messenger of God.

Apparently, Tabari is not satisfied with his own explanation. Referring to some other unnamed exegetes -- **AHL AT-TAWIL**, he tells the reader unwillingly that this might have been a **KHAA** "mistake" by Joseph for which he repented and God forgave him (ibid). Obviously Tabari was

conscious of Joseph's impenitence throughout his Islamic story and of the Almighty's bold and unregretful assertion: "Thus did We contrive for Joseph" (Q12:76).

Hijrah

So far we have discussed various modes of the believers' cold war against nonbelievers. The following indicates that the hijra segment of the Prophetic mode of treatment of nonbelievers is also authenticated by the Islamic story of Abraham et al. The practice and attitude of hijra, i.e., aggressive, insolent, supremacist and self-righteous segregationism and isolationism, were demonstrated in various ways as a prominent feature of the Prophets' performances. Hijra, departure from the land of nonbelievers, also aimed at saving the believers from disasters which were to be perpetrated by God on the nonbelievers. In general, after all cold war tactics fail to bring the heathens to their knees, hijra signifies a move before all-out jihād is waged either by believers (with God's help, anyhow) to conquer and subjugate the nonbelievers or directly by the Almighty to annihilate them.

In the performance of Islamic sunnah or hijra after Islam is rejected by the people, Abraham and Lot are the best examples of their era. Guided by God, Abraham, Lot and the few faithful left the cursed Babylonian land of nonbelievers which had rejected their call for the "blessed land" (Q19:47-50; 21:71; 29:26; 37:99; 60:4). This **ARD AL-LATI BARAKNA FIHA** "God-blessed land" was Syria where, our sources believe, Abraham and his descendants possessed **NUBUWWAH** "Prophethood" as well as **MULK** "sovereignty" (T,17:46 cf. Q21:7; TT-1,1:316). To signify the Prophets' act of hijra, the Quran uses the term **ITIZAL** (19:47-50) "to separate, secede, forsake, withdraw from association and communion" (Lane, AEL, 1/5:2036) as well as hijra (29:26) or its equivalents (37:99). Tabari, usually, uses **MUFARAQAH** "to part with": or "to shun" as a synonym. Along with Lot and the faithful, Abraham "shunned his people and their creed and migrated to Syria" -- **FARAQ QAWMAHU WA DINAHUM WA HAJAR**

ILA'SH-SHAM (T,17:46 cf. Q21:71). Lot followed Abraham in hijra for the sake of God to Syria -- **MUTTABI-AN ALA DINIHI MUHAJIR-AN ILA'SH-SHAM** (TT-U,1:205). As the relevant Quranic verses mention, it was a religious duty God wanted Abraham and the faithful to perform (ibid:200). The Almighty, however, reassured Abraham that the hijra will be followed by His blessings for him and for his descendants (Q19:47- 50; 21:71-5; 29:26-7). The hijra of these Prophets, Muslims are reminded, was not an act of peaceful isolationism. Symbolizing the believers' insolent separatism and anticipating the nonbelievers' destruction, it promised eventual victory and success for the faithful.

And We delivered them and their people from the great distress. And We helped them, so they were the victors (Q37:115-6 cf. 99-116).

Following Tabari's usual similar explanations (e.g., ,16:93 cf. Q19:49-50; T,17:45-7 cf. Q21:71) of such passages, Abu'l-Ala Maududi of our time agrees that, hereby, Muhammad's contemporary Muslims

were told that they would be honored and blessed with true renown just as Prophet Abraham had been blessed with true renown after his Migration (Maududi, Meaning, 7:75 cf. Q19:49- 50).

Later in "the Mutafikat" and in Midian, before God wanted to punish the nonbelievers, Lot and Shuayb were told to leave the wretched lands of the nonbelievers (TT-U,1:212).

Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Job and their descendants after having established themselves as "sovereigns" in the "Holy land" they did not have to perform hijrah. According to sacred Islamic historiography, they - and Ishmael in Arabia - were masters of the lands they inhabited. They lived in the "Domains of Islam" of their times. Although God's trial of Job to test his faith dominates his Islamic story, the subtext indicates Job was the lord of Syria and presided over the worship- places of the Children of Israel, i.e., the Muslims of their time (TT-U,1:226-8). We also know that Joseph preferred hijra to life in a country with a non-Muslim, though friendly, sovereign where our Prophet could not impose Islam on the otherwise friendly population.

In various other ways, Muslims find general and occasional reflections in the story of the era of the supercilious, self-righteous and segregationist attitude of the Prophets towards the nonbelievers. The portrayal of the 'autonomous regions' of the faithful does not indicate the existence of friendly or normal transactions with nonbelieving neighbors, mostly referred to as Canaanites. In the beginning, Abraham had uneasy relations with his neighbors; he moved to a different place away from the heathen (TT-1,1:247). The Prophet Isaac commanded his son Jacob not to marry any Canaanite nonbelieving woman (TT-U,1:222). The believers were adamant self-righteous isolationists. Job's sons told a non-Muslim king who wanted to marry the Prophet's daughter: "As for our sister, if you want to marry her, enter into our religion" (K:203). Jacob bade his son Joseph to carry his coffin from Egypt, to be buried in the Holy Land (TT- U,1:225). Joseph left a similar will; accordingly, his coffin was carried by Moses during the Exodus to be buried near his ancestors in the Holy Land (TT-U,1:225). In response to the Egyptian Lady Zulaykha's request, who had desired to know Joseph's language, our Prophet remarked, "It is the language of my grandfather Abraham... Were it not forbidden to polytheists, I would teach it to you" (K:174). The language of the Prophets was too sacred to be used by unpure heathens. About Shuayb the believers proudly read that he "neither associated nor socialized with" the nonbelievers (K:205).

Holy War: Conquest or Annihilation

In our discussion of Islamic Prophets' treatment of nonbelievers we are looking for elements of a Cold War - hijra-jihad-conquest-or-annihilation model. Although the main burden of jihad, to punish the nonbelievers, was carried out by the Almighty, the Prophets and the believers of the period added their contribution. Muslims find that God preferred a militant posture of the believers

against nonbelievers. God commanded Abraham to "fight the nonbelievers and fear them not; "The was promised divine help and "victory" (K:141). Abraham and other Prophets and the believers of the era followed suit. On the basis of their Divine duty and right, they waged occasional unprovoked jihad and engaged in expansionism.

The very concept that our Muslims of the period migrating from Mesopotamia had a divine right to occupy Syria, the Holy Land, is expansionist. Ibn Sad's brief treatment of Abraham indicates that after establishing themselves in parts of greater Syria, Abraham and his followers engaged in armed action against the nonbelievers (IS-B,147). Regardless of the vagueness, Islamic sources approvingly report expansionist activities of Isaac and his children. They overwhelmed the Canaanites in Syria and expanded their domain to the (Mediterranean?) coasts, Alexandria (sic) and Rum (Asia Minor?) (TT-U,1:223-4).

Jacob's appointment as a Prophet was accompanied with the Divine commandment to attack the "Land of Canaan" (K:165). He told the King of Canaan

I am Jacob son of Isaac son of Abraham, friend of God... I have come to call you and your people to believe in God and to confess that I am His servant and messenger. If you believe in God, He will reward you with bounteous good things; otherwise, I shall truly, with the strength of God being with me, wage holy war against you! (K:166).

Though Jacob and the faithful were few, with the miraculous help of God they terrorized the enemy into surrender. During the battle the faithful caused the wall of the enemy's fort to tumble down crushing to death "all who were inside" (K:167). Before his death Joseph advised his son and wasiy, Ephraim, "to strive truly to make the people of Egypt walk in the path of God" (K:191), Job's sons Bishr, also a Prophet, and Hawmal fought fierce battles against the nonbelievers; with God's help the believers overwhelmed the Kafir King who after defeat accepted the Prophet's creed. Afterwards Job's sons agreed to marry their sister to him. The new Muslim King and son-in-law of Job is praised for having "fought against the infidels until he died" (K:204; also see TT-U,1:228).

The nonbelievers who could not be conquered by the faith or subjugated or expelled by the faithful were dealt with from on high by the Almighty. Those who rejected the Prophets' call and their domination of affairs had to be punished. The Divine punishment of nonbelievers from on high, desired and rejoiced in by the Prophets, was as usual collective and disproportionate to the nonbelievers' alleged crimes. The humiliation, destruction and agonies the heathens suffered are described by Islamic sources for the reassurance and edification of the believers.

An economic blockade was the first step God took to punish the nonbelievers. Abraham used it as a pressure on the people to convert them to Islam. Forcing the heathen to submission by any means was more important than conviction.

God took away the rain from them, and Nimrod was left in dire straits... Abraham went outside the city to a sand dune and called his Lord to turn the sand into food for the faithful... from which the believers took as much as they wanted; and the infidels took from Nimrod until his supply was exhausted, whereupon the people began to incline to Abraham (K:145).

After Abraham and the faithful left the country, God commanded an angel to open the gate of mosquitoes to storm the heathen country which had refused to acknowledge Abraham as the Messenger of God. The storm of mosquitoes (or gnats) was so thick it covered up the sun. The mosquitoes ate the flesh and sucked the blood of the nonbelievers; nothing was left of them save their skeletons (TT-U,1:202).

Then God sent gnats down on Nimrod's army and the whole world was filled with them. They caused the death of so many that the rest fled to their houses, lit fires and locked their doors, all of which they did to no avail (K:149).

Namrud was tortured in an especial way: God sent a mosquito to enter his nostril. The mosquito "crawled to his brain and began to gnaw at his flesh, marrow and blood, praising God." God tortured Namrud in this way for four hundred years -- FA ADH-DHABAHU'LLAH ARBAA MIAT SHANAH and then killed him. During the period Namrud was under torture, the pain was so great, Tabari and Kisai tell the believers jubilantly, that "he had an

iron bar made with which he ordered his aides to strike his head, for every time they struck him the gnat would be still." It was during this painful relief operation that

A man of enormous strength, struck his head so hard that his skull split in two, and the gnat emerged like a chick from an egg, saying "there is no god but God, Abraham is the apostle of God and his friend." Nimrod died in a most horrible manner; and God visited earthquakes upon his people, and their city was pulled down around them.

Instead of expressing sympathy Kisai continues:

God hastened their souls to Hell and made their everlasting abode miserable (K:149-50; also see TT-U,1:202).

After the believer's rage is satisfied, Tabari concludes the story, reminding the faithful and heathen this was the fate of the King (and the people) who had called Abraham a mad man (TS,5:434).

Those who rejected the call of the Prophet Lot also met a terrible fate. The angels had orders from the Almighty not to destroy the Mutafikat if there had been even five individuals performing Muslim prayer out of a population of four million. There were no Muslims besides Lot and his two daughters; so, the nonbelievers had to be destroyed (TT-U,1:209-10).

The people of Lot cried lies to the warnings. We loosed against them a squall of pebbles except the folk of Lot; We delivered them at the dawn (Q54:33-5).

The Almighty, as usual, demonstrated creativity in His methods of torturing nonbelievers to death, of course, for the satisfaction of believers.

A day before the destruction of the nonbelievers, they went blind. Next morning God "turned" the country of the nonbelievers

Uppermost, nethermost, and rained on it stones of baked clay, one on another... (Q11:82-3).

They were flooded with rain (7:84). "By thy life, " the Almighty intimates to Muhammad (and Muslims),

they moved blindly in the frenzy of approaching death. hen the

(Awful) Cry overtook them at the sunrise. And We utterly confounded them, and We rained upon them stones of heated clay (Q15:72-74).

The Quranic passage as usual concludes with reassurances to Muslims of all times that their contemporary nonbelievers will meet a similar fate, as Tabari explains: **INN FI SUNINA BI-QAUM LUT MA SANANA BIHIM LA-ALAMAT-UN WA DALALAT-UN BAYYINAT LI-MAN AMAN BI'LLAH ALA INTIQAMIHI MIN AHL AL-KUFR BIHI, WA INQADHIHI MIN ADHABIHI, IDHA NAZAL BIQAUM AHL AL-IMAN BIHI MINHUM** (T,17:47 passim cf. Q15:75-7). For the satisfaction of Muslims, Tradition elaborates the Quranic outlines:

Then Gabriel spread out the Wings of Wrath; Israfael gathered up the corners of the cities; Michael placed his wing beneath the seven lower layers of the earth; and Azrael prepared himself to take their souls with fiery prongs... Gabriel uprooted the cities from one end to the other down to the black waters, then he lifted them up, together with the mountains, houses, trees and rivers to the sea which is in the air, and turned it all upside down. The angels in the lower heavens, hearing the cocks crow and dogs howling asked, "Who are these upon whom God's wrath has fallen?" And they were told they were Lot's people.

Did the angels, these ideal creatures of God and friends of Muslims, express any sympathy or mercy? No. The believers are not supposed to do so. Therefore the angels praised the Lord for destroying the nonbelievers and rejoiced in their punishment.

Thereupon they set up a great clamor, praising God and blessing His name. Then God [to be sure that the angels hear Him] cried out to Gabriel, "strike the cities one against the other and rain down upon them stones of clay!" As they were crumbling into air, the people awoke and saw fire below and angels above, pelting them with marked stones. Then [long before Adolf Hitler used gas chambers for his final solution of the problem of nonbelievers in the Broken Cross, the Almighty introduced the method in dealing with the non-Muslims:] hick, black smoke which no one could breathe, began to rise from beneath the cities. And the ruins were left to be a reminder to anyone who might see them (K:159; brackets added; also see TT-U,1:214-6; cf.T above Quranic passages).

In his Tafsir, Tabari tells the believers with satisfaction that the agonies of four million deaths under the hail of stones was so intense that the dwellers of heaven could hear their lamentations along with the howls of their suffering animals (T,12:98 cf. 81-98). The nonbelievers not present in the city at the time of disaster could not escape Divine wrath; burning heavenly stones followed and slew them wherever they were

(TT-U,1:214). The nonbelieving wife of Lot was doomed to destruction (Q11:81). However, the immediate cause was her show of sympathy for her unfortunate people. When she saw the nonbelievers being tortured to death, she could not control herself and cried out with pain: **WA QAWMAH!** "Oh grief, for my people!" As soon as she said this grieving for her people, a stone struck and killed her, **FA ADRAKAHA HAJAR-UN FA QAALAHA** (TT-U,1:212; also see K:159). A true believer, a Muslim, is not supposed to sympathize with nonbelievers in agony; she or he must rejoice on such occasions. God had already taught Abraham about the correct attitude of a believer on such occasions. Perhaps, under his pure human (nonprophetic?) impulse Abraham "disputed" with God about the terrible punishment the angels were to inflict on Lot's people. This show of "clemency" and "compassion" of Abraham for the nonbelievers was, however, promptly discouraged by the Almighty, who sternly commanded His momentarily misguided Messenger to "forsake" this tender-heartedness regarding the nonbelievers.

...he was disputing with us concerning the people of Lot; Abraham was clement, compassionate, penitent. 'O Abraham, turn away from this; thy Lord's command has surely come; and there is coming upon them a chastisement not to be turned back' (Q11:75-6).

Other Quranic passages and Traditions further clarify the confusion, if any, for Muslims. They are told Abraham was concerned only for Lot and the believers. Once the angels assured him that his fellow-Prophet and the few believers would be safe, Abraham "regaining his peace of mind, no longer disputed with them" -- **FA SAKAT ANHUM WA ITMANNAT NAFSUHU** (T,12:77-83). Who cares for the nonbelievers, Abraham must have said or thought, a Muslim might speculate.

The two peoples of Aykah and Madyan who rejected Shuayb's call "were tortured (to death) in two different ways" -- **UDH-DHIBATA BI-ADHABAYN SHATTA:** "the people of Madyan were seized by the Cry" and those of Al-Aykah were burned to death by a fire-rain (,14:48). Apparently the terrible Cry was that of Divinely-wrought earthquake and storms.

The earthquake seized them and morning found them in their habitation fallen prostrate, those who creid lies to Shuaib, they were the losers (Q7:91-2). (They) were seized by the Cry . . . So away with Midian, as Thamud was done away (Q11:94-5).

Explaining the Quran, Tradition graphically portrays the punishment given the people who refused to submit to Shuayb's authority. God commanded the winds of Hell

to scale over them until their bodies became emaciated, their faces black. Yet, in spite of that, they would not believe (K:207).

Note that the above report justifies the use of torture to force the heathen to belief. The idea is also confirmed by the Quran in the context of Shuayb's story:

We have sent no Prophet to any city but that We seized its people with misery and hardship, that haply they might be humble (Q7:94).

Then God, opening a gate of Hell, sent suffocating hot wind which permeated their homes. They burned in heat. Then God sent a cloud with an apparently refreshing wind. The suffering men, women (sic) and children (sic) rushed towards it to cool themselves in its shade. This was a Divine ruse, a **MAKR ALLAH**, however: the cloud rained fire. After describing the successful operation of the Divine Deception against men, women and children, the Almighty exclaims, jubilantly:

Do they feel secure against God's devising (**MAKR ALLAH**)? None feels secure against God's devising but the people of the lost (Q7:99; for above full description see T,9:3-9 cf. Q7:91-99; TT-U,1:229-30). [According to Tabari, God through the above passage warns disbelievers in Muhammad of a similar treatment (T,9:9).]

Shuayb wept not for the dire misfortunes of the nonbelievers. As a Muslim Prophet he had no reason for regret. "How should I grieve for people of unbelievers?," he remarked (Q7:93). Exposing his rage against victims' rejection of his version of monotheism and of his status as the Almighty's spokesman, Messenger, Shuayb said

How should I sorrow for a people - and grieve for their annihilation who rejected God's unity and denied (the authenticity of) His Messenger? (T,9:6).

A beleiver in Shuayb, a Muslim of the period, rejoiced in the destruction
of the nonbelievers rebuking the fallen heathens

The advice of Shuayb came to them: they turned
their backs without a plea
Then came a shadow, blowing over them, by
stormy thunder borne aloft
It left not one in Midian land, yea e'en
the mighty, dead, decayed;
(K:207-8; see also T,9:4-5).

ENDNOTES

PART III: Belief in the Books and Messengers

Section 5: THE ERA OF ABRAHAM AND SONS

¹For the Islamic stories of the Prophets Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Job and Shuayb see (along with detailed commentaries in Tabari's afsir) the Quran 2:124-41, 258-60; 3:33-6, 63-8, 95-7; 4:54, 125; 6:74-91, 161; 7:80-99; 9:69-70, 113-4; 11:69-95; 12 the whole Sura; 14:35-46; 15:51-80; 16:120-3; 19:41-50; 21:51-75, 83-4; 22:26-33, 42-8, 48; 26:69-104, 160-91; 27:54-61; 29:16-38; 37:83-113, 133-8; 42:13; 50:12-15; 51:24-37; 53:36-62; 54:33-41; 60:1-6; Bu, 33:100; Bu, 60:8, 9, 48; Bu, 77:68; Bu, 79:51; Bu, 80:6; Mu, 1:259; Mu, 43:150-4; Mu, 51:58; N, 5:1; AD, 13:15; Tir., 19:S21, t, 3; 44:S17, t; 44:S21, t, 4; 44:S98; M, 49:4; 59:1. 1S 1/1:21-6, 145; 1/II"125; TT-1, 1:216-364 or TT-U, 1:162-270; K:136-208; also see El¹⁻² under abovenames, e.g., Abraham, Ishmael... by various authors.

^{1a}Believing that Hajar was his great-great-grandmother and an Egyptian, and thus the Arabs he addressed were Egyptians' kinsfolk, the Prophet Muhammad recommended lenient treatment of Egyptians in case of their conquest by the Muslims -- IDHA'FTATAHTUM MISR FA'STAUSAU BI-AHLIHA KHAYR-AN. FA-INN LAHUM DHIMMAT-AN WA RAHIM-AN... KANA HAJAR UMM ISMAIL... (TT-1, 1:247).

²For the exclusive story of the Prophet Lot and the people of "the Mutafikat" see, along with relevant exegese in , Q7:80-4; Q9:70; Q11:74-83; Q15:58-77; Q26:160-75; Q27:54-8; Q29:28-35; Q54:33-9; Q66:10; Q69:9; -1, 1:292-307; K:155-9; also see B. Heller/G. Vajda, Lut (Lot), El², 5:832-3.

³TT-1, 1:319. The sentence is constructed in such a way that Yaqub (Jacob) may be read as the subject, i.e., it was Yaqub who, along with his children crossed the sea etc. It is obvious in the context however, that the author is referring to Yaqub's children.

⁴For the full story of the Islamic Prophet Shuayb see Q7:85-99; Q11:83-95; Q15:78-9; Q26:176-90; Q29:34-7; Q38:12; 50:14; , relevant to above Quranic passages; -1, 1:325-9; K:204-8; F. Buhl, "Sho'ib," El, 4:388.

⁵For more of Abraham's connection with Islam, the Muslim Community of Muhammad and with the Kaba and Mecca see, along with Tabari's detailed commentaries, Quran 2:140-1; 3:33-4, 63-8, 95-7; 4:54, 125; 6:85-7, 161; 14:35-8, 4:16:120, 123; 22:26-33, 78, 84 cf. T, 19:86; 37:83-4, 102-7 cf. T, 23:85-6; 43:28.

⁶For specific references to the above points in the Quran related to the Prophets of the era under discussion see 7:89; 9:113-4; 11:84; 14:35-6, 113; 16:120-3; 19:41-6; 21:52-6; 22:26-29, 42-8; 26:70-6; 26:174; 29:16-25; 37:85; 50:14; 60:4 for example.

⁷Q3:54, 120; 4:76; 6:124; 7:195; 8:18, 30; 10:21; 11:55; 12:28, 31-4, 52, 102; 13:42; 14:46; 16:26, 45, 127; 20:60, 64, 69, 70; 22:15; 27:50, 70; 34:33; 35:10, 43; 37:98; 40:25, 37; 52:42, 46; 71:22; 77:39; 86:15; and Q105:2-8.

PART III: Belief in the Books and Messengers

Section 6: THE ERA OF MOSES AND FOLLOWERS

This section will study the Islamic descriptions of the Prophet **MUSA** (Moses) and his followers up to the time of the emergence of another epoch-making Islamic Prophet, **ISA MASIH** (Jesus Christ). This era according to Muslim chronology lasted for one thousand years. After an introductory survey of the era, this section will study; 1) the Islamic link to Moses and his followers; 2) their mission, concerns, interests, inspirations and demands; and 3) their patterns of behavior towards the nonbelievers and nonconformists of their time.¹

The era begins with Moses and ends with the Prophets Uzayr (Ezra), Barkhiya and Yunus (Jonah), though the conclusion of the story of this era in our sources is too complicated to tell us exactly who was the last Prophet (or divinely inspired leader, or ruler of the believers) of the age preceding the Muslim version of the Christian era. Some of the Prophets of the era, such as Moses, Yusha (Joshua) son of Nun, Dawud (David) and Sulayman (Solomon) also acted as the supreme religious as well as political leaders of the community and domain of the believers. At other times, the Prophets were the highest spiritual guides of the community and of its Muslim rulers. Those Muslim leaders who were not Prophets, but acted according to Prophetic teachings and guidance, are usually called **MALIK SALIH** (sing.) "righteous kings" and/or **MALIK SADIQ** (sing.) "truthful kings." In theory, however, a contemporary Prophet enjoyed paramountcy in all affairs including those of the state. These Prophets like **SHAMWIL** (Samuel) were virtually King-makers. The "righteous kings" were nominated or recognized and sanctified by the Prophets or the community of believers. In general, they belonged to a particular house; usually, sons succeeded fathers. Occasionally, the "righteous kings," i.e., ideal Muslim rulers, received direct divine inspiration, mostly in dreams. Some rulers of Muslim entities or states, such as Abya (Abijam), the grandson of Solomon, are reported not to have followed the Prophetic teachings rigorously enough; they are declared to be apostates, perceived as nonbelievers, and treated accordingly. Obedience to the exhortations of contemporary prophets,

and faithfulness to the accumulated divine teachings of the previous Prophets, particularly those conveyed by Moses in the great Book of revelations, **AT-TAWRAT** (Torah?), were the criteria for being a believer, i.e., a Muslim. The Tawrat was kept as a sacred document in the **TABUT AL-MITHAQ** "the Ark of the Covenant."

The chronological order of the important Prophets and rulers of the Muslim community of the period is given by Tabari as follows:

- 1). The Prophets Moses and his brother **HARUN** (Aaron).
- 2). **YUSHA** (Joshua).
- 3). **KALIB** son of Yufannah (Calib son of Jephunneh). According to Kisai, Eleazar son of Aaron, and Asasiah followed Caleb as leaders.
- 4). The Prophet **HIZQIL** (Hezekiel).
- 5). The Prophet **ELYAS** (Elijah?) and King Ahad.
- 6). The Prophet **AL-YASA** (Elisha).
- 7). After the Prophet Elisha, seventeen (or so) rulers or leaders followed one another, Tabari has mentioned exact names and durations of their rules (TT-U,1:328-9). **DABURAH** (Deborah) was one of the leaders of this period, about whom we are specifically told that a man called Baraq or Bazaq administered the Muslim community her behalf -- **FA DABBAR AMRAHUM FIMA QIL RAJUL MIN QIBALIHA UQAL LAHU BARAQ** (TT-U,1:328).
- 8). The Prophet **SHAMWIL** (Samuel) and King Talut (Saul).
- 9). The Prophet-King **DAWUD** (David).
- 10). The Prophet-Emperor **SULAYMAN** (Solomon).
- 11). King Reheboam son of Solomon.
- 12). **ABYA** (Abijam?) the apostate son of Reheboam.
- 13). King **ASA** son of Abya. (Asa was an important "righteous king").
- 14). About a score of leaders or elders follow Asa as the rulers of the weakened and disintegrated community of believers before
- 15). The Prophet **SHAYA** (Isaiah?) and King **SADIQAH** (Sedecias?), who is also confused with **HIZQIYA** (Hezekiah) in a report in Tabari, emerged.
- 16). The Prophet **YAHYA** son of the Prophet **ZAKARIYYAH** (John the Baptist? son of Zacharias?).

- 17). The Prophet **BARKHIYA** of Najran in Arabia.
- 18). The Prophet **IRMIYAH** (Jeremiah?).
- 19). The Prophet **UZAYR** (Ezra?)

Tabari also mentions a few other named and unnamed Prophets belonging to this last period of the era. The chronological order of **AL-KHIDR**, **DHU'LQARNAYN** and **YUNUS** (Jonah) included in this section as believing leaders is discussed below.

Moses was born in Egypt. His parents were Israelites. Although Tabari, when dealing with the conclusion of the previous era, particularly when speaking of Joseph and his children, had implied that all the believers had left the Egyptian mainland, the reader is told of a great number of Israelites dwelling there when Moses was born. These Israelites in Egypt believed in Islam, the creed of the Prophets Joseph, Jacob, Isaac, Ishmael and the Friend of God, Abraham (TT-U,1:271). The specific Pharaoh, Qabus son of Musab son of Muawiya (sic), during whose time Moses was born, is called the "worst heathen and the worst libertine -- **AKFAR WA AFJAR**" (ibid) meaning he did not believe in Islam. This Pharaoh was married to Asiya, a beautiful Israelite, i.e., a Muslim.² It is implied that the preceding Pharaoh, who had ruled since Joseph's time, was friendly to the Muslims; he was converted to Islam.

Moses was predestined to be a Messenger of God. In dreams, visions and by soothsayers, the Pharaoh was warned of Moses's appearance. The Pharaoh tried to eliminate Moses, but he survived miraculously. As a miracle, Moses was raised in Pharaoh's palace as an adopted son. Asiya, the believer, convinced the Pharaoh that Moses was not the child about whom the Pharaoh was warned in visions. Asiya is portrayed, approvingly, as having misled her heathen husband (TT-1, 1:273 passim). Moses was aware of his Israelite connection while he enjoyed the privileges of an Egyptian prince.

In his early youth Moses became accidentally involved in a quarrel between an Egyptian citizen and an Israelite. Trying to help the

Israelite, Moses killed the Egyptian. After the incident, Moses left Egypt for Midian where he met the Prophet Shuayb (Jethro?) and married his daughter Safurah (Zipporah?). Apparently, Moses did not mean to return to Egypt, nor did he seem to have had any concerns for the Israelites in bondage. During his stay in the desert Moses was unexpectedly called by God Himself and awarded Messengership. Moses heard the voice of God, though he did not see Him. Reluctantly, Moses accepted the mission, asking God to appoint his brother, Aaron, also a Prophet to help him in the performance of divine duties; God did. God gave Moses two miraculous signs as tokens of his Prophethood: his staff would change into a huge serpent, capable of devouring anything and his hand would turn white, emitting divine light, whenever Moses chose to demonstrate miracles. Moses was assured by the Almighty of protection and help against nonbelievers.

Moses returned to Egypt and informed Aaron of their divine mission. The two Prophet-brothers confronted the Pharaoh as commanded by God. Almost all the Israelites, i.e. the Muslims of the time, acknowledged their Prophethood. Moses and Aaron asked the Pharaoh and his people to believe in their Prophethood and in Islam. After the Pharaoh and his people refused, Moses asked the Pharaoh to let the Muslims leave Egypt. After a series of humiliations and punishments perpetrated miraculously against the Pharaoh and the Egyptian nonbelievers, Moses and Aaron led the Muslims towards the promised Holy land. The believers crossed the sea which was opened by God miraculously. The Pharaoh and his troops, who had decided to follow the believers and take them back to Egypt, were drowned when the waters closed.

After crossing the sea, the community of believers formed an independent entity, a Dar al-Islam, under the religio-political leadership of Moses. He continued to receive revelation from God. The Holy Book, **AT-TAWRAT**, formed the main source for these divine teachings. The faithful were exhorted to march on the Holy Land and capture it

through jihad. It was promised to the believers by God (Q5:21). The stories of David, Solomon, Dhu'l-Qarnayn and others tell us that the expansion was not to be limited to the Holy Land. The expansion was by conquest rather than by peaceful preaching. Our sources give the impression that the expanding Islamic state of the time was not interested in the conversion of non-Muslims to Islam; it was interested more in their subjugation and in the expansion of the military and political domain of the faithful. There is no indication that Muslim Israelites of this period called others to accept their creed, Islam.

The Islamic era of Moses and his followers may be divided into various phases. After crossing the sea. Moses, commanded by God, wanted to continue his march to complete the conquest of the Holy Land. His plan was frustrated by his followers' indulgence in idolatry and by their lack of enthusiasm for fighting the nonbelievers of the "Holy Land." During a temporary absence from his people, when Moses had gone to the Mount to receive revelation from God, most of his followers encouraged by a dissident Israelite, Samiri, had indulged in idol worship. After he returned and punished the culprits appropriately (Q2:93 passim), Moses resumed the movement towards (the central parts of) the promised land. The Israelites were hesitant to fight the nonbelievers further. For this, God punished them by making them wander forty years in the **TIH** "wilderness" (Q2:21-6). Aaron and Moses died before the end of these wilderness years. Thereafter God appointed Joshua a Prophet, commanding him to resume Islamic expansion by moving towards Uriha (Jericho?) and fighting the heathen rulers of the region (TT-U,1:304-10 cf. Q5:23, Q18:59-64). By the time of Joshua's faithful successor, Calib, the conquest of the Holy Land was complete. The age of Joshua and Calib is portrayed as the first golden period of the era of Moses and followers. It was followed by a crisis period, a period of decline of Muslim power, which continued up to the emergence of the Prophet Samuel. During this period the Israelites lack of enthusiasm to fight nonbelievers was criticized by contemporary prophets, such as

Hizkil (Ezekiel), and by the true faithful. The Quran, and Tradition as in Tabari and Kisai, condemn these failings (TT-U,1:322-5 passim; Q2:343, e.g.). During this period many Israelites betrayed the Covenant which bound them to the worship of the one God, and adopted idol-worship -- **TARAKU AHD ALLADHI... FI'AWRAT WA ABADU'L- AWTHAN** (TT-U,1:325; cf. Q37:123-5). The three prophets of this period (Hizkil, Ilyas (Elijah?) and Alyasa (Elisha?)) struggled vainly against the Israelites' failure to fight the nonbelievers and their growing indulgence in idolatry. Even the harsh divine methods of the Prophet Ilyas could not convince the wrongdoing Israelite's to return to complete orthodoxy (TT-U,1:327 passim).

It is during this period of crisis that the concept of divine punishment of unorthodox and nonconformist believers, or apostates, in the hands of non-Muslims enters sacred Muslim historiography. The weakness and disintegration of the perceived Muslim empire established by Joshua and Calib, and its domination by the neighboring non-Muslim states, was a Divine punishment for not adhering to the teachings of the Prophets -- **FA SALLAT ALLAH ALAYHIM MAN YANTAQIM BIH MINHUM** (TT-U,1:328). This idea is more fully articulated during the second (post-Solomon) time of crisis. Therefore, the Muslim idea that their fall from a position of power results from non-adherence to Islam is rooted in Muslim concept of history. It was during this period that the believers lost the Ark of the Covenant to the nonbelievers of Gaza (sic) (TT-U,1:329). Four hundred sixty years after the death of Joshua, the Prophet Shamwil (Samuel) heralded the second golden age of Islam within the era of Moses and followers (TT-U,1:328).

The revival of the believers' power, in this period, turned on their readiness "to fight in the way of God." They asked the Prophet Samuel to choose a King to so lead them -- **SAALU SHAMWIL... AN YABATH LAHUM MALIK-AN YUJAHIDUN MAAHU FI SABIL ALLAH** (TT-U,1:329; cf. Q2:246 passim). As Muslims see it, the counterattack against unbelief and against heathen rulers of the region surrounding the contracted Muslim

entity was begun by the righteous King Saul under the spiritual guidance of Samuel. Expansion and consolidation was completed by the following Prophet-King, David. The Prophet-Emperor Solomon, son of David, is perceived to have presided over the first universal Muslim empire. The post-Solomon age, extending to the end of the era, is portrayed as the second crisis period, when the believers are blamed for their lack of adherence to the Covenant, Tawrat and the teachings of the Prophets. This failing is particularly reflected by the believers' failure to fight the nonbelievers and by their adoption of idolatry. The Prophets and the "righteous" leaders and activists of the time are shown to have struggled for the revival of the status quo ante, i.e., the establishment of a puritanical Islamic theocracy loyal to the perceived model of Moses, Joshua, David and Solomon. Abya, the Israelite King of the time, is blamed and cursed by our sources for his nonconformism, apostasy and disloyalty to the teachings of the Prophets. Asa, Abya's son, is portrayed as a Muslim hero par excellence. Succeeding his nonconformist father, Asa brought an Islamic counter-revolution purging his domain of un-Islamic elements. Asa's loyalty to Islam was rewarded by God. The Almighty helped him to overwhelm the heathen Indian (sic) empire. Thus once more Muslims gather that rigid adherence to Islam guarantees their protection and rise to power.

Many generations after Asa, the Prophet Shaya and his protege, King Sadiqa (Sedecia/Zedekia, king of Juda 596-587 B.C.), briefly but successfully confront the nonbelievers. Sadiqa's successors are reported to have slain the Prophet Shaya (Isaiah?). After this treachery, the Israelites lost the sympathy of the Prophets who came after Shaya - and the sympathy of Muslim historiography. The Israelites are no longer considered as Muslims. The Prophets of the post-Shaya period confronted mostly internal nonbelievers, i.e., nonconformist Israelites - sometimes with the help of external heathens - for not conforming to Prophetic teachings and exhortations.

Tabari's post-Shaya (Isaiah?) period corresponds roughly with the

rise of the Assyrian, Chaldean and Persian empires (750-333 B.C.E.); he particularly mentions Bukhtnassar (Nebuchadnezzar), Belshazzar and Cyrus the Great, though, as usual, in his confusing and fantastic style. The fall of Jerusalem and the exile of the Children of Israel (increasingly named **AL-YAHUD** "Jews" in this part of the story) are described without regret or sympathy. The tragedies symbolize the wrath of God and thus are appreciated by our sources. Prophets commanded by God are shown to have collaborated with the Mesopotamian invaders against the apostate Jews and Arab (sic) heathens. The Quran condemns the Jews for having slain many Prophets during this period (Q2:61). According to Tabari, these perfidies took place beginning with the murder of Shaya (T,15:18-46 cf. Q17:2-8). In his Tafsir, Tabari attributes Tradition reports of this directly to the Prophet Muhammad.

Tabari implies that the Prophet Yahya (John the Baptist?) preceded Irmia (Jeremiah), and that it was the assassination of the former that divinely triggered the invasion of the Holy Land, particularly the **BAYT AL-MAQDIS/MUQADDAS** "Sacred House," i.e., Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (TT-U,1:389; T,15:18-46). Irmia (Jeremiah?) was the Messenger of God during this period. God had already told him of His plan to destroy the faithless Israelite by the hands of Babylonian descendants of Yafith (Jafeth) (TT-U,1:391). A divine thunder preceded Nebuchadnezzar's arrival. It struck the sacrificial altar in Jerusalem and destroyed seven of the gates of the city, perhaps facilitating the Babylonians' entry. One hundred thousand (sic) Israelites were taken prisoner to Babylon, among them the Prophets' children such as Danial (Daniel?), Hanania, Azaria and Mishail (ibid: 394-5). (Later, Daniel emerges as a Prophet.) While the imprisonment and misfortunes of the Israelites are described as a divine punishment, the Prophets' children, i.e., the faithful in exile, are unapologetically shown collaborating with the invaders against the nonconformist Israelites. We are told that after capturing "the Sacred House", Nebuchadnezzar found Jeremiah imprisoned by the faithless Israelites (TT-U,1:383).

The Prophet had foretold that as punishment for their faithlessness God would soon impose Nebuchadnezzar on the Israelites, killing their fighters, enslaving their women. The faithless Israelites, Irmiya told Nebuchadnezzar, reacted by chaining him in the dungeon. Nebuchadnezzar is reported to have exclaimed: "Worst and cursed is the people who disobey the Messenger of their Lord" -- **BIS AL-QAWM ASAW RASUL RABBIHIM**" (ibid). Nebuchadnezzar released the Prophet Irmiya and treated him well. God bade Irmiya remain in the desolate city (ibid). No urge and desire is shown by God and Irmiya to defend the Israelite domain; it was no longer a Dar al-Islam. Nebuchadnezzar's harsh treatment of the Israelites is rather rejoiced in. God forbade Irmiya to pray for relief for the nonconformists who wanted to repent (ibid). Miraculously, God had Irmiya sleep one hundred years, promising to restore the city (Jerusalem) in His own time. When Irmiya woke up, he found the city populated and prosperous. It was Islamized. He lived along with other Israelites until the Rum (the Greeks and Romans) came no more independent Israelite entity survived (TT-U,1:384).

After the Babylonian invasion of the Holy Land some apparently faithful Israelites and Prophets moved toward Arabia and settled in Yathrib (Medina), Wadi al-Qura, Najran etc. along the western part of the peninsula (TT-U,1:383). Commanded by God, these Prophets and the faithful encouraged Nebuchadnezzar to pacify Arabia. Maadd son of Adnan (an ancestor of Muhammad) was one of the local faithful accompanying the Prophets. Maadd and the Prophets are shown to have friendly contacts with the Babylonian tyrant. They apparently remained in the court of Nebuchadnezzar as divinely inspired collaborators (TT-U,1:397-9).

The Prophet Uzayr (Ezra?) was one of the last Prophets of the era, according to Islamic sacred historiography. Uzayr emerged on the scene after the Israelites' return from Babylonian captivity. The Israelites had completely lost the Tawrat. The Holy Book was burned during the destruction of Jerusalem. No one had a copy nor did anyone remember its contents. Uzayr wept and said:

Because of our sins, our Lord became angry with us, imposing our enemy on us, who killed our men, destroyed our country and burned the Book of God that was with us - nothing else other than that (Holy Book) will put our life in order in this world and hereafter (TT-U,1:397).

An angel gave Uzayr a cup of holy water to drink. As soon as he drank the water all the Towrat "appeared in his heart (memory)" -- **FA MATHALAT AT-TAWRAT FI SADRIHI**. So he brought back the Holy Book, the divine Commandments, to the Israelites. But after his death the Israelites proved their degeneracy once again; they called Ezra the son of God and thus like the Christians committed **SHIRK**, the greatest crime from Islam's point of view - attributing a son to God (TT-U,1:396-7; T,10:110-3; Q9:30-1). With this act of **SHIRK**, associating partners to God, the Children of Israel completely forfeited their Islamic identity. God "assailed" these "perverted" people (Q9:30-1).

Al-Khidr (or al-Khadir) and Dhu'l-Qarnayn are two other faithful figures of sacred Islamic history relevant to the era under discussion. "The Servant of God who enjoyed God's mercy and Divine Knowledge" mentioned in Q18:60-81 is generally named al-Khidr or al-Khadir and identified, by Tradition, as a contemporary of the Prophet Moses (see A.J.Wensinck, "Al-Khadir/Al-Khidr", *El*²,4:902-5). Dhu'l-Qarnayn "The Two-Horned" is named so by the Quran 18:83-98. There is no clue in the Quran about the time of Dhu'l-Qarnayn. He is included in this era only on the basis of controversial Traditions which identify the Quranic Dhu'l-Qarnayn with Alexander the Great. Some modern Muslim scholars think the Quranic Dhu'l-Qarnayn was Cyrus the Great_{2a}. Traditionalist Muslims do not necessarily accept such interpretations. Whether Prophets or not, both Al-Khidr, i.e., 'the Servant of God,' and Dhu'l-Qarnayn are mentioned in the Quran as Divinely inspired and guided figures worthy of imitation by the Muslims. Dhu'l-Qarnayn is particularly important for our purpose as, according to sacred Islamic historiography, he is one of the two Muslim emperors who ruled the whole world - Solomon being the other. For the Prophet Muhammad, his

Companions, and for the believers, Dhu'l-Qarnayn is a real praiseworthy historical figure (see T,16:8-23). As usual, they are not interested in determining his exact historicity. The Almighty (through Muhammad) and Muhammad have told the believers about the reality of the existence of Dhu'l-Qarnayan and others; that is enough evidence for a believer.

The Quran and Tradition mention Yunus (Jonah) as a Messenger of God (Q4:163; Q6:86-900; Q10:98 cf. T,11:170-3; Q21:87-8 cf. T,17:76-82; 76-82, Q37:139-48 cf. T,23:98-106; K:321-6). Jonah was born in Jerusalem and was sent by God to preach the faith to the people of Ninevah. According to the Quran, he was the only Prophet whose threats of divine chastisement in this world worked: those who were threatened by Jonah - "a hundred thousand, or more" (Q37:147-8) -after observing terrible disasters (as Jonah had prayed for) approaching them, surrendered to the Prophets' creed (Q10:98 cf. T,11:170-3; Q37:139-48 cf. T,23:98-106; K:ibid). God forgave them and let them live. This happened, however, after Jonah, having prayed for the heathens' destruction, had left the country. Al-Kisai relates Jonah's story just before the chapter on Jesus.

In his Tafsir, Tabari implies the same chronological order, but he does not mention Jonah among those Israelite Prophets of the latest phase of the era who confronted Israelite nonconformists and collaborated with the Mesopotamian tyrants. In his Tarikh, however, Tabari includes the stories of the Prophet Jonah, son of Mattai, in the post-Jesus narrations (TT-U,1:457-65). A Muslim reader of Tabari's Tarikh is likely to think Jonah lived after Jesus. Based on the Quran, Jonah is famous in Islamic sacred history for his miraculous survival after he was swallowed by a fish as a Divine admonishment. The Almighty's declaration of amnesty, after the nonbelievers' surrender to belief under pressure, had angered Jonah; he insisted on revenge because they had, first, refused to acknowledge his Prophethood. In the belly of the fish, Jonah repented and praised the Lord vehemently. God forgave and rehabilitated him, enabling him to live a happy life among

the believers, preaching his creed. Our sources make it clear that the Almighty's demonstration of mercy for those whom Jonah wanted to be punished was based on the fact that they had become "faithful," i.e. Muslim (e.g. K:325). Of course, God does not destroy believers.

The Islamic Link

Moses, the Prophets and their followers of the era were Muslims, and their creed was Islam. They admired and practiced Islamic norms and rituals. Mecca and Medina were sacred places for them. Informed by God, they foretold the coming of Muhammad as the last and most distinguished Messenger of God (see, e.g. Q6:154 cf. TS,12:236; Q42:13; Tir., 46:1; Da., Int. b.1; IS,1/1:64, 103, 106, 108, 111). The Islamic story of this era authenticates Islam as God's favored religion and the only true creed acceptable to Him. On the Mount, when Moses talked to God and received revelation, he was given a thorough lesson about the importance and superiority of Muhammad and his followers, about His close relationship with Muslims and about the Almighty's kindness to Muslims and about His interest in Islamic rites.

"O Lord," said Moses, "I find in the tablets thou hast revealed to me thou wilt create a community of people who will command justice and forbid injustice [in the Islamic sense], and that thou wilt make them thy nation." "O Moses," cried the Lord, "that is the community of Muhammad." "I find a nation whose gospels are in their hearts, who read their book literally, whereas before they read esoterically. I shall make them my nation," said Moses. "That is Muhammad's nation," he was told. "I find a nation who fight those in error, hypocrites and the defective, and to this nation the taking of booty is permitted. If one of this nation intends a good deed and does it, thou writest for him ten good deeds; and even if he does it not, thou writest for him one. If he intends an evil deed and does it not, thou writest nothing against him; if he does it, thou writest against him one evil deed. I shall make them my community." "That is Muhammad's community," cried the Lord. Moses, I have decreed for Muhammad deliverance from Hell and have made for him a place in Paradise. Among all the progeny of Adam, I have created no one nobler in my sight than Muhammad. All the apostles before thee have believed in him and longed for him, and likewise shall those who come after thee, for he is the best prophet and his nation is the best nation: his name is Muhammad [emphasizing the meaning of the name: "the praised, commendable, laudable one" --] and I am **MAHMUD**: [which means the same as Muhammad in Arabic] his name is derived from mine own. O Moses, no prophet will emerge from the grave until Muhammad came forth from his, he and his nation. No

one will enter Paradise until Muhammad and his nation enter. O Moses, if a man of Muhammad's nation pray two rakas before sunrise, I will forgive him the sins he has committed during the day and night [**RAKA** "a bending" of torso from an upright position, followed by two prostrations is a unit of Muslim prayer ritual. This and the following rakas of prayer refer to the five times a day Islamic obligatory ritualistic prayers.]; if he pray four rakas at sunset, I will open all the gates of heaven to receive his prayer. I will grant him forgiveness, tip the balance in his favor and charge the angels to intercede on his behalf; and the dark-eyed houris will watch over him. O Moses, if he pray four raka's in the afternoon before sunset, there will not be an angel in heaven or earth that will not ask forgiveness for him, nor will I punish him in Hell. If he pray three raka's after sunset, that is better in my sight than a year of worship. And if he pray four raka's when night has fallen, I will open the gates of paradise to him and will forgive him. O Moses, if he perform his ablution [Muslim ritual washing of face, hands and feet -- **WUDU** -- before the ritual prayers] with water, for every drop I shall give him a degree in Paradise and will erase a like number of evil deeds from his register. O Moses, if he fast the month of Ramadan [the month for obligatory Muslim fasting], I will give him the wages of thirty martyrs" (K:237-8; brackets and slight language changes added).

Moses is also reported to have

found tablets of gold, on which was written: In the name of God the Compassionate, the Merciful. There is no god but God, Muhammad is the Apostle of God... (K:250)

David knew that Abraham had built the Kaba (K:305). David was also aware that Ishmael was God's Messenger and was praised by Him (as in the Quran) as truthful -- **SADIQ AL-W'AD**. David knew well that from Ishmael's "seed shall come the best of the universe, Muhammad" (K:280). During one of his air travels (sic), Solomon

passed over Medina, the city of our Prophet Muhammad and said to those who were with him, "This is the abode, after migration, of a prophet who will be the Lord of all apostles. Blessed be he who sees him and believes in him." Then he passed over Mecca and said, "This is the birthplace of that prophet. The excellence of this city over all others is as the excellence of Muhammad over all other prophets" (K:308).

The Prophet Isaiah "gave the good news of (the coming of) Jesus as well as Muhammad -- **BASH-SHARA BI ISA WA MUHAMMAD**" (TT-U,1:378).

Tabari and Kisai, following the Quranic lead faithfully, use the words "Islam" and "Muslim" to reinforce in the Muslim mind the Islamic identification of the believers of the era of Moses. Similarly, the

believers of this era are shown to have used Islamic terminology, performed Islamic rituals, and followed traditional Muslim ways of conduct.

Tabari tells readers that the Children of Israel in Egypt followed "Islam," the religion of Joseph, Jacob, Isaac and Abraham (TT-U,1:270). As the Pharaoh was drowning in the sea, he declared, in vain, his readiness to recite the Islamic confession: "There is no god but God" and to become "one of the Muslims" (Q10:90; TT-U,1:292,296). In various contexts, Moses, his contemporary Prophet Khidr, Saul, David, his soldier Uriah, Elijah and their followers are referred to as "Muslims" and are reported to have performed ablution (**WUDU**) and prayer (**SALAT**) in the Islamic way (K:219, 222, 247-8,257, 268, 277, 290, 314). When Zipporah, the future wife of Moses, wanted to take Moses home to meet her father, Moses, as prescribed by Islam, walked ahead of the young lady (TT-U,1:280). Kisai gives some interesting details. "Walk behind me and direct me by throwing stones before me, and beware lest you speak to me!" said Moses. "She did as he told her" (K:222). Gabriel asked Moses to circumcise his son (K:225). The Divine laws revealed to Moses required, as in Islam, stoning fornicators, severing of a thief's hand and payment of **ZAKAT**, the Islamic tax (K:239; TT-U,1:315). Moses had initially ordered weekly congregational worship on Friday. His unfaithful followers and, then, Christians changed it wrongly into Saturday and Sunday respectively. As punishment God made it difficult for them (K:296 cf. Q16:124). Joshua was buried with Islamic rites. David was given the knowledge of "Islam" (TT-U,1:338). The worship-houses built by David and Solomon were called **MASJID**, mosque (ibid:343). David knew Abraham was a "devout Muslim" (K:279). The converts to the Israelite religion knew that it was "Islam" (K:266). Solomon converted his heathen wives to "Islam" (K:317). Solomon called Balqis (Sheba?), the non-Muslim Queen to "Islam" -- **DAAHA IL'AL-ISLAM**, and demanded that she and her courtiers become Muslims -- **ATUNI MUSLIMIN** (Q27:38). After their conversion to Islam, Solomon almost forced the

celibate Balqis to marry because, Solomon decreed, abstention from marriage was "not authorized by Islam" -- **LA YAKUN FI'L-ISLAM** (TT-U,1:347-50 cf. Q27:30). God sent Jonah to the people of Ninevah to **YADUHUM ILA'L-ISLAM** "call them to Islam" (T,11:172 cf. Q10:98).

Just before Tabari closes his chapter on Moses and his followers, the believers are informed of the Almighty's special concern for Muhammad revealed to the latest Prophets of the era - and of these Prophets' pilgrimage to Mecca. The Almighty instructed His Messengers, Iirmiya and Barkhiya to command (sic) Nebuchadnezzar to invade Arabia and punish its people harshly for, apparently, their refusal to acknowledge the Prophets. God was, however, concerned about the safety of only one person in Arabia: Maadd son of Adnan, the ancestor of Muhammad - and an offspring of Ishmael. Maadd had to be protected during the divinely decreed onslaught (TT-U,1:397). God told the Prophets Iirmiya and Barkhiya to

take care of Maadd son of Adnan from whose progeny will come Muhammad, the one I will bring forth at the end of the time, put a seal with him on prophethood [i.e., he will be the last and perfect prophet] (ibid:398, brackets added).

Obviously, the Prophets and Nebuchadnezzar followed God's commandment about Maadd. Along with the Prophets, he had a respectable position in the tyrant's court.

After Nebuchadnezzar died, Maadd son of Adnan, accompanied by the Prophets, the Prophets of the Children of Israel (sic), may Allah's blessings be on them, left for Mecca; he fulfilled its (pilgrimage) rites -- **AQAM ALAMAHA**, performed pilgrimage -- **HAJJ** --, and the Prophets performed pilgrimage along with him (TT-U,1:399).

The Mission and Concerns.

Muslims find a repetition of Prophetic concerns, likes, dislikes and aspirations, in the era of Moses and his followers. They emphasized 1) submission to the Messengers' right to paramount leadership as spokespersons for the Almighty, 2) adherence to monotheism and worship of the One God, 3) belief in the Last Day and 4) maintenance of a

particular pattern of behavior toward nonbelievers, symbolized, more than during the earlier eras, by jihad conducted directly by the believers. The dogmatic requirements seldom translated into the necessity for any change in other norms of life except in the performance of certain rites. Beyond faith and the performance of rituals, the only action that concerned the Prophets and believers was jihad per se.

The Prophets' concern for jihad and expansion of the Islamic domain was not motivated by any utilitarian urge. Jihad did not aim at change benefiting the society at large in this world. It was not aimed at providing human society with social justice and relief in any humanistic or humanitarian sense. Except for their disbelief in the Prophetic dogma, i.e., Islam, nothing socially, economically or politically wrong is projected by our sources with places and people against whom jihad was enjoined and done. The Prophets and the faithful, after the perceived occupation of the non-Muslim lands, do not seem to have engaged in earthly reforms for the benefit of colonized people. Muslims read that Islamic imperialism did not care to be seen as concerned for a this-worldly betterment of society and as benign or civilizing, in the modern sense of these words.

The Prophets' overall Islamic stories and the Islamic meaning of the censorious as well as complimentary terms and phrases in the Quran, respectively condemning the nonbelievers and applauding the believers, confirm our contention that dogmatic faith in the One God, His Prophets and in the afterlife along with the performance of related rituals were of utmost concern. Nonbelievers of the era are seldom condemned for any specifically worldly misdeed; the believers are rarely applauded for giving this-worldly comfort to a human being per se. The demand for obedience to God and the Prophets, and for belief in the afterlife, is hardly ever translated to good works in a general sense; frequently, it means adoption of a negative attitude toward nonbelievers and waging war against them.³

Moses was sent by God to the people who were **FASIQ** "ungodly," "The Pharaoh and his Council" were **MUFSIDIN** "workers of corruption" (Q7:101-3). They were "ungodly" because they had forgotten to worship and obey God (TS,13:10-1). The **ZULM** "wrongdoing" of the Pharaoh and his Council (Q7:103) is defined in terms of their **KUFR**, disbelief in God and in the Prophethood of Moses and Aaron (TS,13:12-3). They were "workers of corruption" because they worshipped deities other than Allah and set partners to Him (TS,12:256; T,12:487). God punished Pharaoh and his people because they **ISTAKBARU** "behaved haughtily" and they were **QUAM-AN MUJRIMIN** "a guilty people" (Q7:133). For Tabari it means they refused to believe in God and in the Prophet Moses out of pride and thus did what was anathema to the Almighty (TS,13:70). Referring to Q10:75, Tabari tells us the two Prophets were sent to the Pharaoh and his people to ask them to worship God and acknowledge the two as His Messengers (T,11:145). In Q10:81-2 the Pharaoh and his people are called **AL-MUFSIDIN** "corrupt" - and **AL-MUJRIMIN** "guilty" or "sinners" for their disobedience to God (T,11:148-9). They are charged with **KUFR** "disbelief" **AL-IN FI'L-ARD** "high handedness in the land," and of "extravagance" (Q10:83,86); all this means is they refused, out of pride, to believe in God, and repudiated His oneness (T,11:149-51). Explaining Q11:96-103, Tabari maintains that God sent Moses, with signs about His Oneness, to belie anyone claiming godhood or lordship, and to make null and void the assertions of any who ascribed a partner to God (T,12:109). Moses was sent to bring forth people from **ZULUMAT** "darkness" to **NUR** "light" (Q14:5), i.e., from disbelief to belief in God (T,13:182). On the Mount when God first talked to Moses, He emphasized repeatedly His Lordship and Oneness and the 'fact' of the Last Day. Moses was instructed to go to the Pharaoh and emphasize the same: "call him to admit the unity of God..." (Q20:12-24 cf. T,16:158-9). The adversaries of Moses are likened to those before them who had disobeyed God, set partners for Him and belied His Prophets - provoking Divine wrath (Q11:101-2 cf. T,12:113). In the Book God gave to Moses, and in

making Moses a guide to the Children of Israel, He emphasized: "Take not unto yourselves any guardian apart from Me" (Q17:2).

The weakness and apostasy of the nonbelievers are repeatedly related to their relapse into polytheism and failure to wage jihad against the nonbelievers. It was a relapse into idol-worship and lack of ardor for fighting the nonbelievers of the promised Holy Land that halted the forward march begun by Moses. The first period of decline and humiliation, symbolized by the loss of the Ark of the Covenant, is seen to have been caused by the same reasons. Muslim decline was checked and, finally, reversed by the establishment of a world-wide Islamic empire, but only when the Muslims surrendered to the religio-political authority of Samuel and promised to fight the nonbelievers wholeheartedly.

Solomon was declared qualified by God, Gabriel, David and "the learned men" in David's court to succeed his father as an ideal Islamic ruler after he (Solomon) answered correctly sixteen fundamental questions composed by the Almighty, conveyed through Gabriel. These basic concerns related to the dogma, rituals, images of nonbelievers, and to a few riddles some of which reflected what may be called a sexist attitude. God and the believers were not concerned about justice, social responsibility and human betterment. They, simply, wanted to ensure that Solomon knew that:

- 1) "the believer is something"
- 2) "the incapable is the least thing" [In the original Arabic text of al-Kisai, Qisas al-Anbiya..., Brill 1922, p. 273 - also, AL-AJIZ, "the incapable," is not further explained. Apparently, it connotes simple physical **AJZ**, disability.]
- 3) "the infidel is nothing"
- 4) "everything is from water"
- 5) "gratitude to God is the greatest thing"
- 6) "property, children and good health is the sweetest thing"
- 7) "poverty after riches was the bitterest thing"

- 8) "apostasy after faith is the most odious thing"
- 9) "the soul in the body was the most beautiful thing"
- 10) "the body without the soul is the most dreadful thing"
- 11) "the next world to this world is the closest thing"
- 12) "this world from the next world is the farthest thing"
- 13) "an evil woman is the most evil thing"
- 14) "a pious woman is the best thing"
- 15) "the earth is the purest thing"
- 16) "the dog and the pig are the vilest thing" (K:294-5).

In the Quranic story of Solomon, his single concern about the Queen of Sheba, Balqis, and her people was their alleged polytheism (Q27:15-44 cf. vv. 24, 43). The disintegration of Solomon's Islamic empire was caused, we are told, because one of his wives had offered a small sacrifice, a locust (sic), to an idol (TT-U,1:367).

Ilyas, a later Prophet of this time, speaks only once in the Quran and then only of the need to adhere to monotheism (37:123-7). Asa was a resurgent voice of Islam during the post-Solomonic decline of Muslim power. Asa succeeded as King his father, Abya, who had apostasized. Concern for the dogma and vehemence against nonconformists and nonbelievers topped the agenda of this great Islamic revolutionary (or counterrevolutionary) figure of Muslim sacred history. As a matter of fact, nothing else was at issue.⁴ Asa received revelation from God -- **AWH ALLAH ILA ASA** so, he was a Prophet-King (TT-U,1:375). Tabari praises Asa for his fundamentalist-revivalist reforms and for his trust in God while fighting internal non-conformists and a great heathen empire (TT-U,1:367-78). Asa's internal reforms dealt exclusively with the abolition of idol-worship which his parents had allegedly allowed. Abya, Asa's father, is criticized for the crime that

he worshipped two idols and called the people to their worship, until he misguided Israelite masses; he continued idol-worship until he died, and then his son Asa became King (ibid:367-8).

Referring to his father's death and idol-worship, Asa

declared in his inauguration decree:

Beware; disbelief and its partisans are indeed dead. Long live the Belief and the believers. The time of idols and their worship is gone. The era of obedience to God and deeds, accordingly, is heralded. From this day on, I shall kill any disbelieving Israelite who raises his head in disbelief in my domain and time [ibid:368].

There is no criticism of Abya the Apostate for any social and secular reason. Nor has Asa earned fame among believers for interest in terrestrial affairs. Nevertheless, Asa is a Muslim hero because of his concern for dogma and jihad.

About Zachariah, his wife and son, John (the Baptist), we are told "they vied with one another, hastening to good works" -- **KANU YUSARIUN FI'L-KHAYRAT** (21:90). The context of the passage and Tabari's commentary make it clear that the "good works" had no terrestrial connotation. The "good works" refer to their obedience to God and to their acts that took them close to the Almighty, such as worshipping God "out of yearning and awe," being humble to Him and fearing his chastisement, and never ceasing, out of pride, to worship God (T,17:81-2). Tabari gives no earthly example of **KHAYRAT** "good works" for which the prophets are praised in the Quran. During the last part of the era, God and Jeremiah appear in continuous conference, appraising the affairs of the Children of Israel, specifying the causes of their misfortunes and fall, and censuring them for what concerns the Almighty and His Messenger (TT-U,1:389-97 passim). God and the Prophet were unhappy because the Israelites committed disobedience and indulged in what was forbidden -- **RAKIBU AL-MAASI WA'STAHALLU AL-MAHARIM** (ibid:390). Their disobedience to God and wrongdoings are specified: the Israelites followed their **AHBAR** "scholars" and **RUHBAN** "monks" whose judgments and decrees were not based on the Book of God (ibid). For a Muslim, it means they did not apply the Shariah Law in toto and literally. Israelite **FUQAHA** "learned men" used their knowledge for worldly gains, not in **AL-AMAL** "action for God. In traditional Islamic terminology **AMAL** "action" or "deed" is limited to the performance of

rituals as prescribed by the Shariah. Indulgence in objective and speculative scholarship was wrong. Fundamentalism was the right path. Instead of following the Divine Law recovered miraculously by the Prophet Uzayr, the thankless and wretched Israelites committed the worst sin: they called Uzayr the son of God (ibid:397). Concerns for dogma, rituals and the necessity for a literal, fundamentalist and anti-intellectual approach are reflected in divine critiques here.

The Quran and Tradition mention a fearful massacre of pregnant Israelite women and infants. We are also told of the enslavement and mistreatment of the Israelites and of the urge of Moses to let his people go from Egypt. In order to see to what extent these descriptions inculcate anti-oppression and anti-slavery orientations among Muslims, we need to read the story from an Islamic angle. As in the case of Abraham, the purpose of Islamic sources in describing the massacre of the Israelites is to demonstrate how the Pharaoh could not find and slay the baby (Moses) who was destined to become the Messenger of God and, destroy the Pharaoh's rule and his people. The emphasis is on the miraculous events culminating in the escape of Moses from all dangers. The descriptions do not basically reproach the Pharaoh for slaying innocent women and children. It is the Prophet's wondrous escape from death, rather than the tragedy of the infanticides, the sources emphasize. The believers are not supposed to grieve for the innocent victims; nor are they expected to question why the Almighty did not act to protect His Messenger in a less tragic way. They are rather expected to rejoice in the fact that the destined Messenger of God was nonetheless preserved.

For a Muslim, slavery per se of the Israelites in Egypt was not a basic Prophetic concern. Had the Israelites not been Muslims, a Muslim would think, God and His Messenger would not have bothered about such temporal misfortunes. Islamic Prophets, as the era ended, did not hesitate to invoke God's wrath against the faithless Israelites; the Prophets collaborated with foreign tyrants who were seen as God's tools

for the punishment and enslavement of nonbelieving Israelites. The Islamic Moses was far from a nationalist, freedom-fighter, or upholder of human rights per se. Moses repeatedly repented for his act of solidarity with an oppressed Israelite which resulted in the accidental death of the Egyptian oppressor. The Quran does not applaud this radical act of Moses. Moses regretfully called his 'nationalistic' passion a Satanic zeal -- **INN HADHA MIN AMAL ASH-SHAYTAN** (Q28:15) and asked God for forgiveness. God forgave him, instead of reassuring Moses that he had done the right thing by trying to help an oppressed person. The next day Moses rebuked the oppressed Israelite by calling him a "quarrelsome nuisance" (Q28:15-18). Moses considered that the Israelite he had helped was a **MUJIRIM** "sinner," and took a vow never again to be such a "partisan" (Q28:17 cf. TB,20:30-1). Later, when Moses returned to the Pharaoh, he reminded Moses of the murder he had committed. Moses frankly admitted that it was a misguided act (Q26:19-20). This simply tells a Muslim that Moses was not interested in Israelite affairs from a secular point of view. Does this tell a Muslim that Moses was a pacifist? No. As we will see soon, the Islamic Moses was a militant from childhood to the last moment of his life, for the dogma - not for the oppressed Israelites.

The demand by Moses, "let the Children of Israel go with me," was an act of **HIJRAH** - an act to segregate the believers from nonbelievers after the latter refused to surrender to the paramount leadership and creed of Moses and Aaron (T,16:191 cf. Q20:77). The Islamic Exodus from Egypt to the Holy Land follows the model of irreconciliation, cold war-hijrah-jihad-conquest-or-annihilation. As discussed below, Muslims find it prepared the ground for the annihilation of the Pharaoh and his people and for the establishment of a power base, a Dar al-Islam in the "Holy Land."

Muslims find in the Quran that during his passionate debates with the Pharaoh, Moses only mentioned once the enslavement of the Israelites and that in a rhetorical context. He did so just to ignore the

Pharaoh's reminder that Moses was brought up by the royal court and had for years in his youth enjoyed the Pharaoh's favors and blessings (Q26:18). Muslims read in the long Quranic discourses between Moses and the Pharaoh that the enslavement of the Israelites and the demand for "letting them go," become unimportant side issues. It is the demand for belief in God and His omnipotence and omniscience, as well as the demand for the acknowledgment of the Prophethood of Moses and Aaron, which are emphasized repeatedly and vehemently (see, e.g., Q20:43-56 passim; Q26:15-26 passim). Had the Pharaoh and Egyptians converted to Islam, acknowledging Moses' paramount religio-social leadership, a Muslim would think, the Prophet would not have objected to the enslavement of Israelite Muslims by the new Egyptian Muslims. Muhammadan Islam allows the existence of Muslim slaves in an Islamic society. The most Moses-like Muhammad - would have recommended was a better - Uncle Tomish - treatment of a few favored Muslim slaves. Muslims know that God would never have opened the sea for nonbelieving - though oppressed - rebellious Israelites trying to escape a 'Muslim Pharaoh's' tyranny. The Almighty, most probably, would have drowned such Israelites, opening the sea for their Egyptian masters had the latter been believers.

The absence of concern for mundane, secular affairs is reflected in the Prophets' stories in some other ways. Adherence to the dogma and jihad, apparently, exempted the believers from strict social accountability and moral responsibility. The believers' morally questionable acts were forgiven by God. Inspired by the Quran 2:102 and 38:17-40, Islamic Tradition has zealously disregarded, if not approved, David's and Solomon's apparently irreligious, disingenuous and immoral acts (see TS,2:404- 457; T,23:136-164). As we saw above in the dialogue between God and Moses - and as discussed in Part Four of this work - performance of rituals "erases" the evil deeds of believers from the "register" and guarantees God's grace and Paradise. Such believers are rewarded by God for merely intending to do good deeds, not necessarily for performing them.

In Q38:17-40 and Tabari's related commentaries, Muslims are told that David - who already had ninety-nine wives - was attracted by the beautiful wife of Uriah, one of his faithful generals, while the latter was on a jihad mission. The Prophet David decided to get rid of the general in order to add the pretty lady to his harem. With this purpose in mind, David kept Uriah at the front to fight the nonbelievers and did not allow him to return to home. The general was eventually killed on the battlefield exactly what the Prophet David wanted. He immediately added the beautiful widow to his harem.

Muslims find that the Almighty handled this scandal profoundly dispassionately. Muslims learn that within Islam when the parties involved in a questionable affair are the believers, "power and honor, deference and patronage and the timeless injunctions of the Divine Law determine everything."⁵

The Quran mentions this affair in an esoteric and confidential style. God deemed it necessary not to humiliate His Messenger, nor did He reproach the Prophet David directly and harshly. After firmly establishing David's credentials as a glorious and righteous Prophet-King, implying God's satisfaction with him, the Quran tells that God sent two angels disguised as men to seek judgment from David. One said that he had only one ewe while the other already owned ninety-nine. "He of ninety-nine," the plaintiff added, "wants to take the only ewe I have." David realized that God was politely reminding him of the wrong he had done a fellow-Muslim.

Therefore he sought forgiveness of his Lord, and he fell down, bowing, and he repented. Accordingly We forgave him that, and he has a near place in Our presence and a fair resort (Q38:24-5).

God's treatment of His Messenger was much more considerate and much less public than Hamlet's mousetrap for Claudius and Gertrude - less than a hit below the belt. It was immediately followed by a declaration of amnesty (forgiveness) and re-verification of David's sacred and exalted status.

Tradition tells us that though forgiven, David was uncertain his victim would rest in the Last Day. He feared that the general whom he had so treacherously eliminated might complain to God and seek justice. God reassured David that in the Day Hereafter the Almighty would intervene and ask the betrayed general to forgive David (T,23:141-51; also see TT-U,1:339-42; K281-6). For David's further satisfaction, God caused the fallen general to speak from his grave, telling the Prophet he was absolved. Perhaps, in order to be sure the aggrieved would not change his mind, God promised the general a generous and tempting reward in Paradise:

a mansion which seemed to him more beautiful than a luminescent pearl, such that the inside could be seen from the outside and in which was a houri so beautiful that one glimpse of her would infatuate the world (K:286; also see T,23:151).

(Only God knows why He did not export this wonderful houri for His dear Messenger, leaving our poor Uriah with his earthly wife.) While Uriah had to wait for the Day Hereafter for recompense, God encouraged David to satisfy his desires in this world with no guilty conscience. [Aisha, the outspoken and jealous wife of Muhammad, had once on a similar occasion remarked sarcastically that the Almighty was prompt in responding positively to His Messenger's desire--**INNI LA-ARA RABBAK LA-YUSARI LAK FI HAWAK** (T, 22:26 cf. Q33:51).]sa God told David:

Go ahead and make love to your women and concubines freely and discard any one when you wish - **FA JAMI MAN SHIT-A MIN NISAIK WA JAWARIK MA SHIT BI-GHAYR HISAB, WA'TRUK MAN SHIT-A MINHUNN-A** (T,23:163).

Muslims know well that Islam's concern for doctrinaire monotheism and ritualistic worship is much greater compared to a concern for morality, in its general sense. According to Islamic sources it was Solomon's failure to heed his wife's near idol-worship - not his pomp and David's immorality - that led to the disintegration of Solomon's empire after his death.

Islamic Torah--**AT-TAWRAT** is interested only in the dogma, rituals

and Prophethood as explained above; it emphasized the imminent appearance and superiority of the last Messenger of God, Muhammad. Rarely reported exhortations of **AT-TAWRAT** against killing, stealing and fornication are promptly Islamized by our sources. Alluding, apparently, to the Ten Commandments, Kisai gives some examples of God's commandments to Moses, punctuating, however, with Islamic amendments, thus de-emphasizing, for Muslim consumption, certain general moralistic aspects of the Commandments. For example, according to Kisai, Moses was told: "Kill not an inviolate soul except rightfully." Referring to Q4:93, Kisai tells the believers that the commandment forbids only the killing of a Muslim. So, a Muslim is reassured that God no longer forbids the killing of a non-Muslim. The Commandment against stealing is Islamized by adding Q5:38 that enjoins cutting off the thief's hand, thus emphasizing the hard punishment rather than a mere exhortation. The equivalent of God's commandment to Moses against fornication with one's neighbor's wife is Q4:25, Kisai tells Muslims. Q4:25 allows especially the unmarried sexual intercourse with an unlimited number of one's slave-women or concubines -- **MIN MA MALAKAT AYMANUKUM**. The Quran 49:10 has amended, Kisai maintains, God's commandment to Moses that required us to "do unto others as you would have them do unto you." According to Q49:10, these brotherly relations are limited to Muslims only; God does not bind Muslims to treat non-Muslims favorably. The ritualistic prohibition against eating "that over which God's name has not been spoken" is maintained on the basis of Q6:121. The Commandment to take rest on the sabbath is rendered meaningless by transposing it with Q2:65 that condemns Jews for transgressing the day (K:235-6). Muslims know well that they need not apologize for these Divinely confirmed amendments. God has reserved the authority to change or amend His commandments at will. [(See Q2:106-7, e.g., and discussion elsewhere in this study on the concept of **NASKH**, "abrogation (of earlier revelations by the later)"]. Besides, the Quran is the last and perfect Word of God - as explained and applied by His last and perfect

Messenger, Muhammad.

Beyond indulgence in sensuality and sumptuousness, this-worldly life and this-worldliness are depreciated directly. The Islamic-Prophetic Sunnah (Tradition) is to consume civilization - not to create and build it. The believers mocked the Pharaoh and the nonbelievers for having a jurisdiction limited to just this world (Q20:72). The Pharaoh and nonbelievers were condemned for preferring the present life, ignoring the fact that the world to come is better and more enduring (Q87:16 cf. T,30:158). Addressing the Pharaoh and his people, a convert to the creed of Moses lectured:

O my people, surely this present life is but a passing enjoyment; surely the world to come is the abode of stability (Q40:39).

Later, internal nonbelievers, i.e., Israelite nonconformists, are repeatedly reproved for their enthusiastic involvement in worldly affairs -- **ALAHATHUM AD-DUNYA WA SHANUHA** (TT-U,1:392; see also Q28:79).

Depreciation of this-worldly concerns and activities did not necessarily mean adoption of a simple, ascetic or moderate style of life by the believers. Once in power and in possession of material resources, the Prophets and the faithful do not seem to abstain from boasting, pomp and luxury, (while the same attributed to nonbelievers is ridiculed and condemned). The Quran projects with gusto the worldly power and extraordinary material resources of the "man of might," David, and of Solomon and Dhu'l-Qarnayn(18:83-98; 21:78-82; 27:15-44; 34:10-13; 38:17-40). Inspired by the Quran, Tradition tells the believers of Solomon's wives, of his countless human and jinn slaves who were forced to perform for him "works in iron, brass, wood and stone" and whose women "he ordered to spin silk, cotton, linen and wool and to weave carpets." Also lauded are Solomon's palaces with "golden lamps... hung with silver chains" and decorated with "twelve thousand seats built of ivory and aloe wood" for his courtiers (K:302-6; also see TT-U,1:344-57). An enslaved artisan made a magnificent throne for

Solomon.

It was "a throne of ivory with pedestals of gold, and on it he put statues of birds and beasts. It was also studded with pearls the size of ostrich eggs. On the first step was a grapevine wrought of gold, with leaves of emerald and bunches of gems set to look like grapes; to the right and left of the seat he fixed a palm tree of gold, on each of which were peacocks, birds and hawks that were hollow and studded with jewels. When the wind blew through the hollow cavities, they would sing songs, the like of which no one had ever heard. When Solomon ascended the first step, the eagles and birds flapped their wings and scattered musk over him... At the seventh step the throne itself revolved with all that was upon it and came to rest for Solomon to seat himself. And the birds perfumed him with musk and ambergris" (K:306. For the power and magnificence of the courts of David and Solomon also see TT-U,1:336- 51).

Though parasitic, this love-hate affair with "the lower world and what is in it" -- **AD-DUNYA WA MA FIHA** is not enigmatic for a believer. The Muslim mind explains these past believers' other-worldly this-worldliness as follows. As long as the believers keep the faith, perform religious rites prescribed by the Prophets, and maintain a 'correct' pattern of behavior toward nonbelievers, the believers indulgence in pomp and luxury is authorized. However, it is projected as a divine right and reward, not, definitely, related to their own efforts. The believers were proud to live on miracles, booty and the labor of the enslaved nonbelievers including the jinn. The perpetuation of these **BARAKAT** "blessings" was guaranteed by the Almighty as long as the believers adhered to the dogma and engaged in holy war against the heathen.

Treatment of Nonbelievers

The patterns of behavior of these Muslim heroes of the era under discussion are linked to their self-images as seen through the lens of Islam, transformed into Muslim self-images. As commanded by Q6:90, Muslims must follow the examples of these past Prophets and their followers.

Moses, other Prophets and the faithful of the era saw themselves as Divinely-guided. They were given by God the **KITAB** "Book," **HIKMAH** "wisdom," and **HUKM** "the authority to judge" others (Q2:53 passim;

Q4:163-5; Q6:84-90; Q7:143-7; Q11:96; 14:5; Q20:9-37 passim; Q27:9-10 passim; Q28:1- 52...). God gave Moses "the Book and the Salvation for the guidance of the people (2:53); he was given "the Book as a light and guidance to men" (Q6:91); he was sent with God's "signs and a manifest authority to Pharaoh and his Council" and to his people "to bring them forth from the shadows to the light" (Q11:96; 14:5; 17:2), just as He has sent Muhammad, we are reminded, to bring mankind from darkness (sic) to the Light, from error and misguidance to the true guidance (religion), from disbelief to belief -- **YAQUL (ALLAH) LI NABIYYIHI MUHAMMAD.. KAMA ANZALNA ILAYKA YA MUHAMMAD HADHA'L-KITAB LI TUKHRIJ AN-NAS MIN AZ-ZULUMAT ILA'N-NUR, MIN AD-DALALAT ILA'L-HUDA.. WA MIN AL-KUFR ILA'L-IMAN (T,13:182-4 cf. Q14:5).**

Muslims find Moses, Aaron, David, Solomon, Ilyas, Elisha, Zachariah, John, Jonah and other Prophets of the era are among those who were given by God "the Book, the judgment, the Prophethood;" God "elected them" and guided them to "a straight path", "those are they whom God has guided; so follow their guidance," the Almighty asserts (Q6:84-90). God gave Moses, David, Solomon and all other Prophets "judgment and knowledge," divine "guidance" and "clear authority" (Q19:12; 21:79; 28:37; 40:23; on above themes also see Q26:11, 21; 28:87; 37:114-32; 38:20; 40:53). The thoughts and action of the believers were sanctioned by Divine revelation, inspiration and authorization. Moses and Aaron frequently claimed that God authorized them as the Messengers of the Lord of the whole universe -- **INNI RASUL MIN RABB AL-ALAMIN (Q7:104) INNA RASULA RABBIK (Q20:47).** It was God who commanded Samuel through revelation to tell Saul to attack and massacre the people of Midian along with their cattle (TT-U,1:337; also see for example K:244, 281, 289 passim).

The Prophets and faithful were the chosen people of God who held them superior to the rest of mankind; they enjoyed God's especial favors. God had chosen (along with Adam, Noah and Abraham) "the House of Imran (Amram)", i.e., Moses and Aaron, sons of Imran, "above all

beings" (Q3:33-4). God had also "preferred" Moses, Aaron, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Zachariah, John and Jonah "above all beings" (Q6:86). Moses was told directly by the Almighty that He had "chosen" him "above all men" (7:144). "I myself have chosen thee," God told Moses (20:13,41). The Prophets were aware and conscious of the Divinely ordained superiority of their Prophetic class. David and Solomon said "Praise belongs to God who has preferred us over many of His believing servants" (Q27:15). The Prophets and the believers did not belong to the same class. As Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob and Job, David, Solomon and al-Yasa (Elisha) were all "men of might and vision," "purified by God" and in God's sight "were of the chosen, the excellent" (Q38:30-48).

While the Prophets were superior to believers, so were the believers to nonbelievers. God "chose," "blessed" and "preferred" them "above all beings" (2:47,122; 7:140, 14:32 cf. T,25:127); He "blessed" them by "appointing among (them) Prophets, and (appointing them) Kings and (giving them) such as He gave to no being" (5:20). God had graciously bestowed upon them "leadership" and ordained them to "inherit" the lands and possessions of nonbelievers and "establish themselves, in the land" (Q28:5-6; Q26:57-9 cf. T). They were honored to have inherited the Book that God revealed to Moses (Q40:53).

Indeed, We gave the Children of Israel the Book, the Judgment and the Prophethood, and We provided them with good things, and We preferred them above all beings (45:16).

Divine help for the Prophets and believers and their victory over nonbelievers were guaranteed.

Surely We shall help Our Messengers and those who believed, in the present life... (40:51). We also favored Moses and Aaron, and We delivered them and their people from the great distress. And We helped them, so that they were the victors (37:114-6).

Moses and Aaron were told not to fear because God was on their side and they would come out "the uppermost" (20:46, 68). Moses told believers

to have trust in God, assuring them He will never abandon them (10:84 cf. T,11:151). Before they marched on the Holy Land, the believers knew that with God's help they "will be victors" (5:23 passim).

From the time Moses was conceived to the period he and the Muslims crossed the sea they were protected miraculously. Stories of these wondrous happenings are told in great detail by the Quran and Tradition.⁶ With the help of the two God-given "signs" - the ASA "staff" which could become a huge serpent capable of devouring everything and perform other wonders, and the YAD BAYDA "white hand" emitting whiteness or light - Moses was able to embarrass, humiliate, terrorize and punish the Pharaoh and other Egyptian nonbelievers.⁷ The angels continued to help the believers. Once, after killing an Egyptian, Moses's life was in danger; it was an angel who showed him the way to Midian, and thus escape (TT-U,1:275).

Miracles favoring believers against nonbelievers continued to happen during the whole post-exodus period. With God's help, Muslims performed wonders and overwhelmed non-Muslims greater in number and might. It is about this era that God reminds us: "How often a little company has overcome a numerous company, by God's leave" (Q2:249). God soon turned them into a majority (14:6) reducing the number of the heathens by direct annihilation and massacre by the believers. For their comfort God "outspread the cloud to overshadow" them and provided them, miraculously, with the best food: "manna and quails" (2:57). In the desert, when they needed water, God told Moses: "'strike with thy staff the rock'; and there gushed forth from it twelve fountains" (2:60). God made nature change its course for the benefit of the Muslims. Moses and the faithful left Egypt by night; they needed to reach a safe point before the sunrise. Moses had to delay the march in order to find and carry with him Joseph's remains as willed by the latter. God delayed the sunrise (TT-U,1:295). During the holy wars of Moses and Joshua against nonbelievers, God used to "imprison" the sun, prolonging the day, so that the believers could kill more of

nonbelievers and conquer the cities under siege (TT-U,1:309-11; K:260). Mountains used to incline toward each other, forming a bridge over a river for the believers (K:261). Even the animals and some wise non-Muslims, such as Balam bin Baur (Balaam son of Beor?), saw and knew the angels were fighting for Moses, Joshua and the faithful. When pressed by the nonbelievers to pray for their victory, God caused Balam's tongue to loll and fall on his chest (TT-U,1:307-8). The Almighty listened only to the believers. During a war against the nonbeliever a powerful heathen, Awj (Og) carried a huge rock to throw upon the Muslims. God sent a bird who knocked out the heathen, helping Moses to kill him (K:253).

Most of the wonderful deeds of Saul, David and Solomon, and their successful wars against the nonbelievers, are attributed to Divine miracles. For Saul, angels brought back the Ark lost to the enemies (Q2:248). God made iron pliant for David, he could twist and turn it to make weapons without putting it into fire (Q34:10; T,22:66). God taught David how to make coats of mail to protect him during the holy wars (Q21:80 cf. T,17:55; Q34:10). The mountains, winds, birds, jinn and demons and all men were made by God subservient to David and Solomon; this divine power helped both to overcome and to subjugate the nonbelievers (Q21:79,81-2 cf. T,17:50-6; Q27:16-44 cf. T,19:140-70; Q34:10-14 cf. T,22:70-86; Q38:18-20, 36-8 cf. T,23:136-64). During a war between Asa and the heathen Indian (sic) emperor who had mobilized 1,100,000 -- **ALF ALF WA MIAT ALF** -- troops against the tiny Dar al-Islam, God sent troops of angels from all the heavens to reinforce the faithful -- **BAATH ALLAH MALAIKAT MIN KULL SAMA AWWAN LI ASA WA QAWMIH**. The angels slaughtered "one million" non-Muslim troops, enabling Asa to collect the booty. The non-Muslim king tried to flee via sea with his remaining hundred thousand soldiers, but the Almighty ordered waves from all sides to drown them all. Victorious Asa and the Muslims thanked and praised the Lord (TT-U,1:372-7).

Even during the last part of the era, God showed the world He was

on the side of the Muslims against non-Muslims. Sanharib (Sennacherib?) the King of Babylon (sic) besieged the Dar al-Islam with 600,000 troops. Sadiqa (Sedecia?), the Muslim King, beseeched the contemporary Prophet Shaya (Isaiah?) to ask God for help. The Almighty responded; next morning all the six hundred thousand heathen besiegers, except their King and five of his secretaries (taken prisoner by the believers), were found dead (TT-U,1:379 passim). Solomon's answers to the Divine questionnaire mentioned earlier sum up the believers' self-images and their images of non-Muslims. When Solomon was

seventeen years old, Gabriel came down to David with a page of gold and said to him, "O David, God sends you greetings and tells you to assemble your children and to read them the problems contained on this page. Whoever answers them will be your successor..." [None of David's other children could answer] Then David said to Solomon, "My son, I will ask you these questions"... "Ask father," said Solomon, "and I pray God guide me to answer them correctly."

Three of the questions and Solomon's answers were:

"My son," David began, "what is something?"

"The believer" (Solomon answered).

"What is nothing?"

"The infidel."

"What is the most odious thing?"

"Apostasy after faith."

David and his learned ulama verified the correctness of Solomon's answer; he was "acclaimed" and declared successor (K:294-5 brackets and emphasis added).

These self-images of the believers and their images of nonbelievers were materialized, Muslims see, in a pattern of behavior governed by a model of militancy, aggressiveness, irreconciliability, "cold war" and hijra in various forms, jihad, conquest and subjugation-or-annihilation. The believers wanted total power and domination or else the world was doomed. (This is what Q2:251,

discussed below, means.) Refusal to coexist peacefully and equally, and nonconciliation with un-Islamic worldviews, individuals and societies were the hallmarks of the Prophets' behavior toward the world beyond Islam. Muslims seeking Divine-Prophetic guidance (as enjoined by Q6:90) for the conduct of relations with contemporary non-Muslims and nonconformists find that the ideas of pluralism and peaceful coexistence with nonbelievers or nonconformists were alien to the world of Islamic Moses and his followers. Pending conversion or subjugation or annihilation of nonbelievers, hijra was practiced in its various forms. As long as jihad and/or hijra had not taken place, regardless of the nonbelievers' friendly or unfriendly behavior an inimical, resentful, disingenuous and cold-war attitude dominated the believers' thoughts and action. There was to be no friendship and no genuine peace with nonbelievers. During the cold-war periods and during holy wars conducted by the believers or by the Almighty the "odious" nonbelievers and nonconformists were treated as "nothing," nobodies - with no right to respect, or equal treatment, or freedom, or immunity from deception, or terrorization and torture, or sympathy, amnesty, and mercy or even life and property. The believers had to be militant and ruthless toward nonbelievers rather than meek and kind. Nonbelievers' joys and prosperity were to be resented and their sufferings were to be relished rather than pitied by the believers. It was a divine obligation and, thus, an honor to be disingenuous, antagonistic, militant, aggressive and ruthless toward nonbelievers. Failure to do so brought God's wrath. For their aggression and expansionism the Prophets and the faithful need not look for a casus belli, the fact of their Islam and that of the non-Islamicness of the others was enough justification for what we call the depersonalization of others. All these dimensions of the believers' treatment of nonbelievers are described unapologetically by Islamic sources for the inspiration of Muslims.

Quranic declarations of superiority of the Prophets and the faithful "over all beings" imply the domination and authority of the

believers over nonbelievers. The response by the Pharaoh and his courtiers, as recorded in the Quran, informs Muslims that Moses and Aaron were not simply preaching a faith; they wanted to change the whole religio-political system - to establish their **KIBRIYA**, their exclusive sovereignty and authority, "in the land" (Q10:78, 110 cf. T,11:146-7). Irreconciliation with other creeds and demand for total surrender were implicit as well as explicit. The Pharaoh and his courtiers charged that Moses wanted to change their religion and deprive the Pharaoh of authority over his subjects. Moses was asking Egyptian subjects the Pharaoh and his advisers thought, to rebel against their authority (Q40:26 cf. T,24:56-7; Q7:127 cf. TS,13:36). The Quran and Tradition do not refute these charges; they verify them.

Pharaoh's dreams are mentioned as truths soon to materialize. One dream predicted that a newborn Israelite (Moses) would soon deprive the Pharaoh of his Kingdom, overwhelm and replace him as sovereign, expel him from his land and change his religion -- **AN MAULUD-AN MIN BANI ISRAIL... YASLIBUK MULKAK WA YAGHLIBUK ALA SULTANIK WA YUKHRIJUK MIN ARDIK WA YUBADDIL DINAK** (TT-U,1:272).

Muslims need not be told that Moses was not merely asking for freedom of religion for the believers. The Israelites, our sources tell Muslims, practiced Islam before Moses. The Pharaoh and his ruling class are not blamed for objecting to the Israelites' religion. Indeed, the Pharaoh, we are told, married the Muslim Asiya with no objection to her creed. The Pharaoh did not take her by force; instead, as

a bride-price the King gave her thousands of okes of gold and ordered so many thousands of sheep slaughtered that there was not a soul in Egypt who was not invited to partake of the feast he had prepared (K:214).

The Muslim Israelites were among the honored guests. So, Muslims are told the pharaoh was proud to have a Muslim wife and that his respect extended to the Israelite Muslims. As a matter of fact, we are told, some Israelites could rise high. Imran (Amram), Moses's father was appointed grand vizier to the Pharaoh (K:213).

Some other reports indicate not only the Pharaoh's toleration of the believers' superciliousness (before Moses emerged on the scene), but also reinforce hijra-oriented segregationalism in Muslim minds. When the Pharaoh asked her father for her hand, Asiya exclaimed: "How can a woman who believes be the wife of an infidel?" (K:214). After the reluctant wedding when Asiya "entered under his roof, Pharaoh came in intent upon her; however, God kept him from her and made him impotent" (ibid). When Moses first reached Midian (leaving Egypt), Shuayb, another spokesman of God, congratulated him in a similar supercilious way for having escaped the nonbelieving nation (Q28:25 cf. T,20:53). Muslims find that after Moses returned as a Prophet, it was he who challenged what resembled a pluralistic system, demanding that everyone accept his faith. Our sources admit that the Pharaoh's harsh treatment stemmed from the fear that a particular newborn Israelite would endanger his rule and replace him as sovereign (TT-U,1:273). The Pharaoh aimed to eliminate that one child, rather than ask Israelites to change their religion. Even during heated confrontations, the Pharaoh's demand to be acknowledged as a deity was addressed only to Moses - who irritatingly sought acknowledgment as a Messenger of God (Q26:29 passim). The context indicates it was a mere rhetorical quid pro quo. The Pharaoh, however, did not ask for a mass conversion of the Muslim Israelites.

Muslims read that it was Moses who pressed the nonbelievers to change their creed, not vice versa. Q7:129-36 (as explained in T,9:34-42) mentions a series of disasters - famine, flood, locusts, lice, frogs and blood - inflicted on the Egyptians. These came about in stages. During this whole disastrous war of nerves, the Pharaoh and Egyptians are shown as underdogs. When every disaster occurred heightened, Egyptians requested Moses to ask his Lord to relieve them of the inflicted punishment and promised under pressure to believe in his Prophethood -- UD' LANA RABBAK... LAIN KASHAFAT AN-NA, R-RIJZ LA-NUMINANN LAK. However, after gaining the relief they refused to

believe - and then the next divine havoc was brought about against them and they finally drowned. So, Muslims are told, Moses aggressively applied pressure and insisted all believe in his Prophethood and creed. The Pharaoh and his people simply wanted to be left alone with their beliefs. They were not to be, Muslims would think. Because they read in the Quran that during the debate with the Pharaoh and Egyptians, Moses told them in a determined and confident voice, "God verifies the truth by His words, though sinners be averse" (Q10:82). This means Moses was telling them that regardless of the nonbelievers' dislike, God would indeed make his creed prevail over other "wrong" (faiths and worldviews) -- **WA YUTHBIT ALLAH AL-HAQQ ALLADHI JITUKUM BIHI MIN INDIHI, FA-YULIH ALA BATILIKUM...** **"WA LAU KARIHA'L-MAJRIMUN"** -- (T,11:148-9).

Regardless of historical facts and of some modern Muslim commentators' apologetic explanations the following four Quranic passages, as traditionally understood, tell Muslims that Moses and the faithful were to destroy the Pharaoh and Egyptian nonbelievers, expropriate their state and property and replace them as rulers of the land.

Said Moses to his people, 'Pray for succor to God, and be patient; surely the earth is God's and He bequeaths it to whom He will... perchance your Lord will destroy your enemy, and will make you successors in the land' (Q7:128-9). And We settled the Children of Israel in sure settlements, and We provided them with good things;... (Q10:93). So We expelled them from gardens and fountains, and treasures and a noble station; even so, and We bequeathed them upon the Children of Israel (Q26:57-9). Yet We desired to be gracious to those that were abased in the land, and to make them leaders, and to make them the inheritors, and to establish them in the land, and to show Pharaoh and Haman, and their hosts, what they were dreading from them (Q28:5-6).

Q7:128-9 means that Moses, Aaron and the believers were destined to succeed them and inherit "the land of Pharaoh and of his people" (TS,13:42-3). About Q10:93 Tabari mentions (and does not reject) the report that the "sure settlements" in which "God settled" the Israelites included Syria as well as Egypt -- **ANA BIHI'SH-SHAM WA MISR** (T,11:166). Note that the immediately preceding verses (Q10:90-92) talk of the Israelites' successful crossing of the sea and of the Pharaoh's

destruction along with his people. The Israelite "settlement" in Egypt followed. Of Q10:93 Ibn Kathir (Urdu translation) also tells us

After God ruined Pharaoh (and his people) the government of Moses took over Egypt -- **ALLAH TAALA NE JAB FIRAWN KO HALAK KAR DIYA TO HUKUMAT-E-MUSAWI BILAD-E-MISR PAR QABIZ (QABID)-O-MUTASARRIF HOGAI (IKU,11/12:74)**⁸

Of Q26:57-90 and Q28:5-6 Tabari maintains that Moses and the faithful not only inherited the "gardens and the fountains and treasures" of the Pharaoh and Egyptians after they were drowned, but also became the **AIMMA**, i.e., **WULAT** "governors," **MULUK** "kings" and **WULAT AL-AMR** "rulers" of Syria as well as Egypt (sic). Tabari is sure that Q28:5-6 refers to Muslim Israelites led by Moses, and to their contemporary Egyptian nonbelievers (TB,19:49; TB,20:19). Ibn Kathir (Urdu) confirms that Egyptian possessions described in Q26:57-9 including the Pharaoh's "sovereignty (or) state, country, throne and crown" -- **SALTANAT, MULK, TAKHT O TAJ** were given by God to the Israelites who were with Moses. Ashraf Ali Thanawi, the Urdu translator, and Muhammad Anzar Shah Kashmiri, the Urdu editor of Ibn Kathir, accept the Quranic passage literally and Ibn Khathir's exegesis which follows Tabari (IKU,19/20:37). Similarly, regarding Q28:5-6, Ibn Kathir (Urdu) reminds the reader that Abraham had prophesied the Pharaoh would lose "the country of Egypt" to one of Abraham's descendants, (Moses). In fulfillment of this prophecy "God gave the state of Egypt to Moses and his nation, something the Pharaoh was afraid of" -- **HAZRAT MUSA AUR IN-KI QAUM KO KHUDA NE MISR KI SALTANAT DI AUR FIRAUN JIS SE KHAIF THA** (IKU,20/21:21). As Muslims see it, that is exactly what should have happened. Moses and the believers demanded what they were predestined for by the Almighty: total ownership and domination of Egypt. It is blasphemous for a Muslim believer to think the two Prophets, Moses and Aaron, wanted less than what God had willed.⁹

There was, however, an interim period of hijra with all that it is intended for in Islam.

We revealed unto Moses, 'Go with my servants by night; strike for them a dry path in the sea, fearing not overtaking, neither afraid' (Q20:77).

This happened after the Pharaoh refused to heed Moses's call for belief in his creed and acknowledgment of his Prophethood, and after the Pharaoh "prolonged his rebellion" - **TAMADA FI TUGHYANIHI** (against God and Moses) (T,16:191). It also happened against a background of Moses's assurances to his followers that the earth, including Egypt, belonged to God, that He would destroy their adversaries and make the believers "successors in the land." Moses proclaimed the believers would eventually emerge victorious (Q7:128). According to Q29:57-9, e.g., quoted above, it happened as soon as Moses and his followers left the society which had refused to surrender to Islam.

For a Muslim, the picture is clear: Moses wanted the Egyptians to surrender to Islam so he could take over. The Egyptians refused. Commanded by God, Moses and the faithful refused to coexist with the nonbelievers, particularly while the latter ruled. God told the believers to shun the Dar al-Harb, the land dominated by non-Muslims. This hijra, migration from the land of nonbelievers, was not however a pacifistic isolationistic act. Neither did the believers seek mere peace and safety, nor were nonbelievers to be left in peace. The hijra was accompanied with the Divine assurance that those who remained would be destroyed, either by the departing Muslims or directly by God. In this case the Almighty played the major role. As promised, the hijra destroyed the nonbelievers and believers occupied their land and possessions. Moreover, the hijra heralded a phase of expansion which in time, according to sacred Islamic historiography, engulfed the whole world. Both hijra and jihad reflected believers' determination never to coexist peacefully, never to reconcile, with nonbelievers. Before we proceed with further accounts of jihad and expansionism, let us complete the survey of the believers' hijra-orientations (in various forms) during the era.

After crossing the sea, the Prophets and the faithful embarked on

perpetual expansionism. They refused to coexist on an equal basis with nonbelievers. The portrayal of post-exodus life implies the believers' preference of hijra-oriented segregationalism. Muslim Israelites lived only in self-ruled places. There are no reports indicating that Muslims lived in perceived non-Muslim lands, nor does the story imply existence of non-Muslims in the believers' domain. The Prophets and conformists cursed and punished desegregation and intermingling when they happened. They left (or threatened to leave) the nonbelievers' company when unable to dictate total conformance. Moses was always quick to pray to his God to "separate" him and Aaron from the unfaithful and nonconformists (Q5:25). Even during periods of decline - during Israelite degeneracies, as Islam sees them - the faithful refused to live peacefully among the unfaithful. In a village where faithful and unfaithful lived together "the faithful threatened them with weapons." When "the ungodly," the nonbelievers, protested against the believers' chauvinism, the faithful demanded

'Either do as we do, or we will divide the village. You will have a sector and we a sector.' Therefore, the faithful divided the village with the others, and they built a high wall between... (K:297)₁₀

The faithful, however, were not happy with the existence of an un-Islamic entity - not conforming with Islamic norms - on their borders. The nonbelievers or nonconformists continued to fish in their own sector on the Sabbath day, violating Islamic-Prophetic ritualistic prohibition. The divinely ordained guardians of mankind "warned them of God's punishment" (*ibid*), which came with the revival of Islam's power in David's time.

Then David heard of the situation and cursed them. While they were drinking and at play, the ground trembled under them and God transformed them into apes, as he hath said (in the Quran 7:166): 'And when they proudly refused to desist from what had been forbidden them, we said unto them, 'Be ye transformed into apes, driven away from the society of men.' (*ibid*; TS,13:179-98; cf. Q7:163).

On another occasion, a faithful group asked God to separate them from

the unfaithful -- **SAALU'LLAH AN YUFARRIQ BAYNAHUM WA BAYNAHUM** -- God opened a tunnel in the earth for the believers; they followed until they reached a place beyond China (sic) where they lived (separately) as pure Muslim. These separatist Muslims, or their descendants, were alive, practicing pure Islam, facing the Kaba (during their prayers), Tabari believed when he wrote his exegeses -- **FAHUM HUNALIK, HUNAFI MUSLIMUN YASTAQBILUN QIBLATANA** (TS,13:173 cf. Q7:159).

The Prophet Ilyas thought death was better than life among nonbelievers. Disgusted with the infidelity and idol-worship of his people, he called on his Lord to relieve him of their company, even by death. The non-Muslim society was so abhorrent. God segregated the Prophet, but not by death. Ilyas was transfigured into a semi-angel creature and enabled to fly and join the angels -- **DAA RABBAHU ANYAQBIDAHU ILAYH... FA KASAHU'LLAH... WA TAR FI'L-MALAIKAT FA KAN INSIYY-AN MALAKIYY-AN ARDIYY-AN SAMAIYY-AN** (TT-U,1:327). Similarly, the Prophet Irmiya preferred life among wild animals -- **AL-WUHUSH** to the company of nonbelievers and nonconformists (ibid:389-95). Condemnation of friendly comingling with nonbelievers was constant. The Israelites who left the Dar al-Islam of the pious Asa for India, and those who intermingled and collaborated with the nonbelievers, are strongly condemned and dealt with as apostates. Those who, from weakness, advocated a policy of peace with nonbelievers were rebuked (TT-U,1:369-74). God told Jonah to "go out from (the nonbelievers)"; as usual, the Prophet's departure was followed by a "torment" for the infidels (K:323).

Holy war - cold or hot -, along with all its dimensions, was the only medium of contact with nonbelievers. God ceaselessly commanded the believers to conquer non-Muslim lands. The only alternative to subjugation or annihilation for nonbelievers was "to believe in the one God who has no partner," i.e., conversion to Islam, acknowledging the supremacy of the Prophets (K:252). No grievances against nonbelievers are divulged that believers might justifiably have had to cause bloody

holy wars. The divinely guided and chosen did not need to explain their expansionism and imperialism on secular bases. God and His Messengers fostered jihad against non-Muslims simply because they were non-Muslim; that was enough cause for aggression.

Moses asked his followers to "enter the Holy Land" because God had decreed so (Q5:21). The Almighty had commanded Moses before to enter particular cities (Q2:58). After Moses, "God sent out Joshua... and commanded him to march on Jericho and fight therein the non-Muslim sovereigns - **AL-JABBARIN**" (TT-U,1:306); "he called the Children of Israel to tell them he was the Prophet of God and that indeed God had ordered him to fight non-Muslim sovereigns to the death... (*ibid*:310). Joshua reminded the Muslims:

'you know Moses pledged us to wage holy war.'... Joshua was so earnest in waging war for God that He gave him victory over more than thirty of the cities of the infidels in Syria and Arabia (K:259; on Joshua's conquests also see TT-U,1:306-11).

Kisai informs believers proudly that Joshua "killed more than thirty kings" during his conquest of Canaan (K:260). Joshua's immediate followers are praised for continuing the unprovoked war against the nonbelievers (TT-U,1:311-2).

The Prophet Samuel and Muslim King Saul are significant for reviving jihad, commanded anew by God; their generation was reminded that **QITAL**, fighting the nonbelievers, was a divine duty --**KUTIB ALAYKUM AL-QITAL**. The Israelites preceding Samuel and Saul, with some of their contemporaries, are rebuked by God and Muslims for their half-hearted fight against nonbelievers for God -- **FI SABIL ALLAH** (Q2:243-51; TT-U,1:329-37; K:270-7).

The Muslim-perceived great empire of David and Solomon started with a Divine reminder that the whole world belonged to the believers.

...We have written in the Psalms, after the Remembrance, 'The earth shall be the inheritance of My righteous servants' (Q21:105).¹¹

Traditions around the above verse further reinforce Muslim sense of

entitlement to the earth's ownership. Muslims of all times have been promised in every holy Book inheritance of the "land of Paradise" and the whole earth in this life ...**HIA AL-ARD YURITHUHA'L-MIUMININ FID-DUNYA** (T,17:104). In the above verse (Q21:105) God decrees help for the Prophets and believers in this world and hereafter, and promises to make them dominant in the earth, Ibn Kathir Urdu tells us -- **FARMAN HAY HAM APNE RASULON KI AWR IMANDARON KI DUNYA MEN AWR AKHIRAT MEN MADAD FARMATE HAYN... KHUDA KA WADA HAY KE WOH UNHEN ZAMIN MEN GHALIB BANAEGA** (IKU,17/18:41). [Some related Traditions specifically emphasize that "the land of the heathen nations will be inherited by the **UMMAH**, community, " of Muhammad" (T,17:104), and that "in the knowledge of God it has already been decided that the community of Muhammad will become the King of the earth" -- **UMMAT-E-MUHAMMADIYA ZAMIN KI BADSHAH BANEGI** (*ibid*)].

God mentions David as "possessor of power "to whom mountains and birds were subjugated. God helped David destroy the nonbelievers and strengthen his Kingdom (Q2:251; Q38:17-29; TT-U,1:336). David's enthusiasm and success in fighting against nonbelievers made him popular among Muslim masses (TT-U,1:334 *passim*). God through His Messenger Samuel had replaced Saul with David as King because of Saul's comparatively less harsh attitude towards nonbelievers. God told Saul he could be forgiven for the sin of leniency he had shown some non Muslims if he abdicated and along with his children, fought for God until they were killed. Saul followed orders (TT,1:335-6). Jihad against nonbelievers is also a penance for the believers' sins.

Solomon longed for an empire unmatched by anyone else's (Q38:35). God fulfilled his desire (TT,1:344). He became one of the two pre-Muhammad Muslim world emperors. The second was Dhu'l-Qarnayn. Muslims find that Solomon rejected the idea of peaceful coexistence with other states. "Solomon did not want to see the existence of other states beside his on the earth. Nevertheless he was a man who loved to engage in jihad and fighting" -- **LI ANN SULAYMAN KAN LA YARA ANN**

FI'L-ARD AHAD-AN LAHU MAMIAKAT MAAHU, WA KAN MAA DHALIK RAJUL-AN HUBIBIBAT ILAYH AL-JIHAD WA'L-GHAZW (T,19:148). The Quran and Tradition appreciate and adore the bellicosity of believers against nonbelievers. When Solomon thought no more independent non-Muslim countries were left on earth, he learned of a peaceful and prosperous (but non-Muslim) state: that of the Queen of Saba (Sheba). Muslims so learn that coexistence even with a peaceful and pliant non-Muslim state is not allowed by the sunnah of Islamic Prophets. The story is mainly told by the Quran (27:15-44), and as usual further explained by Tradition.

Solomon heard of a prosperous country ruled by a woman with a great throne. The misguided people therein worshiped the sun instead of God. Deceived by Satan, their ways looked good to them, added Solomon's spy-bird, the Hoopoe (Q27:22-4). The heathen were happy with what they had. It was a great opportunity for Solomon, for whom "awaited great awards in this world and hereafter by waging jihad, war against them, by (capturing and) adding (Saba) to his empire" (T,19:148). For no other reason except her non-Islamic creed, Solomon immediately sent an ultimatum to the Queen, warning her against arrogance, and demanding her unconditional surrender and conversion to Islam (Q27:26-31; cf. T,19:153). The Queen is shown by the Quran and Tabari to have received Solomon's letter with great respect calling it an "honorable letter" -- **KITAB KARIM** (beginning) with the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful" (Q26:29- 30). This report does not mean to appreciate the heathen queen's conciliatory civilized manners and politeness. It aims to remind the reader of God's and Solomon's grandeur. It also tells a Muslim that a non-Muslim leader's politeness and friendly gestures are not reason enough to stop the believers' aggression. A nonbeliever's friendly gestures mean nothing to a believer.

Unlike David and Solomon, whose arbitrary and authoritarian modes of action are approved by our sources, the Queen called a "Council" to advise her on how to respond. The Council assured the Queen their country possessed "great force and might" to deal with the situation.

However, they had the Queen make the final decision. The Queen was a pacifist. She loathed war. "The Kings," she said referring to Solomon, "when they enter a city, disorder it" (Q27:32-4). She wanted to keep blustering Solomon away by adopting a friendly and conciliatory manner short of complete surrender and conversion to Islam. Along with a gift, she sent a good-will delegation to Solomon to "see what the envoys bring back" (Q27:35). The non-Muslim delegation seeking peaceful coexistence received a rude and threatening response by Solomon, who said:

What, would you succor me with wealth, and what God gave me is better than what He has given you? Nay, but instead you rejoice in your gift! Return thou to them; we shall assuredly come against them with hosts they have no power to resist, and we shall expel them from there, abased and utterly humbled (Q27:36-7).

Solomon was right; the whole world already belonged to the believers. He did not need to accept as a gift what he could seize by force. Solomon did not wait further but started military operations. He told a general who had extraordinary power to seize and bring to Solomon the Queen's throne before her surrender and conversion to Islam. The operation took less than a moment (sic) (Q27:37-40). Solomon strongly desired to have the Queen's fabulous throne before her conversion to Islam (Q27:38 cf. T) because afterwards Solomon could not seize Muslim property. (It was fine for the Prophet to pillage non-Muslim property). Other reports emphasize the point that by doing so Solomon wanted to demonstrate his extraordinary power to the Queen, terrorizing and demoralizing her, paralyzing her resistance (TB,19:101-4; IKU,19/20:73-4). Faced with Solomon's extraordinary power, the Queen surrendered and submitted herself to Solomon in the center of his Dar al-Islam. Arrangements were made to impress the heathen queen further with Solomon's pomp and power. The Queen did what she sought to avoid - converted to Islam - and her state was annexed to Solomon's empire. She wanted to remain a celibate. Solomon told her Islam did not allow celibacy. In his Tafsir Tabari has the Queen married to Solomon -- **LAMMA TAZAWWAJ SULAYMAN BALQIS...**, in a report in the Tarikh he also

alludes to this -- **ISTANKAHA SULAYMAN**. In the Tarikh, however, Tabari has also mentioned that Solomon married the Queen to one of his governors appointed to administer the newly occupied land - the Queen's country - on Solomon's behalf. (For the full story see Q27:15-44; T19:140-70; TT-U,1:345-51.)

Solomon's domestic policy was as uncompromising, irreconcilable and hegemonistic as was his foreign policy. There was no honorable place for non-Muslims - even the most loved ones - in Solomon's Muslim empire. Solomon heard of the existence of another non-Muslim state in a far-off island, difficult to reach - not for Solomon, however, who had the winds and the jinn at his disposal (Tabari reminds the reader). Solomon mobilized his human-jinn forces. The wind carried the forces of Islam to the island. Solomon killed the heathen King and pillaged this heathen country. Among the booty was the fallen King's daughter "the like of whom in beauty and charm was never seen." Solomon chose her for himself and told her to become a Muslim, which she did. Solomon loved her very much - much more than his other women -- **FA KHARAJ ILA TILK AL-MADINAT TAHMILUH AR-RIH ALA ZAHR AL-MA HAA NAZAL BIJUNUDIH MIN AL-JINN WA'L-INS FA-QATAL MALIK-AHA WA'STAFAA MA FIHA WA ASAB FIMA ASAB IBNAT-AN LI-DHALIK AL-MALIK LAM YURA MITHLUHA HUSN-AN WA JAMAL-AN FA'STAFAHA LINAFSIHI WA DAAHA ILA'L- ISLAM FA ASLAMAT... WA AHABBAHA HUBB-AN LAM YUHIBBUHU SHAY- AN MIN NISAIHI** (TT-U,1:351). Solomon built a special palace for his new wife and put a number of maidservants at her disposal.

The beautiful lady missed her father and his Kingdom; she grieved and wept. She told Solomon of her feelings. Solomon, referring to his own empire, reminded her, politely, that the Kingdom and authority she now had were greater than the Kingdom and authority of her father. Above all, Solomon said, God now had graciously guided her to Islam, which was better than everything. The lady, to overcome her grief, asked Solomon for an image of her father. Solomon commanded demons to cast up such an image for her. His understanding was that she would

only look at it. In Solomon's absence, she began to prostrate herself before her father's image; her maidservants did the same. They worshipped the image - the worst crime in Islam. Asaf bin Barkhiya, Solomon's pious Chancellor, discovered the crime. For our Prophet-Emperor and his ideal Muslim Chancellor - and for our sources - nothing was wrong with providing special palaces for royal Muslim ladies and having a luxurious life-style (as Solomon and his nobility are portrayed in). But, wrongful faith and wrongful worship, i.e., non-Islamic ideologies, could not be allowed. As soon as Asaf told Solomon what was happening, Solomon rushed in, "broke the idol (i.e. the image) and punished the lady as well as her maidservant." Solomon divorced the lady. There was no place for a semi-idol worshiper in a Muslim emperor's palace. (For the full story see TT,1:351-7; K:317). Though Solomon repented his unintentional negligence for the rest of his life God punished his inattention by causing his empire to disintegrate after his death (TT,1:367; cf. 352-7).

Asa, the last important pious ruler, wins Tabari's praise not only for his unflinching domestic revivalist- fundamentalist policy but also for his resolution to wipe out the filth (sic) of un-Islam from the whole world. We have already seen part of Asa's manifesto related to internal reforms: re-Islamization of his contracted Muslim domain. Though he ruled a small country, Asa's foreign policy was as ambitious and belligerent as an ideal Muslim ruler is supposed to be. After re-establishing by force the worship of Allah and forbidding idol worship within his jurisdiction, Asa declared his intention to export his Islamic revolution to other counties:

We shall never shun obedience to Allah and shall make this (faith) dominant. We shall strive [,wage jihad,] until we purify the earth of its defiled and unclean (people) [i.e. nonbelievers and nonconformists], cleanse it of its filth and squalor. We shall fight and expel from the country those who oppose us in carrying this out -- **WA LA NATRUK TAAT ALLAH ILLA AZHARNAHA, JAHADNA HAA NUTAHHIR AL-ARD MIN NAJISIHA WA NUNAQQIHAHA MIN DANASIHA, WA NUJAHID MAN KHALAFANA FI DHALIK BI'L-HARB WA'N-NFY AN AL-BILAD** (TT-U,1:368).

Muslims expect the **NAJIS** "the defiled filth" and the **DANAS** "the unclean squalor" i.e. non-Muslims to be thankful for Islamic aggression and expansionism. Referring to David's jihad against nonbelievers and to his slaying of Goliath, the Quran rationalizes:

Had God not driven back the people, some by the means of others, the earth had surely corrupted; but God is bounteous unto all beings (2:251).

As Tabari says, the conquest of nonbelievers by believers demonstrates God's **FADL** "kindness" to nonbelievers as well; because if believers do not do so, all will perish -- **LAHALAK AHLUHA... LAHALAK MAN FI'L-ARD**. That is the meaning of the Quranic phrase, "the earth had surely corrupted," Tabari asserts. So, to save the world from God's wrath, believers are obliged to **DAF'** "dislodge" the nonbelievers -- **LAW LA DIFA ALLAH BI'L-BARR 'AN AL-FAJIR (=BI'L-MUMIN AN AL- KAFIR, p. 372.)...** **LAHALAK AHLUHA:** With no Muslim in a society [obviously engaged in the conquest of nonbelievers] all will perish -- **LAW LA BAQIYAT MIN AL-MUSLIMIN FIKUM LA-HALAKTUM** (For Tabari's above exegeses see TS,5:372-6. Ibn Kathir, in his exegesis of Q2:251 has adopted a similar line of 'rationalization' of Islam's aggressive expansionism (IKU,2/3:111-2).

So far, we have seen the Prophetic creed's refusal to coexist peacefully with other worldviews, inculcating self-righteousness and a strong sense of superiority among the believers and exhorting them to engage in unprovoked perpetual wars against nonbelievers and in continuous expansion of the Prophetic creed's dominion. Also, within the dominion, i.e., the Dar al-Islam, where Muslims ruled, a policy of nontolerance toward nonconformists and nonbelievers was adopted. The following is a study of the believers' pattern of behavior toward nonbelievers and nonconformists more specifically on certain points.

Muslims are told that militancy and use of terror techniques and force to hurt, humiliate, demoralize and torment the nonbelievers and to enforce the faith through such means were favorite Divine modalities and

methods during the era of Moses and his followers. Stories about Islamic Moses and related stories established traditions that were to be followed by latter generations.

Moses, the founding father of the era, is portrayed, approvingly, as militant and aggressive, ready to treat nonbelievers ruthlessly. Such descriptions inspire Muslims to prefer a blustery style, particularly, in dealings with nonbelievers. Even as a child, Moses who was, obviously, divinely inspired demonstrated his ingratitude to a nonbelieving benefactor. "Playing in Pharaoh's lap," Moses "grabbed his beard and held onto it; with his right hand he slapped Pharaoh's face so hard that his eyes became red and his crown fell from his head" (K:218; also see TT-U,1:274). When Moses and Aaron went to the Pharaoh to tell him of their mission, they approached the palace blustering: they struck the gate so ringingly that "the Pharaoh and his gatekeepers were terrified" -- **FA ATAYA'L-BAB FA DARABAH FA FAZAA FIRAWN WA FAZAA'L-BAWWAB** (ibid:284; also see K:226) Moses ended his life with the performance of a violent act. Muhammad proudly related his predecessor's angry confrontation with the angel of death -- **MALAK AL-MAWT**. When the angel went to Moses to end his this-worldly life, pugnacious Moses struck the angel and gouged out his eye -- **QAL RASUL ALLAH... AN MALAK AL-MAWT KAN YATI AN-NAS AYAN-AN HAA ATA MUSA, FA LATAMAHU FA FAQAA AYNAHU...** (ibid:305). (We do not know whether the Almighty replaced His angels' eye or the angel of death has remained one-eyed since then!) During their confrontations with the nonbelievers of Egypt and the Holy Land, God and Moses inflicted all kinds of violence on the heathens. During the early stages of his arrival in the Holy Land, Moses is reported to have fought the nonbelievers in person and killed some of them (ibid:303).

The Almighty, Moses and the believers enjoyed terrorizing the heathen. On the eve of Moses's birth, God terrorized the Pharaoh with dreams, visions and miraculous happenings. In a dream Pharaoh saw a fire proceeding from Jerusalem that burned all Egyptians, and destroyed

their houses, but left the Israelites, i.e., Muslims, unharmed (TT,1:273). Mysterious voices and ghosts assailed the Pharaoh. He moved vainly in search of peace of mind from palace to palace (K:213-4). Once he dreamed that a man struck his head with a staff and then, grabbing his feet, threw him into the Nile.

The next night Pharaoh dreamed of the same man with a staff in his hand who struck him on the head. Then he saw Asiya, winged, flying into heaven. The earth convulsed and swallowed him up. Awakening in fright he called for the dream interpreters (K:214-5).

When Moses was born Pharaoh heard a voice saying, "Moses is born and you are destroyed, Pharaoh!" (K:215). Noncollaborators with Divine will to preserve Moses could not escape terrorization. Moses's mother asked a carpenter to make an ark for her baby to drift safely in the river. He wanted to inform the Pharaoh of the scheme,

but the earth swallowed him up to his ankles and said, "If you return and make her the ark as she wishes, I shall let you go, otherwise I shall swallow you until you die!" The carpenter swore that he would build the ark, and the earth set him free (K:216).

Moses's mother was brought by Divine stratagem to nurse him in the Pharaoh's court (Q28:12 passim). Moses was kept underground and preserved by God in Pharaoh's palace, for whom He had predestined Moses to be "an enemy and source of grief." Those who would not cooperate freely with this covert operation were Divinely coerced. Gabriel, Asiya the believer and another secret Muslim agent in Pharaoh's court (Q40:28) spread doubletalk to protect Moses. In his teens, Moses was seen secretly performing Islamic rituals, "ablution and prayer" and was heard cursing Pharaoh and the nonbelievers. The man who saw and heard this wanted to inform the Pharaoh. Moses coerced him to silence and belief in his divine status.

"O Earth," cried Moses, "take him!" And the earth swallowed him up to his waist. When he swore that he would not tell anyone and would believe in him, Moses said, "O earth, set him free!" And he was loosed (K:219).

When the Pharaoh came to know about this, Moses dodged him by TAQIYYA, doubletalk. His doubletalk also resulted in the torture and death of the informer.

(Pharaoh) called Moses and asked, "To whom were you praying?" To my Master who has fed, raised and clothed me," said Moses. "You have spoken well," said Pharaoh, "for it is I who have done all that for you." [Moses let him think so and, perhaps, was pleased to see the misfortune of the truthful but heathen informer] And he ordered the man who had informed him to have his hands and feet cut off and to be burned in the fire (K:219)).

There is no regret in our sources for the cruel MAKR of the Prophet Moses, nor for the fate of the "nothing" infidel. Contrasting the importance of a believer's life to God with the "nothingness" of the nonbelievers, Kisai quotes the Prophet Muhammad: "The end of the world is easier for God to bear than the killing of one believer..." (K:220).

The archangel Gabriel was always there to play his role. The Pharaoh observing baby Moses's violent postures toward him suspected the child to be his future enemy.

"This boy is young," said Asiya "and does not know what he is doing. I will give you proof." She ordered a silver salver, and placed in it a glowing ember and a pearl and said to Moses, "Take whichever one you want." Moses put his hand out for the pearl, but Gabriel caused his hand to swerve toward the ember, which he picked up and put to his mouth, burning his tongue. He threw it from his hand and began to cry. [And thus, the Pharaoh was deceived by Gabriel to believe that the child was not the one destined to destroy his Kingdom] (K:218; brackets added; also see TT-U,1:274).

Along with other havocs inflicted on the Pharaoh and Egyptians, Moses used his magical serpent to terrorize the nonbelievers (see TT-U,1:285 passim). It terrorized the Pharaoh into belief in Islam.

(Once the serpent crushed) the blocks of stone in Pharaoh's palace and swallowed everything in its path. It approached Pharaoh and said loudly. "Witness that there is no god but God and that Moses is His apostle!" When Pharaoh who was lame, started to flee, the serpent caught the train of his robe and threw him behind the throne. "Moses!" cried Pharaoh, "for Asiya's sake, save me from the serpent!" When he heard Asiya's name, Moses cried to the serpent, which came to him as a tame dog comes to its master (K:228).

A courtier (a believer in disguise) used to scare -- **KHAWWAFAHUM** -- the Pharaoh and other courtiers and demoralize them by threatening God's chastisement (TT-U,1:286). **TAKHWIF** and **IRAB**, terrorization, continued to be a form of dealing with nonbelievers - and also a style of administration - in later generations.

Because the Pharaoh and his people rejected Islam, they had to be punished. This is exactly what happened, the Quran and Tradition tell the believers. Before the "ruin" they were tortured in various ways. Famine, "years of dearth, and scarcity of fruit" was imposed upon them. And, then, God "loosed upon them the flood, and the locusts, the lice and the frogs, (and) the blood..." (7:129-33). Finally they were drowned in the sea and their country destroyed.

We took vengeance on them and drowned them in the sea, for that they cried lies to Our signs and heeded them not... We destroyed utterly the works of Pharaoh and his people, and what they had been building (7:136-7;)... when they had angered Us, We took vengeance on them, and We drowned them all together; and We made them a thing past, and We set them for warning to later folk (43:55; 7:136, 141; 10:88-90; 11:102 passim; 14:6; 20:80-2; 23:48 passim; 26:62-7. The details of their sufferings and destruction are as usual graphically described in T, TT, and K).

On the occasion of crossing the sea, Gabriel's **KAYD** "trick" was interesting and imaginative, though cruel (if not indecent). The Pharaoh hesitated to enter the path created by the wonderful parting of the sea. He "held his steed in check." The Pharaoh might have decided to return and escape the disaster. This was not what God wanted.

Just then Gabriel descended, mounted on a mare, and rode in front. Pharaoh's horse, smelling the mare, followed her; and the armies followed him... All the Egyptians (one million and seven hundred thousand, according to Tabari) were drowned, and the Children of Israel stood watching them as they went down (K:234; TT-U,1:291-2).

While drowning, the Pharaoh wanted to believe and thus be saved. Lest he attract God's mercy by speaking his repentance aloud, Gabriel shoved sea-dirt in his mouth to silence him. Muhammad apparently appreciated and enjoyed these activities when Gabriel reported them to him. Gabriel

told Muhammad he hated the Pharaoh for his claim (TT-U,1:292; cf. Q10:91 and T relevant parts; also see K:234).

No condolences were to be expressed for the nonbelievers' misfortunes. Their sufferings and agonies are described in Islamic sources to be relished by the believers. After the Pharaoh and his people were destroyed, the Quran tells the believers "Neither heaven nor earth wept for them, nor were they respited" (Q44:29 passim). Explaining this verse, the Prophet Muhammad told the faithful that when a believer died the heaven and earth mourned for forty days, but they did not do so when the Pharaoh and his people were annihilated. Heaven and earth, Muhammad added, will always weep at Muslim's death; they never do for a non-Muslim, KAFIR (T,25:124-5). Moses, though picked and brought up with love by the House of Pharaoh, was destined to be "an enemy and (source of) grief" -- **ADUWW-AN WA HUZN-AN** for them", God says unabashedly (Q28:8). A believer owes nothing to a nonbelieving benefactor. The nonconformists who refused to wage war against nonbelievers were cursed to wander in the wilderness for forty years; God told Moses: "Grieve not for (those) ungodly people" (Q5:26). Quran's graphic portrayal of punishments and destruction of nonbelievers need not be repeated. Such descriptions are usually followed, to satisfy believers, by spiteful statements like:

So behold thou, how was the end of the workers of corruption (7:103; 27:14). So We recompense those who are forgers (7:152). My chastisement - I smite with it whom I will (7:156). And Korah, and Pharaoh, and Haman... Each We seized for his sin... against some We loosed a squall of pebbles and some were sized by the Cry, and some We drowned...(29:34-41). So, when they had angered Us, We took vengeance on them, and We drowned them all together and We made them a thing past, and We appointed them for an example to others (43:556).

As we saw above, the Islamic story of Moses inspires the use of force to impose the believers' will and creed on others. It tells the believers that the Almighty used many and different tortures and forces to make nonbelievers surrender to His chosen creed and people. Pharaoh's people were tortured by years of famine, and starvation and other disasters

"that haply they might remember" (Q7:130), i.e., this was done "to warn and remind them" - "to prevent them from their misguidance and scare them to repent to their Lord" -- **IZAT-AN LAHUM, WA TADHKIR-AN LAHUM LI-YANZAJIRU AN, DALALATIHIM WA YAFZAU ILA RABBIHIM BI'T-TAUBAT...AKHADHATHUM ALLAH BI'S-SININ BI'L-JU' AM-AN FA AM-AN** (T,9:28-9). God seized the Pharaoh and his Council "with chastisement that haply they return" (Q43:46-8), i.e., so that they return from their disbelief to (the ; acknowledgment of) His oneness and to His obedience, and repent from what they stood for" (T,25:79). The Almighty adopted the same method in dealing with the nonconformists within the believers' camp. Some Israelites found Tawrat's instructions difficult to follow. For Moses it was tantamount to a rejection of the Book of God. Requested by Moses,

God commanded the angels to lift Mount Sinai into the air until the heavens were obscured, whereupon a voice cried to them, "Accept the book! otherwise God will hurl this mountain down upon you"... and the mountain came slowly down over them until they thought it would crush them... when they accepted the book, God took the mountain away (K:240).

The believers are to nurse resentment against nonbelievers and maintain a grudge against their welfare and prosperity. Islamic Moses was, apparently, more interested to see the heathens doomed than redeemed. When Moses and the faithful were leaving Egypt, he demonstrated his ill-will against Egyptians in his prayer. The Prophet was not happy to see the good life and prosperity of the nonbelievers remain intact. He also prayed to God to seal the hearts of the nonbeliever so that they do not believe. (This would make their destruction easier, and let the believers inherit their possessions.) God answered the call of His Prophet; He turned them into stone.

Moses said, 'Our Lord, thou hast given to Pharaoh and his Council adornment and possessions in this life. Our Lord, let them go astray from Thy way; Our Lord, obliterate their possessions, and harden their hearts so that they do not believe, till they see the painful chastisement.' He said, 'Your prayer is answered...' (Q10:88-9).

God answered his prayer by turning them all into stone: treasures, men, women, children and baker at work beside his oven (K:231; also see TT-U,1:291). Commanded by God Moses told his followers to pillage the Egyptians, taking their goods, jewelry, fineries, precious clothes and treasures of gold as God-given booty (TT-U,1:295, 297; also see Q44:25--8). This apparently happened before the rest were turned to stone. The believers' divine right to expropriate nonbelievers' property was restored for future Muslim generations of the era.

Islamic Moses did not loathe physical torture of the heathen and demonstration of disrespect even for the corpses of nonbelievers. Muslims were not certain of the Pharaoh's death; Moses prayed to God to show them his corpse and God was pleased to do so as "a sign and a lesson" --FA-AKHRAJAHU'LLAH AYAT-AN WA IZAT-AN (T,11:165 cf. Q10:92). The believers saw the corpse. The disgusting dead heathen looked like a "red bull," i.e. like a swollen dead pig -- FA KHARAJAHU'LLAH ILAYHIM, YANZURUN ILAYH MITHL ATH-THAUR AL-AHMAR (ibid). The enjoyment at the sight of this disgusting divine "sign" was, however, not enough for the believers. They rushed to the corpse (like vultures?) and mutilated it -- FA AKHADHATHU BANU ISRAIL YAMTHILUN BIHI (TT-U,1:292). This is, Tabari tells us, what the following Quranic verse, addressed to the Pharaoh, means: "So today We shall deliver thee with thy body that though mayest be a sign to those after thee" (Q10:92 cf. TT- U,1:292; T,11:164-5). God, Moses and the believers participated in another similar operation after the believers started their onslaught against the nonbelievers of the promised land. Awj (Og) was a powerful heathen of the land. During a combat with Moses Awj was equipped with a huge rock on his head. Our Prophet was in danger

But God sent the hoopoe-bird, which began to peck at the stone that was on Og's head. When it had made a hole in it, it fell down around Og's head and he was unable to throw it off. The hoopoe pecked at his head until it reached his brain. Then Moses, who was twenty cubits tall, came forth with his staff, leapt up twenty cubits from the ground and struck him on the knee, and Og fell dead (K:253; TT-U,1:303).

The fallen heathen's corpse was used in a levee on a river; the people, obviously the believers included, used to trod on it -- **FA-DARAB AWJ-AN FA-SAQAT MAYT-AN FA-KAN JISR-AN LIN-NAS YAMURRUN ALAYH** (TT-U,1:303).

After crossing the sea, Moses had ordered an all-out attack on the lands of nonbelievers. God declared that "the easts and the wests of the Holy Land" belonged to the faithful - God had decided "by annihilating the natives, to grant their lands to (Muslim) Israelites" -- **URITH DHALIK BANI ISRAIL BIMAHLIK MAN KAN FIHA** (TS,13:76 passim; cf. Q7:137). So told by God, Moses commanded the faithful to fight to the death the natives, who were "practicing idolatry in the domain of the Prophets" (TS,13:81 cf. Q7:183; K:241, 252). Our sources do not refute the natives' fears and charges that the faithful were there to kill and expel them and appropriate their possessions (TT-U,1:308).

Muslims learn that nonconformism (or opposition within the Prophet's camp) i.e. in the Dar al-Islam was not tolerated. Those who troubled and disobeyed Moses, cast aspersions on his character, indulged in un-Islamic practices, or refused to fight nonbelievers were dubbed **MUNAFIQ**, hypocrites, apostates - and dealt with accordingly. The harshest punishment, "abasement in this life," was inflicted on those who violated the dogma by making a golden calf and thus indulged in a sort of idol-worship (cf. Q7:152 passim ; also see TT-U,1:316-9). Moses burned the golden calf and threw its ashes in the sea. God did not accept the repentance of the calf-worshippers. Those who had abstained were also admonished for not acting to stop the un-Islamic practice. Moses told worshippers and abstainers to unsheathe their swords and kill each other; seventy thousand persons were slaughtered before God forgave the rest (TT-U,1:298; cf. Q2:54). According to another report, Moses asked those who had not worshipped the calf to slay those who had done so (TT-U,1:301). God told Moses to "grieve not" for the tragic fate of the unfaithful (ibid:303). Those who insisted on seeing the God with their own eyes "whom Moses claimed had spoken to him, were seized by an earthquake (Q7:155; cf. T).

"The enemy of God" Qarun (Korah?) was an "hypocrite," like as-Samiri (Samaritan?) who had encouraged the Israelites to the calf. Qarun was rich; he hesitated to pay **ZAKAT**, Islamic tax, to Moses and incited others to dodge it. The Quran scores Qarun and his friends for their love of this worldly life (Q28:79). Qarun is also blamed for encouraging a woman to accuse Moses of promiscuity with her. "God revealed to Moses to command the earth to do with Qarun and his supporters whatever he (Moses) wanted to do with them." Moses told the earth to seize them. The earth swallowed them up to their knees - then up to their navels - then to their necks. They cried for mercy but God revealed to Moses to have no mercy on the --**FA AWH ALLAH... YA MUSA LA TARHAMHUM**. Moses did not. The earth swallowed them whole. Also, Qarun's palace and everything in it sank in the earth which rattled with him inside." (For the full story see TT-U, 1:312-9; K:245-6; Q28:78-82; cf. T.)

Muslims are told believers were authorized to conceal their faith when necessary while working for planning to work for the cause of Islam. The believer in Pharaoh's court whom the Quran approves of concealing his faith -- **YAKTUM IMANAHU** -- used to intervene on appropriate occasions to help Moses against the Pharaoh (Q40:28). His efforts to demoralize the Pharaoh are appreciated (40:28-34). After Moses was charged in absentia for murdering an Egyptian, the same clandestine Muslim warned Moses in time to leave the country (Q28:20 passim; also see T: relevant parts; K:221).

As the religio-political leader of the Muslim community. Moses engaged in disinformation when he thought necessary. The subordinates who collaborated were praised (and are praised by our sources); those who ignored disinformation directives were punished and are condemned. During the march on the Holy Land, Moses, before attacking a particular city, sent twelve spies, including Joshua and Calilb, "to gather information." Moses told them to conceal what they learned about the

city from the Children of Israel. The spies found the people of the city powerful and dangerous. Excepting Joshua and Caleb, the spies babbled to Israelites what they had seen. Moses's people were frightened and refused to fight. Moses - like many leaders of our time, mostly in the so-called Third World - did not want the public to know the facts. He admonished those who had spread the news. Joshua and Calib, who had abided by the Prophets directive are praised by God (TT-U, 1:301-2; K:242; cf. Q5:23 passim).

Before we proceed to the believers' treatment of the nonbelievers after Moses, his contemporary al-Khidr, and Dhu'l-Qarnaya are worth mentioning to see from a Muslim point of view the "nothingness" and helplessness of nonbelievers. One of Khidr's three strange arbitrary actions (mentioned in the Quran 18:60-83) was that he killed an innocent child for no apparent reason. Khidr justified the homicide as follows:

As for the lad, his parents were believers; and we were afraid he would impose on them insolence and unbelief; so we desired that their Lord should give them in exchange one better than him in purity...(Q18:80).

The Prophet killed the child because he was likely to become a nonbeliever; God and Moses, approved of the action. The Prophet Muhammad also sanctioned the action because the slain child was predestined to become a non-Muslim --**AL -GHULAM ALLADHI QATALAHU AL-KHIDR TUBIA YAWM TUBIA KAFIR-AN** (T, 16:3 passim). Thus a **KAFIR**, a non-Muslim, has not, necessarily, a right to life.

The Almighty authorized the Muslim world conqueror, Dhu'l Qarnayn, to deal with nonbelievers and believers 'appropriately'. God approved his chosen treatment of the nonbelievers, telling Dhu'l-Qarnayn about the peoples he was to approach:

. . . either though shalt chastise them or thou shalt take towards them a way of kindness.' He said, 'As for the evildoer, him we shall chatise, then he shall be returned to his Lord and He shall chatise him with a terrible chatisement. But for him who believes, and does righteousness, he shall receive as recompense the reward most fair and we shall speak to him of our command, easiness (18:86-8).

Dhu'l-Qarnayn's mission was "to call them to Allah and His worship" (T, 16:18). Approved by God, he decided to kill the nonbelievers --**AMMA MAN KAFARA FA SAWF NAQTULUHU**. God would of course further "chastise" them horribly in the Hereafter (T, 16:11-3). Only those converted voluntarily to Islam would receive gentle treatment. During his invasions, Dhu'l-Qarnayn called the victims "toward God and His worship." He tortured in various ways those who refused. Fearing sure death, they all surrendered; because they initially resisted, they were enslaved. Later, they converted to Islam (T,16:18).

Muslims are told that Joshua, during his attacks on nonbelievers took their children prisoner, confiscated their property and killed their warriors (K:259). Under Joshua's command, "bands" of the faithful would corner a nonbeliever, cutting his neck but intentionally not severing it (to inflict maximum pain) -- **FA KANAT AL-ISABAT MIN BANI ISRAIL YAJTAMIUM ALA UNUQ AR-RAJUL YADRIBUNAHA LA YAQTAUNAHA** (TT-U, 1:307,310). The believers appropriated nonbelievers' property as spoil of war --**GHANIMAH** (ibid). After destroying the city wall, Joshua and his troops declared Jericho open to loot, and burned it - except the gold, silver, copper and ironware, which they took to the Muslim treasury -- **ABAHUHA WA AHRAQUHA WA MA KAN FIHA MA KHALA'DHDHAHAB WA'L-FIDDAT WA ANIYAT AN-NAHAS WA'L-HADID FA-INNAHUM ADKHALUH BAYT AL-MAL** (TT-U, 1:311). God instructed Joshua and the faithful to fight another King and his people. God also told Joshua to ambush the King; he did so. Joshua captured and crucified the King, burned his city and massacred twelve thousand there (ibid). After capturing the next city, Joshua, with God's permission, drafted its inhabitants as wood-cutters - **HATTABIN**-- and water - carriers-- **SAQQAIN**; "they remained so and will remain so" (to serve the believers) (ibid). The Almighty joined the next operation more actively against five united heathen kings. A storm of hailstones God inflicted on the nonbelievers killed more of them than the swords of the believers -- **RAMAHUM ALLAH BI AHJAR AL-BARAD, FA KAN MAN QATALAHU'L-BARAD AKTHAR MIN MAN QATALAHU BANU ISRAIL BI'SSAYF**.

Joshua told the sun and the moon to stop so he could take revenge upon his enemies before the Sabbath approached; the sun and the moon obeyed. Joshua ordered the cave blocked up that the five kings took refuge in. After Joshua had exacted revenge from his enemies, he ordered the kings brought out. He killed them and then crucified them. Afterwards, he threw their corpses into the cave. Then, he prosecuted the rest of the Syrian Kings, despoiling thirty-one of them; he distributed captured lands (among the believers) (ibid).

The two houses, **SIBT YAHUDA** and **SIBT SHAMUN**, following Joshua, win appreciation for continuing jihad and harsh treatment against nonbelievers. They fought the rest of the Canaanites, killed ten thousand of them, pillaged and occupied their lands and cut the two thumbs and the two toes of one of their captured Kings --**MAT YUSHA...WA QAM BADAHU SIBT YAHUDA WA SIBT SHAMUN BI HARB AL-KANANIYYIN FA'STABAHU HARIMAHUM WA QATALU MINHUM ASHARAT ALAF... WA AKAHADHU MALIK BAZIQ FA QATAU IBHAMAY YADAYH WA RIJLAYH** (TT-U, 1:311-2).

After this, a period of degeneration and decline of Muslim power started because of the adoption of non-Muslim ways, especially idol-worship, and because of the believers' failure to continue jihad (with its implicit harsh treatment of nonbelievers) (see Q2:243-6; cf. TS,5:266-99; Q37:123-31; TT-U, 1:322-30). "They ran away to escape jihad in God's way" (T, ibid: 268, 271; cf. Q2:243). In his concluding remarks on Q2:243 Tabari reminds us: God through this verse emphasized (the necessity of) persistence in jihad in His way" (T, ibid:278). Israelites of this period are condemned for losing their dominance over the nonbelievers (T, ibid:298 passim; TT-U, 1:329 passim). The two major Prophets of the period, Hizqil and Ilyas had to deal mostly with Israelite nonconformists and disbelievers. During Hizqu'il's Prophethood God inflicted plague on them, and Ilyas punished them with a disastrous famine (ibid:321, 326 passim; K:267). Islamic Elijah (Ilyas) asked God for victory over the nonbelievers. "I ... ask, " he said to God,

(that you) give me mastery over their daily bread and afflict them with hunger and famine if they do not repent and believe Thee and

Thine Apostle; otherwise, destroy them!

"And God granted his request", (K:267 see also TT_U, 1:326). During the three-year famine wrought by Elijah, livestock, beasts of burden and even the trees died; thus, the non-believers were put under great duress to believe (TT-U, 1:326). After the nonbelievers refused to yield to these pressures. Elijah asked for a coup de grace. God command Malik, the warden of Hell

to cast his thunder and lightning bolts over the region of Elijah's people. Malik hurled forth into the air a spark that the myrmidons drove forward until it was directly above that region. Then such torment rained down upon the people that they all perished. Afterward the region was uncovered, and there they lay, scorched (K:269; for the full story also TT-U, 1:325-9).

Relief and the resulting period of rejuvenation of Islam's power ensued only when Israelites were ready to wage jihad under Talut (Saul), divinely guided by the Prophet Samuel (Q2:246-51; cf. T:relevant parts; also see TT-U, 1:329-36). Saul's downfall and his replacement by David were caused by an unwitting partial leniency and amnesty toward nonbelievers. As usual, for no mentioned reason, God, promising victory, instructed His Prophet Samuel, to tell Saul to attack the people of Midian, "leaving none therein alive." Kill them all, God said -- **AWH ALLAH ILA NABIYY BANI ISRAIL AN QUL LI TALUT FALIYAGHZ AHL MADYAN, FA LA YATRUK FIHA HAYY-AN ILLA QATALAH, FA INNI SA UZHIRUH-U ALAYHIM** (TT-U, 1:337). Saul followed the commandment of jihad. He killed everyone in Midian, save the King whom he took prisoner and livestock, confiscated as booty. However, this time God wanted all, including the King and livestock of the nonbelievers, killed, "sparing none". God punished Saul for saving the lives of the nonbelievers' King and livestock. The Almighty told Samuel to dethrone Saul and replace him with David (ibid). To atone for this heinous sin, Saul was to lead his children and fight unto death against nonbelievers - which he did (ibid:335).

God instructed Samuel to find David and anoint him King of the Believers. Among his qualities, God said was **AWH ALLAH ILA NABBIYYAIM**

AN FI WALAD FILAN RAJUL YAQTUL ALLAH BIHI JALUT (ibid:336 passim).

David used to boast: "I am David the Goliath killer" (K:274; also see Q2:251 passim). It was David's efficiency as a fighter against nonbelievers and his readiness to "take everything they had.. as booty" that made him popular among Muslims and provided him legitimacy in the eyes of God and believers to succeed as Prophet-King (see, e.g., TT-U, 1:338 passim; K:274 passim). David is spoken of as "marching out against eighty thousand nonbelievers, fighting them from sunrise to sunset and killing a great number of them" (K:278).

David's divinely-inspired terror techniques are mentioned with appreciation. After David became King, God inspired him to kill an important Israelite charged by another with stealing a cow. David killed the man; "(consequently) David's awe-inspiring reputation among Israelites was intensified"; as so (God) strengthened his kingdom with his (dreadfulness)"--**FA'SHTADDAT HAYBAT BANI ISRAIL IND DHALIK LI DAWUD, WA SHADDAD BIHI MULKAH** (T, 23:138-9; cf. Q38:20). Tabari in his concluding remarks does not reject the possibility of God's adopting such a terrorizing method exclusively, or as it being one among other methods to "strengthen" David's kingdom (see T,23:139). David dispatched Nabal, a general, to pursue David's rebellious son Absalom and bring him back alive. In a pitched battle, Nabal killed Absalom. On the general's return David "lunged at Nabal and killed him" (K: 289-90)

Of Solomon's terror tactics we are told:

whenever litigants came for Solomon's judgement, the lions would stare at them as though speaking, the birds would rustle and the genii would murmur. The litigants would be struck with such unbearable awe that they could not utter a word other than the truth (K:306).

If the spy-bird hoopoe had not brought the news of the existence of a non-Muslim country, enabling Solomon to capture it, he would not have hesitated to "chastise him with a terrible chastisement" for an unauthorized absence from the Prophetic imperial camp (Q27:21 passim).

Islamic Solomon's story justifies, in the Muslim mind, enslaving nonbelievers. (See for example Q21:82; Q27:17; passim, Q34:12-3;

Q38:37-9; along with Tabari's commentaries; also see K:301-3). Solomon's very conception was accompanied with a divine declaration that Satan and his children (i.e., nonbelievers) "will be his slaves"; Solomon was predestined to "reign over the kings of mankind" (K:288-9). During his campaign he was entitled to pillage the nonbelievers' towns and own their property and persons, including their women (see e.g., TT-U, 1:351).

The use of questions methods seemed appropriate. We know that Solomon's Islamic regime used forced labor. During the construction of the great Temple commanded by God, he forced the rebellious jinn "to cut stone, lay marble and perform other tasks." Solomon needed an expert to cut rocks without making noise. He was told Sakhr the Rebellious, a powerful nonbeliever, was so skilled. How to capture him? It was proposed that the spring Sakhr used to drink water from "should be filled with wine so that when he drank he would become intoxicated (and a prisoner)." "Solomon gave...permission to carry out this scheme." Sakhr was drugged and put at the Prophet Solomon's disposal to build the house of God (K:304-5).

Perhaps because Bilqis, the Queen of Sheba, was eventually converted to Islam and married to Solomon or a believer, Kisai describes approvingly what she did against the "infidel" King who ruled the country before along with her disingenuous methods. Her father was the King's vizier. After the King asked the vizier for her hand, Bilqis, using deceit killed the infidel King, incited the nobility and replaced him as ruler. Responding to the marriage proposal Bilqis said,

Marry me to him, for I shall kill him before he touches me. So her father returned to the king and informed him of her consent. The king rejoiced at what he heard and wrote her a letter, in which he said, "I have fallen in love with you because of your renown, without having set eyes on you. When you have read my letter, hasten to me." But Bilqis wrote in answer, "I long the more for your countenance, but this palace is constructed by the genil; and I have had herein installed devices that are suitable for the likes of you." When her letter was brought to him, he arose and had his finest garments lain out. He put them on and rode out in the company of the nobility until he came to the palace, whereupon Bilqis ordered her father to go out to the king and tell him to enter the palace alone. There were seven doors to

the palace, and at each door was stationed a daughter of the genil as radiant as the sun. In their hands were plates of gold, filled with dirhems and dinars, with which Bilqis had commanded them to shower the king when they saw him. As the king entered, they poured the coins over him; and he asked each of them, "Are they my beloved?" "No," they replied, "I am only her servant. She is yet before you. She is yet before you." He proceeded until he finally reached the last door. When Bilqis came out and he saw her great beauty, he almost went mad. She set before him a table of gold, upon which was a variety of foodstuffs; but he said, "I have no need of these." Therefore she had wine brought and began to pour for him. He drank and moaned. She then offered him a heavy wine; and, when he had become intoxicated, he fell down on the ground, as immobile as a piece of wood. Bilqis arose, cut off his head and said to her serving girls, "Take this infidel and hide his body in the sea." They tied him to a rock so that he would not float up to the surface of the water. She then sent to the king's treasures to bring her all the money and riches that were in the storehouses: when the letter reached the treasures, they gathered together all that was there and sent it off to Bilqis' palace. Thereupon she invited the viziers and offered them wine, which they drank. "The king says for you to send him your wives and daughters," she said. They became furious and said, "Is he not satisfied with what he has already had?" When she realized that anger had taken control of them, she said. "I shall return and acquaint him with your wrath." And she left them alone for a time. Upon her return she said, "I have told him what you said, but he says he must have it so." And they increased in rage, whereupon she said, "Would you like me to kill him and rid you of his evil, in which case I would reign over you?" They agreed to this and swore fealty to her. Then she left them for a time and returned with the king's head. They rejoiced exceedingly and made her queen. (K:312-13).

When Abijam, the apostate Israelite King, died, his contemporary the Prophet Daniel had no grief. Instead, the angry Daniel went to the palace and cried:

Praise be to Him who has exiled him far from His mercy (K:321).

The Prophet exhorted Abijam's son Asa to reestablish Islam. "Asa accepted and Daniel rejoiced" (*ibid*). Asa soon demonstrated his Islamic ruthlessness. Asa's mother sided with those who opposed the reestablishment of a puritanic-fundamentalist regime. She reproached Asa for putting the nation in a "great distress" and for "opposing the learned and wise, and following the opinion of idiots." This, she said, stemmed from his opinion of idiots." This, she said, stemmed from his excessive fickleness--**KATHRAT TAYSH**--young age--**HADATHAT SINN** -- and lack of

knowledge--**QILLAT ILM**. The mother also said she would disown him if he did not mend his ways. Asa responded like a true Muslim. He told his mother there was no more kinship between them. Asa ordered her banishment. He also told his secret police chief to kill her if she made trouble in exile. "The hearts of the people around him were struck with terror, when they heard of this; they surrendered to his obedience and ceased their conspiracies against him." One who had done so to his mother could do worse to them, they thought aloud-- **FA QAL LAHA..QAD QATA FIMA BAYNI WA BAYNIK RAHIM, WA AMAR BIHA AL-MALIK IND DHALIK FA AKHRAJAHA WA GHARBUHA THUMMA AWSA ILA SAHIB SHURTATIHI WA BABIHI AN YAQTULAHA IN HIYA ALAMAT BI MAKANIHI. FALAMMA SAMIA DHALIK AL-ASBAT ALLADHIN KANU HAWLAHU WAQATT FI QULUBIHIM AL-MAHABAT FA ADHA'NU LAHU BI'TTAAT WA'NQAAT FIMA BAYNAHUM WA BAYNAHU KULL HILAT, WA QALU QAD FAAL HADHA BI UMMIHI FA AYN NAQA'NAHN** (TT-U, 1:369; cf. 367-9).

The Prophet Shaya and the Muslim ruler Sadiqa, who followed the Prophet's instruction, were truly faithful to Islam. Sanharib, the non-Muslim King of Babylon, and his six hundred thousand troops marched on Jerusalem. During the siege, as God promised, all of them perished miraculously in a night except the King and his five secretaries, taken prisoners of war by the believers. First, the six were given thorough lectures on how God always helps believers and slays nonbelievers. The captives confessed they were "wretched" and stupid not to have known this. Then the Muslim ruler praised the Lord and addressed the captive King as follows:

Indeed our Lord has not saved you and those with you for giving any respect to you; but indeed He has saved you and your companions for something worse to increase your wretchedness in this world and chastisement hereafter, and so that you will tell those behind you of what you have seen of the act of our Lord, and warn those after you. Had it not been for this purpose He blood and the blood of those with you is more worthless to God than the blood of ticks (TT-U, 1:380).

Ordered by the Muslim Israelite King, the commander of the royal guard flung shackles around the captives' necks, and they were paraded in chains for seventy days round the Sacred House, Jerusalem. They were

given two loaves of barley each day as food. It was humiliating as well as painful. The captive King requested the believers' ruler to kill him and his fellows, crying: "Death is better than what you do to us." Sadiqa, the Muslim king sent them to special prison for those waiting execution--**SIJN AL-QATL**. Allah intervened revealing to His Prophet Shaya telling Sadiqa to send the heathen King and his captive secretaries home to scare their people. Sanharib told his people what the Muslim God had done to them. Referring to the believers Sanharib said: "This is a community where none can face its lord" (ibid; cf. 378-81). Islamic torture and terrorization were effective.

The Almighty and His Prophets, emigres in Arabia, were nonetheless harsh in their treatment of those who rejected the dogma of Islam. "God revealed to Barkhiya" who had settled in Najran

to go to Nebuchadnezzar and command him to fight the Arabs--
...trample under feet their country with his troops, kill their fighting men and appropriate their possessions. (Why? God told His Prophet Barkhiya to tell Nebuchadnezzar: "Because) they (the Arabs) have disbelieved in Me, have adopted gods other than Me and have belied My Prophets and Messengers." So, Barkhiya went from Najran to Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon... and told him what God had revealed to him (TT-U, 1:397).

God also gave other Prophets besides Irmiya and Barkhiya the mission of inciting Nebuchadnezzar against the heathen Arabs. They were told to command (sic) Nebuchadnezzar to invade Arabia sparing therein not a single person or animal, demolishing everything; no trace of the heathen should remain, the Almighty emphasized--**AMAR BAD AL-ANBYA AN Y'AMURAHU AN YADKHUL AL-BILAD AL-ARAB FALA YASTAHYI FIHA INSIY-AN WALA BAHIMAT-AN WA AN YANTASIF NASAF-AN HATTA LA YUBQI LAHUM ATHAR-AN** (ibid:398). God told the Prophets He was taking revenge on the heathen by inflicting Nebuchadnezzar on them--**QAD SALLATTU BUKHTNASSAR ALAYHIM LI ANTAQIM MINHUM** (ibid). Performing their divinely-ordained, fifth-columnist duty, the Prophets brought the Chaldean tyrant and his troops to Arabia "where they massacred every living soul they confronted" (ibid). A voice was heard from heaven". "This is the way Prophets are avenged" (ibid:399).

At the end of the era, the story of Jonah reconfirms Islam's use of terror, torture and force to impose the faith on reluctant non-believing people, "for they will not believe," God said, "until they experience torment". From the top of a nearby hill, the Prophet watched the heathen being "tormented". As ordered and commanded by Gabriel, the "Warden of Hell" issued sparks, "the size of thunderclouds," from the hottest part of Hell.

With that, the King (of nonbelievers) arose and sent his fine robes, ordering his people to do likewise. This they did, weeping and crying out in his voices, "O God of Jonah, forgive us! We repent to thee, O most Merciful! "God accepted their repentance and lifted the punishment from them (K:323; also see 10:98 and T:relevant parts).

ENDNOTES

PART III : Belief in the Books and Messengers

Section 6 : THE ERA OF MOSES AND FOLLOWERS

Our descriptions and understanding of the era of Islamic Moses and his followers are based on the following sources. Occasionally the Tafsir of Ibn Kathir-Urdu translation is consulted. Q2:40-, 152, 246-54 cf. T relevant sections; Q3:33-4; Q4:163-5 cf. TS,9:399-407; Q5:20-6 cf. TS,10:159- 200; Q6:84-91 cf TS,11:507-26; Q7:101-71 cf. TS,13:7-221; Q9:30-1 cf. T,10:110-15; Q10:75-98 cf. T,11:145-173; Q11:96- 103 cf. T,12:109-14; Q14:5-8 cf. T,13:182-6; Q17:2-8, 55, 104 cf. T,15:18-46; Q18:60-98 cf. T,15:271-91 and T,16:1-8; Q19:2-15; Q20:9-98 cf. T,16:141-209; Q21:78-88 cf. T,17:76- 82 passim cf. T,17:50-6; Q23:45-9 cf T,18:...; Q26:10-68 cf. TB,19:49 passim; Q27:7-44 cf. TB,19; Q28:3-46 cf. TB,20:19 passim; Q29:39-41; Q34:12-4 cf. T,22:68-87; Q37:114-148 cf. T,23:90-106; Q38:17-40, 48 cf. T,23:135-64; Q40:23-55 cf. T,24:55-76; Q42:13-14; Q43:46-56 cf. T,25:77-84; Q44:17-33 cf. T,25:116-27; Q53:36--49; Q69:9-10; Q79:15-26; Q87:1-19; TT-U,1:270-434; TT-U,1:365-584; K:208-326; for references in the Sahah Sittah and other Hadith literature see A.J. Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadam Tradition under the titles of Musa, Harun, Jews, Jerusalem, David, Sulaiman, Harut and Marut, Ilyas, Yahya, John the Baptist etc.; also see El under the above titles and more by various authors.

²The believers are told in this context that Asiya, Mary (mother of Jesus), Khadija (the first wife of Muhammad) and Fatima (Muhammad's daughter) were the most beautiful women of all history (K:213; also see TT-1,1:387).

^{2a}See Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, The Holy Quran with Translation

and Commentary, Rabwah, Pakistan (1949), vol. II, part I, P. 1532 (n. 2122) cf. Q18:83-4. I think, Maulana Abu'l-Kalam Azad in his TARJUMAM AL-QURAN, a commentary (in Urdu) on the Quran (with reference to Q18:83 passim) - which I could not check for this study - had expressed a similar opinion.

These contentions may be supported by reading thoroughly (with the help of Tabari's Tafsir) the Qurani stories as well as those in Tradition related to this era. For general reference see endnote no. 1 in this section, specifically Q2:51 passim; Q20:24, 43, 47-8, 55, 72, 86- 100; Q23:45-7 cf. T,18:24-5; Q26:10, 16, 23-9, 47-8 cf. T; Q28:38, 41, 48 cf. T; Q40:27-8; Q43:46-7; Q44:22, 31 cf. T,25:120 passim; Q69:10, 17; cf. T; Q87:11-19 cf. T.

A fundamentalist Muslim reading Asa's account in Tabari is likely to liken Asa to Umar b. Abd al-Aziz who succeeded his less fundamentalist Umayyad predecessors, or to the Indian Moghul emperor, Awrangzeb, who succeeded his more liberal father and grandfathers, Shah Jahan, Jahangir and Akbar the Great, or, more exactly, with Khomeini coming into power after the secular Pahlavi regime of Iran.

See Malise Ruthren's review of Marmaduke Pickthall, Said the Fisherman and Peter Clark, Marmaduke Pickthall: British Muslim in The Times Literary Supplement, September 5, 1986, p. 964. The "two-dimensional quality" of Pickthall's Muslim character who lied and cheated his way to riches was rationalized by the character himself on the basis of his faith in Islam. Eventually God forgives the believers! As in the case of Muhammad's problematic marriage with Zayd's wife, Zaynab, the Divine verdict favored the greater Muslim against the lesser.

As al-Bukhari (Bu,6:S33), Ibn Sad (IS-b,8:150-60) and Tabari (T,22:20-7 cf. Q33:50-1) tell us, some women (other than the Prophet's formal

wives and known concubines) had "offered themselves" to the Prophet Muhammad and the Prophet accepted their "offer." The Prophet's nine existing formal wives disliked the affair. Some of them such as Aisha used to violate the Prophet's privacy with such women and ridiculed them. This had created a difficult situation for the Prophet. The Almighty intervened declaring extramarital affairs with these women "lawful" for the Prophet "exclusively." God also authorized the Prophet to "put off" those wives who continued to object (Q33:50-1). It was on this occasion that Aisha remarked: "I see your God (always) in a hurry to fulfill your desire" -- **INNI LA-ARA RABBAK LA-YUSARI LAK FI HAWAK (T,22:26)**. According to al-Bukhari, Aisha said, "I do not see your God but being always prompt to fulfill your desire" -- **MA ARA RABBAK ILLA YUSARI FI HAWAK (Bu,6:S33)**.

See for example Q2:49-50 passim; 7:138-41; 10:90; 14:6; 20:37-40, 80-2; 26:62-7; 43:30-1; for details also see T relevant sections; TT-U,1:272--96; K:215-35 passim.

Q7:106-8, 117-9, 129-33; Q20:15-23; Q26:32-3; 27:12; 28:31- 2; cf. T, and K relevant sections.

I have used an Urdu translation of Ibn Kathir's famous Tafsir "exegesis" of the Quran. This translation is entitled **TAFSIR IBN KATHIR URDU**; hence IKU in my reference notes refer to it. Ashraf Ali Thanawi, the Urdu translator and Anzar Shah Kashmiri, the Urdu editor of Ibn Kathir, are among the well-known ulama of Dar al-Ulum "University" of Deoband (India), the al-Azhar of Sunni Islam, east and northeast of Iran, particularly South Asia. IKU is an official Deoband publication, published by **MAKTABA-E-FAYZ AL-QURAN, DEOBAND, SAHARANPUR, U.P., India (1962-64?)** My references, e.g., IKU,19/20:37, refer to Tafsir Ibn Kathir Urdu, Parah 19, Juz 20, page no. 37.

,Tabari, Ibn Kathir, and contemporary authentic and traditionalist Ulama do not suffer from the scruples and confusion of our modern Muslim translators and commentators aware of discrepancies between historical facts and Quranic statements. With reference to Q26:57-59, M. Asad has added "in the course of time" in his translation of the passage and maintained in his commentary that "this is apparently an allusion to the honorable state and prosperity which the Children of Israel had enjoyed in Egypt for a few generations after Joseph... before the new Egyptian dynasty." Asad has also said it is an allusion to the period of the Israelites' prosperity and honor in Palestine (p. 564). With regard to Q28:5-6, Asad translates AIMMA, as "forerunners in faith" because "Hebrews were first to accept a monotheistic creed... and thus became the forerunners of both Christianity and Islam" (p. 589). Abdullah Yusuf Ali (cf. 26:57-9) maintains that for the Israelites the promised land was (only) Palestine. The Divine promise of Egypt, he asserts, applies to "another people, the Muslims" who inherited Palestine as well as Egypt (p. 954). Maulana Muhammad Ali, who, because of his Qadiyani (Ahmadiya) background, is more enlightened and concerned about historical facts, tries a more generalized commentary. According to M.M. Ali, Q26:57-9 "refers to gardens and springs in general and not to the particular gardens etc. from which the Egyptians were turned out" (p. 344). Of Q28:5-6, Ali remarks: "By making them heirs is not meant that they would be made heirs to pharaoh's possessions, but heir to a Kingdom in the promised land of Canaan" - and this also refers, Ali adds, to the establishment of the Kingdom of Islam and the vanquishment of its persecutors (p. 744). Though in principle, even our modern commentators, despite their 'modernizing' twists and turns, do not reject the idea of an eventual "vanquishment" of Egypt promised by God to the believers. As we have seen above, these modern apologists' speculations, however, do as much violence to quite clear Quranic texts and their meaning - as understood by authentic Muslim scholars from the seventh to the present century - as the Quran and Tradition do to

historiography in this regard.

¹⁰This was quite similar to what Muslims did in India and Cyprus:
partition of the land on the basis of the faith.

¹¹According to Islamic images of the past **AZ-ZABUR** usually translated as the Psalms denotes much more than the Biblical Psalms. **Az-Zabur** is one of the four greatest "Books," (i.e. collections of revelations) sent by God to David. The other three being **AT-TAWRAT** (Torah?) to Moses, **AL-INJIL** (the Gospel) to Jesus and the **QURAN** to Muhammad.

PART III: Belief in the Books and Messengers

Section 7: THE ERA OF JESUS CHRIST AND HIS FOLLOWERS

The Islamic Christian era, which begins with **ISA MASIH** (Jesus Christ), son of **MARYAM** (Mary), lasts until the emergence of Muhammad as the last Messenger of God circa 610 CE. Jesus and his true followers are Muslim heroes; their images are Muslim self-images and their patterns of behavior, if described appreciatively or uncritically in Islamic sources, must be imitated by Muslims as enjoined by Q6:90. We also take into consideration the actions of certain non-Christian individuals and groups of the era whom our sources praise, implicitly or explicitly, and mention as if their deeds were divinely inspired and/or conformed to a true believer's treatment of others. The section will begin with a general introduction of the era as portrayed in Islamic sources. Then, we will discuss 1) the Muslim concepts of the link between Jesus and his pre-Muhammad followers and Islam; 2) the mission, concerns, interests, likes and dislikes of the Islamic Jesus and his followers; and 3) the patterns of behavior of Jesus and his followers, and of other praised individuals of the era, particularly toward nonbelievers and nonconformists.¹

Introduction

Islamic images of the era of Jesus and his followers are not as systematic and consistent as are those of the preceding period. Islamic descriptions of the era heralded by Moses, regardless of its ups and downs, develop a sense of continuity centered on the Holy Land as the core of the Dar al-Islam and on the Israelites who, as believers as well as nonbelievers or nonconformists, were the focus of attention of the Almighty and His Messengers. The material about Jesus and followers, compared to that about the previous era, is much briefer and more anecdotal. Early pre-Constantine Christian history is almost completely ignored, and the post-Constantine Roman empire is not treated as a Dar al-Islam. Likewise, the non-Christians of the era - the Jews, pagan Arabs and Iranians - are not necessarily treated completely as infidels. Nor are the Christians preferred to them in all cases discussed in this segment of Islamic historiography. During the whole era, in contrast to

the Israelites, true Christians emerge more as individuals rather than a group. As we discuss below, these apparent inconsistencies are 'rationalized' according to some basic Islamic perceptions of the history of pre- Muhammad Christianity.

The Islamic story of the era of Jesus begins with reference to continued Israelite degeneracies after their return from Babylonian exile. The Israelites rebuffed the Messengers of God one after the other and killed many of them. The Prophet Zakariyya (Zacharias), his son, the Prophet Yahya (John [the Baptist]), and John's second cousin, Jesus, were among these victims of unfaithful Israelites (TT-1,1:590-1). The circumstances around the death of John appear in detail. John was killed "by the Israelite King" because he had opposed the King's incest with the wife of his brother. To avenge John, God inflicted a certain Babylonian King Khardaus, and his general Nabuzaradhan, on them. It was a greater scourge than that which Nebuchadnezzar inflicted earlier on unfaithful Israelites. Khardaus destroyed their country, killed their men and enslaved their children and women (TT-U,1:424 cf. 418-25; cf. Q17:4-8 as explained in TT above and in T). Tabari does not tell us how these Babylonians disappeared from the scene and how the Israelites still remained influential in the Holy Land. In his immediately following accounts of Jesus, Tabari tells us clearly that the Holy Land was ruled by Israelite Kings subordinate to Roman emperors (TT-1,1:604-6).

The story of Jesus begins with a description of Mary, niece of Zacharias and progeny of David. During her childhood and early youth Mary, along with her cousin Joseph the Carpenter, under the supervision of Mary's uncle, Zacharias, served in a synagogue which is also called a mosque (TT-1,1:593-5; K:326-30). "When Mary reached the age of womanhood" Gabriel, commanded by God, appeared to her "and breathed into her (mouth): the breath reached her womb, and she conceived Jesus" (K:328; Q19:16 passim; TT-1,1:593-6 passim). It was a miracle. Jesus was destined to become a great Messenger of God. Most of the

Israelites, however, cast aspersion on Mary's character; they particularly charged that Zachariah made her pregnant -- **FA-QALAT BANU ISRAIL: MA AHBALAHA AHAD GHAYR ZAKARIYYA** (TT-1,1:600 passim). This was the occasion when the Israelites chased and killed the Prophet Zacharias (ibid), though Kisai keeps Zacharias alive until a later time. Mary delivered Jesus in a wilderness. "God revealed to her [in Kisai:330 Zacharias advised her] to leave her people's land because they, if able to reach her, would condemn her and kill her and her child" -- **FA- AWH ALLAH ILAYHA AN AKHRIJI MIN ARD QUAMIK, FA-INNAHUM IN ZAFARU BIK AYYARUK WA QATALUK WA WALADAK** (TT-1,1:595). Mary took the child to Egypt. Joseph the Carpenter, who after some initial uncertainties believed in the miracle, accompanied them (ibid). When Jesus was thirty, Mary, commanded by God, returned to Syria (sic; ibid:598), where Jesus received revelation i.e., was appointed by God a Prophet officially. His Prophethood lasted for three years. Except for a few - the twelve Disciples, Mary, Joseph the Carpenter, and **MARYAM AL- MAJDALANIYYAH** (Mary Magdalene) - almost all other Israelites he addressed rejected his teachings. They tried to kill him, but God raised him to Heaven (ibid) where he lives among the angels by the Almighty's Throne. Just before the end of time in this world, Jesus will return to lead Muslims to a final victory.

Up to the time of Jesus's Prophethood, Islamic descriptions concentrate on miraculous events aimed at proving Mary's miraculous pregnancy and his predestination as a Messenger of God. Jesus spoke out from his mother's womb admonishing Joseph the Carpenter for his reluctance to believe in Mary's miraculous pregnancy (K:329). The rest of the material in our sources about Jesus deals with the 'last supper' before the attempted crucifixion, his miraculous escape from death, i.e., ascent to Heaven, his brief appearance after the crucifixion to the believers, and with his return to Heaven. Traditions on his second coming, based on Quranic leads, are found mostly in Tabari's Tafsir and in the parts of Hadith-Sirah literature describing Islamic eschatology.

We are not told much about Jesus's Prophetic activities culminating in his last farewell supper with the believers. Of the events leading to the attempted crucifixion Tabari in his Tarikh simply tells us that Jesus was confronted by the Israelites who became his enemies and finally killed him -- **BANU ISRAIL... ADWAN ALAYH FA-QATALUH**, i.e., tried to kill him (TT-1,1:604). Although Tabari is aware that the Holy Land was a part of the Roman empire and the Israelite "king" ruled on behalf of the Caesar -- **WA'L-MALIK ALA BAYT AL-MUQADDAS MIN QIBAL QAYSAR** (TT-1,1:605), he does not mention any Roman opposition to Jesus. Like the Babylonians, who reportedly sympathized with John and earlier Prophets, pagan Roman and Iranian rulers are portrayed as having had a benevolent attitude toward Jesus and the Disciples. According to Islamic sources Jesus and his followers were confronted only by the Jews.

Al-Kisai gives some more details of Jesus's Prophetic activities.

The King of Israel died... Zacharias sent to Mary and Jesus to return to Jerusalem, so they set out from Egypt, headed for Jerusalem. They went down into Nazareth... and Jesus called the people to the faith. "What proof have you of your prophecy?" they asked. He said (as in the Quran 3:49) "I will make before you, of clay, as it were the figure of a bird; then I will breathe thereon, and it shall become a bird, by the permission of God; and I will heal him that hath been blind from his birth; and the leper: and I will raise the dead by the permission of God" (K:333; parentheses added).

The audience challenged Jesus to revive Shem son of Noah from his Tomb.

Jesus approached the tomb, prayed, took a vessel of water, sprinkled it on the tomb and said, "Arise, Shem through the might of God!" And the tomb was split asunder, and Shem left out... (K:333-4).

After a brief, friendly conversation, in which Shem told Jesus that he had been dead for four thousand years, he returned to his tomb. The conversation implies that Shem recognized Jesus and believed in him. The Israelites, however, continued to demand more miracles.

... they became more recalcitrant. Thereupon Jesus cursed them, and God transformed them into apes and pigs, whereafter they lived for three days and then died. The people who believed in him remained, and Jesus stayed among them until God raised him up to Himself (K:334).

Of the events just before and after Jesus's ascent to Heaven, Tabari says - as in Q3:55; 4:158 and 19:57 - that God informed Jesus He was to raise him from the world. Jesus arranged a supper for his Disciples. During the supper Jesus predicted one of the disciples, Shamun (Simon? Peter?) would deny him, and another would betray him for money. The next day the Jews (sic) who were looking for Jesus were led by one of the Disciples (Judas) to him. In a confusion caused by God, the Jews arrested and crucified another person. Jesus was raised to Heaven. This was not known until seven days after the crucifixion. On the seventh or eighth day Jesus appeared to his mother and a woman [Mary Magdalene (TT-1, 1:602)] he had healed who were mourning him at the crucifixion site. Jesus told them he was raised to Heaven and it was another they had crucified in confusion. Then, Jesus asked for the eleven Disciples to meet him in such and such -- **KADHA WA KADHA** a place. There the Disciples told Jesus that the one who betrayed him to the Jews for money had committed suicide by strangling himself. Jesus told the Disciples of a "lad," namely Yahya (John), who would be one of them - apparently to replace Judas. Jesus told them to go about the earth calling people toward God. He also told them they would be able to speak the tongues of all they met. Then Jesus was transfigured and flew among the angels with whom he lives in Heaven by the Throne (of God). As instructed by Jesus, **AL-HAWWARIYYUN** "the Disciples" and **AL-ATBA** "the followers" (apostles?) trod various lands: "Futrus (Peter) the Disciple and Bulus (Paul) who was a follower, not a Disciple, to Rome," Andrayis (Andrew) and Mathy (Matthew) to a land of cannibals, Thomas to Babylon in the east, Filibis (Philip) to North Africa, Yaqubas (Jacobus=James) to Jerusalem, Ibn Tulma (Bartholomew?) to the land of Hijaz in Arabia and Simun (Simon?) to the Berber land in Africa (TT-U,1:430-3; also see Q3:55 passim, Q4:158; Q19:57 with relevant

sections in T, e.g., TS,9:371-2). Our sources do not tell more about the activities of these Christian apostles.

Before we proceed with Islamic images of the periods after Jesus's ascension, basic Islamic beliefs about Jesus Christ may be summarized as follows. Let the Quran begin:

They are unbelievers
 who say, 'God is the Messiah, Mary's son.'
 For the Messiah said,
 'Children of Israel,
 serve God, my Lord and
 your Lord. Verily
 whoso associates
 with God anything,
 God shall prohibit him
 entrance to Paradise,
 and his refuge shall be
 the Fire; and wrongdoers
 shall have no helpers.'

They are unbelievers
 who say, 'God is the Third of Three.'
 No god is there but
 One God.
 If they refrain not from what they say, there
 shall afflict those of them that disbelieve
 a painful chastisement.
 Will they not turn to God and pray His
 forgiveness?
 God is All-forgiving, All-compassionate.

The Messiah, son of Mary, was only
 a Messenger; Messengers before him
 passed away; his mother was a just ("saintly" in
 Pickthall) woman;
 they both ate food. Behold, how We make clear
 the signs to them; then behold, how they
 perverted are!

Say: 'Do you serve, apart from God,
 that which cannot hurt or profit you? God is
 the All-hearing, the All-knowing.'
 Say: 'People of the Book, go not beyond the bounds in your
 religion, other than the truth,
 and follow not the caprices of a people
 who went astray before, and led astray
 many, and now again have gone astray
 from the right way.'
 Cursed were the unbelievers of the Children
 of Israel by the tongue of David, and
 Jesus, Mary's son; that, for their rebelling
 and their transgression (Q5:72-8; parentheses added).

Islamic Jesus was a human and a Messenger of God just like Adam, Moses and Muhammad - not God nor son of God. He was born of the virgin Mary, a Divine miracle demonstrating God's omnipotence. God created Adam and

Eve without parents; so He could create Jesus from Mary's womb without carnal contact with a man, the Quran and Tradition argue. Mary explained this to Joseph the Carpenter when he

learned of her pregnancy. He said to her, "Mary, does anything grow without seed?" "No," she answered. [In Tabari, she said NAAM "yes"]. "Can there be a child without a father or mother?" he asked. "Yes," she said, "Adam was without father or mother." "How did you come to have the child you are carrying?" he asked. "He is a gift from God," she said. "And he is like Adam, whom He shaped from dust and to whom He said, 'Be' and he was." God caused Jesus to speak from his mother's womb and say, "O Joseph, what are these words that you speak?" (K:328-9; see also TT-1,1:594-5 who records this conversation in more detail about God's power to create things *ex nihilo*, and adds Joseph was convinced that Mary's pregnancy was a Divine miracle -- WAQAA FI NAFSIH ANN ALLADHI BIHA SHAY-UN MIN ALLAH AZZ WA JALL).

Islam defends Mary's virginity, piety and righteousness vehemently and condemns those who sully her character (e.g. Q3:42-7 passim; Q19:16-34 cf. T). Jesus Christ is not only a past Muslim hero but will also return near the end of life in this universe as a champion of Islam. He is related to Islamic history as well as to Islamic eschatology. When the Jews (sic) wanted to crucify Jesus, God caused a confusion; they crucified another man, mistaking him for Jesus. God saved and raised Jesus to Heaven where he awaits the second coming as a future Muslim hero. Rejecting the Jews' alleged claim to have killed Jesus, the Quran maintains:

And for their saying, 'we slew the Messiah, Jesus son of Mary, the Messenger of God, - yet they did not slay him, neither crucified him, only a likeness of that was shown to them..., and they slew him not of a certainty -no indeed; God raised him up to Him;... (Q4:157-9).

Jesus was definitely God's Messenger to the Israelites, though the propriety of the extension of his Prophetic mission to other peoples is not denied (Q3:49-51; 13:38). The departure of Christ's disciples and apostles to various lands to preach Jesus's teachings is mentioned approvingly. Like other Prophets, Jesus enjoyed God's support in extraordinary ways; he was given miraculous power. Some of his followers also had miraculous qualities. Jesus's birth, his

disappearance and reappearance are Divine miracles. From his conception to his ascent to Heaven, wonderful happenings saved his life and the honor of his mother, Mary. Jesus spoke in the cradle, made live birds out of clay, healed the sick (lepers) miraculously and raised the dead (1:524-35; K:326-36; Q3:46, 49; 5:110-13; 19:30-3). God also provided, miraculously, food, "a table of viands" to his disciples (Q5:114).

With a few eschatological remarks about the Christ's second coming, al-Kisai's The Tales of the Prophets ends with Jesus's ascension. After descriptions of the person of Jesus Christ, the bulk of material about pre-Muhammad Islamic Christians in Tabari's Tarikh and Tafsir is on 1) the **ASHAB AL-KAHF**, "Those of the Cave" (the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus?) introduced as true Christians, and 2) about a certain Christian apostle, **JURJIS** (St. George?) who is reported to have met the remnants of Christ's Disciples and adopted his creed (TT-U,1:465-75). According to "Muslim scholars" -- **ULAMA AHL AL-ISLAM**, Tabari asserts, **ASHAB AL-KAHF**, the Islamic Seven Sleepers, lived after Jesus (TT-U,1:455). The Quran as explained by Tabari also cites specifically three other Prophets, Sadiq, Saduq and Shalum sent by God after Jesus as His Messengers, particularly to the people of Antioch. In a Tradition in Tabari's commentaries on Q36:13-32 (which alludes to these three Prophets), it is maintained that the three apostles were sent by Jesus -- **KANU RUSUL ISA IBN MARYAM, WA ISA ALLADHI ARSALAHUM ILAYHIM** (T,22:156; cf. T,22:155-62; T23:1-2; TT-1,1:462-4; cf. Q36:13-32).

Tabari includes the story of Shamsun (Samson?, TT- U,1:464-5) in the post-Jesus narrations, as a part of events that took place during the period of "Tribal Kings" -- **MULUK AT-TAWAIF**. The "Tribal-Kings'" period in the Near East begins, for Tabari, with the death of Alexander the Great, extending to the rise of the Sasanian King Ardashir Babakan, i.e., Ardashir I (r. 226-241 CE.) (see -U,1:414). Generally, by "Tribal Kings", i.e., lesser Kings, Tabari means the Hellenistic Parthian rulers. According to a sub- title in the Persian translation

of Tabari's Tarikh, Shamsun lived during the "Tribal-King" period -- **wa shamsun niz dar ayyam-e muluk at-tawaif bud** (TT-P,2:562). Our Islamic Samson lived in a Roman village or town -- **KAN MIN AHL QARYAT-IN MIN QURA'R-RUM** (TT-U,1:464). "God had guided him and his people were idol-worshippers... Shamsun was a Muslim..." (ibid). Tabari seems to imply Shamsun lived after Jesus. Because a Muslim reader, unaware of other sources, is likely to form such an impression, the Islamic Samson as a Divinely-guided believer is discussed here.

A reader of Islamic material on the six centuries before Muhammad remains oblivious to early Christian history. The Christian nature of the post-Constantine Roman/Byzantine empire remains similarly vague, though Tabari is aware that Constantine converted to Christianity and that, excepting Julian, the succeeding emperors remained Christian. Tabari is almost silent on Roman persecution of the Christians. He gives only one sentence to the execution of Peter and Paul by Nero. In almost all cases Jews were the persecutors; at other times, their identity remains unknown. From the names of persecutors of "Those of the Cave" it is obvious they are Romans, but Tabari does not project their identity to readers as such. Tabari's readers are likely to form the impression that pagan Romans as well as the Persians and the Babylonians had a somewhat benevolent attitude toward Christ and his followers. We read of an unnamed pro-Christian "King of Rome" -- **MALIK AR-RUM**, i.e. Roman emperor. When told posthumously of Jesus "the Messenger of God", of his miracles, of the crucifixion and that the Disciples were being tortured by the Israelites, this emperor wished he had known in time to save Jesus from his enemies. "He rescued the Disciples from their (the Israelites') clutches," and asked them about Jesus and his religion. When told, the emperor adopted the Disciples' creed -- **FA TABAAHUM ALA DINIHIM**. He also looked for Jurjis (St. George?) and found him. The emperor took over - and kept with respect - the cross that had touched Jesus's body when he was crucified. Our unnamed true Islamic Roman Christian emperor acted further to prove his

faith in Christ: he assaulted Israelites and massacred many of them -- **FA ADA ALA BANI ISRAIL FA QATAL MINHUM QATLA KATHIRAH**. "And this was the beginning of Christianity in the Roman empire," Tabari concludes (TT-U,1:433-4). Tabari implies that this converted King of Rome must have been the emperor who ruled at the time of Jesus's crucifixion and just after. In his brief roll of Roman emperors from Tiberius (14-37 CE) to Heraclius I (610-641 CE), Tabari states that emperor ISFASYANUS (Vespasian, r. 69-79) in the third year of his rule, which was, according to Tabari, the fortieth year of Jesus's ascension (to Heaven), sent his son Titus to Jerusalem. Titus destroyed it and killed many Israelites. Vespasian did this, Tabari claims, because he was angry at what had been done to Christ -- **GADAB-AN LI'L-MASIH** (ibid:435). With no further comment, Tabari remarks, later, that Constantine was the first Roman emperor converted to Christianity. About Julian's reversion to the "previous Roman religion" Tabari has harsh words, condemning him as **ELYANUS AL-MUNAFIQ**, "Julian the Hypocrite", i.e. the Apostate (TT-U,1:435-6, 492). Of the Iranian benevolent attitude toward Jesus, Tabari tells us that the Magi, "the wise men from the East who came bearing gifts to the infant Jesus," were actually messengers of good-will sent by the King of Iran to the Christ -- **RUSUL MALIK FARS ALLADHIN WAJJAHAHUM AL-MALIK ILA'L-MASIH** (ibid:434).

Beyond these accounts, Tabari's readers remain uninformed about the Church history of the period. In his detailed treatment of Iranian history then, Tabari mentions points of contact between the Iranian and Roman empires - particularly the tides of war and peace between the two empires. In such treatments, however, the Christian identity of the post-Constantine Roman empire remains submerged. Except for his implied condemnation of Julian the Apostate, Tabari remains unenthusiastic about the Christianity of Constantine and succeeding Roman- Byzantine Christian rulers. He does not treat them unequivocally as Muslim heroes, i.e. the true followers of Islamic Jesus Christ. Contrary to followers of Moses in the pre-Christian era, the "Islam" i.e., the

Christianity, of the pre-Muhammad Rum (Roman-Byzantine empire), is not taken for granted. For Tabari's readers pagan Roman solidarity and sympathy with Jesus and the Disciples are articulated more than the Christian identity of post-Constantine Romans. During his discussion of Rome and Iran, Tabari considers them both secular states. For Tabari, it was not a confrontation between a believing Byzantium and pagan or Zoroastrian Iran. Though unambiguously opposed to Zoroastrianism, Tabari's sympathetic treatment of Iran is obvious. As a matter of fact, occasional Iranian emperors, e.g., Anusharwan (Khosrow/Chosroes, 531-579 CE), seem to Muslim readers more Muslim-like than their Christian Roman counterparts. Anusharwan wrote his letters beginning with the Islamic pro forma "In the name of Allah, the Merciful, the Compassionate" (TT-U,1:525).

The theoretical base for the unenthusiastic treatment of Roman-Byzantine Christianity is laid, perhaps, in Tabari's introduction. After the people, i.e., his earliest followers, saw Christ's wonderful miracles they were awed. Iblis (Satan) thought it was time to mislead them about the nature of Christ. Tabari remarks that Satan told them Jesus was God. Then a companion of Satan told them Jesus was the son of God; another companion of Satan told the people Christ was God's partner (TT-U,1:429). Thus, Tabari, inspired by the Quran, wants to tell readers that most of the Christians were misguided from the very beginning. This also explains sacred Islamic historiography's lack of interest in early Christian apostles and Church Fathers. They were among those misguided by Satan.

Traditions attributed to the Prophet Muhammad further clarify and rationalize Muslim images of Christianity after Christ's ascension. This is what happened, Muhammad tells the believers: The followers of Christ were divided into four groups. Three were misguided; only one small group remained loyal to the Christ's Islamic teachings. One group consisted of those who believed Jesus was God on earth -- **HU ALLAH FI'L-ARD**: they were the Jacobite Christians -- **AL- YAQUBIYYA**

FI'N-NASARA, according to Tabari. The second group believed Jesus was son of God: the Nestorians, according to Tabari. The third called Jesus one of the three Gods - the other two being God [the Father] and his mother, Mary (sic). Tabari introduces this faction as the Israelite Christians -- **AL-ISRAILIIYYAH MIN AN-NASARA**. The fourth group (the true Christians), the Muslim (sic), believed Jesus was the (human) servant and Messenger of God, **ABD ALLAH WA RASULUH**. Tabari maintains the Jacobites overwhelmed (other groups) and the Muslim-Christians suffered (see T,16:86 cf. Q19:37 passim). The Tradition attributed to the Prophet Muhammad lays the foundation of Muslim treatment of "the Christianity of the (Byzantine?) Kings." "The Kings coming after Jesus," the Prophet said, "transformed (i.e. distorted) the Torah and the Gospel" -- **KANAT MULUK BAD ISA BADDALU'T-TAWRAT WA'L- INJIL**. That is, Muhammad tells the believers, the Romans-Byzantines usurped Jesus and distorted his teachings; they were not authentic Christians. The true believers, Tradition adds, "following the creed of God and Jesus, opposed and fought these "kings" -- **WAZAT AL-MULUK WA QATALATHUM ALA DIN ALLAH WA DIN ISA**. These true Christians were killed by the (pseudo-Christian) Kings. Those who survived segregated themselves, took to wilderness and mountains and became monks with good intentions in the beginning (T,27:239 cf. 238-40; Q57:27). In another Tradition, Muslims are told "the two heathen groups" -- **FIRQATAN AL-KAFIRATAN** i.e., the believers in Jesus as God and/or son of God, overwhelmed the Muslim (Christians), believers in the Christ only as a human "servant and Messenger of God." These Muslims, the authentic and true followers of Jesus, were massacred by the pseudo-Christians. Thereafter, the Tradition concludes, Islam remained extinct until God raised Muhammad -- **FA LAM YAZIL AL-ISLAM TAMIS-AN HAA BA'ATH ALLAH MUHAMMAD** (T,28:92 cf. Q61:14). Muslim perceptions of the spuriousness of post-Constantine Trinitarian Christians are augmented by those Quranic passages and detailed Traditions which refer to contacts between the Prophet Muhammad and the leaders of Arab Christians - mostly those of Najran - in western

Arabia. These reports strongly condemn Christians contemporary to Muhammad, and by implication those before him, for their false Christian beliefs (see, e.g., 2:136-40 cf. TS,3:109- 127; Q3:46 passim, cf. 6:418-9 passim; Q3:52 passim, cf. TS,6:451-2; Q3:57-62 cf. TS,6:465-82). The Quran's and Traditions' condemnation of the Trinitarian concept is overwhelming (for more see Q4:171-2 cf. TS,9:15 passim; Q5:17-8, 71-84; Q19:36). Given all the above and the Muslim awareness that post-Constantine Christianity was based on the Trinity, the Christian-Roman-Byzantine empire is deprived of recognition by our sources as a perfect Islamic domain (such as those of Joshua, Calib, David, Solomon and Asa). Those who believed in the Trinity, such as the majority of the RUM, the Romans and Byzantines, were not true and authentic believers in Islamic Jesus.

Though, in general, Christian history is not recognized by Islamic sources as a part of sacred Islamic history, there are some exceptions. The Quran 30:2-7 alludes to the confrontation in the first quarter of the seventh century between the Roman and Iranian empires. There vaguely, but in the detailed accompanying Traditions very clearly, Muhammad and his followers enthusiastically identified themselves and Islam with the Byzantines and their creed. Conversely, Muhammad and Muslims equated Iranians and their creed with pagan Arabs and paganism (T,21:1-20 cf. Q30:2-7). The Prophet and Muslims grieved when the Byzantines were defeated in the early seventh century. Muhammad and his followers rejoiced in the later Byzantine victory over Iranians. Muslims mourned the earlier Roman defeat and wished for a Roman recovery. "The believers in God and His Messenger will rejoice the day," they said, "when the Rum (Byzantines) with the help of God will be victorious" (T,21:16). As recorded in another report,

The news of the Byzantines' defeat grieved and troubled the Prophet and his companions when it reached them in Mecca. The Prophet loathed to see the unscriptured Magians -- **AL-UMMIYYUN MIN AL-MAJUS** (i.e., Iranians/Persians), overwhelm the People of the Book of Byzantium. This made the disbelievers of Mecca happy and they rejoiced in the misfortunes of the Byzantines. When (the Meccan nonbelievers) met the Prophet's companions they said, "You

are People of the Book and the Christians are (also) People of the Book. We are unscriptured (people), **UMMIYYUN**; and now our brethren, the people of Persia (Iran), have gained victory over your brothers, the People of the Book" (T,21:17-18).

A series of Tradition reports says that "the Muslims yearned for the victory of the Byzantine People of the Book, and the disbelievers (non-Muslim Meccan Arabs) wanted the Iranians to win because they were also idol-worshippers" (ibid). It was then that the Quranic passage 30:2-7 was revealed which cautiously, and vaguely, predicted a Byzantine comeback.

The year 624 CE brought victory for the Byzantines against the Persians. It was also the year of the first major Muslim victory over their Meccan adversaries at Badr. In this year, the Tradition records; "Allah helped the Prophet, and those with him, gain victory over the disbelieving Arabs and helped the People of the Book (the Byzantines) gain victory over the disbelieving Iranians, and the believers rejoiced in God's help to them and in (His) help to the People of the Book against the Persians" (T,21:17). Apparently, the news of the series of victories gained by Heraclius and that of Iranian setbacks continued to reach Arabia. The Prophet and his companions rejoiced in the news of Chosroes' death when it reached them just after the Truce of Hdaybiya (628 CE). In this context, a report emphasized the Islamic nature of both Muslims in Arabia and of the Byzantine Christians:

Then Allah gave victory to the Byzantines over the Persians... when (the Prophet) had returned from Hdaybiya. So the Muslims were happy with the truce they had made (with the Meccans at Hdaybiya) and with the (news of the) victory of the people of the Book over the pagan (Magians or Iranians). It was with what God strengthened Islam (T,21:19).

Another group of Tradition reports which buttress in Muslim eyes a positive image of Emperor Heraclius relate to the Prophet Muhammad's purported letter to the Emperor calling him to acknowledge his Prophethood. The Traditions tell believers that Heraclius received the Prophet's letter with great respect and was ready to declare his faith in Muhammad as the last Messenger of God. However, finding his bishops

and nobility violently opposed to these inclinations, Heraclius unwillingly backed off. (See, e.g., Bu.1:6, 2:38; Mu.32:74; IS-B,1:258-60.) In these Traditions, however, the good-will shown to Muhammad is attributed to Heraclius as an individual while his courtiers, particularly the clergy, are shown to have opposed, vehemently, Heraclius' pro-Muhammad leanings. (The most detailed versions of Heraclius' positive responses and his courtiers' and clergy's opposition to Muhammad are in Bu.1:6; Bu.2:38; Bu.6:7; Mu.32:74; IS,1/11:16; IS,4/1:185.)

The Negus as a particular Christian ruler of Abyssinia, and the Abyssinian Christians in general, have received positive treatment based on two categories of Tradition. 1) Before the Prophet migrated in 621/622 CE to Medina, a number of the Prophet's companions left Mecca for Abyssinia. The Negus is reported to have treated the Muslim refugees well. In these reports the Negus is perceived as a Christian who believed in Islamic Jesus. 2) Another series of Tradition reports claims the Negus covertly converted to Islam, acknowledging Muhammad as the last Messenger of God (See 1.1:154-5, 657).

The obvious contradiction between Muslim perceptions of the Byzantines formed by Islamic material on the Perso- Byzantine war and those images projected by the rest of the material in this regard is explicable by historians aware of the evolution in Muhammad's attitude toward various groups and issues. Such an analysis, however, does not concern this study. Belief in the institution of **NASKH**, abrogation of certain Quranic and Tradition reports by the later Quranic passages and Traditions, solves the problem of contradictions for a Muslim believer. Besides, the amount of material in the Quran and Tradition against the Trinitarian concept is so overwhelming that a Muslim does not need to be reminded of the solitariness and, hence, ineffectiveness of the reports portraying solidarity with the Byzantine Christians of the early seventh century. As for the Negus, as will be seen later, he was a believer in the Islamic Jesus, according to our sources - not in the Trinitarian

Christ; he also believed in Muhammad as the last Messenger of God.

In their historical sketches of Iran and Arabia in the period between Jesus and Muhammad, the Quran and, mainly, Tradition as reported by Ibn Ishaq, Ibn Hisham and Tabari, make references to the fivefold (native Arab, Jewish, Abyssinian, Roman and Iranian) involvement in the Peninsula, and, consequently, to the tugs of war between Arab paganism, Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Christianity. Our sources make their preferences known to Muslim readers. In the description of a given event, one party or figure emerges as a hero, others as villains. In general our sources' preferences, when clear, are consistent with theoretical Muslim thinking.

Though tacitly approving Iranian secular history, no sympathy or respect is indicated for Zoroastrianism and its founder, Zaradusht (Zoroaster). Tabari calls him a **RAJUL MUNAFIQ**, a hypocrite, an apostate, and condemns Mazdak harshly for being a staunch Zoroastrian and socialistic reformer (TT-U,1:525 passim). As a matter of fact, Tabari, in defense of his hero Sasanian Kings, gives the impression they believed in something opposed to Satanic creeds. Muslim readers know well that only Islam is opposed to Satanic religions including Zoroastrianism. Of the Sasanian King Bahram I (r. 273-276 CE) we are told "Mani the Apostate" called him to his religion. Bahram learned about his religion and found Mani an agent of Satan -- **WA KAN MANI AZ-ZINDIQ...** **YADUH ILA DINIH, FASTABRAYA MA INDAHU, FA-WAJADAHU DAIYAT-AN LI'SH-SHAYTAN** (TT-1,2:53). Bahram did what a true believer should do to nonbelievers; he tortured Mani and his followers to death (ibid), Tabari tells us approvingly. Only in such contexts, Tabari contrasts Zoroastrianism to "Magianism" -- **AL-MAJUSIYAH** condemning the former and, tacitly, approving of the latter as a desirable creed. "Zoroaster the Apostate," Tabari remarks, had created an "(evil) innovation" -- **BIDAH**, a heresy, in "Magian religion". Tabari gives credit to Anusharwan (Khosrow I, r. 531-579 CE) for uprooting this evil innovation "spread by Zoroaster and Mazdak," for outlawing its practice

and massacring its followers and the Manichaeans, and for reestablishing the Magian religion -- WA ANN KISRA... ABTAL MILLAT RAJUL-IN MUNAFIQ... ZARADUSHT... IBTADAAHA FI'L-MAJUSIYYAH. FA-NAHA'N-NAS KISRA ANI'S-SIRAT BI-SHAY-IN MIMMA IBTADAA ZARADUSHT... WA MAZDAQ... WA ABTAL BIDATAHUMA WA QATAL BASHAR-AN KATHIR-AN THABATU ALAYHA... WA QAUM-AN MIN AL-MANANIYYAH (AL-MANAWIYYAH), WA THABBAT LI'L- MAJUS MILLATAHUM... (TT-1,2:99). For a Muslim reader, thus, Anusharwan's terrible treatment of 'Zoroastrians,' 'Manichaeans' and 'Mazdaeans' is portrayed as an ideal treatment of nonbelievers by believers.

The conversion of pagan Arabs to Judaism is approved of. This preference for pre-Muhammad Jews over pagan Arabs is based on the Tradition that the Jews maintained their respect for the Kaba at Mecca as "the House of their father, Abraham." Tabari and Ibn Ishaq speak approvingly of a Yamanite King, Tiban (or Tubba) Asad Abu Karib, who during the campaigns in Arabia was converted to Judaism. In Yathrib (Medina), he was told by Jewish scholars it was the city to which the last Messenger of God, Muhammad, would migrate. They also told him of Mecca's sanctity. Tiban therefore did not pillage the two cities; instead, as the Jewish scholars advised, he paid his respects to the two cities and performed Islamic ritual pilgrimage. The King adopted Judaism, and on his return to the Yaman invited his people to adopt the new religion. The two Jewish scholars who accompanied the King assisted him, with the help of the Torah, to overcome pagan resistance to Judaism. Tiban Asad the Jew and the Jewish scholars - while they believed in the sanctity of Mecca and Medina and in the imminent appearance of Muhammad - are praised as heroes (TT-U,1:529-36; 1.1:7-12). Such pro-Islam Jews are not condemned for not converting to Christianity.

In reports on the clash in southwest Arabia between Jews and Christians and between the Christians and Arab pagans, Christians clearly receive full sympathy. See, for example, descriptions of the Roman-Abyssinian Christian intervention against Jews and pagan Arabs in

the region. The introduction of Christianity at the cost of Judaism and paganism is welcome. Christians of southwest Arabia then are obviously Muslim heroes. A certain **FAMIYUN** and an **ABD ALLAH**, son of Ath-Thamir, who introduced Christianity in Arabia, (Najran), are given much importance by Ibn Ishaq and Tabari. The alleged massacre of Christians by the Jewish King, Dhu Nuwas, is condemned (1.1:14-8; -U,1:543 passim; cf. Q85:4-8 and relevant T). Curiously, the Christianity of the northern Arabs, i.e., the Ghassanids et al who cooperated with the Roman empire against Iran, is not highlighted. Perhaps they were too close to the Byzantines, "the Kings" who were misled by Satan and had killed the true Christians.

Roman-cum-Abyssinian-supported Christianity loses sympathy and respect when it is reported to have tried to compete with the central status of the Kaba at Mecca. Such Christians, the Quran 105 tells the believers, were directly confronted and destroyed by God. The Abyssinians built a magnificent cathedral in Yaman specifically to divert Arab pilgrims from the Kaba at Mecca. Pagan Arabs' resentment against this anti-Meccan and anti-Kaban move of the Christians and the Arabs' actions in this regard are mentioned with enthusiastic approbation. The church trying to compete with the Kaba, the eternal House of God -- **BAYT ALLAH**, loses its sacred nature. Enraged, an Arab entered the church in the darkness of night "and disgraced it"; he left a rotten cadaver in the church. According to Ibn Hisham (and a report in Tabari also) the Arab defecated in the church to show his ire against it and, thus, demonstrated his solidarity with the Kaba at Mecca (TT-U,1:556; 1.1:20-22; for Ibn Hisham's report see 1.1:696). Christian response to the Arab outrage against the Church is mentioned for condemnation. Incensed, Abraha, the Abyssinian governor of Yaman, attacked Mecca to destroy the Kaba. Abraha's army fielded, with other necessities, an elephant (or more). We are also told that Abd al-Muttalib, Muhammad's grandfather, was the most prominent Meccan personality then. Though unable to resist the Christians, the pagan Abd

al-Muttalib resented the onslaught, and prayed to God to make "His House victorious over the Cross" (1.1:26-27). It was, apparently, in response to this prayer that, according to the Quran 105, God destroyed the invaders: He made "their guile to go astray. And He loosed upon them birds in flights, hurling against them stones of baked clay and He made them like green blades devoured." Abraha's army was miraculously destroyed before it could reach the Sanctuary at Mecca (TT- U,1:556-7). During the narration of this episode our sources appreciate the Muslim-like pagans who resisted and fought the Christians for the Kaba. Arabs who collaborated with the invading Christian "black barbarians" are condemned; those who prayed for the protection and victory of the Kaba against the "cross" are upgraded (1.1:26-7). Muslims are told to rejoice in the destruction and humiliation of the invading Christian army:

As they withdrew, they continually fell by the wayside, dying miserably by every waterhole. Abraha was smitten in his body, and as they took him away his fingers fell off one by one. Where each finger had been there arose an evil sore exuding pus and blood, so that when they brought him to Sana he was like a young fledgling... as he died his heart burst from his body (1.1:27; slight changes in English translation made).

The anti-Kaba Christians were villains, no longer heroes. This is indicated by reports about the rebellion of pagan Arabs and their efforts to invoke Iranian intervention which materialized in 570 CE against the Christian Abyssinian rulers of the Yaman. The pagan Arab leader, Sayf b. Dhu Yazan went to the Iranian Capital, convinced the Iranians of the benefits for them of their intervention in southern Arabia against Christian Roman- Abyssinian elements, and finally overthrew the Abyssinian rule, replacing it with Iranian suzerainty; Sayf son of Dhu Yazan emerges as a hero. In southern Arabia the Roman-Abyssinian Christians, formerly much praised in the context of reports about Famiyun and Abd Allah ath-Thamir, are now mentioned as "black dogs", and pagan Arabs and the Iranians who overwhelmed the Christian army become "a noble band" and "lions sent against the black

dogs" (1.1:32; for the full story see TT-U,1:558-70; 1.1:30-4). These stories sow in Muslim Arab minds the idea of the indivisibility of Islam from Arab nationalism. Also, such descriptions along with Traditions projecting Arabs as a superior group of Sam's progeny, and the facts that Muhammad was an Arab and God's last Word is in Arabic, reinforce in the minds of non-Arab (particularly, Sunni) Muslims the sacred nature of an Arab per se. For example, even the most degenerate person in Arab costume is treated as a saint by a typical Muslim in South and Southeast Asia.

The Islamic Link

Whatever the sins of Christians in the eyes of Islam, the believers are told that Jesus and his true followers are not responsible for them. The Quran tells Muslims that God and Jesus disavow the traditional Christian concepts of the Trinity (Q4:172 passim; Q5:72 passim; Q9:30-1...). When not clearly stated, our sources imply that the Christians portrayed as Muslim heroes did not believe in the Trinity. Islamic credentials of Jesus and his followers are, however, recorded for the believers in various explicit ways.

Jesus was one of many pre-Muhammad Prophets guided by God to the Straight Path, **SIRAT MUSTAQIM**. This Straight Path was the religion of God, verily Islam - **DIN ALLAH WA HU AL-ISLAM** (TS,11:509 cf. Q6:83-7). As God revealed the true faith to them, the earliest Disciples of Jesus believed in God and in Jesus as His Messenger; they urged God to witness that they were Muslims (Q3:52; 5:111). Explaining Q3:52, Tabari asserts:

God has hereby informed [us] that His favored creed [that] He sent through Jesus and the Prophets before him was indeed Islam - not Christianity nor Judaism. God (hereby) dissociated Jesus from those who have unduly assumed Christianity and followed it (as Jesus's creed), as God dissociated Abraham from the creeds other than Islam. This was (particularly) addressed to the (Christian) delegation of Najran [who had debated Muhammad and were wrong in their understanding of Jesus's teachings] (TS,6:451-2 cf. Q3:52; brackets added).

God, after reiterating that He "guarded the virginity" of Mary and "breathed into her of His spirit and appointed her and her son to be a sign unto all beings," assures Muslims that they, Jesus, Mary and other Prophets mentioned in the passage belong to the one and the same creed and **UMMAH**, community. The Jews, Christians and pagans are misguided, and will be punished by God (for their misbeliefs) on the Last Day (Q21:91-4; cf. T,17:84- 6). In commentaries on Q2:136-40 about Jesus and other Islamic Prophets, Muslims are told that God had baptized Noah and the Prophets after him, including Jesus, in Islam, God's religion (TS,3;118 cf. Q2:183). Those who "worship" the Christ as God are condemned (ibid:122 cf. Q140). The Prophets are exonerated from any link whatsoever between Judaism and Christianity which were created (by their misguided followers) after them --**INNA ANBIYAAHU BURA-UN MIN AL-YAHUDIYYAT WA'N- NSRANIYYAT, WA KANAT AL-YAHUDIYYAT WA'N-NASRANIYYAT BAD HAULAI BI ZAMAN** (TS,3:125 cf. Q2:140 passim). Muslims are further told that Jews and Christians knew of Islam, but concealed it. They knew well that Islam was the creed of God and that God had foretold, in the Torah and the Gospel, of Muhammad as His Messenger. "Indeed, they (Jesus, his true followers and Prophets) were Muslim" -- **KATAMU AL-ISLAM WA HUM YALAMUN ANNAHU DIN ALLAH... WA KATAMU MUHAMMAD WA HUM YALAMUN ANNAHU RASUL ALLAH WA YAJIDUNAHU FI'T-TAWRAT WA'L-INJIL... INNAHUM KANU MUSLIMIN** (TS,3:126-7 cf. Q2:140; also see TS,6:505 cf. Q3:71). In the Last Day Jesus will tell God he had never asked his followers to take him and his mother (sic) as gods; he had told them, Jesus will clarify, to worship only the one God and consider him as a human servant of God (Q5:116-7). Explaining Q5:118, Tabari remarks that Jesus (after his second coming) will forgive the Christians only when they convert from Christianity to Islam (TS,11:241). Jesus had foretold Ahmad (Muhammad) by name as the Messenger of God to come after him:

And when Jesus son of Mary said, 'Children of Israel, I am indeed the Messenger of God to you, confirming the Torah that is before me, and giving good tidings of a Messenger who shall come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad (Q61:6).

The Prophet Muhammad confirmed to believers that indeed he "was the one whose good news was given by Jesus to his people" (TS,3:82-3). The Traditions related to the Perso- Byzantine wars have some relevance; they also remind Muslims that Jesus and his true followers adhered to Islam. Jesus's teachings also remind Muslims of similarities between his creed and Islam. He emphasized, as Islam does, the necessity of rigid belief in the oneness of God, in the institution of Prophethood, and enjoined typical Islamic rites: performance of SALAT, Muslim prayer, and the payment of ZAKAT, Islamic tax (Q5:11, 117; Q19:31, e.g.). Christ's Islamic link is also reinforced in Muslim minds by the Traditions about his second coming. The Prophet Muhammad said, "Jesus did not die; he is indeed coming to you before the Day of Resurrection" (TS,6:455; cf. Q:55). Emphasizing Christ's link to the Muslim community, Muhammad remarked: "How can a community be destroyed that is led by me and is followed in the end by Jesus?" -- **KAYF TAHLIK UMMAT-UN ANA FI AWWALIHA WA ISA FI AKHIRIHA** (TS,6:457). Dissociating Jesus from conventional Christian symbols and associating him with Islamic rites (such as the pilgrimage to Mecca and the uncleanliness of pork), Muhammad said:

Allah will indeed send Jesus son of Mary down as a just arbitrator **HAKAM ADL** and a fair leader-- **IMAM MUQSIT** -- who will break the cross, kill the swine (i.e., destroy them), put poll-tax (on non-Muslims)... and will enable people to go on pilgrimage (to Mecca) safely. On his death Muslims will perform his death prayer (TS,6:458-9; parentheses and emphases added. It is to be noted that destroying the swine, **AL- KHINZIR**, is with reference to the Christian allowance to eat pork. The Tradition reminds Muslims that unlike Christians, Christ, following Islam, will prohibit the use of pork).

Emphasizing Christ's link to Islam, Muhammad also said:

Prophets are brothers from different mothers. Their mothers are different but their creed is one. I am the closest person to Jesus son of Mary because there was no other (major?) Prophet between me and him... (In his second coming) he will follow me as the leader of my community -- **INNAHU KHALIFATI ALA UMMATI** -- He will crush the cross, kill the swine... and fight the people to the death for Islam until God will destroy in his time all (other) creeds and nations -- **WA YUQATIL AN- NAS AL'AL-ISLAM HATA YUHLIK ALLAH FI ZAMANIHI AL-MILAL KULLAHA**. He will remain forty years on the earth and then will die; Muslims will pray for him and bury

him (with honor) (TS,6:458-9 cf. Q3:55). They will bury him beside Muhammad's tomb (K:335).

Along with specific Quranic assertions and the underlying contention that the believers of the era were Muslim, our sources periodically identify the believers with Islam and Islamic symbols. For example, Mary's father recommended Islamic ablution and prayers (K:327). Before the birth of Jesus, Mary and Joseph served in a mosque -- **AL-MASJID** -- which was the greatest "mosque" of the people concerned during the time (TT-U,1:425). "Those of the Cave," the Islamic Seven Sleepers, "followed Islam, the Creed of Jesus" (ibid:455). "God had blessed them with Islam -- **RAZAQ HUM ALLAH AL-ISLAM**" (ibid:457). After they awoke miraculously from their 309 years' sleep they found the previous nonbelieving people of the region were replaced by a "Muslim community -- **UMMAT MUSLIMAH** -- and their King was a Muslim -- **WA KAN MALIKUHUM MUSLIM-AN**" (ibid). We already know that our Islamic Samson was a Muslim. Julian's apostasy is described in Islamic terminology: he was a **MUNAFIQ**, a hypocrite, an apostate (ibid:436). The honest Jewish scholars had told the Yamanite King of Muhammad's imminent appearance as the last Messenger of God, and of the divine sanctity of Mecca and Medina (TT-U,1:531-34).

The Mission and Concerns.

Having established the Islamic credentials of Jesus and his true followers, their concerns are supposed to inspire Muslims. Muslims find Jesus and his followers were basically concerned with a dogma, related rituals and certain puritanic norms of behavior, and a particular pattern of behavior towards nonbelievers and nonconformists. The dogma, as before, involved belief in a rigid monotheism, belief in the authenticity of the Prophets as Messengers of God, and belief in the reality of the Day Hereafter.

The most important concern of Jesus and his followers was a certain concept of godhood. There was only one God who had revealed

Himself to Jesus, as He had done to other Prophets. This God had to be feared and worshiped.

Quranic passages related to the story of Jesus emphasize the fear of God and the necessity for belief in Him as the only omnipotent, omniscient God. These passages exhort directly and indirectly to worship God, obviously, the way Jesus and his apostles recommended (see the Quran 3:43, 49; 5:111, 112, 117; 21:92; 23:52, 57; 42:13; 43:64; 48:29 and 66:12). When specified, the ways of worship seem to a Muslim like those prescribed by Islam (see Q3:43; Q19:31; Q48:29).

Belief in one God and His worship are always contrasted literally to polytheism and idolatry. When Jesus was born, we are told, all the images and idols worshiped throughout the world fell upside-down (TT-U,1:426, 431). It was the idolatry of the city of "the People of the Cave" which was loathed by a disciple of Jesus. He refused to enter the city (ibid:454-6 cf. Q18:15). The three apostles were sent to Antioch because the heathen King of the city worshiped idols and, thus, gave partners to God. The apostles preached against idolatry (TT-U,1:462-3; cf. Q36:23-5 passim). No other concern is mentioned. The confrontation between the "Muslim man," Shamsun (Samson?) and his people was caused by the same concern: his people were idol-worshippers -- KAN QAWMUHU AHL AWTHAN YABUDUNAHA (TT-U,1:465). Our wonder-making Islamic St. George, Jurjis, began a long-drawn-out struggle against the King of Mosul (sic) - which resulted in the martyrdom of 34,000 (sic) of his followers - only because the King worshiped an idol (TT- U,1:465 passim). Similarly, the spread of Christianity in Najran, Arabia, is appreciated because it rid the people of idolatry (TT-U,1:543 passim).

The many Quranic passages condemning the Christian Trinitarian concept - some of which were uttered by Jesus himself - mean to tell the reader that the Islamic concept of godhood was the utmost concern of Christ and his followers. Besides, in these passages, Muslims are reminded (as a major concern of the Quran) of God's omnipotence. As in the story of Jurjis, we find the believers of the era constantly and

vehemently reminding nonbelievers of God's majesty.

Jesus and his followers also emphasized the need to acknowledge and obey him as God's Messenger who received revelation from the Almighty through invisible means. This concern is emphasized in various ways and contexts in the Quran; see 2:87, 136, 253; 3:46-57; 5:111; 6:90; 19:21, 30-4; 43:59-64; 57:27; 61:6, 14, etc. "Fear God and obey me" was the fundamental demand Jesus made as the Messenger of God (Q3:50; 43:63). As usual, it was not made clear what specifically constituted "fearing God." As the only liaison between men and God and the recipient of revelation, Jesus was to tell others of God's likes and dislikes; he was a divine arbiter.

And when Jesus came with the clear signs he said, 'I have come to you with wisdom, and that I may make clear to you some of that whereon you are at variance; so fear your God and obey you me. Assuredly God is my Lord and your Lord; therefore serve Him; this is a straight path' (Q43:63-4).

The "clear sign" was the Gospel; "wisdom" referred to his Prophethood; "making clear" controversies referred to his authority to explain and/or change decrees of the Torah. The "straight path" summarizes what is mentioned in the passage: fear of God, obedience to Jesus and belief in only one God. Nothing else was acceptable to the Almighty --

HADHA'L-LADHI AMARTUKUM BIHI MIN IIQA ALLAH WA TAATI WA IFRAD ALLAH BIL-ULUHA, HU AT-TARIQ AL-MUSTAQIM WA HUA DIN ALLAH ALLADHI LA YUQBAL MIN AHAD MIN IBADIH GHAYRAH (T,25:92-3). Tradition, in explaining the Quranic version of Jesus's concerns, does not go beyond dogma and rituals. When Jesus was asking for "helpers in the cause of God," he was seeking, Tradition tells us, those who would acknowledge him as the Messenger of God (Q3:52; cf. TS,6:443).

In this role, Jesus wanted the people to follow the teachings of the Torah and the new Book of revelations, Injil (the Gospel), given to him. God authorized him to adjust and change the Shariah (laws) of previous Prophets (Q3:50). These teachings, however, repeatedly mention the need for belief in monotheism and in the authenticity of Christ's

Prophethood. When occasionally specified, they refer to rituals (e.g., the performance of prayers) and to dietary regulations (see Q3:43, 50; 19:31; 23:51). A reader wanting to know Islamic Jesus's teachings on mundane worldly affairs will be disappointed. Islamic Jesus, not unlike other Islamic Prophets, was least interested in this world.

When mentioned at all, it seems the social concerns of the believers were puritanical. In the story of "the People of the Cave" we are told that a disciple of Jesus traveled to their city. He found an idol fixed on the main gate. The disciple did not enter because to do so he would have to bow his head tantamount to prostrating himself before the idol. The disciple decided to work in a bathhouse on the outskirts of the city. While he worked, he also preached during the day and prayed at night. He used to tell the people of "the news of heaven and earth and about the Last Day." (The young men who became known as "the People of the Cave" were converted to Islam during their contacts in the bathhouse with the disciple of Jesus). One day the King's son went to the bathhouse. A lady accompanied him. Because it was un-Islamic for a man and a woman (apparently unrelated) to be seen together in a public place, the disciple upbraided the prince. The prince apparently ignored this and appeared for a second time with the woman. The vigilante Muslim disciple of Islamic Jesus was outraged. He addressed the heathen prince in abusive language and rebuked him -- **SABBAHU WA'NTAHARAHU**. Tabari tells Muslims with relish of the Islamic vigor of the disciple. The prince again disregarded the castigation and appeared for a third time with his lady. This was too much for the disciple - and for God, who was obviously concerned about such important social problems. They who had violated an important Islamic norm had to be eliminated; for the satisfaction of believers, both died miraculously in the bath the same day (TT-U,1:455-6).

Patterns of Behavior: The Treatment of Nonbelievers.

The patterns of behavior of Jesus and followers toward nonbelievers were based on their divinely sanctioned superiority and authority and, thus, were not only justified but also exemplary for believers of all times. Muslim images of Jesus and his followers are Muslim mirrors, hence the need for an understanding of Muslim perceptions of Islamic-Christian self-images. Jesus, an authentic Messenger of God, his mother and followers were the Almighty's chosen people and, thus, superior to the rest of mankind. They enjoyed God's special favors and help against the nonbelievers. The angels knew this:

And when the angels said, 'Mary, God has chosen thee, and purified thee; He has chosen thee above all women'... When the angels said, 'Mary, God gives thee good tidings of a Word from Him whose name is Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary; high honored shall he be in this world and the next, near-stationed to God. He shall speak to men in the cradle, and of age...' (Q3:42-6; also see Q5:110).

God gave Jesus "clear signs" of Prophethood and "confirmed him with the Holy Spirit," i.e., the archangel Gabriel (sic). God protected him against his enemies, the Israelites (Q2:87; cf. 2:320 passim; Q5:110-15). God told Jesus,

I will set thy followers above the unbelievers till the Resurrection day... As for the unbelievers I will chastise them with terrible chastisement in this world and the next; they shall have no helpers (3:55-6; emphases added).

The true Christians, such as "those of the Cave," were Divinely guided and their "hearts" were "strengthened" by God (18:13-4). In his explanation of Q3:55, in which God promised the superiority of Jesus's followers over nonbelievers, Tabari reminds us that the Divine decree applies to those who followed Islam, the creed of Jesus -- **HUM AHL AL-ISLAM ALLADHIN IABAUHU ALA FITRATIHI WA MILLATIHI WA SUNNATIHI** (TS, 6:462). God promised Jesus to help, unto the Last Day, his followers, who practiced Islam, against nonbelievers -- **(ALLAH) NASIR MAN IABAAK ALA'L- ISLAM, ALA'L-LADHIN KAFARU ILA YAWM AL-QIYAMAH**

(ibid:463). This theme of Christian superiority over others, and of God's preference for the believers against nonbelievers, is repeated in the Quran and Tradition. God "confirmed those who believed (in Islamic Jesus) against their enemy and they became masters" (Q61:14). The Prophet Muhammad said, "All the newborn except Mary and her son were touched by the Satan" (TS,6:338 passim). Muhammad also called Mary, Asiya (the Pharaoh's Muslim wife), Khadijah (Muhammad's first wife) and Fitama (Muhammad's daughter, married to Ali) the most outstanding - the best of - women, superior to all others of the world -- **KHAYR NISA AL-ALAMIN** (ibid:397 passim). When Jesus was born the pious people knew he was the lord of people of his time -- **SAYYID AHL ZAMANIH** (TT-U,1:427). Jurjis told his audience that God had given Jesus superiority over all men of the world (ibid:467).

In the descriptions about Christian superiority Muslims also get a strong dose to reinforce their anti- Jewish perceptions. The nonbelievers contrasted to believers in Q3:55 and TS,6:462, Tabari tells us, were particularly, and remain, the Jews. Forgetting the difference between 'Islamic Christians' and 'pseudo- Christians,' Tabari remarks approvingly: "(So,) Christians are superior to Jews until the Resurrection Day. There is no country east or west with a single Christian not superior to the Jews. They (the Jews) are thought low, despicable and disesteemed in every country" (TS,6:462 cf. Q3:55).

Aware of their divinely sanctioned superiority the believers behaved toward nonbelievers accordingly. Muslims find again that the Divinely-guided of the era demanded total submission to their creed; they refused to reconcile and peacefully coexist with the followers of other creeds; they initiated the confrontation for no reason other than their strong sense of self- righteousness; they demonstrated an attitude of hijra in its various dimensions; they appreciated - and indulged in - the use of force and MAKR to help their cause, to bring the nonbelievers to their knees and help the believers, or simply to show ruthless indifference toward nonbelievers; they saw, gleefully, the nonbelievers

humiliated, tormented, and, finally, annihilated. Again, in one form or other, all the elements of a model of irreconciliation, cold war, hijra, jihad and subjugation or annihilation are reflected in the believers' conduct of relations with nonbelievers of the era of Jesus Christ.

That Jesus and followers were Divinely guided, chosen and made superior to others, implied irreconciliation with other creeds, and rejection of pluralism (or peaceful coexistence with nonbelievers). Christians knew theirs was God's chosen creed, Islam; only Islam was acceptable to God (TS,6:504 cf. Q3:71). After his second coming, all religions will become one. Jesus will conquer and dispel all other religions which will take up Jesus's creed, Islam -- **FA TASIR AL-MILAL KULLUHA WAHIDAT, WA HIYA MILLAT AL-ISLAM** (TS,9:379). It is clear in the Islamic story of the era that Jesus and his followers always insisted others change their creed, and acknowledge the Christ's worldview exclusively. Jesus's command "obey me" came at the cost of all other creeds. In the Islamic version of Pentecost it was Jesus who commanded the Disciple to export his call to other societies - "to call (the people) to (his version of) God and to tell the people what God had commanded him to do" -- **FA BATH-TAHUM FI'L-ARD DUAT- AN ILA'L-LAH... WA AMARAHUM AN YUBALLIGHUN-NAS ANHU MA AMARAHU'L-LAH BIHI** (TT-1,1:602-3). For a Muslim, it is a lesson to engage in an ideological onslaught against other ideologies. "The three apostles of Antioch," Jurjis and other Islamic Christian heroes **INITIATED** the confrontation with the nonbelievers. Nonbelievers did not go after them, at first. Believers refused to coexist peacefully and mingle with nonbelievers.

Jesus's ascent to Heaven was his hijra from the society which had rejected him. He and his few followers were not supposed to coexist passively with the unclean heathens; as destined by God, they had to be superior. Until then Jesus had to withdraw to Heaven, the archtype of Dar al-Islam. Of course, Jesus will come back to materialize the superiority of his creed. The hijra anticipated a comeback to fight nonbelievers. It was not a passive retreat.

After only a few responded to his call and "Jesus perceived the unbelief" of the rest, the Quran tells us

God devised, and God is the best of devisers. When God said, 'Jesus, I will take thee to Me and will raise thee to Me, and I will purify thee of those who believe not. I will set thy followers above the nonbelievers...' (Q3:52-5). God raised him up to Him; God is All-mighty, All-wise. There is not one of the People of the Book but will assuredly believe in him before his death, and on Resurrection Day he will be a witness against them (Q4:156-9).

Commenting on Q3:52-5, Tabari says, "When Jesus saw the small number of his followers and the multitude of those who rejected him, he complained to God' (TS,6:456). Jesus was uneasy living in a society that did not believe in his supremacy. "God revealed to him, (saying) 'I will take and raise you to Me'." This is immediately followed by God's assurance He would keep him alive and send him back to slay the One-Eyed Swindler, **AD-DAJJAL AL-AWAR** (the Antichrist?), the leader of non-Muslim forces (ibid), according to Islamic eschatology. The Quran (3:55) also calls Jesus's ascent an act of "purifying" or "cleansing" him from the nonbelievers. Thus, "God purged him of the Jews, Christians (sic), Magians and other disbelievers of his people" (TS,6:462). Thus it was "unclean" for Islamic Jesus to live among the nonbelievers. At his second coming, Jesus, as a Muslim leader, will be able to convert the whole world to Islam. Only then he will live for forty years in a world-wide Islamic empire, [will marry an Arab woman, according to Kisai:334], and will die a natural death (See TS,9:379-89 cf. Q4:159). Q4:156-9 quoted above refers to his triumphant second coming. "The People of the Book," i.e. the Jews in particular, will be forced to believe in Islam under Jesus's leadership before his actual death. This forced belief in Christ's Islam, however, will not benefit them in the Day Hereafter. Jesus will "witness against them," i.e., will send them to Hell forever. There will be no forgiveness.

The segregationist attitude of Islamic Christians recorded by our sources as an ideal behavior can be seen elsewhere. At the beginning of Jesus's story, Tabari refers to the presence of children of past

Prophets in Babylon- Iran. They were believers. Though treated well, they refused to eat meat slaughtered by their nonbelieving hosts. The "Magians" complained to the King about this exclusivity. When the King asked why, the believers told him frankly, "Yes, indeed, we have our (own) Lord whom we worship and we do not eat from what you slaughter" (TT-U,1:421). We know that the Prophet Muhammad considered only one of the four early Christian groups (which he thought had emerged after the Christ's Ascension) as truly Christian "following the creed of God and Jesus" (T,27:239 cf. 238-40; Q57:27). According to Muhammad, these Muslim Christians fought but failed to subdue the heretics. These unsuccessful Muslim Christians, however, did not choose to coexist peacefully with nonbelievers. Instead, the Prophet told Muslims, "thy took to wilderness and mountains and became monks with good intentions in the beginning" (ibid). The Prophet appreciated this kind of monasticism because it was hijra aimed at 'cutting off communion' with nonbelievers after the believers failed to subdue the heathen. These early Islamic Christians are perceived to have refused peaceful coexistence with nonbelievers; hence the Prophet's approval of their monasticism.

The "People of the Cave" who had converted to the creed of Jesus met resistance to their new faith in their town. They were divinely inspired to retreat and take refuge in a cave in the wilderness. They were told by God, however, "Your Lord will unfold to you of His mercy, and will furnish you with a gentle issue of your affair" (Q18:16 passim). Tabari remarks with great appreciation: "They isolated (themselves and) their creed and shunned their people -- **FA TAFARRADU BI-DINIHM WA'TAZALU QAWMAHUM** (TT-U,1:457). Our Islamic Seven Sleepers re-established contact only after the nonbelieving King was dead and a Muslim King, along with Muslims, had overwhelmed the town -- **MAT DHALIK AL-MALIK WA GHALAB ALAYHIM MALIK-UN MUSLIM MAA'L-MUSLIMIN** (T,15:205 passim). Salman the Persian was a true Christian before he met Muhammad and converted to Islam. Salman tells stories of his Christian career

and that of other Iranian converts to (Islamic) Christianity. He was pleased to mention that, when in his homeland, he and other fellow-Christians refused to eat the meat of animals slaughtered by nonbelievers, shunned their nonbelieving parents and migrated to Jerusalem to be able to live among believers (TS,2:150-4).

Stories of the era and related references in the Quran and Tradition encourage and justify use of force and adoption of toughness toward nonbelievers. First, we consider the Quran and Islamic material in this regard about Jesus Christ. The Quran informs us that certain characteristics of Muhammadan Muslims were recorded in the Torah and the Gospel. Obviously, it was to inspire 'Jewish and Christian Muslims' to adopt these Divinely-appreciated ideal traits, a Muslim would think. Believers in the Torah and Gospel were told that Muhammad indeed will be the Messenger of God, and those with him, i.e. Muhammadan Muslims, will be "hard against the unbelievers, merciful one to another" -- **ASHIDDA-UN ALA'L-KUFFAR, RUHAMA-U BAYNAHUM** (Q48:29). The Almighty wants, Jewish and Christian Muslims were told, "to enrage the unbelievers through (Muhammadan Muslims)" (ibid). As in the Quran, God had also enjoined in the Torah and the Gospel for believers of all times "to fight to the death in the way of God, to kill and be killed (for Islam)"; Paradise will be their reward (Q9:111 cf. T,11:35). So, true believers in Islamic Jesus knew well that God wanted them to be "hard" and "enraging" in their conduct of relations with nonbelievers - reserving soft treatment only for the believers - and to fight to kill the heathen. As Muhammad has already told us, true believers in Jesus Christ confronted and fought the heretics to the death (T,27:239 cf. Q57:27).

The Quran, in the context of Jesus's story, unapologetically talks of "painful chastisement" for those who "disdain" and "wax proud," i.e., refuse to become believers (Q4:173). The disbelievers in Jesus were to be severely punished "in this world" by God (Q3:56). This means they were "to be slain, taken prisoners and enslaved, humiliated, and made miserable (obviously, by the believers)" -- **AMMA FI'D-DUNYA FA**

BI'L-QATL, WA'S-SIBA WA'DH-DHILLAT WA'L-MASKANAH (TS,6:465 cf. Q3:56).

The Jesus of the future is also portrayed as a ruthless fighter against nonbelievers. He will be a great **MUJAHID**, a holy warrior. The Quran 4:159, "There is not one of the People of the Book but will assuredly believe in him before his death, and on Resurrection Day he will be a witness against them" provides a base for the following. After his second coming Jesus will command the Islamic Armageddon. It will be the last great jihad, culminating in the elimination of all other creeds by force and the establishment of a world-wide Islamic regime (TS,9:379 passim; cf. Q4:159). Jesus will use force, weapons (sic), to convert non-Muslims, particularly the Jews, to Islam. "Even if under the pressure of weapon, every Jew before death will witness: 'Indeed Jesus is God's servant and His Messenger'" -- **LA YAMUT AL-YAHUDI HAA YASHHAD ANN ISA ABD ALLAH WA RASULUHU, WA LAU UJJIL ALAYH BI'S-SILAH** (TS,9:383). "No Jew will remain on earth who will not believe in him, though this belief will not succor them" (ibid:381). They will be the Muslim version of Marranos. All the reports in Tabari around Q4:159 indicate that Muslims under Jesus will hound nonbelievers, especially the Jews, everywhere. The Jews will run for their lives. They will be beaten, put to the sword, thrown from the rooftops and drowned. In brief, a pogrom, and all will be forced to comply with Islam (TS,9:379-90). [Throughout his discussions in the above sections, Tabari repeatedly clarifies that Jesus will fight for Islam acknowledging Muhammad's superior Prophethood, and that belief in Jesus as the Messenger of God implies belief in Muhammad's Prophethood - otherwise faith in Jesus is meaningless (see especially TS,9:379,386-8).]

Had the Roman Christians converted to Islam before the compilation and canonization of the formative exegeses of the Quran, and other Traditions in the Middle Ages, our sources would definitely have included, as exemplary, the Roman-Byzantine treatment of Jews, pagans and heretics. (Also, we would have inherited more volumes of Tabari's

Tafsir and Tarikh.) Had Heraclius or even a later emperor converted to Islam along with the empire, or had the Romans been completely overwhelmed by the Umayyads - as Iran was - or had, in the Middle Ages, Christians been an obscure and (like the Jews) small and powerless group, or had the relation between the early Church and the Roman empire not been so obvious and historically recent, it would have been much easier for Tabari to project the Islamic-Christian identity of Constantine and other strong Christian Byzantines in their dealings with non-Christians and heretics, than portray Bahram I and Khosrow I as semi-believers. The reason for our sources' exclusion of Roman-Byzantine persecution of others is not Islam's sympathy with the victims, but because our sources did not want to recognize the victimizers, i.e., these Christians, as believers. Consequently, Islamic sacred history leaves us with a few more examples of true Christians' militancy, their indulgence in jihad and related activities, against nonbelievers.

Shamsun, our Islamic Samson, used to attack heathen idolators and fight them single-handedly for the sake of God. He would fulfill his needs by pillaging them. He would kill or enslave nonbelievers and reap fortunes through these holy excursions -- **KAN YAGHZUHUM WAHDAHU WA YUJAHIDUHUM FI'LLAH FA YUSIB MINHUM WA FIHIM HAJATAHU FA YAQTUL WA YASBI WA YUSIB AL-MAL** (TT-U,1:464-5). In his lone excursions against nonbelievers Islamic Samson was one of the forerunners of Abu Dhurs, a Companion of Muhammad, who with the tacit approval of the Prophet also so sallied. (See Part III, Section 9, Segment 1 of this study.)

Tabari starts Jurjis's story with appreciation for the believer's militant intentions against the idolator King. After observing the King's idolatrous activities, Jurjis decided to wage jihad against him; "God fired him with hatred for the nonbelieving King and (spine) to fight him" -- **HADATH NAFSAHU BI JIHADIHI WA ALQ ALLAH FI NAFSIHI BUGHDAHU WA MUHARIBATAHU** (TT-U,1:467). Believers' inherent BUGHD, "hatred," for nonbelievers is Divinely inculcated. One way to apply

force was to promise relief to nonbelievers from divine "chastisement" if they surrendered to the believers faith. Our Islamic Christian missionary of the era in Arabia, Abd Allah ath-Thamir, (following also the Muslim trait, described in the Islamic Gospel, of being kind only to the believers -- **RUHAMA-U BAYNAHUM**), used this method of conversion under duress. Ath-Thamir approached the sick and told them they would be relieved of the **BALA**, affliction, if they accepted his religion. Only those who did so were cured (TT-U,1:544). Obviously, Abd Allah ath-Thamir let the heathen suffer. Relief was only for the believers. In addition to these confirmations, holy war is a sensible part of Islamic Christian conduct toward nonbelievers, we are told approvingly.

Approval for the use of force against nonbelievers may be observed in the Babylonian army's massacre of nonbelieving Israelites. The Babylonians appear again as God's instruments to avenge John (the Baptist) and other Prophets (TT-U,1:423 passim).

For all practical purposes Tabari treats the Iranian emperors Bahram I and Khosrow (Chosroes) Anusharwan I as semi-believers and lauds their actions against adversaries as ideal treatment of nonbelievers and heretics. To a Muslim reader the deeds of Bahram I and Khosrow I are described as exemplary as those of other Islamic heroes of the past. With appreciation, Tabari tells the reader that "after (Bahram I) realized that (Mani) was an agent of Satan, he ordered to kill him (Mani), strip off his skin, stuff it with straw and suspend it on one of the doors of the city of Jundishapur" (TT-U,1:488). About Anusharwan we are told, approvingly, that he outlawed the creeds of Zoroaster and Mazdak and "massacred a great number" of their followers (ibid:525). "He ordered the necks cut of Mazdaki leaders and (confiscated and) distributed their possessions (ibid:527). The Khosrow's "massacres in large scale" of many other groups are also mentioned with approval (ibid:526).

The Divinely-appreciated "enraging" characteristic of the

believers was reflected in their officious style and in their use of unrestrained language.

Tabari unapologetically reports that the Disciple who converted the Islamic "Seven Sleepers" also addressed the heathen prince at the public bathhouse. He rebuked the prince, called him names and scolded him -- **AYYARAHU, ... WA SABBAHU WA'NTAHARAHU** (TT-U,1:456). The Disciple also insulted the heathen lady companion of the prince; he called her **HADHIHIL-KADHA**, "this-so-and-so" (*ibid*). Jurjis did not hesitate to call the heathen King (whom he was trying to convert to the best of creeds, Islam), **AL-MALUN AN-NAHS** "damned sinister"; he called the King as well as his gods names -- **YASUBBUHU WA YASUBB ALIHATAHU**, Tabari tells us approvingly (TT-U,1:467). The tradition is inspired by God, Jesus and the apostles. The Almighty "assails" the Jews as well as Trinitarian Christians (Q9:30). David as well as Jesus "cursed" the nonbelievers (Q5:78). The three apostles sent to Antioch called the heathen "a forward folk" (Q36:19).

The story of the era is not deprived of its share of Divine Deception practiced by God and the believers for the cause. "... and God schemed and God is the best of schemers" (Q3:54). This is to tell believers that God used guile to raise Jesus to Heaven. Divine Deception -- **MAKR ALLAH** was this, Tabari explains: God made another individual look like Jesus, let him be mistaken for Jesus and killed while the Almighty raised His Messenger to Heaven" -- **WA AMMA MAKR ALLAH BIHIM FA INNAHU ILQAUHU SHIBH ISA ALA BAD... HAA QATALAHU'L-MAKIRUN BI-ISA, WA HUM YAHSABUNAHU ISA WA QAD RAFA'LLAH ISA** (TS,6:453-4). True believers do not ask why an apparently innocent person had to be sacrificed by the Almighty to save His Messenger. One must not be concerned for the right to justice and life of an individual. Moreover, when it comes to the practice of **MAKR**, guile, scheming, deception, it must be known that the Almighty is the best -- **WA'LLAH KHAYR AL-MAKIRIN** (Q3:54). Should not so be the believers?

The **MAKR**, the guile, practiced by God to save His Messenger was

imitated by a Muslim Christian of the era to save his throne. The Negus's Islamic belief in Jesus caused an uproar among his Christian subjects. He could be dethroned. The Negus pacified his angry Trinitarian subjects by doubletalk, recorded with great appreciation by our sources. The Negus

took paper and wrote, 'He testifies that there is no God but Allah and that Muhammad is His slave and apostle; and he testifies that Jesus, Son of Mary, is His slave, His apostle, His spirit and His word, which He cast into Mary.' Then he put it in his gown near the right shoulder and went out to the Abyssinians, who were drawn up in array to meet him. He said, 'O people, have I not the best claim among you?' 'Certainly,' they said. 'And what do you think of my life among you?' 'Excellent.' 'Then what is your trouble?' 'You have forsaken our religion and assert that Jesus is a slave' (i.e., a normal human creature of God). 'Then what do you say about Jesus?' 'We say that he is the Son of God.' The Negus put his hand upon his breast over his gown, (signifying), 'He testifies that Jesus, the Son of Mary was no more than "this."' By "this" he meant what he had written, but they were content and went away (1.1:154-5; parentheses added). This reached the Prophet (Muhammad), and when the Negus died he prayed over him and begged that his sins might be forgiven (1.1:154-5).

When Muhammad was informed of this, he approved of the weaselling of this true Muslim-Christian believer, the Negus (ibid). Muslims may conceal their identity and indulge in double-talk when they think it necessary. Long before this, the Islamic-Christian hero Jurjis had asked those converts to his creed, including the King's wife, to conceal their belief. The queen, a secret believer, acted on crucial occasions to demoralize her heathen husband (TT-U,1:465,473,475 passim).

When all failed, nothing worked, and the believers were not in a position to wage jihad as before, God took direct action against those who disdained Jesus's creed. About the city that had rejected the call of 'the three apostles of Jesus,' God tells Muslims jubilantly:

It was only one Cry and lo, they were silent and still. Ah, woe to them! Never comes unto them a Messenger, but they mock at him. What, have they not seen how many generations We have destroyed before them...? (Q36:29-30).

For their rejection of the Prophetic call, "God annihilated the King and the people of Antioch; they perished from the surface of the earth; none survived" (T,23:2).

Divine punishment for the people confronted by Jurjis was worse. At the end of his protracted jihad against the nonbelievers, our Islamic St. George was full of revenge; he wanted to have the "delight" of observing the heathen suffer before his death. He called to Allah and prayed:

O God, do not make me die and go away from my place until your assault and affliction fall on these too proud people - retribution from which they have no shield - so that (observing their suffering) the thirst of my heart for revenge is satiated and my eyes are delighted (TT-U,1:475).

As soon as Jurjis finished his prayer, God rained fire which consumed the whole city and its heathen inhabitants. Perhaps this was not enough to delight our Muslim-Christian apostle. God took the burnt city up, roasted it well and hurled it to earth upside-down. For long afterwards, Tabari adds with glee, such a fetid smoke came out of the ruined city that anyone who smelt it became gravely ill from a variety of diseases (sic) (ibid).

ENDNOTES

Part III: Belief in the Books and Messengers**Section 7: THE ERA OF JESUS CHRIST AND FOLLOWERS**

¹Our descriptions of the era of Islamic Jesus and his followers are primarily based on The Quran 2:87, 136-40, 253; 3:35-71, 82-84; 4:156-59, 171-4; 5:17-8, 51, 71-84, 109-20; 6:82-90; 9:30-2, 111; 10:98; 18:9-27; 19:2-39, 88- 92; 21:91-92; 23:50-62; 28:52-5; 29:46-7; 30:2-7; 36:13- 32; 42:12-19; 43:57-65; 48:29; 57:27; 61:6, 14; 66:12; 85:4-8; 105:1-5; Tabari's relevant exegeses in his Tafsir as specified throughout this section; TT-U,1:417-635 or TT-U,1:585-632; TT-1,2:1-233; K:321-36.

PART III: Belief in the Books and Messengers

Section 8: THE PEOPLE OF THE BOOK

Islam's Images and Treatment of the People of the Book
(Jews and Christians): A Summing Up.

Islam believes in the authenticity of pre-Muhammad Prophets most of them being Biblical figures - and in their Divinely inspired and revealed teachings collected in holy "Books." The followers of these Prophets and Books, **AHL AL-KITAB** "the People of the Book", as long as they acted according to Islamic principles of Prophethood, were genuine believers and Divinely guided people of their times. The main principle was this: from Adam to Jesus Christ (and, finally, to Muhammad), each succeeding Messenger of God had to be recognized by the followers of previous Messengers, otherwise their status as believers would be invalidated. Muhammad was the perfect and last Messenger of God. According to the procedure, he had to be acknowledged by the earlier People of the Book. Those who refuse are no longer believers. Jews and Christians not converted to Islam are nonbelievers, definitely. Yet, Islam calls them **AHL-AL-KITAB** "the People of the Book."

This is not a recognition of their basic religious scriptures, i.e. the Bible and the Talmud, as Divinely revealed and inspired. Jews and Christians did receive in the past at-Tawrat, az-Zabur, al-Injil, and other "Books", collections of Revelations to the Prophets, Muslims believe. However, by the time Muhammad appeared, Jews and Christians had distorted and corrupted "the Books." Only the Quran and Muhammad are entitled to tell others the true contents of these "Books". God, as He spoke in the Quran, and Muhammad, as His last Messenger, may also change not only some of the decrees involved in the true contents of the previous Books, but also (through **NASKH**, "abrogation," discussed below) may even change or invalidate some earlier Quranic revelations and Muhammadan Sunnah. "The People of the Book" are called so, apparently, because they claim to follow some or all previous "Books" that Islam admits once contained authentic Divine revelations and inspirations.

In theory, Islam divides nonbelievers, i.e. non-Muslims, into two groups: 1) the People of the Book, i.e. Jews and Christians, and 2) the People of Jahiliyyah, ("ignorance"), i.e., the rest of non-Muslims, generally called **AL-MUSHRIK**, "the one who ascribes a partner (to God)", i.e., a polytheist, idolater, pagan. According to classical Islamic

perceptions, which persist, today any non-Muslim who does not claim to be a Jew or a Christian is a Mushrik, a pagan. In practice, as in the Quran and Tradition, the People of the Book are charged with **SHIRK** and disbelief in God and in the Afterlife. The brief surah 98, **ALBAYYINAH**, "The Clear Sign", in the Quran sums up Islam's images of Jews and Christians: "they are the worst of creatures" -- **SHARR AL-BARIYYAH**, who along with "the idolaters shall be in the Fire of Gehenna, therein dwelling forever" (Q98:6). Similarly, the Quran 9:29 sums up Islamic treatment of the People of the Book: Muslims must fight them to the death -- **QATILU** "until they pay the tribute out of hand and have been humbled." These two Quranic passages set Jews and Christians as **AL-MUSHRIKUN**, idolaters and pagans. Jews and Christians have violated God's commandment that enjoins "one to serve only God" (Q98:5); they have refused to acknowledge Muhammad as God's Messenger (Q98:2); they are atheists: "(they) believe not in God and the Last Day and do not forbid what God and His Messenger (Muhammad) have forbidden" (Q9:29). Except in one matter, the differences between how Islam treats the People of the Book and the "pagans" are insignificant. The main difference, theoretically, is the third choice the People of the Book have, compared to the only two choices available to those who do not claim to be Jews or Christians. The "pagans" must be converted to Islam or be killed (Q9:5 passim). Their massacre may be postponed; they may be enslaved as long as Muslims are pleased to do so. The People of the Book, however, may choose: payment of **JIZYAH**, tribute, "out of hand" while being "humbled" by Muslims (Q9:29) in all ways. This means acceptance by Jews and Christians of Muslim military and political domination, of inferior status, and of drastic limitations on their social, economic, political and religious freedoms and activities.

The Quran contains some material which if read out of context by a non-specialist, or used disingenuously, may wrongly give an understanding of softer Islamic images and treatment of the People of the Book (and of other non-Muslims) that has been suggested. Before we study the extent, various aspects and overall dimensions of Islamic

material related to the People of the Book, a discussion of these 'soft passages' is pertinent.

Apparently (and obviously) contradictory material in the Quran and Tradition stems from the way Islam, i.e., the Quran and Sunnah, evolved during His lifetime. Muhammad's attitude toward the People of the Book evolved during his Prophetic career, and traces of this evolution of Muhammad's images and treatment of non-Muslims are preserved in the Quran and Tradition. This happened because his compilers and canonizers could not anticipate the fall of Islam from a position of power, nor foresee the emergence of modern historical analytical method.

There exist two basic contradictions in our sources about the People of the Book. The first relates to the Islamic 'principle of acknowledgment' of God's Messengers, and Islam's lumping the Jews and Christians together, theoretically, in one group. According to this principle the Jews should have believed in Jesus to be considered pre-Muhammad believers. According to belief in this principle, our sources condemn the Jews for not believing in Islamic Jesus. Also, in the mid-Medinan Quran Christians are preferred to Jews (see 5:82-83). In contrast, the Meccan (as well as later Medinan) Quranic passages project a common image of the Jews and Christians and treat them accordingly. Though using a different terminology -- **AHL-ADH-DHIKR** "the People of Remembrance" (Q21:7), the Meccan Quran (as Tradition explains) puts the Jews -- **AHL AT-TAURAT**, and the Christians -- **AHL AL-INJIL**, in one category (T,17:5). The discrepancy between the two positions was never clarified. There is undoubtedly much greater criticism and condemnation of Jews in the Quran and Tradition than of Christians, but in theory both Jews and Christians are treated equally as the People of the Book. This is not to say that the greater, harsher criticism of Jews in the Quran and Tradition, compared to what concerns Christians, has no effect on Muslim minds.

As an historian sees it, the broader, harsher material against Jews in the Quran and Tradition was generated by historical events. Had Abyssinia been ruled by a Jew, had the Prophet confronted Christians in

Medina and Khaybar instead of the Jews, had the Jews of Medina and Khaybar been as docile and isolated as the Christians of Najran, or had the Prophet survived the wars between Muslims and the Byzantines, the proportions of material in the Quran and Tradition about Jews and Christians would have been different. Similarly, had Muhammad's confrontation with Christians started before it did with the Jews, and had it been more violent than that with the Jews, **AL-YAHUD**, the Jews and **NASARA**, Christians, would probably have changed places in the Quran 5:82-3 (to be discussed).

The second basic contradiction in the Quran relates to its enjoined treatment of the People of the Book. Portions of the Quran related to the Prophet's life in Mecca, with some earlier Medinan passages, are, by and large, positive and to some extent ambiguous about Jews and Christians. Those portions revealed in Medina grow increasingly tough. The Prophet did not face opposition from Jews and Christians when he was in Mecca. His main adversaries were pagan Arabs. In Medina, Muhammad was disappointed by the many Jews. They refused to acknowledge him as an authentic last Messenger of God. A violent confrontation ensued. Similarly, during the expansion of the Prophet's ambitions and influence (in the Medinan period, 622-632 CE), he finally confronted the Christians of Najran in Arabia, and then began his initial incursions against the Byzantium. Thus, Muhammad, and along with him the Almighty, changed their minds about the People of the Book - first about the Jews and then about the Christians. This is reflected in the change of tone in the Quran and Tradition. And one result is the presence of contradictory material in our sources about the People of the Book.

In Mecca the Quran referred Muhammad's pagan Arab adversaries to "the People of Remembrance," Jews and Christians, as witnesses, hoping they would verify his claims to Prophethood (21:94). These hopes lingered on in the later passage 10:04. The Medinan Quran finally called Jews and Christians enemies of Muhammad and Islam and commanded Muslims to fight and subjugate them (e.g., 2:109; 9:29-35; 98:1-6). In

Mecca (or, before a certain time, at Medina), the Prophet and his Companions (identifying variously with Judaism and Christianity) adopted Jerusalem as their **QIBLA**, the direction to face during formal prayers. In Medina God commanded them to make the Kaba at Mecca their **QIBLA**, in direct opposition to the People of the Book (2:144 passim). The Meccan Quran emphasized that Muslims and the followers of past Prophets belonged to a single community, **UMMAH WAHIDAH** (Q21:92). Projecting the unique, exclusive and superior nature of the Muslims, the Medinan Quran calls them **KHAYR UMMAH** (3:110), "the best of all communities," and **UMMAH WASAT** (2:143), "the midmost community" to distinguish them from followers of other creeds. Jews and Christians who had refused to acknowledge Muhammad's Prophethood are called "ungodly" or "libertine, **AL-FASIQUUN**" (3:110). In Mecca, the Quran, Muhammad, and the Muslims vehemently defended the cause of Christian Byzantium, identifying themselves passionately with the People of the Book against **MUSHRIK**, "pagan, polytheist," Iran (Q30:2-7; T, 21:14-24). In Medina God commanded the Muslims to fight the People of the Book to the death -- **QATILU**, and keep them "humbled" under Islam's subjugation (Q9:29). Tradition tells us that Q9:29 particularly referred to the **RUM**, the Christian Roman empire. "This verse (Q9:29) was revealed to the Messenger of God conveying His commandment to fight the Rum. So (following God's commandment), the Messenger of God fought the battle of Tabuk [a Byzantine territory] after the verse was revealed" -- **INN HADHIHI'L-AYAT NAZALAT ALA RASUL ALLAH FI AMRIHI BI-HARB AR-RUM, FA GHAZA RASUL ALLAH BAD NUZULIHA GHAZWAT TABUK** (T,10:109).

Within Medina, Islam's negative treatment of the People of the Book unfolded gradually. It began with verbal attacks short of physical violence and war. After a castigation of the People of the Book Muslims were told to "pardon and forgive (them) till God brings His command" (Q2:109). Accompanying Tradition tells us that God's new command was soon conveyed in passages (e.g., Q9:29) which **NASAKH**, "invalidated" the section on "pardon" and "forgiving" in Q2:109. Now Muslims were told in the **NASIKH**, "invalidating" or "abrogating" passages, e.g., Q9:29, they

must fight the People of the Book to the death until they are converted to Islam or pay jizya as a token of acceptance of their inferiority and utter humility.

So, God abrogated "pardon" and "forgiving" (mentioned in verse 2:109) by making the believers duty-bound to fight them (i.e., the People of the Book) to the death until their 'word' and the believers' 'word' become one [i.e., both have the same religion, Islam] or they pay jizya out of hand and are humiliated -- **FA NASAKH ALLAH AL-AFW ANHUM WAS-SAFH BI FARD QITALIHIM AL-MUMININ HATTA TASIR KALIMATUHUM WA KALIMAT AL-MUMININ WAHIDAT AU YUADDU AL-JIZYAT AN YAD-IN SAGHIR-AN** (TS,2:503, cf. 501-3 cf. Q9:29; parentheses and brackets added).

This is an example of how the Muslims explain so-called soft passages in the Quran. Obviously, Muslim believers do not accept an historical explanation of the contradictions between the "soft" and "harsh" passages. Such an explanation would be blasphemous. The apparently soft passages are studied, by believers, in their immediate and general contexts in the Quran, along with specific explanations in Tradition, and on the basis of the principle of **NASKH**, "abrogation or "invalidation." **NASKH** means that the **HUKM**, decree or sense, of certain passages of the Quran was changed by later passages while the **KHA**, text, of the abrogated verses was retained. Thus, one may find passages in the Quran that do not mean what they say. The **KHA** is preserved; its **HUKM** is abrogated. In other cases, according to the principle of **NASKH**, invalidated passages miraculously disappeared. God caused the Prophet and the believers to forget earlier Quranic revelations. The same principle of invalidation applies to the Sunnah. What the Prophet said, did or approved of later overrode the earlier Sunnah, if contradictory. The Quran rationalizes the concept of **NASKH** by the Almighty's omnipotence: "Knowest thou not that God is powerful over everything?" (Q2:106). A true believer is not supposed to ask why the Almighty changed His mind; it is His unquestionable prerogative. The Almighty being his source of inspiration, Muhammad has the same authority.¹

The 'Soft' Verses About the People of the Book.

In seven Quranic passages, 2:62, 3:113-4, 5:13, 5:82-3, 22:17, 29:46 and 57:27, we see supposedly "soft verses" related to the People

of the Book, Jews and Christians.

Passage I:

Surely they that believe, and those Jewry and Christians, and those Sabeans, whoso believe in God and the Last Day, and work righteousness - their wages await them with their Lord, and no fear shall be on them, neither shall they sorrow (Q2:62; repeated in Q5:69).

Taken out of context and traditional Muslim understanding, the passage may suggest that Jews, Christians and other non-Muslims will be rewarded in the Hereafter on the basis of their belief in God and their righteous works, and that belief in Islam is not necessary for their salvation. Distending this further, this may mean that Muslims and non-Muslims, particularly the **AHL AL-KITAB**, may coexist peacefully on the basis of equality. This, however, is not the way Muslim believers are supposed to understand Q2:62 and 5:69.

Q2:62 is a part of the longest discourse on Jews and Christians in the Quran (2:40-152). The reader of the surah soon sees the harsh tone of the whole discourse, condemning Jews and Christians left and right. The Jews are charged with exchanging belief for "something valueless" (2:41). They are attacked for their hypocrisy and are (called) deprived of God's help (2:44-8). Referring to their deliverance from the Pharaoh with God's help, Muslims are told of the Jews' ingratitude to God and of their "perversity" (2:49-61). This is where 2:62 follows. The next passage, 2:63-74, again talks of the "perversity" of the Jews. In 2:65 they are charged with transgressing the Sabbath, for which they were transformed into "apes, miserably stinking" as punishment. 2:75-82 condemn Jewish craft and false pride. 2:75 projects the Muslim belief that the People of the Book distorted their holy scriptures and concealed prophecies in their holy scriptures foretelling Muhammad's prophethood and Islam's authenticity (TS,2:245-49). 2:79-81 condemn Jews, repudiating their alleged claim that they will not be in Hell forever. 2:83-103 condemn Jewish disobedience and unbelief: they are charged with murdering their own people. In 2:89 Jews are again blamed and cursed for rejecting Muhammad knowingly. As their scriptures

foretold, they were waiting for Muhammad, the Messenger of God; but when he appeared, the Jews refused to acknowledge him out of pride and jealousy (TS,2:332-47). 2:96 ridicules and condemns Jews' love of life. 2:98 calls them enemies of God, His Angels and Prophets. In 2:99 they are charged with breaking the Covenant. 2:101 repeats the charge that they concealed in their holy scriptures the prophecy about Muhammad's Prophethood (TS,2:403-4). In 2:104-110 Muslims are warned against the ill-will of the People of the Book; in their animosity toward Islam, Muslims are told, Jews are the same as pagans and idolaters. Jews had troubled Moses; Muslims are told not to do the same with Muhammad. Muslims are warned against the People of the Book's attempts to lead them (Muslims) to disbelief.

Those unbelievers of the People of the Book and the idolaters wish not that any good should be sent down upon you from your Lord;... do you desire to question your Messenger as Moses was questioned in former times?... Many of the People of the Book wish they might restore you as unbelievers, after you have believed, in the jealousy of their souls, after the truth has become clear to them... (2:105-9).

2:116 condemns Christians for calling Jesus son of God. In 2:119 Muhammad is reassured of the authenticity of his Prophethood and is instructed not to bother himself about the Jews, Christians and other nonbelievers; they will go to Hell anyhow (TS,2:558-61). The Prophet is further told:

Never will the Jews be satisfied with thee, neither the Christians, not till thou followest their religion. Say, 'God's guidance is the true guidance.' If thou followest their caprices, after the knowledge that has come to thee, thou shalt have against God neither protector nor helper. Those to whom We have given the Book [the Muslims] and who recite it with true recitation, they believe in it, and whoso disbelieves in it, they shall be losers (2:120-121).

The disbelievers are those who disbelieve in Muhammad and his Prophethood, and they are the losers (TS,2:562-72). In all verses preceding and following 2:62 there is not a single kind word about Jews, Christians and followers of other religions. For this reason, Tradition has explained 2:62 and other similar passages in ways consistent with

the spirit of sacred Islamic sources and with the reality of the Prophet's treatment of non-Muslims.

Tabari, like other traditional commentators, adopts two methods in dealing with the controversial or "vague" passages of the Quran. First, with the help of Tradition and rules of Arabic language, he clarifies the 'real' meanings. Second, he contrasts the portions in question to those Quranic passages revealed later; in such cases (and when there is any contradiction) he maintains that the latter passages abrogate, **NASKH**, the previous ones. A believer has to follow the final version of the Quran as adopted by the Prophet and his Companions. In both cases Tabari quite logically follows the whole context of the Quran and the Prophet's teachings and career. Tabari and his sources speak of 2:62 to telling effect.

In his 12-page explanation (TS,2:143-155), Tabari first defines the true Christians and Jews mentioned in 2:62. The true Jew, he maintains, is one who believed in Jesus and Muhammad as Messengers of God and follows them; similarly, only believers in Muhammad among the Christians can be considered the true believers in Jesus. These are the Jews and Christians who have been promised reward and reassurance in 2:62 (TS, 2:148). Tabari, drawing upon Muhammad, maintains that any Jew who refused to acknowledge and follow Jesus and Muhammad and, similarly, a Christian who did not believe in Muhammad and follow him, is doomed-- **KANA HALIK-AN** (TS,2:154). Recalling the story of the conversion of Salman Farsi, Tabari tells us that Salman, before his conversion to Islam, was a Christian acquainted with a number of good Christians in Persia and in the Holy Land. Once Salman asked the Prophet about the fate of these good and pious Christians he had known. The Prophet told him bluntly: "they did not die as Muslims -- **LAM YAMUTU ALA'L-ISLAM.**" The Prophet implied they will go to Hell. Apparently Salman was unconvinced and became very disturbed; "the earth became dark to him and he wondered how those good pious Christians" could go to Hell for not becoming Muslims before Islam. It seems the Prophet realized the inconsistency in his assertion and must also have felt Salman's

uneasiness about the Prophet's harsh verdict. The Prophet called Salman back and told him that 2:62 had been revealed to him. The Prophet explained the verse as follows:

Anyone who died following the religion of Jesus, while practicing Islam, before hearing of me, he was good and died as a Muslim, but those who do not believe in me after they hear of me are doomed and destroyed -- **MAN MAT ALA DIN ISA WA MAT ALA'L-ISLAM QABL AN YASMAA BI, FA HUA ALA KHAYR, WA MAN SAMIA BI WA LAM YUMIN BI, FA QAD HALAK** (TS,2:155).

Tabari then argues that the Jews, Christians, Sabaeans and other believers in God and the Hereafter mentioned in 2:62 mean those who converted to Islam after they heard of the Prophet Muhammad and his call. The rewards and reassurances promised in the verse apply to those converted (from such creeds) to Islam. As usual, Tabari also defines **AMAL SALIH**, "righteous deed," in terms of obedience to God and compliance with the Faith, which is faith in Islam and Muhammad's Prophethood (TS,2:148, passim).

Before ending his discussion of 2:62, Tabari cites approvingly another Tradition report which says that 2:62 was abrogated by a later Quranic verse:

Whoso desires another religion than Islam, it shall not be accepted of him; in the next world he shall be among the losers (Q3:85).

"This report indicates," Tabari argues,

that God had previously promised the Jews, Christians and Sabaeans Paradise in the Hereafter on the basis of their righteous deeds, but then He [changed His mind and] canceled -- **NASAKH** -- this by His (new) Word which says "whoso desires another religion than Islam, it shall not be accepted of him..." (TS,2:155; brackets added).

Q5:69 is identical with 2:62, and Tabari, for necessary explanations refers the reader to what he has said on 2:62 (TS,10:477).

Before considering other apparently "soft" verses, two examples from contemporary orthodox and fundamentalist Muslim exegetes will show how the traditional understanding of such Quranic passages has persisted. Commenting on 2:62, Mufti Muhammad Shafi, the late grand

Mufti of Pakistan, asserts that the verse means only those "completely obedient" to God "in beliefs and action," will be rewarded in the Hereafter. "Obviously, after the revelation of the Quran, complete obedience depends on (one's) being a Muhammadan, i.e., Muslim," Shafi adds. For him, the non-Muslim groups mentioned in the verse will be rewarded - and their past "mischiefs" forgiven - only if they convert to Islam (Shafi, Maarif, 1:181-3). Another contemporary Muslim, Abul A'la Mawdudi, basically adopts the same line in his exegesis of the verse. Aware of modern sensitivities, however, he is somewhat evasive about non-Muslims, except for the whipping boys, the Jews, mentioned in the verse. Maududi has changed the verse into an anti-Jewish document. Maududi indirectly reminds "nominal" Muslims that their salvation also depends on practicing Islam in toto. He says:

This verse occurs here to remove the self-delusion of the Jews that salvation was their sole monopoly, irrespective of what they believed or did. They were suffering from the delusion that they had some special relation with God and they would go straight to Heaven, irrespective of their creed or conduct simply because they were Israelites and that all other people would go to Hell. In this verse their misunderstanding has been removed. Allah declares that salvation does not depend upon one's connection with any group but on one's right beliefs and good deeds. God's judgment will not be based on the census records of this world but on one's real worth. Therefore they should accept the Guidance [i.e., Islam] (Maududi, Meaning... 1:74-5; brackets added).

This is a reminder to liberal nonconformist Muslims. Being merely recorded in census reports as Muslim is not enough; one must follow "the Guidance," i.e., the teachings of the Quran and Sunnah completely to deserve reward for one's deeds in the last Day; one has to be a fundamentalist Muslim. Before ending his commentary, Maududi asserts:

Incidentally it is clear from the context in which this verse occurs that the Quran is not laying down here the details of the creed and the essential practices for salvation. These things have been described in detail in their proper places (ibid).

Maududi follows Tabari, but speaks in a pseudo-diplomatic style. Tabari and his orthodox followers (such as Mufti Muhammad Shafi) tell readers honestly and immediately what "the details of the creed and essential practices for salvation" are. Maududi, the

fundamentalist-cum-politician, aware of the global concern for the basic human right to equality, despite different creeds, refers evasively to other "proper places" in the Quran and Tradition for "the details of the creed and the essential practices for salvation" mentioned in 2:62. He or his followers would tell us what those "essentials" are, perhaps, after they are in a position of "power or authority" as mentioned by Abdullah Yusuf Ali, another believing (but modern), educated translator and exegete of the Quran. (See Abdullah Yusuf Ali, The Holy Quran, 1974 [henceforth AYA-Q] p. 854, s. 2788-9 cf. Q22:17 discussed below.)

Let us examine another 'soft' Quranic passage on the People of the Book.

Passage II:

Yet they are not all alike; some of the People of the Book are a nation upstanding. They recite God's signs in the watches of the night, bowing themselves, believing in God and in the Last Day, bidding to honor and forbidding dishonor, vying one with the other in good works; those are the righteous (Q3:113-4).

Is this an open-minded, generous tribute to the "upstanding," godly, righteous and honorable Jews and Christians, regardless of their religious faith, who engage in "good works"? No. The People of the Book mentioned are those converted to Islam (TS,7:118-30). The passage honors those Jews who became Muslim and practiced Islam well -- **NAZALAT FI JAMAAT MIN AL-YAHUD ASLAMU FA HASUN ISLAMUHUM** (ibid:120). They were called "upstanding" in the sense that they followed the Quran and the Sunnah of Muhammad strictly (TS,7:124). Their recitation of "God's signs" refers to their reciting the Quran(ibid:125). Their "bowing in worship" refers to their adoption of a particular type of prayer, **SALAT**, prescribed by Islam (ibid:129). Their "bidding to honor" -- **YAMURUN BI'L-MARUF** -- means they command people to believe in God and His Messenger (Muhammad) and acknowledge Muhammad and what he has brought to them, (i.e. Islam) -- **YAMURUN AN-NAS BI'L-IMAN BI'LLAH WA RASULIHI, WA TASDIQ MUHAMMAD...WA MA JAAHUM BIHI** (ibid:130). Their "forbidding dishonor" means "they forbid people to disbelieve in God and to reject Muhammad and what he has brought to them from God" (ibid).

Passage III:

In Q5:13, after criticizing the Jews harshly for "breaking the compact," and mentioning that they are "cursed" by God for "perverting words from their meanings," for forgetting Muhammad's Prophethood foretold to them (cf. TS,10:129) and for their "treacheries" against Muhammad, the Prophet is instructed:

Yet pardon them, and forgive; surely God loves the good-doers.

Lest we confuse Allah and Muhammad with Guatama Buddha and Mahatma Gandhi, Tabari immediately reminds us: **HADHIHI MANSUKHAT-UN.. NASAKHATHA AYAT BARAAH** -- "this (verse) is abrogated by the disavowal verse (9:29, which says, 'Fight them to death...')." The Tradition further tells us that 5:13, asking for pardon and forgiveness, was revealed before the commandment for fighting Jews and Christians to the death was revealed and, thus, is invalidated. In his conclusion, without rejecting the Traditions calling for the abrogation of 5:13, Tabari argues that the right to life given to the People of the Book after they accept their "humbled" status and pay jizya as a token of their humiliation is an act of pardon and forgiveness! (TS,10:134- 5).

Passage IV:

The following verse, taken out of the context of sacred Islamic literature and traditional Muslim interpretations, may indicate not only a Muslim preference of Christians over Jews and idolaters but also a "soft" corner in Muslim hearts for pious Christian religious personalities:

Thou wilt surely find the most hostile of men to the believers are the Jews and idolaters; and thou wilt surely find the nearest of them in love to the believers are those who say, 'We are Christians': that because some of them are priests and monks and they wax not proud (5:82).

The condemnation of Jews is clear enough; as for these "nice Christians" mentioned, succeeding verses clearly explain what "Christians" the Quran praises. They are those who "when they hear what has been sent down to the Messenger (Muhammad) thou seest their eyes overflow with tears

because of the truth they recognize (in the Quran)"; those "nice Christians" declare their faith in Muhammad and Islam. They admit the Muslims are indeed the righteous people and express their eagerness to join them as Muslims. Of course, such sincere converts to Islam, shall be rewarded by God for what they speak and

with gardens underneath which rivers flow, therein dwelling forever; that is the recompense of the good- doers (Q5:85).

"But those who disbelieve, and cry lies to Our signs," against Muhammad, the Quran and Islam - Christians or not - "they are the inhabitants of Hell" (Q5:83-86, cf. TS,10:498- 512).

Explaining 5:82, Tabari as usual engages in reference and cross-reference to the immediate and general context of the verse. He gives specific examples of "nice" Christians, priests and monks. The verse and the passage that follows it, Tabari believes, relate to the Negus and a group of Abyssinian pious Christian priests and monks who became Muslims -- **FI'N-NAJJASHI WA ASHAB-IN LAHU ASLAMU MAAHU** (TS,10:499). Tabari describes in detail various versions of their sincere conversion to prove that the goodwill demonstrated in 5:82 is limited to those Christians who believe in Muhammad as the Messenger and in the Quran as the Word of God (TS,10:498-506).

Passage V:

The Quranic verse 22:17,

Surely they that believe, and those of Jewry, the Sabaeans, the Christians, the Magians, and the idolaters - God shall distinguish between them on the Day of Resurrection; assuredly God is witness over everything,

may suggest uncertainty about the fate of all groups mentioned - it should be left to God to decide in the Hereafter. Does this mean Muslims do not know if one or more of the groups mentioned are wrong and, consequently, should not "distinguish," i.e., discriminate against any? Does this mean Muslims do not know if any of these groups will go to Hell?

Muhammad Ali, a modern Muslim translator and commentator on the

Quran, using this Quranic verse, maintains that differences in religious beliefs do not call for punishment in this life. He suggests Muslims are not obliged to take the law of God in their own hands and resort to punitive action in this world against non-Muslims (MMA-Q:650, n:1680). Abdullah Yusuf Ali, another contemporary Muslim translator and commentator, tells us that Q22:17 teaches Muslims toleration of other creeds, adding, confusingly, as long as the Muslims do not possess "power or authority" (AYA-Q:854, n. 2788-9). As a member of the Ahmadi (Qadyani) sect, M. Ali's attempted (sincere but not authentic) interpretation of the verse conforms with his beliefs. The Ahmadi, like the Bahais, have vainly tried to do away with the concept of **JIHAD BI'S-SAYF** (jihad with sword, i.e. the use of force) for spreading the domain of the creed. They have honestly tried to soften some harsh aspects of Islam. However, both sects have been declared non-Muslim by all traditional Sunni and Shii Muslim communities. With due respect to Muhammad Ali, he does not represent Islam.

Abdullah Yusuf Ali is one of those modern Muslim translators and commentators of the Quran who are aware of modern sensitivities. In their commentaries and treatises they try, when they think necessary, to tone down the meaning of the Quran, or intentionally sow vagueness and confusion. They practice a form of **MAKR** or **KAYD** or **TAQIYYAH** (discussed below in this section). As a believer, Abdullah Yusuf Ali is also aware of Islam's claim of superiority over other creeds. Consequently, he contradicts himself by interpreting the verse (Q22:17) as a sign of Islam's toleration of other religions, but then limits this toleration to conditions in which Muslims do not possess "power or authority". This is to say, one may not be intolerant if he has not enough "power or authority" to do so. A Persian poet, probably Sadi of Shiraz, calls such a character, ironically, **GURBA-E MISKIN**, "poor-humble cat"!

GURBA-E MISKIN AGAR PAR DASHTI
TUKHM-E GUNJISHK AZ JAHAN BARDASHTI (Had the 'humble' cat possessed wings, no sparrow would have lived.)

For an authentic, legitimate and straightforward Muslim

understanding of Q22:17, let us turn to Tabari. He tells us that

the Almighty's distinguishing between them (Muslim believers, Jews, Christians, Sabaeans, Magians and idolaters) means that He will send all the (five) groups to the Fire, and the believers in Him and His Prophets to paradise; this is what distinguishing between them by God means (T,17:129).

Tabari defines the last five groups in negative terms and contrasts them to believers in Islam. He tells that of the six creeds mentioned in 22:17, five belong to Satan and only one, Islam, belongs to God --

AL-ADYAN SIATUN, KHAMSAT LISH-SHAYTAN WA WAHID LI'R-RAHMAN (T,17:129).

It would be blasphemous for a Muslim believer to show tolerance towards the followers of Satan. Tabari perhaps could not conceive of trying to find any connotation of Islam's tolerance of other creeds.

Passage VI:

Q29:46 instructs Muslims:

Dispute not with the People of the Book save in the fairer manner, except for those of them that do wrong;

At once comes the instruction:

and say, "We believe in what has been sent down to us, and to you; Our God and your God is One and to him we have surrendered."

To a modern reader unaware of the whole Quranic context and Tradition, the verse might mean 1) Muslims must maintain politeness, "the fairer manner," in their discourses with Jews and Christians; 2) Muslims believe in the authenticity of the holy scriptures of the three religions; and 3) Muslims believe that followers of the three religions worship the same God, so all of them are equally Divinely Guided. Consequently, they may co-exist peacefully without any claim of superiority. A cursory look at traditional Muslim understandings of the verse reveals that these conclusions are misguided. Tabari's is instructive. To dispute with the People of the Book in a "fairer manner" means "to call them in 'beautiful words' to God and His signs, (Islam) and to warn them of the Almighty's 'strong arguments'" (T,21:1, cf. 1-4). In response to the "call", Tabari makes it clear, the People

of the Book have only two choices before war is declared on them: 1) conversion to Islam; or 2) payment of jizya, accepting humiliation -- **WA HUM SAGHIRUN**. "As for those who 'do wrong,' refuse to pay jizya, God commands believers to fight them with the sword until they become Muslim or pay jizya" (T,21:1). After this summary, Tabari, as usual, draws upon Tradition to detail his understanding of the verse 29:46. Tradition includes among "wrongdoers" those who annoyed Muhammad, ascribed a son to God, and did not believe in Islam and Muhammad as the Messenger of God. These "wrongdoers" do not deserve a "fairer manner" of disputation. Tabari also mentions the Traditions that maintain 29:46 was invalidated by God -- **HIA MANSUKHAT NASAKHAHA QAWLUHU** -- in 9:29, which enjoins fighting the People of the Book to the death until they are forced to pay jizya, and are kept "humbled" under Muslim supremacy (T,21:2 cf. Q29:46). Note that Tabari's earlier explanation and the opinion of his sources who consider 29:46 to be abrogated by 9:29 lead to the same consequences: a 'fairer manner' of disputation is reserved for those Jews and Christians who convert to Islam - or at most to those who pay jizya acknowledging their humbled status.

Although this explanation leaves no possibility for ascribing a pluralistic sense to the second part of the verse, 29:47 at once makes it clear that disbelievers in the Quran are considered heathen, **AL-KAFIRUN**, disbelievers in God and disobedient to Him. So when Muslims say they believe in what was "sent down" to Jews and Christians, this is not an acknowledgment of the authenticity of their holy scriptures. What was "sent down" to Moses and Jesus was distorted by Jews and Christians, Muslims believe.

Passage VII.

...and We sent, following, Jesus son of Mary, and gave unto him the Gospel. And We set in the hearts of those who followed him tenderness and mercy. And monasticism they invented - We did not prescribe it for them - only seeking the good pleasure of God; but they observed it not as it should be observed. So We gave those of them who believed their wage; and many of them are ungodly (57:27).

In order to explain who the "Christians with tenderness and mercy in

their hearts seeking God's pleasure" are, Tabari gives his version of the history of Christianity before Islam (T,27:238-41), some of which was mentioned in an earlier section. According to one Tradition, the Kings and people after Jesus Christ changed and corrupted the Torah and the Gospel and did not act according to the law of God. A few true believers in Jesus, seeing the disloyalty of their society to the laws of God, yet unable to check this corruption, left for the wilderness where they lived in monasteries basically to seek God's pleasure. Most of them, however, exceeded proper limits in their monasticism; only a few remained pure. These are the ones, the Tradition says, who joined the ranks of Islam as soon as they heard of Muhammad. In 57:27 those promised their wages are the "nice Christians" who acknowledged Muhammad as the Prophet, to be rewarded two-fold (vide Q57:28 et seq.). The "ungodly," **FASIQIN**, are those who reject Prophet Muhammad.

The second version of Christian history is ascribed to the Prophet himself. There were 71 or 72 sects before his time. Only three of them achieved salvation, the rest were doomed (to Hell). One group achieving salvation was composed of those who followed Jesus Christ, fought against the (nonbelieving) kings and were eventually slain by the nonbelievers. The second group consisted of those Christians who vocally resisted the disbelief of their rulers and were killed by the nonbelievers. The third group of true Christian believers was formed of those who, unable to strive for the sake of God and His religion brought by Christ, left the nonbelieving society for monasteries in deserted places. Eventually, the Prophet said, these monastic Christians split in two: 1) "Those who believed in me", promised reward in 57:27; and 2) "Those who rejected and belied me," the ones called 'ungodly' in the verse. Also, the passage immediately following Q57:27 negates any positive feelings about the People of the Book. Tabari's Tradition-based reports (T,27:241-7) and these following verses (Q57:28-9) are more illustrative. These verses talk of the "twofold portion of (God's) mercy" for the believers "so that the People of the Book may know that they have no power over anything of God's bounty and that bounty is in

the hands of God; He gives it unto whomsoever He will." Apparently, somewhat contradictory reports ascribed to the Prophet and quoted by Tabari indicate a complicated "occasion of revelation." One point Tabari explains relates to the identification of "the believers who are promised twofold reward." Some Tradition reports state this means those Christians who convert to Islam. Compared to Muslims with a pagan background, who will get one portion of Divine reward, Muslims with a Christian background will be rewarded twice: once for their belief in Jesus and then for their acknowledgment of Muhammad.

The second series of Tradition reports indicates that, perhaps as a result of some protest by Arab Muslims, the Prophet revised his verdict in their favor. These reports tell believers that all those who believe in Islam will automatically be rewarded more by God than the believers in past Prophets (who died before they heard of Muhammad). Here Tabari makes it clear that non-Muslim Jews and Christians argued against the Prophet's decree, maintaining that as senior and authentic People of the Book they would not be treated by God as Muhammad claimed. On this occasion, the Tradition says, the Almighty intervened by revealing 57:28: "...that the People of the Book may know that they have no power over anything of God's bounty, and that bounty is in the hand of God; and God is of bounty abounding." The Prophet apparently first tried to use a "carrot" to attract the Jews and Christians to his creed, but, sensing the uneasiness of his Arab followers (the base of his power), - and the fact that the 'carrot' did not attract the Jews and the Christians to Islam - then made necessary adjustments (See also Bu.9:17; 37:8-9, 11; 60:50; 66:17; 96:31, 47; Tir. 41:92).

The number of apparent Quranic "soft verses" and Traditions treating the People of the Book kindly (compared to the vast, antagonistic material in the same sources) is so meager that only by common sense can a Muslim reader realize the general direction of Islam's images and treatment of the Jews and Christians. Before we survey this anti-People of the Book material, note that our sources rationalize for Muslims their negative images and treatment of the Jews

and Christians on two important theoretical bases: 1) the People of the Book are charged with **SHIRK**, polytheism or idolatry. Their claim to monotheism is rejected. 2) They are also charged with corruption and distortion of revelations they received from earlier Prophets. Related to this is the alleged mistreatment and/or misrepresentation of the very Prophets the People of the Book claim to follow.

The importance of adherence to a rigid monotheism and strong opposition to **SHIRK**, ascribing partners, sons, etc. to God, are emphasized throughout the Quran (e.g., surah 112). Muslims know the Almighty's aversion to **SHIRK**. They are repeatedly told the People of the Book have committed this unforgivable crime and, are consequently "assailed" by God.

And they say the All-merciful has taken unto Himself a son. You indeed advance something hideous! The heavens are well nigh rent of it and the earth split asunder, and the mountains well nigh fall down crashing for that they have attributed to the All-merciful a son; and it behooves not the All-merciful to take a son... (19:88-92). The Jews say, "Ezra is the Son of God"; the Christians say "the Messiah is the son of God." ...conforming with the unbelievers...God assail them! How they are perverted (Q9:30).

Moreover,

They have taken their rabbis and their monks as Lords apart from God... (9:31).

Jews are cursed by God for their alleged belief in demons and idols (4:51-2) and for uttering blasphemy against God (5:64). Their rejection of Jesus and Muhammad is "as a matter of fact," disobedience to God. Christians do the same by belying Muhammad. Thus, in the Muslim mind, the Judeo-Christian claim to monotheism becomes a hoax, and the distinction between them and pagans is abolished. They "conform with the unbelievers" (Q9:30).

Islam charges the People of the Book with corruption of earlier divine teachings primarily because, according to the Quran and Tradition, Jews and Christians concealed prophecies about the authenticity of Muhammad as the last Messenger of God. As we know, Muhammad as God's last Messenger was foretold repeatedly by God and His

Prophets. According to an eternal covenant between God and men, Muhammad's Prophethood must have been acknowledged by all, particularly by the People of the Book so told by their Prophets and revealed scriptures. Instead, when Muhammad appeared, the People of the Book distorted the holy scriptures and rejected Muhammad - violating the Divine Covenant and the teachings of the Prophets they claim to follow.

The Jews and, to some extent, Christians are portrayed as troublers of the Prophets and violators of Divine teachings throughout their history. The Jews troubled even Moses, showing their ingratitude and continuously reverting to idol-worship (see, e.g., Q2:40-152; 138:171). They committed **KUFR**, disbelief, belied the Prophets and slew them (e.g., Q3:5, 112; 570). Muhammad tells Muslims that "the Children of Israel massacred 43 Prophets in one hour before the noon" (TS,6:286). The Jews committed "mighty calumny" by claiming they killed Jesus (Q4:156-8). The Christians did the same by ascribing godhood to Jesus.

The material in the Quran and Tradition encouraging believers to form a negative image of the People of the Book and be tough toward them is overwhelming. The greater amount relates to the Jews, with a predictable formative effect on the Muslim mind. In order to have a glimpse of this material we scan the Quran the way Muslims usually read it - beginning with the sura I. Then we survey briefly the sources of Tradition. The Quranic passages against the People of the Book come mostly in the beginning Medinan surahs, read most often by the believers. The first surah, **AL-FATIHAH**, "the Opening" is memorized and also recited by every Muslim at least 35 times a day during the five-times daily obligatory prayers. Al-Fatihah is a fixed part of every **RAKAH** of prayers. This surah is also recited on numerous other occasions. In this short surah Muslims beseech God "never to lead them to the Path of those against whom God is wrathful, nor of those who have gone astray" -- **GHAYR AL-MAGHDUB ALAYHIM WAL-LA'DDALLIN** (1:7). As told by the Prophet Muhammad, Muslims know that the **MAGHDUB**, "those against

whom God is wrathful" are Jews and the **DALLIN**, "those who have gone astray" are Christians (TS,1:185-96). The second surah has already been treated.

The third surah in its long discussions (e.g., 3:19-29, 62-120, 181-198) has no kind words for the People of the Book who did not convert to Islam. They are told sternly "the true religion with God is (only) Islam"; they are charged with **BAGHY**, "insolence," and "slaying the Prophets and other righteous men" and "promised" a "painful chastisement" (3:19-21). Without belief in Islam, their good works will avail them nothing here or Hereafter (3:20- 2, 117). They are called "liars" and "forgers" (3:24) and Muslims are instructed "not to take them for friends" "unless" Muslims "have a fear of them" (3:28). The People of the Book's claim to have followed Abraham (and other Divinely-guided figures) is rejected and Muslims are told confidently:

No; Abraham in truth was not a Jew, neither a Christian; but he was a Muslim... certainly he was never of the idolaters [implying that Jews and Christians are not different from the pagans] (Q3:67, cf. 66; brackets added).

Only the Muslims and Muhammad truly inherit Abraham's monotheistic legacy (3:68). The People of the Book are portrayed as enemies; they desire Muslims "to go astray" (69) and along with "idolaters" wish to "hurt" Muslims in person and property (3:186). They are accused of "confounding the truth with vanity", i.e., concealing the prophecies in their scriptures about Muhammad and Islam (3:70-1 cf. T). Except for those converted to Islam, they are dishonest cheats: "... of them is he who, if thou trust him with one pound, will not restore it thee, unless ever you standest over him"; this because they are (compulsive) liars: "they speak falsehood against God and that knowingly" (3:75 cf. 78 and T.). They "sell God's Covenant, and their oaths, for a little price";

There shall be no share for them in the world to come; God shall not speak to them, neither look on them on the Resurrection Day, neither will He purify them; and for them awaits a painful chastisement (3:77).

They distort their holy scriptures, "and that knowingly" (3:78). Those who deify Jesus or other Prophets [as Jews are also alleged to have done (9:30)] are condemned; they are called "ungodly" for violating the eternal Divine Covenant obliging them to acknowledge Muhammad as God's Messenger (3:79-82). The People of the Book are again told sternly:

Whoso desires another religion than Islam, it shall not be accepted of him; (3:85).

On those who reject Islam shall fall "the curse of God and of the angels and of men, altogether"; they are doomed to the permanent chastisement of Hell (3:87-8). Continuing the harsh criticism of Jews and Christians, God reassures Muslims of their superiority to others:

You are the best nation ever brought forth to men, bidding to honor, and forbidding dishonor and believing in God. Had the People of the Book believed, it were better for them (3:110).

Assuring Muslims of eventual victory, God encouraged them to fight the People of the Book (3:111) who are doomed anyhow:

Abasement shall be pitched on them, wherever they are come upon... they will be laden with the burden of God's anger, and poverty shall be pitched on them; that because they disbelieved in God's signs [i.e., Islam], and slew the Prophets (and)... acted rebelliously [by rejecting Muhammad's leadership] (3:112; brackets added).

As the Prophet and Muslims demonstrated in their actions against Medina's Jewish Qaynuqa and Nadir tribes, the believers work as the Almighty's instruments to materialize the Divinely destined "abasement" and "poverty" of the People of the Book. (For the connection between this verse and the Prophet's actions against the Jews, see T on Q3:111-2). In the closing of this long critique of the People of the Book, Muslims are again warned against intimacy with Jews and Christians (portrayed again as sworn enemies of Muslims and Islam). Muslims who might have a "soft" attitude toward the Jews and Christians are told their affection is misplaced:

O believers, take not for your intimates outside yourselves; such men spare nothing to ruin you; they yearn for you to suffer. Hatred has already shown itself of their mouths, and what their

breasts conceal is yet greater... Ha, there you are; you love them, and they love you not; you believe in the Book, all of it, and when they meet you they say, 'We believe,' but when they go privily, they bite at you their fingers, enraged. Say, 'Die in your rage; God knows the thoughts in the breasts.' If you are visited by good fortune, it vexes them; but if you are smitten by evil, they rejoice at it. Yet if you are patient and godfearing, their guile will hurt you nothing; God encompasses the things they do (3:118-20).

Q3:181-8 resume such criticism of the People of the Book on almost the same lines - repeating the charge of concealing prophecies about Muhammad's Prophethood - and concludes, addressing the believers:

Reckon not that those who rejoice in what they have brought, and love to be praised for what they have not done - do not reckon them secure from chastisement; for them awaits a painful chastisement (Q3:188).

Repetition of certain themes in the Quran reinforces their effect on believers. Not least of all, negative images of the People of the Book suggesting and/or decreeing their negative treatment are repeated throughout the Quran. In various ways the People of the Book are portrayed as enemies and ill-wishers of Muslims and Islam (Q4:44, 54-5, 153; 5:57, 82; 9:32). Muslims should not follow the **AHWA**, whims, of these enemies (Q5:49). They are blamed for braking the Covenant and for distortions and "perversion" of the holy scriptures, particularly of those portions that prophesied Muhammad and Islam (and by rejecting Muhammad and discriminating in their treatment of God's Messengers [e.g., Q4:46, 150-1; 5:13-14; 66]). Their self-image as godly ones and God's chosen people is ridiculed. Their monotheism is suspect; more often they are called, directly or indirectly, idolaters and worshipers of demons and satans. Particularly referring to the Trinity, Christians are condemned for their misbeliefs (Q4:48, 51, 171-73; 5:17-8, 72-6, 9:29- 35; 19:34-40). Instead, it is said they were cursed by God, (the Jews) transformed into apes and swine, and punished variously; they will definitely be punished on the Last Day (4:160, 173; 5:13-4, 60, 80; 7:166; 9:35).

Besides calling the People of the Book **AZ-ZALIMUN**, transgressors, and **AL-FASIQUUN**, ungodly or libertines, the Quran uses strong,

non-flattering language about them: they are worse than apes, swine and idol-worshippers - they have gone further astray from the right way (Q5:60). Ridiculing Jewish scholars' attachment to their holy scriptures, the Quran exclaims: "The likeness of those who have been loaded with the Torah, then they have not carried it, is the likeness of an ass carrying books. Evil is the likeness of the people who have cried lies to God's signs", i.e., Islam (62:5). The Quran calls both Jews and Christians the "worst of creatures" dwelling in the fire of Gehenna forever (Q98:6).

God assail them! How they are perverted (9:30). The People of the Book are awarded the worst character: they indulge in usury and dishonest dealings (Q4:161); they killed and belied the Prophets (Q5:70); they committed disreputable acts (Q5:79); their "rabbis and monks indeed consume the goods of the people in vanity"; they "treasure up gold and silver and bar their people" from accepting Islam (9:34).

Give them the good tidings of a painful chastisement, the day they shall be heated in the fire of Gehenna and therewith their foreheads and their sides and their backs shall be branded (9:34-5).

They have a disgusting love of wealth and life, and are rank cowards - they quake at death (ibid; 62:6-7). The Quran insists that Jews and Christians convert to Islam (Q5:15, 47, e.g.); their claim that they follow the Torah and/or the Gospel is a hoax, unless they believe in Islam (Q5:66-8). Muslims are again warned against friendship with Jews and Christians - who, it seems, make a united front against Islam: O believers, take not Jews and Christians as friends; they are friends of each other. Whoso of you makes them his friends, is one of them (Q5:51).

Muslims who seek or think of reconciliation and accommodation with the People of the Book are dubbed those "in whose heart is sickness"; they are warned against harboring such thoughts. Such inclinations are tantamount to apostasy against Islam, which bears grave consequences for them (Q5:52-3). Tradition gives examples. During the Prophet's lifetime some Muslims led by Abd Allah b. Ubayy opposed the Prophet's

harsh policy toward the Jews of Medina. These were the ones "in whose hearts was sickness" -- **FI QULUBIHIM MARAD**. They were called **MUNAFIQ**, hypocrite or apostate, and were excommunicated. God prefers militancy to pacifism against the People of the Book. The ideal Muslims are those who disdain public opinion of their single-mindedness toward the People of the Book and other non-Muslims. They should consider only God, the Prophet and believers their friends. For such devoted Muslims, "the party of God," defiant of reproof for their "disdain towards unbelievers," victory is assured by God. They must not befriend non-Muslims, including Jews and Christians, this passage reminds again:

O believers, whosoever of you turns from his religion, God will assuredly bring a people He loves, and who love Him, humble towards the believers, disdainful towards the unbelievers, men who struggle in the path of God, not fearing the reproach of any reproacher... Your friend is only God, and His Messenger, and the believers... Whoso makes God his friend, and His Messenger and the believers - the party of God, they are the victors. O believers, Take not as your friends those of them who were given the Book before you, and the (other) unbelievers (Q5:54-7).

Callousness toward the People of the Book is repeatedly commanded and commended by the Almighty. Muslims "must not grieve" for the misfortunes of these "unbelievers" (Q5:68). On mere suspicion, Muslims are authorized to dissolve any existing compacts with "these worst of beasts in God's sight", prepare for war on them and "terrify" "these enemies of God and Muslims" (Q8:55-60). Referring to actual events that happened in Medina, Q33:26-7 encourage terrorization of the People of the Book and authorize Muslims to slay and enslave the People of the Book considered disloyal, then confiscate their possessions and lands. Similarly, Q59:2-4 encourage, justify and relish a "terrible" treatment of the Jews: their terrorization, destruction of their property, their expulsion from the country, and threats of further "chastisement in this world," i.e., murder and enslavement (which, Muslims know, actually happened during the next round of confrontation with the Jews of Banu Qurayza). The passage also contains a warning for the remaining People of the Book: "Take heed, you who have eyes!" The passage also tells

Muslims that such treatment of the People of the Book who have "made a breach with God" is not enough; "there awaits them in the world to come the chastisement of the Fire" (Q59:3).

Tradition reports in the Hadith literature buttress negative Quranic images and treatment of the People of the Book. Muslims are told that all non-Muslims, including Jews and Christians, will go to Hell (Bu.65:54, b. 8; Mu.1:240; cf. T29:39-42). Abraham, Moses, Jesus and other Prophets will be embarrassed on the Last Day by the misdeeds and misbeliefs of their self-styled (non-Muslim) followers and will disassociate themselves from Jews and Christians). Although the Quran permits marriage with Jewish and Christian women and eating from Jewish and Christian slaughter, Hadith reports are reluctant about the application of this permission. This reluctance is based on doubt whether the so-called Jews and Christians are really so or not. These Traditions also argue that the abrogating, **NASIKH**, Quranic verses clearly forbid friendship and intimacy with the People of the Book. Marriage implies friendship and intimacy. Similarly, eating from their slaughter also involves a degree of confidence.

Another line of argument against eating the food of the People of the Book is related to their alleged habit of mixing wine with their food (AD,26:23; cf. TS,9:572-94 cf. Q5:5). In general, Muslims are advised to avoid permanent marriage with the women of the People of the Book and consumption of their food. They are **NAJIS**, unclean or untouchable, as Khumayni, the greatest practitioner of Islam in our time, tells us. As a learned **FAQIH**, "jurisprudent" of Islam, his verdicts are firmly grounded in Tradition. Ruh Allah Khumayni has decreed that the whole body of a **KAFIR**, unbeliever, including hair, nails and perspiration, is unclean -- **TAMAM-E BADAN-E KAFIR HAA MU WA NAKHUN WA RUTUBATHAY OU NAJIS AST**. According to Khumayni's definition in the same context, the People of the Book are **KAFIR(s)**, unbelievers.² Khumayni has also decreed that a Muslim is not allowed to marry permanently an unbelieving woman; however, he adds, temporary marriage for a (short) fixed period, **SIGHA**, with the women of the People of the

Book is permissible (Khomeini, Tauzih:262, Issue No. 2397).

In some Hadith reports Muslims are allowed to utilize Jewish-Christian scriptures (Bu,60:50; AD,20:11; Tir.39:13). This allowance, however, is not expression of belief in these sources. Either it seems to have a manipulative purpose, or these reports reflect an earlier phase of better relations between Muhammad and the People of the Book. In general, believers are warned against these sources and are told neither to affirm nor deny their truth (Bu,52:29; 96:25, 97:51; AD,20:3). In Bu,97:42 believers are categorically forbidden to gather information from the scriptures of the People of the Book. Following the Quran, the Hadith reports warn believers against Jews charged with trying to mislead Muhammad concerning the teachings of the Torah (Bu,65:s3,b. 16; 86:24, 37; 97:51; Mu,29:26, 27; AD,37:25; IM,20:10). Jews and Christians are cursed for their use of their Prophets' tombs as worship-places, meaning that they have changed the Prophets into deities (Bu.8:55; 60:50; 64:83). Jews and Christians are ridiculed for their internal differences; they are divided into 72 sects (AD,39:1). As noted correctly by G. Vajda,

the attitude of Islam towards the Jews and Christians, as reflected in the hadith, is one of mistrust. It stresses the importance of differentiating at all costs, as regards religion and social conduct, between the believers and these two religious groups... The basic rule is KHALIFUHUM, "do not act as do the People of the Book" [or do the opposite of whatever they do. In other words it is a lesson in opposition for the sake of opposition rather than being objective] (G. Vajda, "Ahl al-Kitab," E1²,1:264-6. Stresses and brackets added).

The way Jews wear their hair is ridiculed, and Muslims are enjoined to dye their hair in contradistinction to them. Believers are forbidden to imitate Jewish and Christian salutation (Bu,60:50; 77:67, 70; Mu,37:80; AD,32:18; Tir,22:10; NAS,48:14, 83; IM,32:32; IS I/II:134, 140). Muslims are categorically forbidden to love the Jews (AbH.5:201). Instead, as suggested in the Quran, e.g. 5:58- 61, 64, believers are encouraged to suspect the motives and hidden intentions of the People of the Book; they seem always to be conspiring against Muslims, making mockery of their religion: **WA'LLAH ALAM BIMA KANU**

YAKTUMUN, "God knows best what they conceal" (against Islam) (Q5:61). As the Almighty has told, the People of the Book engage in spreading corruption in the world, **YASAWN FI'L-ARD FASAD-AN** (Q5:64). The Jews are alleged to have distorted their salutations addressed to the Prophet and Muslims: instead of saying **AS-SALAM ALAYKUM**, "peace on you," they said, **AS-SAM ALAYKUM**, "weariness (or death?) on you" (Bu,56:98; 79:22; 80:58, 62; Mu,39:10-12; AD,40:137; Tir,40:12). Related to this are reports asking Muslims to avoid offering salutations and greetings to Jews and Christians (Bu,79:20, 22; Mu,39:6-13; AD,40:137; Tir,19:41; 40:12; IM,33:13). Muhammad is reported to have intentionally refused to say "God bless you" when the Jews sneezed (Tir,41:3); he is also reported to have told Muslims to urge Jews and Christians from the path when they meet them (Mu,39:13; AD,27:137; Tir,40:12). Muslims are told that the Prophet ordered all remaining Jews and Christians expelled from Arabia (Bu,58:6; 89:2; 96:28; Mu,32:63; AD,19:21, 26; Tir,19:43; Ma,45:17-19). Muhammad gave these instructions on his deathbed. Umar, the second caliph of Islam, following the Prophet's instructions, expelled all the Jews and Christians from Khaybar, Fadak and Najran in Arabia (Bu,41:17; 54:14; 57:19; Mu,22:6; AD,19:26; Mu,5:19; IS,II/1:83; III/1:203). Apparently, the Prophet's decree reflected his desire that, probably, no non-Muslim should be allowed to live within an Islamic domain³.

The eschatological Hadith reports on the Islamic version of Armageddon are likely to have Muslims believe that the "Last World War" will take place mainly between Muslims and Christians (and to some extent Jews). The Rum (Roman-Byzantine empire), a Christian domain in Muslim consciousness, will be the main adversary during the Islamic Armageddon (Mu,52:35, 36; AbH,4:230). Before the decisive Muslim victory under Christ's leadership, the armies of the Rum will be mobilized; one main battlefield will be near Damascus (sic). It was a Christian city when Muhammad reportedly predicted the event. Although all other non-Muslims, including Jews, will be annihilated, the symbols particularly mentioned to be destroyed, the Cross and swine, are Christian. (For specifics of the Rum before the "Hour" i.e., before the

end of the world, see Mu,52:34, 37, 38 AD,36:2-4; 6-7; Tir,31:58-9; IM,36:35. On the role of Jesus before the "Hour" and his destruction of the Cross and swine see Bu,34:102; 46:31; 60:49; Mu,1:242-7; Tir,31:54; IM,36:33).

Muslim friendship with the People of the Book and other nonbelievers must be disingenuous; Muslim generosity towards them must be planned to win their hearts and minds for Islam. This is what two particular Islamic methods of dealing with the Jews, Christians and "pagans" in special circumstances suggest. These two Islamic modes of behavior, forms of **MAKR** and **KAYD**, are known as **TAQIYYAH**, "fear, caution, stratagem, camouflage or prudence," and **TALIF AL-QULUB**, "winning the hearts." Both principles are based on the Quran, and Muslims are unanimous about their propriety during conduct of relations with non-Muslims. A believer cannot oppose the Quran.

TAQIYYAH, dissimulation of a Muslim's real feelings from non-Muslims, is authorized by the last phrase of Q3:28 which, referring specially to the People of the Book, says:

Let not the believers take the unbelievers for friends, rather than the believers - for whoso does that belongs not to God in anything - unless you have a fear of them, -- **ILLA AN TAAQU MINHUM TUQAT-AN** (Q3:28; emphasis added; for how the verse 3:28 relates to the People of the Book, and for other explanations see the Quranic context of the verse and TS,6:313-17).

In Tabari's words, God tells Muslims not to befriend unbelievers "except when you are under their sovereignty and have fear of them for yourselves; (in such cases) pretend with your tongues friendship for them while remaining hostile to them covertly" -- **ILLA AN TAKUNU FI SULTANIHIM FA TAKHAFUHUM ALA ANFUSIKUM, FA TUZHIRU LAHUM AL-WILAYAT BI ALSINATIKUM, WA TUDMIRU LAHUM AL-ADAWAT**(TS,6:313). But there is a limit to the practice of this Divine stratagem. The Almighty, as Tabari understands, tells Muslims not to help non-Muslims in practice against fellow Muslims -- **LA TUINUHUM ALA MUSLIM-IN BI-FIL** (ibid). The next Tradition asserts God indeed forbids believers intimacy and friendship with nonbelievers except when the latter dominate; then Muslims may

feign politeness toward the nonbelievers while opposing them in faith --
NAH ALLAH... AL-MUMININ AN YULATIFU'L-KUFFAR AU YAAKHIDHUHUM WALIJAT
MIN DUNI'L- MUMININ ILLA AN YAKUNU'L-KUFFAR ALAYHIM ZAHIRIN, FA YUZHIRUN
LAHUM AL-LUTF WA YUKHALIFUNAHUM FI'D-DIN (*ibid*; emphases added).

TAQIYYAH, the expression of friendship with non-Muslims on such occasions, is to be performed only verbally, not in deed -- **BI'L-LISAN WA LAYS BI'L-AMAL** (*ibid*:315). That is, a Muslim's pretensions of friendship, **WILAYAH**, and amiability and civility, **MULATIFAH**, toward non-Muslims must be disingenuous, rather than a show of sincere desire for accommodation and friendliness. **TAQIYYAH** in dealing with nonbelievers is further rationalized by the Tradition, which says:

There is no sin on a person for saying in fear for himself something sinful in the eyes of God, while his heart is sure of the faith (in Islamic decrees). Indeed **TAQIYYAH** must be performed only with tongue (i.e. saying something without meaning it) (TS,6:315; cf. Q3:28; parentheses added).

To close, Tabari reminds Muslims that this method of concealing the truth (when necessary) should be used only in dealings with non-Muslims -- **INNAMA HIA TAQIYYAT MIN AL- KUFFAR LA MIN GHAYRIHIM** (*ibid*:316).

While **TAQIYYAH** helps Muslims in difficult circumstances, **TALIF AL-QULUB**, "winning the hearts," as prescribed in Q9:60, directs them to use their economic power for Islam. Tradition gives examples of how Muhammad applied the gratification method. With the conquest of the rich Hawazin confederates in 630 CE, the Prophet had obtained booty; he had become the richest person among the Quraysh, as Abu Sufyan, a former Meccan rival, giped (W:944). The loyalty of many Meccan chiefs to Islam was uncertain. Muhammad gave them fifty or a hundred camels, according to their status. Safwan b. Umayyah was one of them. The effect was as expected. Safwan acknowledged frankly that before the gift Muhammad was the most hated person for him; after he received this gratuity from the Prophet, he became his most loved one -- **LAQAD ATANI RASUL ALLAH WA INNAHU LA- ABGHADA'N-NAS ILAYYA, FA MA BARIH YUTINI, HAA INNAHU LA- AHABBA'N-NAS ILAYYA** (T,10:162). As Tabari tells us, this became common in Muhammad's lifetime:

Arabs and non-Arabs were among those whose hearts were (so) won: the Prophet used to gratify them with presents so they would become believers (T,10:162).

Recipients were impressed, saying, "this is a good religion", those ignored criticized and left it (ibid:161). The **MUALLAFAT AL-QULUB**, "those whose hearts were won" for Islam in this manner, included Jews and Christians (ibid:162). Tabari concludes by telling us this method of winning the hearts of the poor - as well as the rich - for Islam is always applicable (ibid:163).

Although Sunni ulama and individuals accuse the Shiites for their allegedly improper and excessive use of **TAQIYYAH**, the Sunnis continue to justify adherence to the principle, especially as Muslims relate to non-Muslims. Ahmad Said, a contemporary Deobandi Sunni orthodox alim, in his translation and commentaries (in Urdu) of Q3:28 about **TAQIYYAH** maintains, "Have no qualm in pretending toleration" with the nonbelievers in difficult circumstances -- **ZAHIRI RAWADARI MEN MAZAIQAH NAHIN**. Ahmad Said mentions Tabari among his other traditional sources (see his title page). Referring to the circumstances the Prophet confronted, Said says Muslims may not be able to confront all the nonbelievers at the same time. "If, unfortunately, Muslims are overwhelmed somewhere by non-Muslims... they may pretend friendship." Said also argues Muslims may "pretend" a friendly attitude toward non-Muslims with the intention of converting them to Islam. Throughout his commentary, however, Said repeatedly asserts that real and permanent friendship and intermingling with nonbelievers is categorically forbidden by the Divine decrees. Islam must not become a **MAKHLUT MAZHAB (MADHHAB)**, a "syncretic, pluralistic religion." During the friendship Muslims must give priority to the political and general interests of Islam - **LEKIN SIYASI NUQTA-E-NIGAH AWAR ISLAM KE AM MAFAD KA KHAYAL BAHAR HAL MUQADDAM RAKKHA JATA HAI.**⁴

ENDNOTES

Part III: Belief in the Books and Messengers.

Section 8: The People of the Book.

¹The concept of **NASKH** is based on the Quranic verses, 2:106, 16:101-2 and 22:52-3

And for whatever verse We abrogate or cast into oblivion, We bring a better or the like of it; knowest thou not that God is powerful over everything? (2:106)

In his detailed discussion of this verse Tabari quotes the Prophet's Companions, authenticating the principle of **NASKH** (TS,2:471-84). The verse says the Almighty occasionally changed the decree or instruction, **HUKM**, involved in certain passages by verses revealed later. The **KHATT**, texts, of some invalidated passages were preserved in the Quran. According to Tradition, God said: "We preserve its text and change its decree (i.e. the verdict involved)" -- **NUSBIT KHAHA WA NUBADDIL HUKMAHA**. In other cases, God caused the Prophet and the believers to forget the abrogated passages -- **NUNSIHA**, "We cast it into oblivion," as the Quran says. Giving many examples from the Quran, Traditions say the abrogated passages were replaced with new commandments; the new decrees were harsher. However, the reward for believers in carrying out these tougher commandments would be greater. In any case, as a Tradition says: **AN-NASIKH WA'L-MANSUKH**, "there do exist (Quranic verses) which abrogate and so are there (those) abrogated" (*ibid*: 476). Among the contemporary authentic Muslim scholars, Dr. Mustafa as-Sibai, (former) Chairperson of the Department of Islamic Jurisprudence and Islamic Schools of Law at Damascus University, (and a famous Leader of the Muslim Brotherhood), in his book **AS-SUNNAT WA MAKANATUHA FI'T-TASHRI AL-ISLAMI** (The Sunnah and its Status/Authority in Islamic Legislature), 1966, based on traditional Islamic sources tells us that about the appropriateness of the concept that some Quranic passages abrogate others, and that some kinds of the Sunnah invalidate other kinds, there is no controversy among the ulama -- **LA KHILAF BAYN AL-ULAMA FI JAWAZ NASKH AL-KITAB BI'L-KITAB... WA LA KHILAF BAYNAHUM AYDAN FI NASKH AS-SUNNAH BI'S-SUNNAH** (p. 358 *passim*). For the continuity of Muslim belief in **NASKH** also see Maulana Mufti Muhammad Shafi, **MAARIF-UL-QURAN** (an Urdu translation and exegeses of the Quran, henceforth mentioned as Shafi, *Maarif*), **IDARAT-UL-MAARIF**, Karachi (Pakistan) 14, 1969, Vol. 1, pp. 225-30 cf. Q2:106. Muhammad Shafi, one of the well-known ulama of the Deoband school, was the founder and Rector of Dar al-Ulum, "House of the Sciences," Karachi, Pakistan. (Traditional Islamic **MADRASAB** seminaries, are now, usually called Dar al-Ulum.) Muhammad Shafi was also known as the **MUFTI-I-AZAM**, "Grand Mufti" of Pakistan he was one of a few orthodox ulama who, unlike most of their Deobandi colleagues, supported the idea of Pakistan. He migrated to Pakistan after it was established in 1947 and supported the movement for the further Islamization of the country. From 1954 to 1966, his commentaries on the Quran were broadcast on Radio Pakistan.

Discussing the principle of "abrogation," **NASKH**, Mufti Shafi maintains that a certain earlier decree, **HUKM**, of the Quran could be replaced by another later Quranic decree, or be invalidated without replacement. Referring to the earliest Muslim scholars, **MUTAQADDIMIN**, including Tabari, Mufti Shafi tells us that 500 Quranic verses were partially or totally abrogated by the later Quranic decrees. Mufti Shafi has opposed the trend among "some contemporary (Muslim) scholars" who deny the concept of **NASKH**. "Such a trend would neither serve Islam nor the Quran," the Mufti asserts. Excepting the Mutazilah who have always been rejected by the ulama of the ummah, community, of Islam, M.

Shafi maintains, all the Muslim learned community beginning from the Prophet's Companions to the legitimate ulama of the present time, have acknowledged the principle of NASKH. Shafi quotes in this regard Ali, the son-in-law of the Prophet, Tabari, Ibn Kathir, Qurtabi, Suyuti, Wali Allah of Delhi and the ulama of Deoband. Regardless of their differences on the number of abrogated verses, all of them believed, M. Shafi tells us, that some (earlier) Quranic verses were abrogated by the later.

Abul Ala Mawdudi, anxious to maintain a 'scientific and rational' image among his modern educated followers without looking incompetent in traditional Islamic 'sciences' to the ulama, adopts, as usual in such subjects, a shifty method. In his commentary on 2:106, after beating around the bush on how the Jews and Christians have distorted previous holy scriptures, Maududi delivers God's commandment in his own words abruptly:

I am the Sovereign and My powers are unlimited. I can repeal any order of Mine or allow it to be forgotten but I substitute in its place something that serves the same purpose better or at least equally well. (Maududi, The Meaning... 1:93, n.109 cf. Q2:106).

Thus, Maududi admits the principle of abrogation in the Quran. He does not discuss it further because he knows traditional arguments rationalizing God's change of mind do not convince the moderns he wants to address. Mufti M. Shafi, following the medieval scholastic pattern of argumentation, likens God to a competent doctor who prescribes some particular medicine, knowing that later he will replace it with a different prescription or ask the patient to stop using it. Maududi, our 'scientific' Islamic fundamentalist scholar, is perhaps aware that Islam's Omnipotent God should not depend on one medicine to prepare the ground for the use of another.

²Ayat Allah Ruh Allah al-Musawi al-Khumayni Risala Tauzih (Tawdih) al-Masail, (Treatise to Explain the Issues), (in Persian), p. 12.

³Muslim literal-mindedness is occasionally, though unwittingly, a blessing. Most probably, the Prophet meant that Jews and Christians should be expelled from all Muslim-ruled areas. Fortunately, only Arabia, by and large, had come under Muslim rule by the time Muhammad issued this decree. Had he survived after further Muslim expansion, Muhammad would likely have called for the expulsion of non-Muslims from all the Muslim domains. Because of the absence of a clear NASS, literal Quranic or Prophetic decree, Muslims may not legislate expulsion of non-Muslims from all Muslim-dominated areas. But such a spirit has been reflected by Muslims throughout history. The early caliphs' policy to settle Muslim invaders of Byzantium and Iran in separate garrison towns reflected more a desire to keep believers away from the "unclean," NAJIS, nonbelievers rather than to preserve non-interference in non-Muslim affairs. Muslims have never wholeheartedly welcomed non-Muslims. The demand by Islamic parties for a "separate electorate," in Indo-Pakistan is a reflection of Muslim separatism. Even after Pakistan was established, Islamic parties, particularly Jamat Islami, insisted on the "separate electorate" system. In what was East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), and in some districts of Sindh province in West Pakistan, a significant number of Hindus continued to live after the partition of India. Islamic parties and circles always complained about Hindu "mischiefs" and "conspiracies". Hindus are seen as a great hindrance to further Islamization of Pakistan and Bangladesh. The en masse expulsion of Hindus during the Bangladesh crisis (1971) from East Pakistan reflected the inherent Muslim desire to rid their society of non-Muslims. The continuing crisis in the Sudan basically stems from the Muslim North's refusal to live equally with the predominantly non-Muslim South. The South demands a secular pluralistic system -which

implies "intermingling" between Muslims and non- Muslims. Apparently, it is difficult for a Muslim believer to digest the idea.

⁴For these references to Ahmad Said see Maulana Ahmad Said (d. 1960) KASHF-UR-RAHMAN MA' TAYSIR-UL QURAN WA TASHIL AL- QURAN [An Urdu translation of and commentaries on the Quran], Delhi, 1962, P. 83 passim cf. Q3:28, sup. (Zamimah=Damimah) 23 of Parah 3.

FOUNDATIONS OF MUSLIM IMAGES AND TREATMENT
OF THE WORLD BEYOND ISLAM

Volume III

By

Malek Muhammad Towghi

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History

1991

PART III: Belief in the Books and Messengers

Section 9: THE ERA OF THE LAST BOOK, THE QURAN, AND OF THE
LAST MESSENGER OF GOD, MUHAMMAD

*Obey God, and the Messenger (Muhammad) (Q3:32; 132; 4:59; 5:92; 8:1, 20, 46; 20:46; 24:54, 56; 47:33; 58:13; 64:12...)

*God to Muhammad: Surely thou art upon a mighty morality (Q68:4).

*Whoso makes a breach with the Messenger... and follows a way other than the believers', him We shall turn over what he has turned to and We shall roast him in Gehenna - an evil homecoming! (Q4:115).

A General Introduction to Part III, Section 9

Muslim belief in God's Books and Messengers as enjoined by the third part of the Islamic Synoptic Credo--**IMAN MUJMAL** culminates in belief in the Quran as the Almighty's last Book and in Muhammad as His Last Messenger. The second part of the Shahadah, the acknowledgment of Muhammad as God's true Messenger, reinforces this belief. The Shahadah implies that God's Message brought by Muhammad is contained in the Quran. It is also implied that all previous Books, as well as the divine teachings of previous Messengers, were forgotten, betrayed, corrupted and distorted by their followers - the so-called People of the Book. The Quran, and Muhammad through his divinely-guided Sunnah, have corrected, reformulated and conveyed the teachings of all previous Books and Messengers. The correct contents of these pre-Quran Books and the authentic stories and teachings of the pre-Muhammad Messengers are to be found only in the Quran and Muhammadan Tradition. So, a commitment to belief in God's Books and Messengers, through the Synoptic Credo is, in practice, reinforced by the Shahadah, a commitment to follow the Quran and Muhammad's Sunnah in all aspects of life, including the conduct of relations with non-Muslims. How the Quran and Muhammad treated nonbelievers during his Prophetic career is held as ideal, exemplary and binding for the treatment of nonbelievers by Muslims for all times in all places. For a Muslim, Muhammad's Sunnah, his exemplary model, is reflected by his application of the Quran and by his words, deeds and reported attitudes. The Sunnah of Muhammad is determined also by his explicit or implicit approval or toleration of the words, deeds and attitudes of his contemporary supporters (see Appendix I).

Circa 610 CE, Muhammad announced at Mecca, his home and birthplace, that he had received Divine revelation of the Quran and that he was the awaited last, perfect and most superior Messenger of God.¹ Except for a

short journey to the nearby city of Taif, Muhammad remained in Mecca until about 622 CE, when he performed hijra to Yathrib (known afterwards as Medina), where he died in 632 CE.

To understand better how the Quran and Muhammad treated nonbelievers differently in his Meccan and Medinan phases, note that at Mecca Muhammad and his followers were not dominant - just a powerless minority in a society dominated by non-Muslims, in a country not ruled by the maxims of the Quran and Sunnah. It was a Dar al-Harb, a "Domain of War", as the concept was later refined. This was also a time when no Dar al-Islam, Domain of Islam (a country ruled by Muslims, according to Islamic tenets) existed anywhere. In Medina, Islam held power. Muslims led by the Prophet ruled that city-state, and most of the Arabian peninsula by the time Muhammad died. Initially, Medina was the world's only Dar al-Islam.

These two phases of Muhammad's life may affect a Muslim's behavior toward (and his conduct of relations with) non-Muslims accordingly. The Meccan phase may be likened now to any situation where Muslims live in a society governed by a non-Islamic worldview and dominated by non-Muslims. It may be a country with a non-Muslim majority, not governed by Islam, such as the United States of America, or a Muslim-majority country, such as Turkey, committed constitutionally to secularism, or a country with a Muslim majority but not, for a Muslim fundamentalist, with a true Islamic system of government such as the Egypt of Anwar Sadat.² The Medinan model of the Prophet's Sunnah guides the behavior of an Islamic state and its Muslim citizens toward the world of non-Muslims within and without a Dar al-Islam. This involves Muslim treatment of non-Muslims and nonconformists in a situation where Islam is in power, and also modes of a given Dar al-Islam's relations with (and attitude toward) peoples and territories beyond its borders. The Medinan model may also affect the behavior of a Muslim resident or Muslim citizen of a non-Islamic country at a time when an Islamic country, a Dar al-Islam, exists elsewhere. (For example, the behavior of a Muslim Lebanese who does not recognize the Lebanese government as Islamic, or a Muslim resident or citizen of the

United States of America, when either believes in the Islamic credentials of Saudi Arabia or Pakistan or Iran. A question will be: will such a Muslim, ultimately, be loyal to his country of residence or to the perceived Dar al-Islam? Islam's expectations during the Medinan period from Muslims living in areas not dominated by Muhammad may give an answer.)

This section has three segments: 1) the Quran and Muhammad at Mecca before the establishment of a Muhammadan Dar al-Islam; 2) Muhammadan Dar al-Islam; at Medina: a study of ideal Islam in power; 3) foundations of Muslim images and treatment of 'modernism' as laid by Muhammad's treatment of the 'People of Jahiliyya'. The first two segments concentrate on specific aspects and modes of Muhammad's treatment of non-Muslims during the two phases of his Prophetic career. The third segment involving both phases studies the effects of the Prophet's perceptions and treatment of (what we call here) the People of Jahiliyyah on Muslim images and treatment of some modern patterns of thought and behavior. (The concept of 'the People of Jahiliyya' is explained in the third segment.)

Part III

Section 9

**Segment 1: The Quran and Muhammad at Mecca: Before the
Establishment of a Muhammadan Dar al-Islam**

During the Meccan phase of the Prophet's career Muslims remained a non-dominant minority. Although Islam was a new creed for the Meccans, peaceful coexistence was apparently possible. As a whole, the Meccans did not deprive Muhammad and his followers (for practicing a new religion per se) of what we call civil rights. For Muslim believers of all times in a similar situation, we study the responses of the Quran, Muhammad and his followers to the Meccan situation.

The Quran and Tradition highlight for Muslims certain modes of the Prophet's conduct of relations with non-Muslims during his Meccan phase. Foremost is the Prophet's persistent irreconciliation with other worldviews. Muslims find that Islam was not seeking mere recognition as one of many worldviews; it sought complete domination and elimination of all other creeds. The Prophet's Meccan career tells Muslims to reject the idea of pluralism and peaceful coexistence with non-Islam.

In seven formal rounds of talks, and in various other ways, nonbelievers of Mecca, though more powerful and politically dominant, tried to negotiate and compromise. In the end they asked that they be left alone. Muslims find that the Prophet began and maintained an aggressive and hegemonic posture toward the world beyond Islam. Muhammad left no room for ideological reconciliation and mutual toleration. He, exclusively, spoke for God. Muslims find that Muhammad and his followers, guided by God, maintained (overtly and covertly) self-righteousness and antagonism toward non-Muslims. Mild, benevolent and helpful nonbelievers were not excepted. Appeasement short of complete surrender did not satisfy Islam.

During discourses with nonbelievers the Prophet maintained certain patterns of response. He usually ignored the nonbelievers' mundane secular social concerns and specific proposals, changing the agenda of discussion to dogmatic issues: the necessity of belief in his version of Godhood, in his Prophethood and in the Day Hereafter. For the Meccans, Muhammad talked irrelevantly. His portrayal of their beliefs and patterns of behavior was unfounded or exaggerated, they thought. The central point

of Meccan objections was their disbelief in Muhammad's unique link to God, rather than their disbelief in the existence of a Supreme Being called Allah. They demanded rational proof of Muhammad's special link. Muhammad ignored these points; he repeated the Quran to authenticate his claim. To the Meccans, it was self- confirmatory.³

Muhammad's Meccan story, however, while rejecting any reconciliation and friendship with non-Muslims, tells believers that the Prophet and his followers adopted calculated pragmatism, if not sheer opportunism. They used and abused the tolerant, favorable traditions of the heathen. They sought and accepted non-Muslim protection and assistance when necessary. Also, when necessary, the Prophet and his supporters did not hesitate to use fawning, misleading and disingenuous methods. As long as the desired end, the ultimate supremacy of Islam, was not betrayed, Muslims learn, the means were justified. Besides, such "slips" could always be ascribed to "Satanic provocations". Though our sources record, unwittingly, the equanimity, civility, tolerance and liberality of the Quraysh towards Muhammad and his followers, this is not aimed at inculcating gratitude and reciprocal moderation among the believers. Ascribing Muhammad's survival and successes to God's preordained will and to miraculous happenings, it is the Prophet's (and his followers') stubbornness, offensive uncouthness and persistent zeal that are appreciated and projected at the Muslim mind. There must be no soft corner in any Muslim heart for the world beyond Islam. The necessary use of non-Muslims resources and good-will, or the adoption of transitory conciliation, must be accompanied, the Prophet's Sunnah teaches, with latent self-conviction about the loathsomeness of non-Muslims and their traditions, and with the determination to frustrate and destroy them eventually. The believer must be an alert fifth-columnist in his un-Islamic homeland and must act against it whenever possible. This leads us to the matter of the use of force, and semi-violent methods, by Muhammad during the Meccan phase. Muslims learn that Islam never seriously discarded the use of force during the Meccan phase. That Muhammad and Companions did not use it on a major

scale, Muslims read between the lines (and Tradition tells them frankly), was not because Islam taught pacifism. It is, simply and regretfully, because Islam had no such power -- **WA KAN AL-ISLAM DAIF-AN.**⁴ The use of violence by Meccan Islam - to the extent it was possible and took place - is glorified by the sources to inspire believers who find themselves in similar situations. The Prophet's search for powerful allies in and beyond Mecca, which culminated in his **HIJRA** to Medina, was clearly dominated by the urge to subdue Mecca by force. Muslims are told approvingly that during his whole Meccan career Muhammad and his followers preferred to be aggressive in tone, indeed, irritating, insolent, bullying and jingoistic rather than meek, humble, and forgiving. Muslims find that the absence of the sword was compensated by biting tongues, demoralizing propaganda and verbal violence against nonbelievers.

As in the case of the People of the Book, the apparently "soft" Quranic verses relating to Meccan pagans are mediated by the Quran itself and interpreted by Tradition for the believers. The context of the Quran, the abrogating verses, the Sunnah and other Traditional explanations tell Muslims that these verses (like the Prophet's ephemeral adjustments) did not teach tolerance. Occasional exhortations to disengage from nonbelievers did not recommend resigned isolationism, nonintervention and peaceful coexistence. They were meant to impress upon believers the wretchedness of nonbelievers - or to save believers from the embarrassment caused by intellectual confrontations. Meanwhile, believers were assured that God himself would soon chastise the heathen here and Hereafter. Muslims see, however, that neither the Almighty nor His Last Messenger waited passively for this punishment of the heathen in supernatural ways. The increasingly aggressive, segregationist disengagements, the mini-hijra, soon crystallized into the great hijra to Medina. Muslims learn that well before Muhammad and his followers left for Medina, they knew the hijra meant establishment of a power-base to use force against Mecca, which had refused to surrender voluntarily to the ideological and political supremacy of Islam. Vain Meccan efforts to

oppose Muslim emigration to a foreign land explain the Islamic meaning of hijra. The hijra from Mecca was preceded by the open Divine sanction of **JIHAD** (all-out struggle, holy war) and **QITAL** (fight to kill) against the Meccans. In sum, Muhammad's Meccan career inspires believers living in a Dar al-Harb, a society where Islam is not exclusively dominant, to use all means for its transformation into a Dar al-Islam, or leave it in search of a power-base abroad, a Dar al-Islam, in order to bring the resisting Dar al-Harb to its knees by force.

KALLA LA TUTI':NO RECONCILIATION.

The non-negotiable character of Islam is emphasized in the very beginning of Ibn Ishaq's story of the "Messenger of God", Muhammad. The revelation Muhammad received was an all-encompassing divine verdict on everything and a "decisive criterion",⁵ leaving neither need nor room for negotiation. The reader is also told that a people's like or dislike of Islam did not matter. Muhammad accepted and propagated it regardless of "men's good will or anger... in spite of the opposition and ill treatment..." (1.1:111). In the Quran "every wise matter was decided" (ibid). People had to follow, not question. The passage in Ibn Ishaq appreciates Muhammad's "resoluteness"; he never compromised with any opponent. The rest of the Prophet's story is a story of no reconciliation with nonbelievers. The Prophet was relentless in his preaching.

As commanded by God, Muhammad invited, first, his close relatives - the Banu Abd al-Muttalib - to believe in his Prophethood and creed.⁶ None had a "nobler message" than his, Muhammad told them. He also told them that Islam had "the best of this world and the next" for believers (1.1:117 cf. 26:214; 15:94). So, along with claiming superiority, Islam promised Muslims other-worldly as well as this-worldly gains. Through the Prophet's story and the Quran, Muslims would soon learn that this-worldly gains would come at the expense of non-Muslims through jihād. Most of Muhammad's relatives responded to his call with silence (ibid); they remained friendly.⁷ The benevolent neutrality of his own clan did not satisfy Muhammad; he extended his call to all clans of Mecca who, like the Banu Abd al-Muttalib, mostly belonged to the Quraysh tribe.⁸ Few were convinced, but there was no immediate opposition to Muhammad's new creed. The Quraysh "did not withdraw or turn against him", reports Ibn Ishaq (1.1:118). Tabari has noted that

in the beginning of his call to this (new religion) they did not go away from him; they used to listen to him till he spoke (ill) of their false gods... which (rebuking) was detested by some people and they adopted a harsh attitude toward him,... so the populace turned away from him and left him...⁹

Ibn Sad also tells us that after Muhammad began preaching Islam, converting some to his new creed, the nonbelieving Quraysh did not treat him with hostility for what he said. Nor did they object to his conversion of a number of them to Islam. Indeed, Ibn Sad informs us, the Meccans patronized Muhammad and were happy a son of the soil "was being talked to (or spoke of things from) heaven". In their own way, they appreciated Muhammad's indulgence in "heavenly affairs". This appreciation changed to dislike and animosity only after Muhammad ridiculed the deities the Meccans worshipped and after he mentioned the perdition of their fathers and ancestors who died as non-Muslims.¹⁰ Ibn Ishaq has a similar report. So long as Muhammad did not speak "disparagingly of their gods", the Meccans did not object to his adoption and preaching of a new religion (1.1:118).

Muslims read that it was Muhammad who broke the tradition of peaceful coexistence with various creeds. After Muhammad adopted an aggressive posture toward the Meccan religions - "spoke disparagingly of their gods" -the Meccans "took great offense and resolved unanimously to treat him as an enemy" (1.1:118). The story of Muhammad's treatment by the Meccans, described by Ibn Ishaq himself, Ibn Sad and Tabari, does not entirely agree with the assertion here that the Meccans resolved UNANIMOUSLY to treat him as an enemy. This lack of unanimity among the Meccans on how to treat Muhammad helped him to survive and finally crush the Meccan opposition. Whatever the extent of ill-will toward Muhammad and his followers, it was expressed, almost always, peacefully and with great restraint. The Quraysh, though in a dominant position, tried to negotiate and solve the problem nonviolently. As a whole, they did not ask Muhammad and his followers to shun their new faith. They simply asked Muhammad not to attack their creed and traditions. They wanted peaceful coexistence and restraint from berating another's religion openly. Muslims find that Muhammad refused this pagan Arab call for what we may call pluralism.

After Muhammad started his ideological onslaught, a delegation of

eight (or so) Meccan plenipotentiaries contacted Abu Talib, who, as the chief of the Banu Hashim/Banu Abd al-Muttalib clan, was Muhammad's protector. Reminding Abu Talib that he too adhered to their creed, they said

O Abu Talib, your nephew has cursed our gods, insulted our religion, mocked our way of life and accused our forefathers of error, ... you must stop him (1.1:119).

Their demands were defensive, not offensive. Abu Talib gave the Quraysh a conciliatory answer but, apparently did not ask Muhammad to cease. If Abu Talib did so, Muhammad must have ignored the request and "continued (on) his way, publishing God's religion and calling men thereto" (ibid).

As these Meccan complaints indicate, "publishing God's religion" was accompanied by harsh attacks on the nonbelievers' **TAWAGHIT**, "false gods", with insulting remarks about their dead. "In consequence", Muhammad's "relations with Quraysh deteriorated and men withdrew from him in enmity" (ibid); they did not attack him. They went back to Abu Talib. They complained anew that Muhammad had continued to revile their fathers, mock their customs and insult their gods. Before leaving, they warned Abu Talib they would fight them both if he failed to stop Muhammad (ibid). The threat never materialized. Abu Talib, however, was concerned. "Spare me and yourself", he told Muhammad, adding, "Do not put on me a burden greater than I can bear" (ibid). Muhammad was unmoved. He told his uncle he would never abandon the "course" he had adopted until God "Made it victorious or (he) perished" (ibid). So saying, Muhammad broke into tears and wanted to leave. The pagan but kindly Abu Talib changed his tone and reassured Muhammad of his protection. "Go and say what you please, for by God I shall never give you up on any account", said Abu Talib (ibid). The performance of social duties as the head of his clan, which involved the protection of all its members, meant more to Abu Talib than a show of solidarity with his co-religionists. Bear in mind that within the Banu Abd al-Muttalib/Banu Hashim clan only Ali b. Abu Talib had acknowledged

Muhammad's Prophethood. The clan's support of Muhammad was based on Meccan pagan traditions that a member of the community was to be protected by his clan, regardless of his religious beliefs - and other clans had to respect this right to protection by one's clan regardless of the protected person's religious, political and philosophical views.

Muhammad continued his propaganda, and the Quraysh went to Abu Talib yet a third time. Now they spoke harshly:

O Abu Talib, this is Umara, the strongest and most handsome young man among Quraysh, so take him and you will have the benefit of his intelligence and support; adopt him as a son and give up to us this nephew of yours who has opposed your religion and the religion of your fathers, severed the unity of your people, and mocked our way of life, so that we may kill him. This will be man for man (1.1:119).

Here was a person who in their eyes had committed sacrilege and treason, going beyond all reasonable limits in his abuse of their tolerant attitude toward religious non-conformism. In truth, by trying to impose a single religion Muhammad was frustrating a tradition of religious freedom then so common in Arabia. By strongly abusing their ancestors for religious reasons, and by insisting that all must follow his new creed, Muhammad, the Meccans thought, was unnecessarily creating a tense situation, polarizing their society dangerously. Muhammad had "brought a message by which", they thought, "he separated a man from his father, or from his brother, or from his wife, or from his family" (1.1:121-2). Despite this, however the Meccans did not resort to force and take law and order into their own hands. Rather they followed what we call due process of law, according to an unwritten but well-understood tradition of their society. They asked Abu Talib to replace Muhammad with another young man, Umarah, whom they offered, and relieve himself voluntarily of responsibility as Muhammad's formal protector. Adoption and compensation for blood were acceptable in Arabia. The Meccans offered such in anticipation. After Abu Talib refused the offer, the Meccans did not enforce their proposal against his wishes. Abu Talib and the whole Banu Hashim clan, though non-Muslims, protected Muhammad and thus enabled him to wield his rights

as a citizen of Mecca. The other Qurayshite clans, though more powerful and influential than the Hashimites and opposed to Muhammad's new religion, respected this Hashimite resolve to give Muhammad physical protection. Muhammad and his followers did not hesitate to accept and manipulate the rights and privileges provided by the traditions and the unwritten constitution of the Arab Jahiliyyah, pagandom, that Islam was so determined to disparage and destroy.

The Meccans decided to act peacefully against Muhammad's propaganda. Muhammad had started to contact outsiders visiting Mecca's seasonal fairs or performing pilgrimage. The Meccans were concerned about their image as the semi-official guardians of the most important Jahiliyyah shrine, the Kaba, and its surrounding 'sanctuary', the **HARAM**. The Kaba contained images of various deities venerated in Arabia, including two images of Jesus and Mary (1.1:552). The fairs were venues for people meeting and exchanging ideas and information freely. The **HARAM** around the Kaba was also a place for secular public meetings and religious performances. Muhammad's new voice spoke against the whole pluralistic system. As guardians and beneficiaries of the system, particularly during the pilgrimage and fair season, the Meccans needed to dissociate themselves from Muhammad. In the selection of their charges against Muhammad, the Meccan leaders tried to be accurate, responsible and objective. Acting conscientiously rather than as self-righteous religious bigots, the Meccans finally decided to tell others that Muhammad resembled a sorcerer. The Meccans thought that only a sorcerer could do what Muhammad had done. It was a reference to his followers' ruthless behavior toward their non-Muslim relatives and fellow citizens. After conversion, Muslims ignored all their filial and social relations and responsibilities.¹¹ The Meccans thought this kind of "brainwashing" could be performed only by a sorcerer. They reached this conclusion reluctantly, however.¹²

Peaceful Meccan counter-propaganda was met by Muhammad in two ways:
1) He continued to claim to receive revelation from God, confirming his

unique status, and asked others to believe in his Prophethood. Meanwhile, the Almighty ridiculed those who had called Muhammad a sorcerer; the believers were told that Muhammad's critics would be punished by God.¹³ But the Prophet did not depend exclusively on Divine succor. 2) He allowed his uncle Abu Talib to defend him secularly. In his poetry addressed to the Meccans in defense of Muhammad, Muslims find, Abu Talib used flattery as well as threats. Abu Talib appealed to traditions and to the nobility and generosity of Meccan leaders.¹⁴

After the Meccans realized that Abu Talib and his clan would never abandon Muhammad - nor Muhammad his aggressive mission - they apparently decided to find some other way, without depending on Abu Talib and the Hashimites. They met near the Kaba and vented their frustrations. The Quraysh said they

had never known the like of the trouble they had endured from this fellow (Muhammad); he had declared their mode of life foolish, insulted their forefathers, reviled their religion, divided their community, and cursed their gods. What they had borne was past all bearing ... (1.1:131).

Before the Quraysh could decide anything, Muhammad moved toward a more aggressive posture and resolve. He appeared, uninvited, at their meeting. This must have irritated them. For the first time they insulted Muhammad, verbally, saying "some injurious things about him".¹⁵

Muhammad left the meeting but returned twice to this private gathering of his adversaries, lingering on (1.1:131). This was too much for the Quraysh; they repeated their "injurious words" about Muhammad (ibid). If the purpose was to make Muhammad leave so that the Quraysh could continue their deliberations in private, they failed. The Prophet threatened them physically. He said:

Will you listen to me O Quraysh? By Him who holds my life in His hand, I bring you slaughter -- **DHABH** (1.1:131). [Which means that he would massacre them. TT-1,2:332. For Tabari's Muslim editor it means "Muhammad intended to threaten them with annihilation -- **ARAD TAHDIDAHUM BIL- HALAK** (ibid note no.3).]

The Quraysh were stunned and faced with peril. They could attack

Muhammad. But this was likely to start a civil war between the Hashimites and the rest. The Meccans wanted peace. Moreover, they thought Muhammad was being undignified. In response to Muhammad's threat of massacre, DHABH, the Quraysh reacted more responsibly and soberly; they kept their heads. They requested Muhammad politely leave them alone. Calling Muhammad affectionately by his Kunya name, they asked him to leave.¹⁶ The Prophet's reaction tells the believers that he was not bound by the nonbelievers' etiquette. Nor did he think it unfit to make a scene. The Quraysh gathered the next morning to discuss the crisis created by Muhammad.

While they were talking thus the apostle appeared [obviously, he was the intruder] and they leaped upon him as one man and encircled him saying, 'Are you the one who said so-and-so against our gods, and our religions?' The apostle said, 'Yes, I am the one who said that!...' One of them (seized) his robe. Then Abu Bakr [a Muslim] interposed himself weeping and saying, 'Would you kill a man for saying Allah is my Lord?' Then they left him. That is the worst [Ibn Ishaq's ultimate Muslim source maintains] that I ever saw Quraysh do to him [i.e. Muhammad] (1.1:131; brackets added).

As a believing scholar Ibn Ishaq does not think it necessary - nor do other believers - to censure Abu Bakr for his unfounded allegation that the Quraysh wanted to kill Muhammad because of his belief in Allah. The Arabs believed in Allah. The context tells the reader that the Meccans had no plans to kill Muhammad. The Meccans were simply reacting to the Prophet's unwanted intrusion into their meeting. A Muslim, however, gathers uncritically that narcissistic exaggerations, along with stubbornness (if not obstinacy), were tactics of the Prophet and his followers as they confronted nonbelievers. Perhaps, because of his hue and cry, Abu Bakr was dragged by his thick beard (ibid). And that was all. Apparently, Muhammad had utterly disrupted his opponents' meeting. Up to that time this "seizing (of) Muhammad's robe" by a non-Muslim was "the worst" that he ever suffered physically from non-Muslims. This also happened because of Muhammad's aggressive intrusion. The Meccans had not gone after Muhammad to tease him.

The Quraysh continued their efforts to settle peacefully with

Muhammad. Utbah b. Rabiah, an old but influential Quraysh leader, known for his cultured manners, politeness and tolerance, convinced the Meccans to continue negotiations with Muhammad (1.1:132). The Quraysh were ready to give concessions, hoping "Muhammad would leave them in peace" (*ibid*). They initiated the fourth round of negotiations with the Prophet. Authorized by the Quraysh, Utbah b. Rabiah approached Muhammad, who "was sitting in the mosque [the HARAM of the Kaba] by himself" (*ibid*). After sitting down, Utbah complained politely:

O my nephew, you are one of us, as you know, of the noblest of the tribe and hold a worthy position in ancestry. [After this respectful beginning, Utbah told Muhammad politely how he had divided their community and created tension by ridiculing their customs, insulting their gods, religion and forefathers.] (1.1:132; the material in brackets summarized.)

When Muhammad agreed to listen, Utbah proposed:

If what you want is money, we will gather for you of our property so that you may be the richest of us; if you want honor we will make you our chief so that no one can decide anything apart from you; if you want sovereignty, we will make you king, and if this ghost which comes to you, which you see, is such that you cannot get rid of him, we will find a physician for you, and exhaust our means in getting you cured, for often a familiar spirit gets possession of a man until he can be cured of it'... (1.1:132).

In his response, except for the point related to his Prophethood, Muhammad avoided direct discussion of various items Utbah mentioned. Instead of addressing the issues, Muhammad recited the Quranic passage (41:1-38) and then prostrated himself before God. Utbah was left with no other choice but to listen attentively to what he thought could be dictated by a ghost (1.1:133). The Quranic passage Muhammad recited confirmed the divine nature of the Quran revealed to him, and the authenticity of his claim to have received revelation from God though he was only a normal human being. The nonbelievers were condemned (41:1-6). Muhammad's adversaries were charged with disbelief in God (41:9) and in the Last Day (41:7). The Meccans were called polytheists, and warned of Divine punishment in this world and the Hereafter - the kind of punishment perpetrated before on those, such as Ad and Thamud, who were too proud of

their worldly power (41:6, 13-17, 19-25). Specially threatened with punishment were those who did not listen to the Quran faithfully (41:26-30). As in most of the Meccan Quran, the passage projected God's omnipotence (41:9-10). The believers were exhorted to remain steadfast, and were promised divine help and reward in this life and in the Afterlife (41:8, 18, 30-2, 34-8). After reciting this Quranic passage and prostrating himself theatrically, Muhammad told Utbah: "You have heard what you have heard,... the rest remains with you" (1.1:133). Utbah found in Muhammad a person uninterested in his kind of discourse. For Utbah, Muhammad spoke quite a different language, behaved in an unusual manner and talked of extraordinary things. Muhammad had changed the agenda unilaterally. He insisted, basically, on his unique relationship with God. Perhaps both Muhammad and Utbah (and the Meccans) knew well the consequences of belief in such a claim: automatic and unconditional recognition of Muhammad's supreme status in everything. What Utbah offered was implicitly limited and conditional. Chieftancy or kingship of the Quraysh or Mecca would mean responsibility and service to the society. The Arabs did not believe in tyranny or in a Divine right to rule. Acceptance of this offer of riches and leadership would in principle be a surrender to negotiation with nonbelievers. This would oblige Muhammad to forego his claim to Divinely-guided leadership and on his unique link to God. And this would pull him from Heaven down to earth. Utbah also expected that if Muhammad accepted the offer, it meant that he, regardless of his own worldview, would tolerate others' creeds and traditions. Muhammad rejected the offer. It was not, however, a rejection of wealth and leadership per se. It was the rejection of these implied conditions put on Muhammad's supreme leadership. As Muhammad's eventual victory would show, accepting his supreme political leadership and his final authority was a part of acknowledging his Messengership. For Muslims, Muhammad did not need any confirmation by mortals. Islam would never be a secular democracy; it was a theocracy from the first, Muslims learn.

After Utbah reported his failure to the Quraysh elders, "They

decided to send for Muhammad and argue with him so that they could not be held to blame on his account in the future" (1.1:133). The Quraysh gave Muhammad a chance to discuss his case in the **MALA**, the Meccan Senate.¹⁷ This was round five. After Muhammad took his seat, the Quraysh

explained that they had sent for him in order that they could talk together. No Arab (they said), had ever treated his tribe as Muhammad had treated them, and they repeated the charges which have been mentioned on several occasions (1.1:133-4).

They also renewed Utbah's offers: money, chieftancy, kingdom and a cure for the thought of Prophethood, which they thought might have been caused by an evil "spirit which had got possession of him" (ibid).

Muhammad again ignored the Meccan line of argument. Instead he insisted that "God has sent him as an apostle, and revealed a book to him, and commanded him to become an announcer -- **BASHIR** and warner -- **NADHIR**. He had brought them the message of his Lord, and given them good advice". "If they took it," Muhammad added, "then they would have a portion in this world and the next; if they rejected it, he could only patiently await the issue until God decided between them" (1.1:134). As before, an arbitrary approach; there was no room to negotiate.

The Quraysh realized that Muhammad was not ready to negotiate, again disdainful of their complaints and proposals. Frustrated, they tried to use Muhammad's Quranic assertions against him. The Quran had continuously mentioned God's omnipotence, the stories of the past Prophets and how God had always miraculously helped the Messengers. Muhammad claimed he was the Messenger of God and that the Almighty was definitely on his side. The Quraysh, whose diplomatic moves had failed to convince Muhammad to talk seriously (as they saw it), now turned to polemics. Referring to Muhammad's descriptions of God's omnipotence and his special link to the Almighty, the Quraysh sarcastically bade Muhammad "ask his Lord" to change the barren desert and rugged mountains of Mecca into prosperous lands of "rivers like those of Syria and Iraq" (1.1:134). They also, rhetorically, called on Muhammad to pray to God to resurrect Qusayy, the common ancestor of Quraysh (to verify the possibility of life after

death and Muhammad's claim that they were in Hell) (ibid). They further asked Muhammad to show them the angel he claimed had brought revelation, to have the angel make gardens and castles for the Prophet. Muhammad told them darkly to "await God's judgment" (ibid) meaning that He would punish them for their disbelief. The Quraysh jibed:

Then let the heaven be dropped on us in pieces, as you assert your Lord could do if He wished, for we will not believe you unless you do so (ibid).

Muhammad replied it "was a matter for God; if He wanted to do it with them, He would do it" (ibid). Note that Muhammad did not reject the possibility of such happening. The Meccans were unconvinced. They taunted him further.

Did not your Lord know that we would sit with you and ask you these questions, so that He might come to you and instruct you how to answer us, and tell you what he was going to do with us, if we did not receive your message? (ibid).

The core of all of these polemics was that the Quraysh did not believe that Muhammad received revelation from God. About the Quran Muhammad claimed was the Word of God, the Quraysh remarked (as recorded in the Quran):

This is naught but a calumny he has forged, and other folk have helped him to it... Fairy tales of the ancient that he has had written down, so that they are recited to him at the dawn and in the evening (Q25:4-5).

They named particular persons, such as a certain Rahman, with whose help, they thought, Muhammad concocted the Quran (1.1:134). During the meeting even a nephew of Muhammad, Abd Allah b. Abu Umayyah, turned against him for not answering the Quraysh leaders satisfactorily (1.1:135). The Quraysh had become more righteous. They told Muhammad:

Our conscience is clear. By God, we will not leave you and our treatment of you, until either we destroy you or you destroy us... We will not believe in you until you come to us with God and the angels as surety (1.1:134).

They wanted rational proof of the Almighty's and His angels' link to

Muhammad. Having no convincing answers, Muhammad left the session. The Quran would later tell him how to respond to the Quraysh.

The Quraysh excelled in threats followed by inaction. Instead of trying "to destroy" Muhammad before "he destroyed" them, they made another effort to understand if he was truthful. Having heard of Judeo-Christian traditions, and knowing of Muhammad's identification with them, the Meccans sent two men to Medina to ask the Jews how to see the truth of Muhammad's claim. This was another Meccan effort to be fair about Muhammad. The Medinan rabbis reportedly told the Meccans to ask Muhammad about "the young men who disappeared in ancient days", about "the mighty traveler who reached the confines of both East and West" and about "the spirit [or soul]". If Muhammad gave correct answers he was to be an authentic Prophet, otherwise "a rogue", the Jews reportedly advised the Meccans (1.1:136). When asked, Muhammad promised to answer the next day (ibid). God was supposed to reveal to him the answers. But Muhammad did not fulfill the promise. The Quraysh grumbled, saying "Muhammad promised us an answer on the morrow, and today is the fifteenth day we have remained without an answer" (ibid). [A nonbelieving historian may speculate Muhammad was engaged in 'research' through whatever sources and methods he used to utilize. As in Q25:5 and 1.1:134 quoted above the Meccans charged "other folk" helped him to "forge" what he claimed to be Revelation, the Quran.] Finally, the angel Gabriel showed up with a number of Quranic passages, which addressed the questions - and also referred to Mecca's recent actions and reactions to Muhammad.¹⁸

The Meccans had argued that if Muhammad really had a link to the Almighty and All-knowing God, he should have taken much less time to save His Messenger from embarrassment. The Quran, as Tradition explained, had a simple explanation. Muhammad had forgotten to say, **INSHA ALLAH**, God willing."¹⁹ Particular Quranic passages reflect Muhammad's response to the infidels after talks broke down in the Meccan Senate.

The Quran answered the questions about "the young men who disappeared in ancient days" (18:9-31) and about "the mighty traveler who

reached the confines of both East and West" (18:83-110) in some detail. About "the spirit" or soul, **AR-RUH**, the Quran was curt:

The spirit is of the bidding of (the) Lord. You have been given of knowledge nothing except a little (17:85).

The Quran called the "young men" **ASHAB AL-KAHF**, "Those of the Cave", (the Seven Sleepers?). The "mighty traveler" was Dhu'l-Qurnayn, "The One with Two Horns", a powerful Muslim (Prophet?) ruler of the past. Answering these questions, the Quran was less concerned with factual data; it continuously alluded to confrontations between Muhammad and the Meccans. Ibn Ishaq, Ibn Sad and Tabari do not say in the immediate context whether Medinan Jews had verified Muhammad's answers. The persistent Meccans doubted the Quranic answers. The answers per se are not important. But the reference in the context and the mode of these answers to confrontations between Muhammad and the Meccans is. Some patterns of Muhammad's Quranic responses revealed during this time emerge.

Referring to the disbelief in Muhammad's unique link to God, the Quran repeatedly confirmed that he was indeed God's Messenger, sent to all mankind (34:28), and that he received genuine revelation from God. For a Muslim, this self-confirmation should have convinced others of Muhammad's truthfulness. The Quran warned nonbelievers of severe punishment, particularly in the Afterlife; the believers were promised success and an eternal life of comfort and luxury in Paradise.²⁰ Muhammad was told that past Prophets had also been mocked by nonbelievers who, though respited for a while, were finally overtaken by God's wrath. The believers were reassured that, as before, the nonbelievers will eventually be punished here and Hereafter for disbelieving Muhammad and for mocking Islam.²¹ Muslims are told they must simply wait for a disaster to strike non-Muslims, rather than re-evaluate their thoughts and actions or reach any reconciliations with nonbelievers.

The Meccan demand for miracles as proof of Muhammad's truthfulness was variously met. First, it was confirmed that the God who revealed Himself to Muhammad could indeed act extraordinarily, especially to succor

His Messengers and the believers and to destroy nonbelievers. Referring to the Meccan sarcasm, the Almighty told Muhammad:

Blessed be He who, if He will, shall assign to thee better than that - gardens underneath which rivers flow, and he shall assign to thee palaces (25:10).

This was a Divine promise to act miraculously in favor of His last Messenger. The story of the young men, "Those of the Cave" (and that of David and Solomon, which was partially inserted (34:10-24), were to prove that God could perform wonders for the believers. "Those of the Cave" were miraculously shielded from their nonbelieving enemies and were resurrected in this world 309 years after their death (18:25 passim). This also confirmed the possibility of an Afterlife preached by Muhammad and rejected by the Meccans. Also miraculous and strange, mountains sang, along with David, God's praise; and iron was made soft for David (34:10). Winds obeyed Solomon; so did the jinn, performing great deeds for the Prophet-King(34:11-3). The Meccans were also told of other past wonders (34:15-21). The Quran confirmed, rather than rejected, the idea of such doings gracing believers. Through these stories, Muslims were told they might hope for God's help and favors in extraordinary ways.

Why did they not happen as the Meccans had asked? The Quran answered polemically and philosophically. About the Meccan demand to see the angel, the Quran remarked:

Had there been in the earth angels..., We would have sent down upon them out of heaven an angel as Messenger (17:95).

The Quraysh had not asked for an angel-Prophet; they just wanted to see the angel as "surety" that indeed they came to Muhammad. Moreover, the Quran had taken the Meccan twit too seriously. Part of the polemical answer is God's advice to Muhammad to say: "God suffices as a witness between me and you" (17:96). Thus, the Prophet (and the believers) need not worry about the nonbelievers' dissatisfaction regarding Islam's claims. A demand for rational proofs of his Prophethood could be shrugged off. God would punish disbelief. And that the nonbelievers would go to

Hell should not worry Muslims. A self-righteous and care-not attitude toward non-Muslims was recommended to believers.

In the philosophical explanation, the Prophet was told that God did not want nonbelievers to believe - they were predestined to doubt and, consequently, suffer here and Hereafter. Nothing was wrong with Islam; nor was the Almighty unable to perform wonders so that the infidels would be convinced to believe. Believers are told that the non-Muslim persistence in un-Islam was part of a Divine design. It is the wretchedness of the unbelievers that Muslims should think of on such occasions, not of any problematic aspects of Islam.²³ Dhu'l-Qarnayn, the Muslim emperor, was another success story, an Islamic hero who sustained the Prophet at a difficult time. That eloquent story was also used as a warning to Muhammad's Meccan adversaries and as a promise that Muhammad and the believers will similarly overwhelm the heathen.

Keeping in mind Muhammad's embarrassment in prior meetings with the Quraysh, a tactic of partial withdrawal was suggested. The Prophet was told to restrict himself to the true believers and keep away from the "wretched" (18:28). It was to avoid and ignore nonbelievers, particularly when the outcome of the debate was not assured in favor of Islam.²⁵ This advice for partial segregation was coupled with a commandment: never reconcile with nonbelievers, but carry on the "great struggle", **JIHAD KABIR**, against them (13:37; 18:28; 25:52). Therefore, Muslims are restrained from debating on purely rational grounds for logical ends. They are, however, required by the Quran to continue relentlessly their struggle against non-believers on their own terms. The use of strong abuse, insults and ridicule against the nonbelievers was a part of this Jihad kabir, "great struggle".²⁶ The story of the 'pious-learned' man (18:60-82), named Khidr in Tradition, and also the answer to the question about "the soul", are meant to discourage intellectualism and logical thinking. The story implicitly criticizes Moses for questioning Khidr's actions which apparently defied rationality. Khidr had divine knowledge. According to the Quran, Moses should not have

questioned his actions. As a divinely guided Prophet, however, Moses apologized and asked Khidr no more questions. The purpose of the story, revealed at this juncture of Muhammad's career was to tell the Meccans they were wrong to ask Muhammad to explain everything by ordinary means. Because Moses finally agreed to follow unconditionally, the Meccans were expected to follow Muhammad blindly. Blind faith, **IMAN BI'L-GHAYB** (belief in the unseen), was eventually set as a condition for being a good Muslim (Q22:3 passim). The brusque answer to the question about "the soul" (17:85) discouraged discussion and thinking about metaphysical phenomena. Muhammad wanted others to acknowledge him as God's Messenger without question. A rational interpretation of Muhammad's demands and expectations was thus out of the question from the very beginning. Islam demanded blind faith in Muhammad. These Quranic responses to the three questions, and other developments, raised tensions.

The Divine directive "not to listen to the nonbelievers, and to struggle with them mightily" precluded negotiation and any possible reconciliation.^{26a} Muhammad was determined not to let the Meccans go their own way, and be content to follow his creed silently (1.1:142-3). This was apparent in the growing Muslim aggressiveness. Abd Allah b. Masud (destined to become a famous companion of the Prophet among Muslims) appeared uninvited in the infidels' private gathering to "make them listen to the Quran" (1.1:141-2). Ibn Masud received a mild beating. Ibn Masud was undeterred and told his fellow Muslims he would continue to proselytize the same way, saying:

God's enemies were never more contemptible in my sight than they are now, and if you like I will go and do the same thing before them tomorrow (1.1:141-2).

This growing nuisance created by Muhammad's followers compelled a few Meccans to react. Even these, however, had social bounds to what they could do. No physical action could be taken against independent, free citizens. Most of Muhammad's followers belonged to this category. Only those with a lower miscellaneous status - the slaves and those not affiliated with citizen clans (the illegal aliens!) - were vulnerable.

Others could be reproached only through social and economic pressure. Regardless of its strident tone, the 'persecution' was nonviolent and physical mistreatment was limited to a few. Witness this report:

It was the wicked Abu Jahl who used to incite the men of Quraysh against them (sc. the Muslims). When he heard of the conversion of a man of high birth with powerful friends he criticized him vigorously and put him to shame. 'You have left your father's religion', he said, 'although he is a better man than you; we shall make your prudence appear as folly and your judgement unsound, and we shall bring your honour low.' If he was a merchant, he said, 'By God, we shall see that your goods are not sold and your capital is lost. If he was an unimportant person, he peat him and incited people against him (IH, 206f. in Watt, Mec. 117).

The "unimportant persons" were freed men and aliens (with no tribal affiliation, no legal citizen sponsors, in modern terms.) Less than ten persons are mentioned by Ibn Ishaq as being mistreated in some way. Only one, apparently accidental, death - that of the mother of Ammar b. Yasir - is reported.²⁷ Masters did not want their slaves to die or become crippled. The few slaves converted to Islam were soon sold to Muslims (1.1:143-5). Free citizens under guardianship could be admonished to a limited extent and only by their own legal guardians or with their explicit permission. Because of strong pagan-tribal traditions, the guardian did not allow capital punishment. Similarly, the fear of retaliation by the pagan members of a clan restrained outsiders from acting against a Muslim convert of the same clan. Guardians and clan members were too concerned about their secular social responsibilities, and image, to let their wards or fellow clan members be hurt seriously for religious reasons. And the Meccans were not fanatics. Hisham b. al-Walid's brother and ward al-Walid was converted to Islam. Some members of the same clan went to Hisham and sought his permission "to admonish" the convert. Hisham told them

All right, ... admonish him, but beware that you do not kill him!
[Hisham warned in poetry]:

My brother, Uways shall not be killed. Otherwise there will be war
between us for ever.

As if it was not enough, Hisham further warned:

Be careful of his life, for I swear by God if you kill him, I will kill the noblest of you to the last man (1.1:145).

"God damn the man," said the men, meaning Hisham; and added:

After what he has said, who will want to bring trouble on himself, for, by God, if this man were killed while in our hands the best of us would be killed to a man (ibid).

"So they left (the Muslim convert) and withdrew" (ibid). The same Islamic sources relate that few Meccans were involved in the limited persecution of Muslims. Abu Jahl was an exception, not the rule. As Watt notes correctly, probably not all the acts of persecution of Muslims attributed to Abu Jahl really happened. [Watt, "Abu Djah1", El²,1:115).

The way Hamza b. Abd al-Muttalib (Muhammad's uncle), and Umar b. al-Khattab, acted during their conversion in this period does not indicate Muslims were helpless in the society. It is also obvious that Muslims had sustained their aggressiveness. After he decided to convert to Islam, Umar spread the news of his unexpected and sudden conversion to torment and provoke his former fellow nonbelievers. He went to their meetings, to declare aggressively and annoyingly that he had joined Muhammad and accepted his creed. After a fight broke out between Umar and a group of nonbelievers, another nonbeliever defended him and perhaps saved his life. He advised his fellow nonbelievers to avoid a possible war by saying: "Why should not a man choose a religion for himself, and what are you trying to do? Do you think that Banu Adiy (Umar's clan) will surrender their companion to you thus? Let the man alone" (1/1:158-9; brackets added). Umar was left alone, though he continued intentionally to provoke and annoy the Meccan nonbelievers, who thought themselves bound by etiquette not to go beyond certain limits. Umar proudly recalled:

When I became a Muslim... I thought of the man who was the most violent [?] in enmity against the apostle so that I might come and tell him that I had become a Muslim, and Abu Jahl [Umar's maternal uncle] came to my mind... So in the morning I knocked on his door, and he came out and said, 'The best of welcomes, nephew, what has brought you?' I answered that I had come to tell him that I believed in God and his apostle Muhammad and regarded as true what he had

brought. He [Abu Jahl] held the door in my face and said, 'God damn you, and damn what you brought,' **QABBAHAK ALLAH WA QABBAH MA JIT BIHI** (1.1:159).

Circa 615 CE, about years after he had declared his Prophethood, Muhammad, amid increasing stress between Muslims and non-Muslims, advised some believers to emigrate to Abyssinia. He asked them to "remain there until God freed them from their distress... (It) was a fleeing to God with (i.e. their religion (and) the first hijra in Islam" (1.1:145; parenthetically). Eventually about one hundred Muslims emigrated to Abyssinia of whom some remained there until after the Prophet's great hijra to Mecca in 622 CE.²⁸ The Meccans opposed Muslim emigration. In vain they tried to convince the Abyssinians to send the Muslims back to Mecca. This is important because it introduced a new mode of relationship between Muslims (who formed a non-ruling minority) and their country: citizenship: the mode of hijra ("emigration"). As Islam meant the hijra was an act of "avoiding and cutting off ties of kinship and friendly association" with non-Muslims.²⁹

The hijra to Abyssinia, the later hijra to Medina, teaches Muslims that the interests of land and nation, if not ruled by Islam, are subordinate to the interests of faith. A Muslim is expected to leave such a land, the Dar al-Harb (the domain of war), breaking relations with its inhabitants, in search of a land ruled by Muslims or by a Muslim. In order to satisfy this requirement, Tradition (regardless of history) deems it necessary to Muslims believe in the conversion of the Negus to Islam (1.1:155) as the believers are told that the Muslims lived in a Dar al-Islam Abyssinia ruled by a Muslim Negus.

It has been argued convincingly that emigration to Abyssinia was not caused exclusively by the Muslims' search for a safe haven (Watt, Mec. 112-7). Muhammad's subsequent activities indicate to a Muslim that the hijra to Abyssinia reflected the Prophet's determination to find and use external support against the Meccans, and to establish a Muslim-ruled domain. Watt's speculations that the Abyssinian venture could have been "part of a subtle plan of Muhammad to get military help" against Mecca

is plausible (ibid:114). This is exactly what he tried in Taif and gained in Medina. The Quraysh desire that Muslims return to Mecca can only be interpreted by their fear of the consequences of the friendly presence of their opponents in a foreign land. The Quraysh were afraid of the interference of a third party in their internal affairs, while the remaining Muslims in Mecca were ready to act as traitors. Discussing the ways of dealing with Muhammad, the Meccans were well aware of the dangers of his contacts abroad. Unanimously opposing the suggestion to expel him from Mecca, they knew that in such a case

he would call up the Arabs, luring and inciting them against you who will league together against you and then will come to you and will expel you from your country and will kill the best of your people.³⁰

This is almost exactly what happened after the Prophet's great hijra to Medina. The story of hijra to Abyssinia also tells the believer the fitness of defaming of one's own un-Islamic country and the aptness of character assassination of one's non-Muslim fellow-citizens. The Meccans had sent two men to Abyssinia to request the return of Muslims to Mecca. The Meccan delegates told the Abyssinians:

Some foolish fellows from our people have taken in the King's country. They have forsaken our religion and not accepted yours, but have brought in an invented religion which neither we nor you know anything about. Our nobles have sent us to the king to get him to return them, so when we speak to the king about them advise him to surrender them to us and not to speak to them, for their own people have the keenest insight and know most about their fault (1.1:151).

The Muslim representative told the Abyssinians in a long, flattering speech, among other things, that the Meccans, or the Arabs in general before Muhammad's call (and those who did not believe in Muhammad), were "uncivilized people" who "committed abomination," "broke natural ties" and treated their guests badly." It was Muhammad, he claimed, who told them to be faithful to (their) engagements, "mindful of the ties of kinship," and hospitable and to "refrain from... bloodshed." The Muslim also charged that the Meccans had "come between us and our religion," had not allowed

them to adopt the new creed. In the end, the Muslim representative told the Negus, with a tint of flattery,

We came to your country, having chosen you above all others. Here we have been happy in your protection and we hope that we shall not be treated unjustly while we are with you, O king (1.1:151-2).

The non-Muslims presented their case carefully and objectively, whereas the Muslims exaggerated their charges against the Meccans. But this would not impress a Muslim reader. Apparently for our sources, who know how inconsistent these reports are with other parts of their own accounts of Meccan Islam, misrepresentation and exaggeration are authorized as long as the target is heathendom and the beneficiary Islam.

The Meccan mission to have the Muslim emigrants extradited failed. In ca. 616 CE, the Quraysh took yet another nonviolent step to defend their system: they boycotted Muhammad and his supporters. Among Muhammad's Hashimite clan only Abu Lahab, his uncle, sided openly with the Quraysh. According to the terms of the boycott document, displayed in the Kaba, the Quraysh decided not to have any further matrimonial or business relations with Muhammad, his followers and his clan who, under Abu Talib's leadership, were providing the Muslims protection. During the boycott, Muhammad and his followers enjoyed freedom of movement, speech, worship and other social-political activity in the Sanctuary of the Kaba, considered by the pagans a public place accessible to all (1.1:165). The infidels, though in power and majority, did not try to monopolize the Kaba and the surrounding Sanctuary, even against their worst enemy, Muhammad.

Though united in their disbelief in Muhammad's Prophethood, the Meccans were not so united in their actions against him. Some nonbelievers violated the boycott covertly and overtly; "friends unknown to Quraysh" provided some provisions secretly to the believers (1.1:160). Hisham b. Amr, a "highly esteemed" non-Muslim

used to bring a camel laden with food by night and then when he had got it to the mouth of the alley he took off its halter, gave it a whack on the side and sent it into the alley to them. He would do

the same thing another time, bringing clothes for them (1.1:172).

The Arabs had yet to learn, after conversion to Islam, an unflinching and disciplined harshness towards members of other faiths. Abu'l Bakhtari, an influential non-Muslim and non-Hashimite, used force against his co-religionist Abu Jahl to keep the food-supply line to the Muslims open. Meanwhile, Muhammad remained adamant and continued asking the Quraysh to convert to Islam.

The Prophet continued his harsh criticism of Meccan deities. Requests had failed to restrain him. Some Meccans finally warned: "By God, Muhammad, you will either stop cursing our gods or we will curse the god you serve" (1.1:162). It would seem that the nonbelievers of Mecca had not until then insulted what was sacred to Muhammad. It was Muhammad who had taken the initiative by using scurrilous language against what was sacred to others. God told Muhammad "Curse not those to whom they pray other than God lest they curse God wrongfully..." (6:108). Thus, for a time the Meccan warning worked. "The Apostle refrained from cursing their gods... though he continued to call them to Allah" (1.1:162 cf. Q6:108). The restraint was caused by the fear "lest they curse (Islamic) God" rather than an honest belief in peaceful coexistence on the basis of mutual respect for one another's faith. The nonbelievers' later complaints, the Quran's increasingly harsh and humiliating language, and the abuses from Muhammad's Companions and supporters given the infidels, their deities and traditions, indicate that Muslims did not refrain for long from using derogatory language.

During the boycott, Muhammad was allowed pagan Arab civil liberties; exciting and lively debates took place between Muhammad and the Quraysh. Muhammad was given a fair chance to express his case; he was applauded by the nonbelievers when he won a point. Most of these debates took place in the Sanctuary around the Kaba. Unlike in the Muslim era, beginning with Islam's conquest of Mecca in 630 CE, the pre-Islamic **HARAM**, "Sanctuary", the Kaba and its vicinity, and, indeed all of Arabia was a "Speakers' Corner", where views could be expressed regardless of their

popularity or unpopularity. An-Nadr b. al-Harith, a Meccan familiar with ancient Iranian stories and legends, declared he could tell better and more marvelous stories of the past than the "old fable" Muhammad was telling people (1.1:162). This was a reference to the Quran's stories of past Islamic Prophets and their adversaries. Abd Allah b. az-Zibara, another Meccan debater, tried to convince Muhammad that their way or worship was not different from those of Jews, Christians and Muslims. Notice that az-Zibara sought recognition of equal rights for his creed, rather than holding his to be superior to others. Nor did his worldview seek to dominate or level other creeds. Az-Zibara argued that the "pagan" Arab worship, or veneration of lesser deities, was not different from the Jewish and Christian veneration of figures other than the Supreme Being. Az-Zibara challenged Muhammad's strict monotheism: "Is everything worshiped besides God in Gehenna, with those who worship it? We worship the angels; the Jews worship Uzayr; and the Christians worship Jesus Son of Mary".³² On one point, al-Walid, a prominent Meccan 'pagan' chief, was impressed by Muhammad's rebuttal to an-Nadr b. al-Harith, and remarked: "By Allah, an-Nadr could not stand up to the (grand)son of Abd al-Muttalib" (1.1:163).

Despite Muhammad's severe style, even the victims of his worst attacks kept their sense of humor. The Prophet's portrayal of the Afterlife for the nonbelievers was grim. Among descriptions of the terrible treatment non-Muslims have in Hell, the Quran had mentioned a certain horrible tree, "az-Zaqqum", whose fruit is as repulsive and disgusting as the Devil's head. Nonbelievers will be forced in Hell to eat this horrible fruit. Referring to this, Abu Jahl remarked, "O Quraysh, do you know what (the true nature of) the tree of az-Zaqqum which Muhammad would scare you with is?" When they said they did not, he said: "It is (as delicious as) Yathrib dates buttered. By Allah, if we get hold of them we will gulp them down in one (bite)".

Although nonbelievers saw that Muhammad had frustrated the chances of a great reconciliation and was as strongly critical of Mecca's

religious traditions as ever, the Quraysh agreed voluntarily and for humanitarian reasons to end the three-year boycott. Because of restrictions on business and trade, Muslims and their supporters were undoubtedly under economic pressure. Four leading non-Muslims³⁴ discussed the plight of Muhammad and his supporters sympathetically. They consequently proposed in the Meccan Senate the nullification of the boycott. Beginning the debate, Zuhayr, one of the four said:

O people of Mecca, are we to eat and clothe ourselves while the Banu Hashim perish, unable to buy or sell? By God I will not sit down until this evil boycotting document is torn up!

Another heathen declared that he and (many) others were "not satisfied with the document when it was written". A third non-Muslim said: "We are not satisfied with what is written and we don't hold with it." Those in favor of the annulment hooted down Abu Jahl, apparently the only voice in opposition, by calling him "a liar". It was almost unanimously resolved:

We take Allah to witness that we dissociate ourselves from the whole idea and what is written in the document (1.1:173 cf. ibid:172-5).

The annulment of the boycott was announced. Humanitarian concerns and social "duties" as a nonbeliever had emphasized (ibid:172) once again had won over religious considerations, as far as the non-Muslims were concerned.

Something great and unusual happened during the boycott period: Muhammad, though vaguely, had respectfully mentioned the Meccan deities in the Quran. The Meccans rejoiced over this unexpectedly tolerant gesture. In gratitude, they reciprocated by doing Islamic ritual under Muhammad's leadership. The Quraysh representatives, by recognizing the superiority of Allah over their divinities, thus in fact recognized the pre-eminence of Muhammad's creed. Moreover, they said they might join Islam exclusively and shun their own religion after practicing both for a while. They wanted time to think, evaluate and choose voluntarily. In practice,

they did not demand of Muhammad more than spoken respect for the divinities they venerated.³⁸

During the boycott both the Quraysh and Muhammad, for their own reasons, thought of the need for some reconciliation. For the Quraysh, this was no surprise-it was their sixth attempt to compromise. But the Quran invalidated the idea for Muhammad. So the Prophet reverted to a no-compromise position. The whole episode was a Satanic trick, soon discovered, and Gabriel corrected the situation. Some reports indicate Muhammad intentionally misled the heathen. There was, however, to be no reconciliation with non-Muslims; neither Allah nor Muhammad ever meant it. The story runs thus:

The Meccans kept the doors open for negotiations with Muhammad during the boycott. One day, when Muhammad was performing **TAWAF** (the ritual of circumambulating the Kaba), four leading Meccans³⁶ approached him to propose:

Muhammad, come let us worship what you worship, and you worship what we worship. You and we will combine in the matter. If what you worship is better than what we worship we will take a share of it, and if what we worship is better than what you worship, you can take a share of that (1.1:165).

The Meccans requested that Muhammad make some respectful mention of their divinities. In exchange, they offered to give him respectful company and moral and social support during meetings with incoming merchants, pilgrims and guests.³⁷ Muhammad had indeed become concerned about his lack of popularity, growing isolation and the rejection of his message by the Quraysh. He

was anxious for the welfare of his people, wishing to attract them... When the apostle saw that his people turned their backs on him and he was pained by their estrangement from what he brought them from God, he longed that there should come to him from God a message that would reconcile his people to him. Because of his love for his people and his anxiety over them it would delight him if the obstacle that make his task so difficult could be removed; so that he meditated on the project and longed for it and it was dear to him (1.1:165; see also T,17:186-9).

According to Ibn Sad, after Muhammad realized his people had isolated him, when he was alone one day he thought:

I wish God would stop revealing to me the kind of revelation which repulses them from me -- **LAYTAHU LA YUNZIL ALAYYA SHAY-AN YUNAFFIRUHUM ANNI.** (After that, Ibn Sad adds:) **WA QARUB RASUL ALLAH...** **QAWMAHU WA DANA MINHUM WA DANAU MINHU** -- and the Messenger of God went close to his people (in a friendly manner) and approached them and they approached him (cordially) (IS- B,1:205).

This actually means that the Prophet, in contrast to his previous antagonistic pose, decided to be polite and friendly. Tabari in his exegeses of Q22:52-3 informs us that the Prophet

secretly wished to receive something from God that would bring him and his people together; with all his affection and desire for them [Muhammad wished] a softening of the harsh treatment of their affair.³⁸

Two reports in Tabari indicate that even before the recitation of the "Satanic Verses" Muhammad had spoken respectfully of the divinities revered by the Meccans--**INNA NASMAUHU YADHKUR ALIHATANA BIKHAYR** (T, 17:189). Apparently, he no longer cursed and ridiculed his people's ancestors and religious beliefs. The sentence following this passage in Ibn Sad also tells of Muhammad's sitting with the Quraysh when the "Satanic Verses" were recited. Obviously a rapport already existed. Muhammad's unexpected friendliness was well received by the Meccans, who reciprocated accordingly. Muhammad's restraint from harsh criticism of what the Quraysh venerated was enough for them to admit him respectfully to their meetings. A new era of amity between Muhammad and the Quraysh ensued. To the great delight of the Quraysh, something happened to tell them that Muhammad's God had approved of his friendly gestures with non-Muslims, and accepted their respect to mention their divinities respectfully. Ibn Sad continues

One day when he was sitting in the assembly of the Quraysh, in one of the meeting places around the Kaba, he began to recite [the Quranic sura 53 beginning with the verses] "By the star when it plunges..." until he reached [the verses 19 and 20 which say] "Have you considered El-Lat and al-Uzza and Manat the third, the other?"³⁹

Lat, Uzza and Manat were divinities revered by the Arabs. Continuing the recital of what was supposed to be the Quran, revelation from God,

Muhammad added, referring to Lat, Uzza and Manat:

These are exalted cranes; and indeed their intercession is approved/is expected; their likes are not forgotten.⁴⁰

Nonbelievers and believers thought the Almighty had verified the great rapprochement. The Quraysh "were delighted and greatly pleased..."; the Muslims believed what Muhammad had recited "from their Lord was true, not suspecting a mistake or a vain desire or a slip" (1.1:166; also see T,17:187). In his recitation, the Prophet reached the concluding verse of the sura, "So bow yourselves before God, and serve Him", which happened to be a 'prostration verse'.⁴¹ The Prophet and the Muslims performed Islamic prostration. The Quraysh were pleased but remained unpretentious. They accompanied Muhammad and the believers in the Islamic ritual (ibid. IS:ibid; T:ibid). Thus the non-Muslims paid their respects to Muhammad's creed. They went even further in their recognition of the preeminence of Muhammad's God, saying:

We have known that indeed it is Allah who gives life, causes death, creates and gives provisions; but our gods intercede with Him for us (IS:ibid; also see T,17:187-8).

The Quraysh said that because Muhammad had given some recognition to their deities, they would now be on his side -- **WA AMMA IDH JAALT LAHA NASIB-AN FA NAHN MAAK** (IS- B,1:205; T,17:187). Many Muslim emigrants to Abyssinia returned to Mecca when they heard of the rapprochement (T,17:187). (It lasted long enough for the news to reach Abyssinia.)

But Muslims are soon told the whole affair was actually a Satanic ruse. God decreed that Muhammad's desire for reconciliation with non-Muslims and their worldview was wrong, mistaken and that Muhammad realized his mistake and promptly apologized to God. He was forgiven; the wretched Satan was to blame. He had exploited the situation by "putting upon Muhammad's tongue" the three "Satanic Verses" in favor of the pagan deities, Lat, Uzza and Manat. Muhammad was unaware of Satan's mischief when he recited the "Satanic Verses", mistaking them as genuine revelation. Through Gabriel, however, God soon informed the Prophet and corrected the

situation. The "Satanic Verses" suggesting recognition and respect for the symbols of un-Islamic religions were directly abrogated by a series of Quranic passages, such as 22:52-5, 17:73-5 (cf. T,15:129-132) and 53:21-30. Through these Divine verdicts - and through many other passages, indirectly - the Prophet and the believers were instructed to shun their softness toward the nonbelievers, instead to revert to their harshness and irreconciliations.⁴²

Two Tradition reports in Tabari (T,15:130) tell Muslims Muhammad never meant a permanent compromise; it was simply a tactical move to dodge the Quraysh.

The Messenger of God was touching (ritually) the Black Stone; the Quraysh hindered him and said: "We will not allow him until he straightens his relations with our (other) divinities." He contemplated and then thought: 'As long as they allow me to touch the Stone, it is of little importance to me to **PRETEND** to have straightened my relations with them (i.e., the divinities) **WHILE GOD KNOWS I ABHOR THEM** (the Meccan divinities).'⁴³

The second report says that as the nonbelievers asked, the Prophet also wanted a temporary respite (hoping they would soon adopt Islam completely).⁴⁴ In both cases, however, a Muslim may conclude that the Messenger of God was right to hide his real intentions from the nonbelievers, in order to serve the cause of Islam. The reports emphasize the appropriateness of the Prophet's pretensions of compromise with non-Muslims, as long as he did not mean it. This is in line with the principle of **TAQIYYA**. That God later invalidated even the sham of compromise and the Prophet followed suit, apparently after some purpose was served, are not intended to condemn the tactic itself, particularly when believers also know that if any mistake was made, Satan was responsible for it. That there will be no reconciliation with non-Muslims does not rule out the likelihood that the believers might take (tactically) a soft stance and then revert to the hard line as Divine verdicts finally require. The dictum of 'no friendship' and 'no reconciliation with nonbelievers' was emphasized by various passages revealed after the brief reconciliatory period of the "Satanic Verses". According to Ibn Sad (as well as Tabari, by inference) Q17:73-5 were

revealed during this period (IS-B,1:205; T,17:129 passim). Referring to the reconciliation, God told Muhammad that the Quraysh were "seducing" him away from Divine revelation by being friendly with him (Q17:73 cf. T,15:130). That is, non-Muslim appreciation of the believer could be a sign of the believer's disloyalty to Islam. To preserve one's Islamic integrity it is safer to be stiff and unfriendly with nonbelievers rather than to allow them to call a non-Muslim a **HKALIL**, friend.⁴⁵ Regarding the "Satanic Verses" and the Quraysh's request to mention their deities respectfully, God told Muhammad they wanted him to falsely ascribe such things to God. In Q17:74 God referred to Muhammad's even "very little" "inclining to them", i.e., his partial and limited rapprochement with non-Muslims, as something undesirable. God, however, soon "reconfirmed" Muhammad to stand against non-Muslims. In 17:75 God reminds Muhammad that had he persisted in the mistaken policy of friendliness and rapprochement, He would have made him "taste double [chastisement] in life and double [chastisement] after death", and he would have found no helper.⁴⁶ So, God disliked and discarded the desire to refrain from saying what hurt the nonbelievers (i.e. civility in religious affairs, friendly and peaceful co-existence with them and respectful mentioning of non-Muslims' religious symbols were condemned). Such an attitude reflects the 'fact' that one has been "seduced" by non-Muslims (17:73). Getting rid of such attitudes, by reverting to non-reconciliation toward non-Muslims, means that one has been blessed by God (17:74). Persisting in rapprochement with nonbelievers is the surest magnet for Divine chastisement here and Hereafter (17:75).

Tradition relates the **SHAN NAZUL**, "occasion of revelation", of the sura 80 to Muhammad's friendly discussion with al-Walid, a leading non-Muslim Meccan (1.1:107; T,Surah 80). This probably took place during the brief Devil-inspired rapprochement. During the discourse Ibn Umm Maktum, a blind Muslim, interfered and "became importunate" in asking Muhammad to recite the Quran for him. The Prophet was annoyed and ignored the Muslim so as to maintain respect for al-Walid by not interrupting the

dialogue just to answer a Muslim's untimely and rude request. But though Muhammad was trying to win al-Walid for Islam, God did not approve of his concern for being a nonbeliever. The sura 80 censured Muhammad for ignoring the Muslim and for paying such attention to a non-Muslim. Thus Muhammad was re-taught how to treat a non-Muslim (see 1.1:167). Muhammad was told that it was not his "concern" to care for "cleaning" the "self-sufficient" al-Walid, who did not believe in the divine guidance. The sura continues to speak of al-Walid with ridicule and derision and of non-Muslims, who, as "unbelievers, the libertines", are told of the Last Day when their "faces... shall be dusty o'erspread with darkness" (80"1-40).

The Quraysh thought Muhammad had deceived them. They also thought what Muhammad was ascribing to God was concocted by himself. "Muhammad has repented of what he said about the position of (our) gods with Allah, altered it and brought something else", they said (1.1:167; also see T,17:188). Although it is alleged that after the abrogation of the "Satanic Verses" the Meccans became worse in their harsh treatment of Muslims,⁴⁷ the facts recorded by the same sources indicate Muslims continued to benefit from the non-Muslim Arabs' tolerant traditions.

After hearing of the reconciliation, some Muslims returned from Abyssinia. By the time they reached Mecca the rapprochement had collapsed and Muhammad had resumed his strong criticism of nonbelievers. In spite of this, those returning Muslims who asked were given protection by non-Muslims (1.1:168). Uthman b. Mazun was one of those given protection by al-Walid, an influential non-Muslim. Even Abu Bakr, the first lieutenant of Muhammad who had left Mecca in protest, was brought back with honor by Ibn al-Dughunnah, a non-Muslim. "Ibn al-Dughunna publicly proclaimed that he had taken him (Abu Bakr) under his protection and none must treat him other than well" (1.1:171). Abu Talib gave protection to a Muslim, Abu Salama, in violation of traditions, even though Abu Talib's nephew, Abu Salama's father, belonged to a different clan. According to the traditions, that clan, Makhzum, was responsible for awarding or

refusing protection to Abu Salama. The Makhzum leaders protested to Abu Talib: "You have protected your nephew Muhammad from us, but why are you protecting our tribesman?" Abu Talib apparently ignored the protest. Then Abu Talib's brother Abu Lahab, an active opponent of Muhammad's Prophethood, intervened in favor of his brother's action for a believer in Islam and said:

O Quraysh you have continually attacked this shaykh for giving his protection among his own people. By God, you must either stop this or we [the non-Muslim Hashimites] will stand in with him until he gains his object (1.1:170).

The Makhzum nonbelievers, though technically justified, backed down.

Continued friendly gestures from the nonbelievers, however, did not impress the Prophet. The abrogation of the "Satanic Verses" was followed by numerous Quranic passages which adopted, along with reconfirmation or self-confirmation of the divine character of the Quran and of the authenticity and exalted nature of Muhammad's Prophethood (e.g., Q68:51-2, 36:1-6, 69-70), a cursing, antagonistic, insulting and reviling tone toward the nonbelievers. These passages commanded believers never to compromise with non-Muslims. Flexibility was discarded, perhaps forever. Referring to the Meccan request for compromise and to some particular nonbelievers (cf. 1.1:164), the Quran exhorted bitingly:

Hearken not to those who cry lies. They wish that thou shouldst compromise, then they compromise. Heed thou not every mean swearer, backbiter, going about with slander, hinderer of good, guilty aggressor, course-grained, moreover, ignoble... We shall brand him upon the muzzle (Q68:8-16; for the words **LA TUTI I** have adopted Abullah Yusuf Ali's translation).

As before, Meccan non-Muslims were likened to past nonbelievers; though respited for a while, the Quran said, these non-Muslims (like those of the past) will eventually be punished and destroyed in this life and the Afterlife. Muslims were exhorted to persevere and be patient, and were promised success and reward in this world and the Hereafter (e.g. Q68:17-50; 36:13-32, 43, 51-67). With contemptuous nonchalance, Muhammad and the Quran pursued the predestination theme, that the wretched

nonbelievers were doomed to disbelief and consequently to Hell. "Do not let their saying grieve thee" (36:76), the Prophet was told, because, the Almighty informed him,

The Word has been realized against most of them, yet they do not believe. Surely We have put on their necks fetters up to the chin, so their heads are raised; and We have put before them a barrier and behind them so they do not see. Alike it is to them whether thou hast warned them or not, they do not believe (36:7-10).

The sura 109, **AL-KAFIRUN**, "The Unbelievers", related to the events of this period (1.1:165; T), was a categorical declaration of a total, permanent break between Muslims and non-Muslims. It is worth quoting in full because some modern Muslim apologists take it-mistakenly or disingenuously - in just the opposite sense.

Say: 'O unbelievers, I serve not what you serve and you are not serving what I serve, nor am I serving what you have served, neither are you serving what I serve. To you your religion, and to me my religion! (Q109).

Thus God instructed Muhammad to tell the nonbelievers at Mecca. "you are not serving what I serve" tells non-Muslims: "You are unable to serve what I serve because you are predestined by God to be deprived of Islam" (T,30:330-1). Tradition explaining the verse asserts: "God knew that indeed they will never believe and their predestination was in the knowledge of God. So he told his Prophet to disappoint them from what they desired" (*ibid*). This referred to the nonbelievers' offer to accept Islam if Muhammad refrained from his harsh criticism of their deities and traditions. The Meccan offer was rejected inelegantly. In sura 109 God also told Muhammad (and the believers) not to hope for the nonbelievers' conversion to Islam and for their salvation. It will never happen, Muhammad was told -- **WA AYAS NABIY ALLAH... MIN AT-TAMI FI IMANIHIM, WA MIN AN YUFLIHU ABAD-AN** (*ibid*). They were doomed to die as non-Muslims. They, Tabari tells us, were eventually killed by Muslims during the battle of Badr (*ibid*), and, thus, the prophecy in Q109 was fulfilled. The last verse of the sura, "To you your religion and to me my religion!", does not authorize mutual respect and peaceful coexistence between Muslims and

non-Muslims. For a believer it means Muslims would never recognize other creeds as viable alternatives to Islam. It is actually to tell the nonbelievers. 'Root in your trash; Islam is too good for you'. In Tabari's words, God asks Muhammad to tell the nonbelievers

To you your religion because you will never (be able to) leave it, for He has sealed it on you (predestined it for you) and (God) has decreed that you never be rid of it and that you will indeed die with it (as nonbelievers). And to me my religion, the one I have (i.e., Islam) which I will never shun because it has already been in the knowledge of God [i.e., that I am predestined to be a Muslim and persist in Islam], that I will never convert from this to another (creed).⁴⁸

For Ibn Ishaq the verse means that God asks the Prophet to reject the proposed mutual veneration of one another's religions and tell the nonbelievers: "I have no need of you at all. You can have your religion, all of it, and I have mine" (1.1:165). So, sura 109 was a declaration of Islam's exclusiveness and an expression of disgust against a proposal for pluralism, reconciliation, and peaceful coexistence. It also aims at explaining to a believer the disbelief of non-Muslims: they are so doomed. Muslims need not worry; those wretches will eventually be punished by God.

Soon, Muslim behavior reflected the rejection of the very idea of compromise, and adopted an aggressive, rude, annoying and contemptuously flippant attitude toward non-Muslims. Upon his return from Abyssinia, Uthman b. Mazun had sought and received protection from the Meccan chief al-Walid, but after a time, renounced it.

'Why, nephew,' he asked, "Can it be that one of my people has injured you?' 'No,' he answered, 'but I want to be under God's protection. I don't want to ask for anyone else's' (1.1:169).

Even after arrogantly renouncing this protection of an influential nonbeliever, Uthman was safe in Mecca so long as he behaved himself. Once he was among the audience for a famous poet, Labid b. Rabi'ah b. Malik. The listeners were mainly, or perhaps exclusively, the nonbelievers who had invited Labid, one of the greatest poets of his day, to their assembly. When Labid recited the verse:

ALA KULL SHAY-IN MA KHALA'LLAH BATIL-U
 ("Everything but God is vain"),

Uthman interjected stupidly (before the poet could recite the second line of the couplet), "True"! When Labid went on to say

WA KULL NAIM-IN LA-MAHALAT ZAIL-U
 ("and everything lovely must inevitably cease"),

Uthman put aside all the etiquette of such an intellectual and cultural assembly and cried, interrupting and insulting the respected guest.

"You lie! The joy of Paradise will never cease." Labid kept his composure and only remarked in a cultured and restrained tone: "O men of Quraysh, your friends never used to be annoyed thus. Since when has this sort of thing happened among you?" One of the audience answered, "This is one of those louts with Muhammad. They have abandoned our religion. Take no notice of what he says." However, "Uthman objected so energetically that the matter became serious. Whereupon... [one of the audience] rose to his feet and hit him in the eye so that it became black". Despite the fact that Uthman was the victim of his own behavior, al-Walid took pity upon him and offered to renew his protection so that, in practice, Uthman could continue his boorishness and unrestrained activity with full freedom. However, Uthman's Islamic zeal was beyond limits. He declined the generous pagan offer, saying that he was ready to take another beating "for God's sake" and that he was "under the protection of One who was stronger and more powerful (than al-Walid)" (1.1:169-70).

Another look at Abu Bakr will illumine the attitude of the Quran, the Prophet and Muslims during and just after the boycott. Abu Bakr, who had left Mecca, was brought back by an unbeliever, Ibn al-Dughunna, given protection and settled apparently in a new quarter among the Banu Jumah tribe. Apparently, according to an understanding between Ibn al-Dughunna, Abu Bakr's protector, and the people of the lane in Mecca (where Abu Bakr was allowed a house), he would not pray in the public street. Abu Bakr ignored this prohibition and the concerns of his neighbors. Instead of praying in his own house or going to the Sanctuary of the Kaba (where

Muslims were allowed to pray according to their faith) Abu Bakr changed the ground in front of his house into a mosque, a prayer-preaching forum. "He was a tender-hearted man," Ibn Ishaq tells us, "and when he read the Quran, he was moved to tears. Some men of Quraysh used to stand by him astonished at his demeanor" (1.1:171). Note that the Meccan Quranic contents abused and ridiculed the Meccans in strong words. This was too much for his hosts. They thought their guest was exploiting their hospitality against their own system. However, instead of taking law and order into their own hands and forcing Abu Bakr to retreat to his own home, they contacted Ibn al-Dughunna, the official protector, the one responsible for Abu Bakr's safety. They said to Ibn al-Dughunna:

Lo, he prays and reads what Muhammad has produced and his heart becomes soft and he weeps. And he has a striking appearance so that we fear he may seduce our youths and women and weak ones. Go to him and tell him to go to his own house and do what he likes there (1.1:171).

Ibn al-Dughunna was convinced and told Abu Bakr:

I did not give you protection so that you might injure your people. They dislike the place you have chosen and suffer hurt. Therefore, so go into your house and do what you like there (ibid).

Abu Bakr ignored the complaint and the proposal. Zealotry does not acknowledge decency, diplomacy, compromise, or concern for others' feelings. He denounced Ibn al-Dughunna's protection and continued to do what he was doing. Apparently the Quraysh non-believers did not take any significantly harsh action against him, except once when a "lout" threw some dust on his head. Abu Bakr, like the Prophet, did not hesitate to complain to al-Walid, an elder of the nonbelievers: "Do you see what this lout has done to me?" Al-Walid, perhaps fed up with this Islamic narcissism, self-righteousness, and calculated opportunism, replied grimly but with his usual restraint: "you have done it to yourself" (1.1:172).

The Quraysh were compulsive peace-seekers. Now that the old Abu Talib was dying, they became more concerned about the future of their

relations with Muhammad. Abu Talib was a deterrent to war. The nightmare of possible civil strife after his death haunted them. They decided to retreat one more step. They no longer requested a reciprocal acknowledgment of their religion and tradition. They wanted simply to be left alone, and in return were ready to leave Muhammad and his followers alone. They preferred a cold peace to an explosive cold war. They wanted some formal peace arrangement before Abu Talib's death. This was to be the seventh attempt at compromise. Quraysh notables went to Abu Talib and said:

You know your rank with us. Now that you are at the point of death we are deeply concerned on your account. You know the trouble that exists between us and your nephew, so call him and let us make an agreement that he will leave us alone and we will leave him alone; let him have his religion and we will have ours (1.1:191).

Perhaps as requested, Muhammad was called. Abu Talib asked him what he thought of the peace proposal. Muhammad said he "wanted them to say only one word which will make the Arabs obey them and will enable them to master and rule the non-Arabs".⁴⁹ Even Abu Jahl, Muhammad's most cynical critic, missed the point. In an optimistic mood Abu Jahl, representing others, said, "Yea... and ten words," and waited impatiently for Muhammad's explanation of that "word". Abu Jahl never thought Muhammad would ask them to surrender, become Muslims, because the very purpose of the meeting was to negotiate a permanent cease-fire and disengagement. Muhammad ignored the niceties to shock his opponents again. He told them peremptorily:

You must say 'there is no God but Allah and you MUST REPUDIATE what you worship beside him' (ibid).

The Quraysh failed to achieve their last wish: "to be left alone". Islam did not exist to be indifferent and neutral toward other creeds. Other creeds "must" surrender to Islam. As if the Quraysh wanted to be sure they understood Muhammad well, they said: "Do you want to make all the gods into one? That would be an extraordinary thing" (1.1:192). It was

their way to protest Muhammad's attempt to impose his creed on all, eliminating other religions. They had no problems with the rigidly monotheistic Jews among them, who had indeed "made all the gods into one", as long as they did not try to impose Judaism on others. Having coexisted peacefully with the followers of other creeds, the Quraysh thought the elimination of religious pluralism would indeed be "an extraordinary thing". Perhaps for the first time, they realized their attempts to negotiate with Muhammad were futile. "They said, one to another, 'This fellow is not going to give you anything you want, so go and continue with the religion of your fathers until God judges between us'" (ibid).

Muhammad thus rejected the seventh Meccan request for peaceful coexistence between Islam and un-Islam. Though Abu Talib was dying, the Prophet was more determined than ever not to compromise - even with kind acts and gestures - short of universal surrender to his creed. As soon as the Meccans left, Abu Talib reassured Muhammad of his support. The Prophet, instead of thanking him and leaving his kind uncle to die in peace, pressed him to declare his faith in Islam. "You say it, uncle" the Prophet insisted, "and then I shall be able to intercede for you on Resurrection Day" (1.1:192; also see ,2:325). Abu Talib refused politely.

Referring to Abu Talib after his death, the Quran declared that he was among the wretched damned to disbelief (Q28:56 cf. T,20:92). The Almighty did not allow Muhammad and Muslims to pray for their greatest benefactor - he was a non-Muslim after all. Thus Muslims were told there was no basis for cordiality and fraternity between people other than Islam. Helping a believer is a thankless job for a nonbeliever. About Abu Talib, who had just died, the Quran said curtly:

It is not for the Prophets and the believers to ask pardon for the idolaters, even though they be near kinsmen, after it was clear to them that they would be the inhabitants of Hell.⁵⁰

Credal purity was held more important than even a much-needed

compromise. One demonstration came in Muhammad's handling of his uncle, Abu Lahab, the new chief of the Hashimites after Abu Talib's death. Though an outspoken opponent of Muhammad's new creed - and vilified by name in the Quran (surah III) - Abu Lahab thought more of his social duties than his religious differences with Muhammad after assuming leadership. In fulfillment of his duties to protect a clan member and his right to freedom of expression and religion, he declared:

Go ahead and do whatever you like and whatever you used to do when Abu Talib was alive. By (the goddess,) al-Lat, none will touch you as long as I am alive (IS- B,1:211; parentheses added).

Abu Lahab soon proved he meant what he said. He affronted a fellow non-Muslim who had abused Muhammad (*ibid*). Abu Lahab was so vigorous, some thought he had become a Muslim (*ibid*). He told such thinkers frankly he had not given up his religion, but he would nonetheless protect Muhammad's freedom of choice and action -- **WALAKINNI AMNA' IBN AKHI AN YADAM HAA YAMDI LIMA YURID** (IS-B,1:211). The other nonbelievers applauded Abu Lahab for fulfilling his civic responsibilities, i.e., giving such protection. Muhammad enjoyed it for some time. The Prophet's turn to reciprocate this heathen goodwill came soon.

Incited by others, Abu-Lahab asked Muhammad about the fate of the late Abd al-Muttalib, Abu Lahab's grandfather. Abu Lahab's generosity had failed to move Muhammad toward religious moderation. He told Abu Lahab that Abd al-Muttalib was in Hell, adding, "And those who die like Abd al-Muttalib (i.e. as non-Muslims) will enter Hell." The Meccans had heard enough of Muhammad's descriptions of Hell, its utterly terrifying and humiliating nature. For the Arabs (like any other people with self-respect and a sense of decency) it was excruciating to hear Muhammad's descriptions of the treatment of their dead ancestors in Hell. For example, after his nocturnal journey to Heaven, as he claimed, in one of his "eyewitness" accounts of the state of non-Muslims in Hell he said:

Then I saw men with lips like camels (the physical transformation

being a part of torturous humiliation); in their hands were pieces of fire like stones which they used to thrust into their mouths and they would come out of their posteriors (1.1:185; parentheses added).

For Abu Lahab, who believed in some "give-and-take," Muhammad's singlemindedness was too much. He revoked his protection.

Nothing really serious happened until Muhammad migrated to Medina, though for a while his life was not as comfortable as it had been under the protection of Abu Talib and Abu Lahab. However, despite Muhammad's plots against Mecca, another influential non-Muslim there, Mutim b. Adiy, took Muhammad under his wing. The oft-mentioned (in the Quran and Tradition) "persecution" of Muhammad then was limited, non-violent and trivial. The "worst" acts are documented. Once one of the nonbelievers threw "a sheep's uterus at him while he was praying" at the Kaba. Another time some one threw a sheep's uterus into his cooking pot. A third time "a lout actually threw dust on his head" (1.1:191). It was the equivalent of throwing an egg at an opponent. Apparently these acts were a quid pro quo for the irritating activities (as nonbelievers saw them) of the Prophet and some of his followers, such as Uthman b. Mazun, Abd Allah b. Masud and Abu Dhar al-Ghifari.

These years reflect Muhammad's growing insolence and militancy, with his resolve to confront all on his own terms and look for a power base outside Mecca. Muhammad came to know that Utbah b. Rabia had angrily taken his side during a passionate discussion with Abu Jahl. Instead of showing his gratitude, the Prophet went to them and said, "O Utbah, you were not angry on God's behalf or his apostle's behalf, but on your own account. As for you, O Abu Jahl, a great blow of fate will come upon you so that you will experience what you most abhor and that perforce!" (1.1:194).

The Quranic responses after Muhammad's rejection of the seventh peace offer by the Quraysh fall in line with this resolve. Concurrently, God as usual ratified and reinforced His Messenger's rejection of the Meccan peace proposals. Taunting and contemptuous references to what the

nonbelievers said and did had become a familiar part of the Quran's style. Lamprooning the recent Meccan reaction to the Prophet's call, the Quran remarked:

And the unbelievers say, 'This is a lying sorcerer. What, has he made the gods one God? This is indeed a marvelous thing.' And the council of them depart, saying "Go! Be steadfast to your gods; this is a thing to be desired. We have not heard of this in the last religion; this is surely an invention" (Q38:4-7 cf. 1.1:192).

The Quran confirmed itself again that it was a genuine revelation from God and that Muhammad was His genuine Messenger (38:1,8,49,65-70). The nonbelievers were condemned and likened to Satan and the disbelievers of the past. Like them, the believers were told, they will be punished here and in the Afterlife (38:3-4, 28, 54-64, 71-88). The believers were promised Paradise (38:50-4). The past Islamic prophets are mentioned as God's chosen and superior people, reminding us that Muhammad is the last, and the best of them (38:17-20, 26, 30-48). Those who had rejected the Prophets met Divine retribution. The same would be the fate for those who oppose Muhammad (T,23:130). Muslims see, during this last Meccan phase, that the Quran was moving more clearly toward the theme of power. The figures of David and Solomon, symbolizing theocracy, a combination of worldly power and prophethood, were more familiar to the Meccans (including Muslims) than the past Muslim emperor, Dhu'l-Qarnayn. Muhammad was told:

Bear patiently what they say and remember our servant David, the man of might,

to whom were subjugated mountains and birds and whose Kingdom was strengthened by God (Q38:17-20). Through these verses God told the Prophet that he, just like David, would eventually be given victory and power over his adversaries (T,23:136). The last Messenger of God had clearly in mind to become, like David, "a man of might" to impose the Word of God.

Although Muhammad continued to talk of miracles and the Last Day wherein nonbelievers will be punished, he did not wait inactively for

them. The talk of miracles during this period, such as the conversion of the jinn (1.1:193-4; Q72) during the unsuccessful return from Taif, and the wonderful half-night return journey to Jerusalem and Heaven (1.1:181-86), were a part of Islam's self-confirmatory efforts, aimed at boosting the believers' morale. The Prophet's biography tells Muslims clearly that particularly after the collapse of the Meccans' seventh effort at compromise and after Abu Talib's death, Muhammad's activities were dominated by the desire to find a power-base outside Mecca - in this world. Continuing Muhammad's story semi-chronologically, this Meccan phase of the Prophet's more active search for worldly power, and his attitude toward the use of force, will be revealed - including the force of Islam's language.

The Use of Force, Militancy, Annoyance and Subversion

We have seen the Prophet's Meccan Sunnah about reconciliation with nonbelievers and his artful use of traditions and resources of the liberal Dar al-Harb to serve his interests and cause. Next we turn to Muhammad's policy on the use of violence in its various forms: threats, subversion, clandestine methods, and the use of strong language and annoying behavior during the Meccan phase. In order to understand Islam's position then on the use of force, militancy in general, I shall examine quickly relevant episodes from the beginning of his call. The tone of some reports in the Meccan Quran, and the Meccan Sunnah of Muhammad tell Muslims that from the very beginning Islam glorified a tough attitude, condoned militant engagements and was disinterested in preaching nonviolence. The Prophet and his followers thought of and vied for the use of violence; they never rejected the idea. In some cases they actually engaged in the use of pressure tactics, force and violence. The use of nonflattering language, verbal violence, became a permanent feature of the Quran's treatment of non-Muslims, influencing Muslim behavior accordingly. In one case they even undertook banditry or guerrilla warfare against nonbelievers. Let us peruse Islam from the earliest years of Muhammad's Prophethood in Mecca.

During the onset of Muhammad's preaching, a skirmish took place between two bands of Muslims and non-Muslims. No Muslim injury was reported. On the other hand, we are told Sad b. Abu Waqas, an early Muslim, "smote a polytheist with the jawbone of a camel and wounded him" (1.1:118). Jubilantly, with pride and approval, Muslims are told "it was the first time the blood (of a non-Muslim) was shed for Islam" -- **AWWAL DAM UHRIQ FI'L-ISLAM** (TT, 2:319; 1.1:118).

Abu Talib's actions as a defender of Muhammad and Islam, if praised by our sources and not disowned by the Prophet and the Quran, are held to be a part of ideal behavior, worthy of imitation by the believers of all times in similar situations. Muslims find that Abu Talib, talked in his poetry of war and violence against Islam's adversaries. He talked, among other things, of "cutting off hands and necks by the gleaming blades" of swords, of "the enemy falling face down in his blood" and of the will "not to tire of war until it tires of them."⁵¹ Abu Talib acted accordingly - lest non-Muslims think he was merely speaking poetry. Once, after a false rumor of Muhammad's assassination, Abu Talib and the youth of his clan dashed with Muhammad into a Quraysh gathering. Taking Muhammad's hand in his hand, Abu Talib said:

O people of the Quraysh! Do you know what I intend to do? They said, No. He... said to the young men: 'Show what is in your hands!' They showed; and lo! everyone had a sharp sword. Then he said: 'Had you slain him (Muhammed) none of you would have remained alive...' (IS/MH 1/1:135/234-5).

Ibn Sad adds with great satisfaction that this show of force on behalf of the supporters of Muhammad in his presence was effective: "They all ran away and the quickest to run was Abu Jahl" (*ibid*).

Even Abu Qays, a peace activist and poet of the time, looked at Muhammad as a "noble character, his sword drawn only in righteous cause".⁵² It was not embarrassing for the Abu Qays, nor for our Muslim biographers of Muhammad, to identify him at Mecca with the sword for the sake of the "righteous cause" of Islam. The Prophet had once openly threatened

non-Muslims with **DHABH**, massacre. Glorifying Muhammad's threat, Ibn Ishaq records its effectiveness for the believers' inspiration and satisfaction.

This word so struck the people that not one of them but stood silent and still; even one who had thitherto been most violent spoke to him in the kindest way possible... (1.1:131).

The appreciation of power and use of force during the Meccan period is reflected in descriptions which approve and glorify some Muslims' jingoism and militancy. Hamza's conversion to Islam was welcome particularly because he was "the strongest man of the Quraysh and the most unyielding" (1.1:131-2). The first thing Hamza did after embracing Islam, Muslims are told, was to storm into an assembly of non-Muslims to tangle with Abu Jahl, who had earlier insulted Muhammad verbally. The Prophet was present. Hamza struck Abu Jahl a "violent blow" with his bow and said, "Will you insult him when (= now that) I follow his religion... Hit me back if you can" (1.1:132). When Abu Jahl's kin got up to attack Hamza, even this most vilified (by Islam) Meccan, Abu Jahl, stopped them, saying: "Let Abu Umara (Hamza) alone for, by God, I insulted his nephew deeply" (*ibid*). Abu Jahl, though in a position of power, was apologizing and restraining his people from violence. No similar Muslim gesture toward non-Muslims is reported.

Umar was famous for his violent character. Muslims were unaware of his sudden decision to become a Muslim. When Umar was approaching Muhammad's place to tell him of this, Hamza remarked before Umar neared: "If he has come with ill intent we will kill him with his own sword." The Prophet did not disapprove; he rather acted accordingly: When Umar entered, Muhammad "seized him round the girdle...and dragged him along violently, saying, 'What has brought you, son of Khattab, for by God I do not think you will cease... until God brings calamity upon you'" (*ibid*). However, Umar spoke his heart. The Prophet is reported to have prayed particularly for the conversion of one of the two: Abu Jahl and Umar. Muhammad wanted one of these two trouble-makers on his side. Umar's conversion to Islam was celebrated as "a victory" (11:155 cf. 155-9).

This violent heathen was now a provocative believer. We have already seen how provocative Umar was after he joined Muhammad. His offensive performances are recorded to inspire the believers (ibid).

The Muslims who had emigrated to Abyssinia kept thinking of finding a way to teach the heathen of Mecca a terrible lesson for their refusal to surrender to Islam. Abd Allah b. al-Harith, one of these emigrants, gave vent to his intentions in poetry:

Those Quraysh who deny God's truth
Are as Ad and Madyan and the people of al-Hijr
 who denied it.
If I do not raise a storm let not the earth,
Spacious land or ocean hold me!
In a land wherein is Muhammad, servant of God.
I will explain what is in my heart
When exhaustive search is made (1.1:149).

His fellow Muslims lauded Abdullah for these sentiments with the title of **AL-MUBRIQ**, "the thunderer or threatener" (ibid). The story of a certain At-Tufayl is important for two reasons: 1) The pressure he applied to his family to convert to Islam is recorded with appreciation, and 2) the Prophet's advice to Tufayl to "gently" treat his fellow tribesmen if they refused Islam. Tufayl's career later and the Prophet's instructions tell Muslims this advice was tactical. Such gentleness changed into violence as soon as it was possible. At-Tufayl b. Amr ad-Dawsi and Abu Dharr al-Ghifari were among a few non-Meccan Muslims of the day. Tufayl returned to his tribe bent on converting them to Islam. Tufayl used harshness and pressure for the purpose. His wife and parents accepted Islam, apparently, to preserve family harmony that Tufayl was determined to disturb for the sake of his new religion.⁵³ At-Tufayl was not so successful in converting his fellow tribesmen. He asked the Prophet to curse them, but Muhammad told him to "go back to his people and preach to them gently." While the Prophet remained in Mecca with no power-base elsewhere, he did not want to lose any potential non-Meccan base. At-Tufayl remained in his tribal domain working for Islam.

In the same Meccan section of the Prophet's biography readers are told that later, with Islam's expansion beyond Medina, particularly at the

conquest of the prosperous Jewish Khaybar land, enough men from Tufayl's tribe were motivated to join the Islamic forces at Khaybar and share the booty. After the conquest of Mecca, the Prophet no longer bade Tufayl be gentle. He asked him to use force against those of his tribesmen who had failed to join Islam by allowing him to burn Dhu'l-Kaffayn, the religious symbol of their tribe. Tufayl, so anxious to see the non-believers annihilated when he had asked Muhammad to curse them, finally was able to satisfy his anger against the unyielding heathen and their simple temple. As he lit the fire to burn their idol, he exclaimed:

Not of your servants am I, Dhu'l-Kaffayn,
 Our birth is far more ancient than thine.
 To stuff this fire in your heart I pine (1.1:175-7).

The Prophet was happily surprised when Abu Dharr of the al-Ghifar tribe (famous for its highway robbery) came to Mecca and became a Muslim.⁵⁴ Both Muslim and Ibn Sad tell the following story in detail. After his secret conversion to Islam, Abu Dharr lingered at Mecca for a while. In a moonlit night when no men were in the Sanctuary -- **HARAM**, the sacred public ground around the Kaba, Abu Dharr concealed himself behind the curtains of the Kaba. Two pagan women went to the sanctuary in order to pray according to their tradition. [Apparently, the non-Muslims used to evacuate the Sanctuary during night to let their women pray in peace and privacy.] The two women began their circumambulation of the Kaba, devoutly praying to Isaf and Nailah, two Meccan deities. According to Ibn Sad, the women were engaged "in the best of prayers (possible) in the earth" -- **AHSAN DUA FI'L-ARD** (IS- B,4:223). The prayerful women were unaware of Abu Dharr's presence behind the curtains. When the women, humming their prayer, passed by the point Abu Dharr was hiding, he remarked, referring to the two pagan divinities: "Make one copulate with the other" -- **ANKIHA AHADAHUMA'L-UKHRA** (Mu-MFA,4:1921; IS-B,4:220). Absorbed in their prayer, the two heathen women continued their chanting, ignoring our believer's vulgarity -- **FA MA TANAHATA AN OAULIHIMA** (Mu- MFA,4:1921; IS-B,4:220-1). Abu Dharr waited for the next round. When the women after completing the

circle reached again the same point, Abu Dharr interrupted again. As if the women had not understood what he meant by copulating the god Isaf with the goddess Nailah, Abu Dharr said: **"HAN-AN MITHL AL-KHASHABAH -- put the penis bar of the one in the vulva of the other"** (ibid).^{54a} The women could only stammer: **"ANT SABI -- You are an apostate (i.e. a godless person)"** (IS-B,4:223). Bewildered and scared, the two women ran away, screaming and calling their men for help -- **FA'NTALAQATA TUWALWILAN WA TAQULAN: LAU KAN HAHUNA AHAD-UN MIN ANFARINA** (Mu-MFA,4:1921; IS-B,4:220-1). Some Meccan men, hearing the women's screams, went to the Sanctuary and found Abu Dharr. They began to beat the believer, but as usual another group of non-Muslims interfered and helped the impolite Companion leave the scene (IS-B,4:223).

Both Muslim and Ibn Sad tell us that at this juncture also the Prophet and his comrade, Abu Bakr, entered the Sanctuary. The Prophet asked the scared and screaming women what was the matter with her. She said, "A godless person is behind the curtains of the Kaba -- **AS-SABI BAYN AL-KABA WA ASTARIHA** (Mu-MFA,4:1921; IS-B,4:220-21). "What did he say to you?", the Prophet asked. The two women replied, "He said indeed something (so disgusting) to us that we cannot repeat it" -- **INNAHU QAL LANA KALIMAT-AN TAMLAU'L-FAM** (ibid). Muhammad and Abu Bakr left the women and moved towards Abu Dharr. The reports in Ibn Sad and Muslim do not indicate that the Prophet and Abu Bakr were unhappy for what Abu Dharr had done. Instead, they approached Abu Dharr affectionately. They took the zealous believer to Abu Bakr's home and offered him good food. Reports in Muslim, Ibn Sad and al-Bukhari (Bu-AMSh, 5:59-60 or Bu.,61:11; 63:33) indicate that it was not the first time that Abu Dharr annoyed the Meccans. Most probably, the Prophet and Abu Bakr had anticipated Abu Dharr's anti-pagan activity in that particular night. That is why, as soon as they heard the hue and cry, they reached the Sanctuary and took Abu Dharr with them.

Obviously a Muslim gathers, by not censuring Abu Dharr's indecent treatment of the heathen ladies and their creed, the Prophet approved of

his behavior. Besides, our sources mention the story to appreciate Abu Dharr's **GHILZA** "roughness" against non Muslims and their creed. Both the **SAHIHAYN**, "the two most authentic (anthologies of Hadith reports)" of al-Bukhari and Muslim mention these reports in chapters entitled **FADAIL AS-SAHABAH RADIY ALLAH ANHUM** "Virtuous Characteristics of the Companions (of the Prophet) With Whom God is pleased". The sub-chapter about Abu Dharr is captioned: **FADAIL ABI DHARR RADIY ALLAH ANHU**, "Laudable Characteristics of Abu Dharr With Whom God is Pleased". For the believers, Abu Dharr's above action was approved by both God and Muhammad. Traditional Muslim scholars have never seen anything wrong with such reports. For example, Muhammad Fuad Abd al-Baqi (MFA), the Muslim editor of the Sahih of Muslim (who on the title-page calls himself "a humble servant of the Quran and Sunnah -- **KHADIM AL-KITAB WA'S-SUNNAH**) tells the readers approvingly in an editorial note that Abu Dharr said so in order to abuse the two pagan divinities and enrage the non-Muslims -- **ARAD BI-DHALIK SABB ISAF WA NAILAH WA GHAYZ AL-KUFFAR BI-DHALIK** (Mu-MFA, 4:1921, Note 6).

Apparently, it was after this last scene created by Abu Dharr he had to leave Mecca. The Prophet advised him to go to his tribe, **AL-GHIFAR**, and work for Islam. Abu Dharr was seized by revenge. He told the Prophet what he intended. "O Messenger of God," he said, "I am returning to my people and will await the time when the fighting will be enjoined; then I will join you because I see that all of your people are against you" (IS-B, 4:223-4). Abu Dharr did not wait for the Quran's formal permission to wage Jihad . Obviously, he had the Prophet's tacit approval for what he did after leaving Mecca. He gathered a band of Muslim converts from his region and wrought havoc. Until he migrated to Medina and joined the Prophet, Abu Dharr raided Meccan caravans. After despoiling them, he would offer to return the plunder if they would become Muslim; otherwise he would confiscate their goods.⁵⁵ This report indicates that some Muslims, obviously backed by the Prophet, were engaged during the Meccan period, before the formal revelation of Jihad , in armed raids and sabotage

warfare against nonbelievers.

Ibn Ishaq records another event, probably from the tensest period of relations between Muhammad and the Quraysh. It indicates that even then Muhammad was not merely a passive victim of the Meccan opposition. Abu Jahl, Muhammad's most active opponent, owed money to a bedouin who asked the Prophet to help him recover the debt. This non-Meccan cunning bedouin was, apparently, exploiting the situation to collect his money. Besides, Abu Jahl's nonbelieving rivals encouraged the bedouin to seek help from Muhammad. Muhammad promptly agreed to accompany the bedouin, as if he was waiting for any excuse to bully the heathen adversary. As soon as the bedouin requested, Muhammad

got up and went with him... The apostle went to (Abu Jahl's) house and knocked on the door, and when he asked who was there he said, 'Muhammad! Come out to me.' He came out to him pale with agitation, and the apostle said, 'Pay this man his due.' 'One moment until I give him his money,' he said, and went indoors and came out again with the amount he owed and paid it to the man. The apostle went away saying (to the bedouin), 'Go about your business' (1.1:178).

Muhammad was clearly prying into Abu Jahl's affairs to embarrass him. Abu Jahl overcame the unexpected nuisance. By promptly paying the debt, he avoided the scene Muhammad was determined to create. For believers, Ibn Ishaq particularly records the Prophet's browbeating approvingly. Abu Jahl is reported to have admitted that as soon as Muhammad knocked on his door and he heard the Prophet's voice he was "filled with terror", and that he was frightened even more when he saw Muhammad (*ibid*). A Muslim enjoys reading this terrorization of a nonbeliever by the dean of believers of all times.

The Prophet repeatedly promised the Meccans that if they accepted Islam "the Arabs and Ajam (non-Arabs) will be subjugated to them," that "the non-Arabs will pay tribute to them" and that treasures of Chosroes and Caesar will be opened to them" (TT,2:311, 324-5; 1.1:113, 119). These were not only predictions of Islam's eventual victory, but also were (and remain to be) sources of justification for Islamic expansionism involving, inevitably, the use of force against nonbelievers.

Muslims learn that after his rejection of the seventh offer for peace and his open break with Abu Lahab, Muhammad increasingly sought a base of power to bring Mecca to its knees by force. This phase began with a trip to Taif, south of Mecca and ended with his great hijra to Medina. The Prophet's Muslim biographers tell us that during this phase Muhammad thought and talked of force against Meccan non-Muslims to humble them. During his contacts and parleys with non-Meccans, the plan of war against Mecca was clearly in his mind. (A believer finds it acceptable to disrupt and subvert one's own homeland if it rejects the call of Islam.) The people of Taif, mainly of the Thaqif tribe, had close family and trade ties to Mecca. Some Meccans owned property in Taif. Most of the people at Taif were pagans, particularly attached to the deity Al-Lat. Muhammad went to Taif "to seek help from Thaqif and their defense [readiness to fight] against his tribe. Also he hoped they would receive the message which God had given him" (1.1:192; brackets added). Muhammad met the three chiefs of the city; one had a Meccan Qurayshite wife.

The Prophet invited them to accept Islam and asked them to help him against his opponents at home (ibid); he invited them to God... and asked them to rise along with him against those of his people [i.e. the Quraysh of Mecca,] who had opposed him -- **FA DAAHUM ILA'LLAH WA KALLAMAHUM BIMA JAA LAHUM MIN NUSRATIH ALA'L- ISLAM WA'L-QIYAM MAAHU MAN KHALAFAHU MIN QAWMIHI** (TT,2:344; brackets added).

After the three chiefs rudely refused, Muhammad beseeched them to "keep the matter secret, for he was loath that his people should hear about it, so that they would be still further emboldened against him" (1.1:193). Obviously, it was the talk of alliance for war against Mecca that Muhammad wanted to conceal. The Meccans already knew enough about his "call to God" i.e. Islam.⁵⁶

The Taif chiefs ridiculed Muhammad, asking him to leave their town. Perhaps to be sure that he did, they encouraged their "louts" to insult and hoot at him (1.1:193). In their own ways, they booed: 'Muhammad, go home.' The Thaqif inhospitality resulted, perhaps, from their desire to demonstrate that they had no intention whatsoever to conspire with Muhammad and thus provoke war. Taif leaders might have thought that any

ambiguity about their response to Muhammad's war-talk against Mecca could be dangerous. By being openly rude to Muhammad Taif was telling Mecca loudly that it preferred peace and paganism to Muhammad's creed that sought war between the two sister cities of Arabia.

Called and chased by the demonstrators, Muhammad took refuge in an orchard owned by the old Meccan negotiator, Utbah and his brother, Shaybah, at Taif. Muhammad's confiding tone indicates that the Quraysh woman married to the Taif chief had followed the mob in order to be sure that her fellow Quraysh was safe. Muhammad exclaimed to her, "What has befallen us from your husband's people" (*ibid*). The Messenger of God did not hesitate to play on the sympathy of a heathen kinswoman and incite her against her husband. From the tone of Muhammad's vehement prayer it is obvious he was exhausted and desperate (see 1.1:193). Ironically, it was the Meccan family resident at Taif, i.e., Utbah and his brother Shaybah who came to the rescue of this problematic son of their city who had gone to Taif to mobilize it against Mecca. The Meccan non-Muslims maintained their human sense of kinship and humane way of dealing with an ideological adversary. Not only did they allow Muhammad to take refuge in their garden, but

when Utbah and Shaybah saw what happened, they were moved with compassion. They called a young Christian slave of theirs called Addas and told him to take a bunch of grapes on a platter and give them to him to eat. Addas did so (*ibid*).

The Prophet later told the believers that on his way back to Mecca seven jinn coming from "Nasibin," Mesopotamia, had listened to his recitation of the Quran and had become Muslims. God soon verified the claim (Q72:1-15, cf. 1.1:194 cf. T). Before reaching Mecca, however, Muhammad needed the protection of its heathen people. Muhammad was too pragmatic to depend on the believing alien jinn. He was, perhaps, uncertain whether Mecca knew of his efforts to incite Taif against it. He wanted some non-Muslim to shelter him before entering the city. Muhammad sent a message asking for protection. It was against the pagan Arab traditions of generosity to refuse someone protection unless bound by a previous commitment not to do

so. Muhammad knew this. He decided to exploit the heathen tradition. Mutim b. Adiy (along with his armed sons and nephews), one of the three non-Muslims he asked, escorted him to the Sanctuary and declared that Muhammad was under his protection. The other non-Muslims (including Abu Jahl) committed themselves to honor the pledge of a fellow-heathen to protect Muhammad (1.1:194) - who used this reassurance against the very heathen whose traditions were so generous and tolerant to provide it.

Rejected by Mecca and Taif - but under Meccan protection - and enjoying pagan civil liberties, Muhammad worked vigorously among other Arab tribes who visited Mecca as pilgrims and merchants. He asked them to believe in his creed and Prophethood as well as give him "protection" (1.1:194-7), which meant readiness to fight the Meccans for him when necessary. War against Mecca was clearly involved in his search for non-Meccan believers, as one response shows. Bayhara b. Firas of the Banu Amir tribe, whom Muhammad had contacted, asked, "If we actually give allegiance to you and God gives you victory over your opponents shall we have authority after you?" (1.1:195). Muhammad answered vaguely, noncommittally.⁵⁷ Bayharah remarked: "I suppose you want us to protect you from the Arabs with our breasts (as the targets of their swords in fighting) and then if God gives you victory someone else will reap the benefit." (*ibid*, parentheses added).

Abu Lahab engaged in counter-propaganda against Muhammad but remained nonviolent (1.1:195). Apparently, few Meccans cared about or noticed Muhammad's concerted, and sometimes clandestine, activities. In some cases Muhammad used subtle flattery. To the tribe of Banu Abd Allah, "the Sons of the Servant of God," he said: "God has given you a noble name" (1.1:195). This was a reference to the meaning of the tribe's ancestor's name "Abd Allah." Muhammad definitely believed this pagan Abd Allah was in Hell. But Muhammad preferred not to voice, then, this part of his beliefs. Muhammad was obviously practicing **TAQIYYAH** or **TALIF AL-QULUB**, saying something flattering about his Abd Allah without meaning it. Finally,

when God wished to display His religion openly and to glorify His prophet and to fulfill His promise to him, the time came when he met a number of the Helpers at one of the fairs; and while he was offering himself to the Arab tribes, as was his wont, he met at al-Aqaba a number of Khazraj whom God intended to benefit (1.1:197).

This was the beginning of Muhammad's contact with the pagan Arabs of Medina - mostly from the two interrelated tribes of Khazraj and Aus, jointly known as Banu Qayla. After their conversion to Islam the Medinans became known as al-ANSAR (the Helpers). The necessary parleys and preparations took about two years before Muhammad migrated to Medina. In this time, two main Medinan delegations met Muhammad at Al-Aqaba near Mecca. Complete secrecy was maintained (1.1:203 passim). What resulted between Muhammad and the Medinans are known as the First and Second Aqaba pacts. As a part of their conversion to Islam, the Helpers undertook to fulfill certain obligations; an obligation to fight dominated the discussions (1.1:197-218). That, as some latter reports imply, the Helpers' representatives had undertaken to fight against Meccans only when they attacked Medina does not affect the militant tone of the Aqaba talks. Indeed, the Helpers finally participated in the Prophet's offensive ventures against Meccans.

A militant reference made during the talks by the Helpers to their Medinan Jewish allies is worth mentioning because it also helps to assess the worth of the Prophet's promises about non-Muslims. The Aus and Khazraj representatives wanted to be sure that Muhammad would not rejoin the Meccans after overwhelming them with Medinan help. Also, the Helpers had alliances with the Medinan Jews, and did not want to jeopardize these commitments. The Prophet told them, somewhat vaguely, that he would not betray the Helpers after "victory" with their aid. About the Jews, the Helpers' allies, the Prophet said reassuringly that he would be in peace with them.⁵⁸

The Prophet's militant intentions against Mecca - and the militant aspects of hijra - are reflected in talks with the Medinans and in the consequent Muslim response before they left Mecca. The militancy of the

Second Aqaba pact is verified by its other title: a "pledge of war" -- **BAYAT AL-HARB**, Islamic sources tell the believers (TT,2:368 passim also see W. Montgomery Watt, "Hidjra", EI²,3:366). Not for nothing did the Helpers during the talks emphasize their bellicosity. "By God, we are warriors and armed people -- **NAHN, WA'LLAH, AHL AL-HARB WA'L-HALAQAH**," they reassured Muhammad (TT,2:362). The Helpers knew by becoming Muslims they committed themselves to "war against all and sundry" and they endangered their property and lives (1.1:204-5). Their allegiance to Muhammad was a declaration of war on all peoples, "black and white."⁵⁹ As God desired, the Helpers, by the "Second Aqaba",... bound themselves to war against all and sundry for God and his Prophet (1.1:207-8). A Medinan later recalled, "We pledged ourselves to war in complete obedience to the apostle in weal and woe, in ease and hardship and evil circumstances" (1.1:208). During the Aqaba talks, some Muslims were already thinking of plundering the Meccans (1.1:205-6). Responding to a mysterious voice warning the Meccans of the believers' war plans, the Prophet threatened "I swear I will make an end of you" (1.1:205). The sources give the impression that the "mysterious voice" was of Satan or a non-Muslim jinn, an evil spirit sympathetic to his fellow-heathen Meccans. Tabari maintains it was Satan who warned the Meccans from the top of Aqaba mountain that Muslims had unitedly declared war on them -- **SARAKH ASH-SHAYTAN MIN RAS AL-AQABAH... "YA AHL AL-JABAJIB... QAD IJTAMAU ALA HARBIKUM..."** (TT,2:364). The point is that even the Devil knew that the Second Aqaba was a Muslim declaration of war against Meccans, and that Muhammad addressed the Devil or the nonbelieving Jinn militantly. Our sources do not believe these Satanic rumors; they mean to tell Muslims unapologetically, yes, Muhammad was preparing for war before he left Mecca. This is further documented by the Quran and related Traditions. The second Aqaba undertaking at Mecca was clearly a **BAYAT AL-HARB**, a "pledge of war." Our sources usually mention Q22:39-4; Q2:193 and Q8:39 in this regard.⁶⁰ 22:39-41 was the first revelation "permitting" believers "to fight the nonbelievers to the death" (1.1:212; T,17:171-9). For Abu Bakr,

Muhammad's right-hand man, it was a declaration of war against Mecca. For him, the Meccans' days were numbered. "They will soon be destroyed," Abu Bakr exclaimed, perhaps rejoicing, anticipating the forthcoming fight between Muslims and Meccan non-Muslims (T,17:172). Apparently, Abu Bakr said this while he was in Mecca.

What of the Quranic passages (such as 22:39) and occasional statements in Tradition (as in 1.1:212) saying **QITAL**, fighting to the death, was permitted at a certain time? For example, it is said the first Aqaba talks took place "before the duty of making war was laid upon" Muslims, or "before war was enjoined" (1.1:198-9). We also read that the Prophet "had not been given permission to fight or allowed to shed blood before the second" Aqaba (1.1:212). Does this mean, for a Muslim, that before a particular time the use of force and violence was taboo? A Muslim is unlikely to think so. Throughout the Prophet's Meccan story force and its practice, as far as possible, were glorified. From Sad b. Abu Waqas's use of a camel's jawbone (in the first year of Islam) to shed the blood of a non-Muslim (1.1:118), through the Prophet's threat of **DHABH**, massacre, to Abu Dharr al-Ghifari's organized raids on heathen caravans, the Prophet's threats of violence and the violent activities of believers are recorded as exemplary for Muslims. That war was "permitted" or "enjoined" or made a "duty" at a certain time does not mean it was strictly forbidden beforehand. But a believer gathers that the Prophet did not use force on a larger scale because he did not have enough resources and backing. Vis-a-vis the Prophet's whole career, a Muslim will probably think that until the Quran openly announced the obligation and permissibility of war, Muhammad and the believers carried on a cold, covert and undeclared war. The Quranic assertions in 22:39-41, 2:193 and 8:39 which may give the impression (to a non-specialist) that war was enjoined for self-preservation, retaliation and for the protection of "cloisters, churches, oratories and mosques" will be explained when we discuss the "soft verses" related to Meccan pagans. Muslims learn that the Prophet and the believers indulged in secrecy and underground

activities when they thought it was necessary, particularly during the Meccan period when Islam did not enjoy enough power to enforce its will. So, acting covertly for the cause of Islam against the interests of the heathendom is not unknown to Muslims. Muhammad acted covertly, **SIRR-AN**, during the first three years of his Prophethood (1.1:115-9). Later, when he worked openly, Muhammad did not abandon covert methods altogether (TT,2:313-7, 332, 336, 341). In the beginning he concealed his Prophetic activities even from his kind uncle Abu Talib (1.1:114, TT,2:313). After Ali told Muhammad that he wished to talk with his father Abu Talib before becoming a Muslim, the Prophet remarked "if you do not accept Islam, then conceal the matter" (1.1:115). Muhammad, Ibn Ishaq informs us, "did not want his secret to be divulged before he applied himself to the publication of his message" (ibid). The story of Umar's conversion indicates that the Prophet, through Muslims of lesser social status and visibility, such as Khabbab, kept secret contacts with Muslims underground, such as Umar's sister and her husband (1.1:156). Some of the Muslims returning from Abyssinia, after knowing that the reconciliation between Muhammad and the Quraysh had not lasted long, entered Mecca secretly, **MUSTAKHFIYAN**, and apparently remained underground in the city (TT,2:340). We know that the Prophet requested the Thaqif leaders of Taif to keep his meeting and talks with them a secret. The conduct of the crucial talks with the Medinans was totally clandestine (see, e.g., TT,2:361 passim; 1.1:203 passim). Suspicious Meccan and Medinan pagans were dodged by Muslim double talk (1.1:205). The story of the secret conversion of the Negus to Islam, and how he tricked the nonbelievers by double talk, is told in the context of the Meccan phase of the Prophet's career (1.1:154).

The Sword of Language

JARAHAT AS-SINAN LAHA'L-TIYAM-U
WA LA YALTAM MA JARAH AL-LISAN-U

(There is healing for the injuries caused by the sword. But what is injured by the tongue does not heal).
(A classical Arabic couplet).

The Quran and Tradition have extensive and intensive vituperation for non-Muslims. Muslims see that Almighty God, His last Messenger and his contemporary supporters used non-flattering language, somewhat effectively, to deal with non-Muslims, particularly during the Meccan phase in which the believers could not impose their will by force. The 'sword of the tongue' - ruthless propaganda and character assassination - replaces the use of a real sword in such situations.

Not for nothing did the Quraysh go repeatedly to Abu Talib, complaining about his nephew's "vilification of their deities, of his relentless acts and of his incessant actions and talking and talking" against their beliefs and traditions, beseeching the old man to stop Muhammad from so saying -- **INN IBN AKHIK YASHTIM ALIHATANA, WA YAFAL WA YAFAL WA YAQUL WA YAQUL, FA-LAU BAATHT ILAYH WA NAHAYTAHU** (TT,2:325). Muslims learn that Muhammad, his supporters and the Quran spoke a hurtful language. (What could be a better source of inspiration, for a believer, than the Quran and the Sunnah?). Muhammad's Quranic language haunted the Meccans. "They had never known anything like the trouble they had endured from this fellow," they said. "He had declared their mode of life foolish, insulted their forefathers, reviled their religion... and cursed their gods. What they had borne was past all bearing," they said helplessly to one another (1.1:130-1). When our sources tell us, uncritically, of Abu Dharr's immoderate language addressed to a woman worshiper, and of Abu Talib calling Muhammad's adversaries "scoundrels and low-born churls" (1.1:125), they verify the appropriateness of such verbal violence against nonbelievers. Although Islam's unsavory speech did not earn Muhammad many followers during the Meccan period, it was, apparently, effective in demoralizing and neutralizing many heathens. One

of the reasons for the conciliatoriness of many Meccans was perhaps their desire to avoid a clash with Muhammad (and with some of his "louts" as the Meccans called them), thus escaping Islam's biting tongue. Abu Jahl ("Father of Ignorance and Vulgarly," i.e. the most ignorant and vulgar person) and Abu Lahab ("Father of Flame," i.e., a muddleheaded angry man), who had the misfortune of confronting Muhammad openly, had to live and die (and be remembered for all times to come), with these epithets given by the Prophet and the Almighty (Q111). Before Muhammad popularized the name "Abu Jahl" for his adversary, his real name was Amr, a common Arabic name. Abu'l-Hikam or Abu'l-Hakam was his title given by friends and other people in acknowledgment of his prudence. Abu'l-Hikam means "Father of Wisdom," i.e., the wisest man; Abu'l-Hakam means "Father of Arbitrators," i.e. the most wise and impartial arbiter. Now this person so acknowledged by his society as the "Father of Wisdom" was defamed by Islam. Only the name Abu Jahl, the "Father of Ignorance," survived. Similarly, Abu Lahab's real name was Abd al-Uzza, "servant of al-Uzza," the deity. He must have had enough respect to have succeeded Abu Talib as Hashimite chief. Abu Lahab's wife was known as Umm Jamil, "Mother of Beautiful." The couple, however, was outspoken in their opposition to Islam. "So, God sent down concerning the pair" (1.1:161):

Perish the hands of Abu Lahab, and perish he! His wealth avails him not, neither what he has earned; he shall roast at flaming fire and his wife, the carrier of firewood, upon her neck a rope of palm fibre (Q111).

This maddened Umm Jamil. She lost her temper at this Quranic jibe. She went to the meeting place around the Kaba to confront Muhammad. Umm Jamil could not find Muhammad but she saw Abu Bakr, and told him in her immature poetry, regarding Muhammad:

We reject the reprobate,
His words we repudiate,
His religion we loathe and hate (1.1:161).

Obviously, Umm Jamil could not compete with the Almighty, who had selected Arabic as the medium of His last message and with the piercing,

penetrating effectiveness of His new original style.

The Quran was (and remains) the main vehicle for attacks on nonbelievers. The Quran was mostly a report of, and response to, situations Muhammad confronted. That is why Muslims developed the elaborate science of **SHAN NUZUL** or **ASBAB AN NUZUL**, "occasions or circumstances of revelation." Quranic attacks, as Ibn Ishaq, Tabari, and others tell us, were originally directed at particular individuals and situations. Almost all those the Quran criticizes were non-Muslims, Muslims are told. When the Quran says "Perish (a) man," i.e., "Death to the man" -- **QUTIL AL-INSAN**, Tradition informs us it was in the context of the Quranic condemnation of particular non-Muslims such as Abbas, Utbah b. Rabbiah and Shaybah b. Rabbiah (T,30:52-3). Of course, Muslims may say the same, i.e., "Perish (a) man" or "Death to the man" to any nonbeliever because it (also) means (any) non-Muslim -- **FA INNAMA UNIYA/ANA BIHI'L-KAFIR** or **LAAN AL-INSAN AL-KAFIR** (T,30:54).

Quranic attacks on Meccan nonbelievers followed certain patterns. First of all came mere name-calling and slanderous labeling of the nonbelievers. They were not called simply nonbelievers or non-Muslim. They were likened to the "blind" and were called "deaf" (11:24). In various forms of the words they were called **TAGHUN**, transgressors, insolents or rebels (37:30), **KADHIBUN**, liars, and forgers against God (23:90), **MUKADHDHIBUN**, beliers (96:13), blind, deaf, dead, dwellers in darkness (35:19-22), **MUJRIMUN**, sinners, criminals and those who have gone astray (68:27), **ZALIMUN**, evildoers (68:29), **MUSRIFUN**, prodigals (51:34), **FASIQUN**, wicked, wanton or nefarious persons (51:46), **ANID**, froward, refractory (74:16), **ABTAR**, cut off (108:3), **HUMAZAH**, backbiter, scandal monger (104:1), **LUMAZAH**, slanderer (104:1), **ASHQA**, the most wretched (92:15), **KAFFAR** and **KAFUR**, ingrate, unthankful (to God) (14:34; 22:38), **HALLAF MAHIN**, mean swearer (68:10), **HAMMAZ MASHSHA BI-NAMIM**, compulsive backbiter going about with slander (68:11), **MANNA LI'L-KHAYR**, hinderer of the good and **MUTAD ATHIM**, guilty aggressor (68:12), **DALLUN**, those who had gone astray (68:7), **UTULL** and **ZANIM**, coarse-grained and ignoble (68:13),

ASFAL SAFILIN, lowest of the low (95:5), sure losers (103:2), **FUJJAR**, libertines (82:14), **KANUD**, ungrateful (100:6), greedy (100:8), stinter (83:3), perverted (51:9), conjecturers (51:10), "being in supreme wickedness" (56:46), transgressing disquieter (50:25), **QAWM BUR**, a corrupt people (25:18), **QATUR**, niggardly (17:100), **AJUL**, hasty (17:11), "like cattle except worse," and **AFFAK ATHIM**, guilty impostor (45:7). Most of these recur throughout the Meccan Quran. For example, the word **TAGHUN** (transgressors, insolents and rebels, etc.) in its various forms appears at least thirteen times in the Meccan passages. Some of these pejoratives are used much more.⁶¹

The Quran did not simply call non-Muslims bad names. Its whole style aimed to maximize hurt. It was not enough to call them "stinters." Adding the curse, the Quran expanded this: "Woe to stinters" (83:1-5). Non-Muslim beliefs were condemned by additional disparagements. Those who ascribed partners to God were told: "You have indeed advanced something hideous" (19:89). Sometimes hectoring and berating words and expressions were hurled at nonbelievers, one after another in a maddening sequence. For example:

into Gehenna every froward unbeliever, every hinderer of the good, transgressor, disquieter (Q50:24-5).

By heaven with all its tracks, surely you speak at variance, and perverted therefrom are some. Perish the conjectures who are dazed in perplexity... (Q51:8-11).

...mean swearer, backbiter, going about with slander, hinderer of good, guilty aggressor, course-grained, moreover ignoble,... We shall brand him upon the muzzle! (Q68:10-16; this short sura, **AL-QALAM**, "the Pen," begins with the Almighty's certification that Muhammad is not "a man possessed" and that indeed he symbolizes an exemplary "mighty morality" -- **KHULUQ AZIM**).

In the many passages describing scenes of the afterlife, and in the verses related to "predestination to good and bad," nonbelievers were heaped with insults and humiliations.

One of the Quran's methods of dealing with nonbelievers was to tell them of their low origin. When the Quran said, "Man was created out of a clot of congealed blood" (96:2), it did not refer to a biology. Meccan

nonbelievers knew such verses were addressed to them. The purpose was to flaunt God's omnipotence (96:3-5) and remind the nonbelieving man of the futility of his (sense of) self-sufficiency, **ISTIGHNA** (96:7). It says man is "no-body" without the help of Divine guidance coming through Muhammad. In another passage the nonbeliever (T,30:54) again is cursed, taunted, and reminded:

Perish Man! How unthankful he is! Of what did He create him? Of a sperm drop (80:17-24).

Tabari tells us that the immediate target was al-Walid, a Meccan nonbeliever (T,30:53). The Quran deprived, particularly, nonbelievers of the right to human dignity. The Quran, in referring to certain individuals and issues, ridiculed and satirized non-Muslims. Usually threats and warnings of punishment were included. About one nonbeliever, God told Muhammad:

Leave Me with him whom I created alone. [After portraying him as a greedy person and ridiculing his opposition to Muhammad, God said:] I shall surely roast him in Sakar (Hell) (74:12-26; parentheses and brackets added).

The disbelievers in Muhammad included almost all excellent poets such as Labid. As a result poets en masse became targets of the Quran's scorn and ridicule. These "guilty impostors," the leaders of "the perverse," are inspired by devils, the Quran remarked.

Shall I tell you on whom the Satans come down? They come on every guilty impostor. They give ear, but most of them are liars. And the poets - the perverse follow them; hast thou not seen how they say that which they do not? (Q26:221- 6).

Of course, Muslim poets are excepted: "Save those who believe" (Q26:227).

The disparagements were rarely specific; they could connote anything in one's imagination. For example, nonbelievers were told that they "persist obstinately in supreme wickedness" (56:46). The context and Tradition tell believers that the victims' rejection of Islam was the basic reason they were addressed so harshly.

What made these diatribes perplexing was that they were mostly unfounded and exaggerated. Because the Meccans found these defamations untrue, they must have hurt more. (Through a later Quranic passage, Muslims know that this is exactly what the Almighty wanted Muhammad and his followers to do to non-Muslims: "That through them He may enrage the unbelievers" (Q48:29), Non-Muslims were charged with outright disbelief in God and of unthankfulness to Him. Meccans believed in God and thanked Him in their own ways. We have seen Labid beginning his recital with an eloquent exaltation of Allah, God: "Everything but God is vain" (1.1:169-70). Utbah genuinely represented the so-called "pagan" Arabs when he told Muhammad they believed in Allah, the Supreme God. The ever-popular name Abd Allah (Servant of God) was no less popular before Islam. Muhammad's 'pagan' father's name was Abd Allah. And an entire 'pagan' tribe was proud to call itself Banu Abd Allah, "Progeny of the Servant of God". Those who called themselves "Servant of God" (Abd Allah) must have had some sense of obedience and gratitude to Him.

The Meccans were also charged with not allowing Muslims to perform their prayers (96:9-10). But Islamic sources who tell of the Meccan phase contradict this Quranic allegation. Likewise thin were the charges that nonbelievers were misers, greedy and niggardly (17:100), that they were always dishonest in business (83:1-5), that they gave stones to the poor instead of bread (107:2-3) and that they buried their children alive. As for giving to the poor, Meccans were not as stingy as the Quran portrayed. Ibn Ishaq has preserved a rare statement by Abu Jahl contradicting the Quranic images of the Meccans as notoriously cruel. Abu Jahl thought Muhammad had claimed the unique status of Prophethood just to gain a superior position. Because, Abu Jahl argued, in all other ways, the Quraysh were a moral, generous, beneficent and charitable people. Abu Jahl said:

'We and Banu Abd Manaf [the Prophet's kin, mostly non-Muslims at the time Abu Jahl spoke] have been rivals in honor. They have fed the poor, and so have we; they have assumed others' burdens, and so have we; they have been generous and so have we, until we have progressed side by side, and we were like horses of equal speed.

They said, 'We have a Prophet to whom revelation comes from heaven, and when shall we attain anything like that? By God (sic), we will never believe in him and treat him truthfully' (1.1:142-3; brackets and emphases added).

Those Abu Jahl addressed did not challenge his assertions. Nor does Ibn Ishaq do so.

A similar rebuttal of Islam's polemical and exaggerated charges is recorded, unwittingly, by Ibn Isaq and at-Tabari. After Mecca fell in 630 CE, Hind, the outspoken daughter of Utbah and the wife of Abu Sufyan, went to the victorious Prophet to declare her conversion. Muhammad asked her to pledge "not to steal."

...she said, 'By God, I used to take a little of [my husband,] Abu Sufyan's money and I do not know whether that is lawful for me or not.' Abu Sufyan, present when she said this, told her that so far as the past was concerned it was lawful. ...He (Muhammad) said, 'And do not commit adultery.' She answered, 'Does a free woman commit adultery, O Apostle of God?' He said, 'And you shall not kill your children.' She said, 'I brought them up when they were little and you killed them on the day of Badr when they were grown up, so you are the one to know about them!...' He said, 'You shall not invent slanderous tales.' She said, 'By God, slander is disgraceful, but it is sometimes better to ignore it...' (1.1:553; also see TT-1,3:62).

What Abu Jahl and Hind said indicates that Arab 'pagans' were reasonably moral and socially responsible. Hind's remarks also imply that they were not hideous baby-killers - contrary to the Quran's images (81:8). Despite the Quran's allegations and the Prophet's rhetoric, the very existence of proportionate female population in Arabia of the Prophet's time and historical descriptions from Islamic sources - such as biographical and genealogical sketches of Ibn Ishaq and Ibn Sad - do not say that burying infant daughters was practiced significantly by 'pagan' Arabs.

When the Quran scored Abu Lahab's wife as a **HAMMALAT AL-HATAB FI JIDIHA HABL-UN MIN MASADD**, "a carrier of firewood with a rope upon her neck" (111:4-5), it meant she belonged, socio-economically, to the lowest class - an elitist, class-conscious slur. The Quran alluded disdainfully to a poor peasant or nomadic woman - still to be found in many societies, indeed - 'carrying firewood with ropes around her waist or neck'. Now, Umm Jamil was an aristocrat. To call her a **HAMMALAH**, a porter, was to

call her a plebeian, a 'hewer of wood and drawer of water.' This intentional vituperation, this spite of the Quran, caused Umm Jamil to lose her temper. Neither Muhammad (whose Muslim biographers emphasize his link to the Arab nobility) nor Umm Jamil wanted to be identified with the underclass of their time.

The "Soft" Verses.

The Meccan Quran contains passages that, apparently, hint at a "soft," patient and nonviolent attitude toward pagan nonbelievers. Some passages may also suggest that Muslims acted only in self-defense and were simply retaliating against **FITNAH** (which is usually translated as "persecution") and against limitations put on their choice of religion. Had "persecution" not happened, one may wrongly conclude, Meccan Islam would have accepted pluralism and peaceful coexistence, thus inspiring Muslims in similar situations to behave accordingly. Believers who know how to read and interpret these passages in the Quran (and similar passages in Tradition) correctly know this is not so. Through various methods proffered by the Quran and Tradition, the real meaning of such apparently "soft" and "self-defense" verses is mediated, corrected and internalized by the Muslim mind.

First of all, the total context of the Quran, and that of Muhammad's whole career, determine the real meaning of any "soft," "self-defensive" passage. Second, it is the "special" but real meaning of the passage, determined by the tone and style of the language (along with other Traditional explanations) that the believer internalizes. For example, in some passages the Prophet and the believers were told: shun confrontation with nonbelievers, be patient or indifferent regarding non-Muslim patterns of thought and action, and go your own way peacefully awaiting God's verdict. These do not, however, teach toleration, or reflect Muslim uncertainty about the ultimate fate of Muslims and non-Muslims. In truth, these verses were instructions to practice hijra - to forswear the company of nonbelievers and turn away from them in disgust. Muslims were

also promised they would soon enjoy Divine succor in this world and eternal reward in the Hereafter, while non-Muslims would soon be frustrated and destroyed here; in the Afterlife, Hell would be their eternal abode. Referring to later events, particularly the battle of Badr (624 CE), believers are told how the Almighty eventually destroyed the nonbelievers whom Muhammad was told to avoid. "Leaving" the pagans to God guaranteed a thorough thrashing by the Almighty. Third, and chief, is the belief in the institution of **NASKH**, "abrogation." The so-called "soft" verses, if not adjusted by other methods, Muslims are told, were abrogated by later Divine commandments.

The whole explanations of these "soft" and "self-defensive" passages glorify, justify, encourage and obligate a disdainful segregationist approach, an aggressive, antagonistic and harsh attitude - and, eventually, the use of force - against nonbelievers. Let us leaf through the Quran in its canonized order and read such Meccan verses the way Muslims read and understand them. 6:70 advised the Prophet to "leave alone those who take their religion for sport and a diversion, and whom the present life has deluded." Verses that follow exhort the Prophet to continue "reminding" nonbelievers, telling them how horribly they will be punished in Hell for disbelief in Islam. (So, to leave nonbelievers alone does not mean to leave them in peace.) As for the nonviolent aspect of these instructions, Tabari tells Muslims that God abrogated this verse by 9:5 - which tells Muslims:

FA'QTULU'L-MUSHRIKIN HAYTH-U WAJADTUMUHUM WA KHUDHUHUM WA'HSURUHUM WA'QUDU LAHUM KULL MARSAD-IN... "slay the idolaters [i.e. non-Muslims other than the People of the Book] wherever you find them, and take them, and confine them, and lie in wait for them at every place of ambush" (Q9:5).

The suggestion "leave them alone" in Q6:70 is no longer applicable, Tabari tells us -- **WA QAD NASAKH ALLAH... HADHIHI'L-AYAT BI-QAULIHI: "UQTULU'L-MUSHRIKIN HAYTH-U WAJADTUMUHUM...** (TS,11:442 cf. Q6:70 cf. Q9:5).⁶² In Q6:91, after condemning the nonbeliever's ingratitude to God and their rejection of Muhammad's prophethood, the Prophet is told to "leave the nonbelievers alone, playing their game of plunging". This did

not mean peaceful disengagement. Nor is the point of emphasis "leaving them alone". Tradition tells Muslims God was thus threatening nonbelievers, assuring the Prophet that infidels would be punished by the Almighty Himself (TS,11:529). 6:106-7 said to the Prophet:

Follow thou what has been revealed to thee from thy Lord; there is no god But He; and turn thou away from the idolaters... We have not appointed thee a watcher over them, neither art thou their guardian.

Tabari explains that this originally meant God told Muhammad to stop wrangling and tending with nonbelievers -- **D'A ANK JIDALAHUM WA KHUSUMATAHUM** (TS,12:32). Had this remained so, Muslims would have had a lesson in nonviolence and noninterference in non-Muslim affairs. This, however, was not to be so. The context of the verse made clear that no goodwill or mutual respect was meant. Within 6:107, nonbelievers are described as wretched, predestined to disbelief: "Had God willed, they were not idolaters." And on the advice to disengage, Tabari soon tells the readers that "the Almighty then invalidated this (sense of the verse) by the (commandment) 9:5 (saying), "Slay the idolaters whenever you find them..." (TS,12:32). Contrary to the suggestion in Q6:107 that tells Muhammad (and believers) they are not Divinely appointed "watchers and Guardians", based on the final verdict in Q9:5, Muslims must act as vigilantes in the harshest possible way. 6:112, telling the Prophet to "leave" the nonbelievers "to their forging," also tells of their wretchedness, assuring that God plans their punishment -- **FA INNI MIN WARA-I IQABIHIM** (TS,12:57).

Q7:180 told the believers to "leave those who blaspheme God's Names" to the Almighty Himself for appropriate treatment. First, Tabari tells the believers, it was a Divine threat to the infidels and "promise (of chastisement)", not a lesson for toleration -- **WA INNAMA HUA TAHDID-UN MIN ALLAH LI'L-MULHIDIN... WA WAID-UN MINHU LAHUM** (TS,13:284-5). Second, the verse was abrogated (*ibid*). Thus, Muslims must act, following Q9:5, against nonbelievers who blaspheme God's names, i.e., talk against Islam. About the earlier revelation,

Take the abundance, and bid to what is honorable, and turn away from the ignorant. If a provocation from Satan provoke thee, seek refuge in God; (Q7:199),

Muslims are told it held only before **QITAL**, fighting to kill polytheists, was made a duty for the Prophet -- **QABL AN YUFRAD QITALUHUM ALAYH** (TS,13:328). Referring to later Quranic verdicts (in 9:5, 73, 123 and 66:9), Tabari asserts that 7:199, like 45:14, was abrogated. According to the final Divine orders in 9:5, 73, 123 and 66:9, the heathen are to be treated with harshness, **GHILZAH**, besieged, trapped and slaughtered wherever they are found. Muslims are told that nonbelievers must be avoided and ignored (according to Q7:199), to be left eventually with only two options: accept Islam, or be slaughtered. Nothing else was acceptable -- **THUMM LAM YUQBAL MINHUM BAD DHALIK ILL'AL-ISLAM AWI'L-QATL** (TS,13:328). The instruction to "pardon" the nonbelievers (Q15:85), Muslims are told, was soon abrogated by the Divine Commandment to fight them to the death when jihad was enjoined (T,14:51). Likewise, Tabari says that 15:94, telling the Prophet to "turn away from the idolaters", was abrogated by Q9:5 asking Muslims to kill idolaters wherever they were found (T,14:69).

Similarly, 25:72 advised believers to "pass by with dignity" when confronted with "idle talk," criticism of Islam. Tabari tells Muslims that God countermanded this passivity; now, the believers are duty-bound to fight to the death such idolaters wherever they are found (T,19:50). 27:70 told Muhammad "not to sorrow" for non-Muslims "nor to be distressed for what the nonbelievers devise." This was accompanied with the Divine assurance that "God would indeed make him victorious by slaughtering them with swords." (Obviously the hands on the swords would be those of Muslims) -- **WALA YADIQ SADRUK MIN MAKRIHIM BIK, INN ALLAH NASIRUK ALAYHIM WA MUHLIKUHUM QATL-AN BI'S-SAYF** (T,20:9). In 18:6 the Prophet is told not to grieve if "they" do not believe (let them be damned). Similarly, in 18:28 Muhammad is told non-Muslims are predestined to wretchedness, advising him to avoid their company disdainfully and keep to the believers' (cf. T,15:234-7). The nonbelievers are hopeless, doomed to

wretchedness:

Surely We have laid veil, on their hearts lest they understand it, and in their ears, heaviness; and though thou callest them to the guidance yet they will not be guided ever (18:57).

In 21:109, the Prophet is told:

Then, if they should turn their backs, say: 'I have proclaimed to you all equally...'

This was not advice to leave peacefully, after merely conveying the message of Islam, those who refused to believe in his Prophethood. Rather, it was a Divine instruction to practice hijra aggressively - to tell nonbelievers that as long as they refused to convert to Islam, a state of war, **HARB**, exists, and that no reconciliation, **SULH**, or peace, **SILM**, was possible --

FA IN ADBAR HAULAI AL-MUSHRIKUN, YA MUHAMMAD, ANI'L-IQRAR BI'L-IMAN BI AN LA ILAH LAHUM ILLA ILAH WAHID FA ARADU ANHU WA ABAU'L-IJABAT ILAYH, FA-QUL LAHUM,... ALIMHUM, INNAK WA HUM ALA ILM MIN AN BADUKUM LIBAD HARB, LA SULH BAYNAKUM WA LA SILM (T,17:107).

Similarly, the instruction to Muhammad "to turn away from nonbelievers and wait" (Q32:30) is accompanied with the explanation that Muhammad was promised the conquest of Mecca (T,21:116). The "turning away" was to be followed by a victorious return; the waiting time was not to be passive and indefinite.

In the context of some such 'soft' verses, Muslims are told that this nonviolent (or less violent) treatment of non-Muslims was temporary. Q37:174, 178 told the Prophet to turn from the Meccan nonbelievers "for a while." It was tactical. Tradition tells Muslims that the advice to "turn away" from non-Muslims held only until the battle of Badr (624 CE), in which the Prophet fought and defeated them (T,23:115-6). And Tabari introduces another reason for this Divine instruction to Muhammad (of segregation from nonbelievers). As Divine punishment for their disbelief, nonbelievers could be overtaken by some catastrophe. So God advised the Prophet to shun the nonbelievers, to escape that imminent chastisement.⁶³

"Turning away," in any case, even for "awhile", did not teach Muslims passive isolationism.

About 43:89, which asked the Prophet to "yet pardon" the nonbelievers and say to them "peace," Muslims are told that God abrogated it. The Prophet was told to fight them to the death - instead of pardoning them and saying "peace" to them -- **THUMM NASAKH ALLAH HADHIHIL-AYAT WA AMAR NABIYYAHU BI QITALIHIM** (T,25:106).

In 45:14-5, the believers were told to "forgive those who do not look for the days of God," i.e. do not believe in the Afterlife; and that "whoso does righteousness, it is his own gain, and whoso does evil it is his own loss." Apparently, a "hands-off" policy towards nonbelievers is suggested, leaving God to decide their fate. Not so. The reader is immediately told this policy is no longer valid. "God bade (Muhammad) fight all (sic) heathen until they said, 'There is no god but God, that Muhammad is the Messenger of God.' So this (Q45:14-5) is among the invalidated (Quranic verses)" --

FA AMARAHU AZZ WA JALL AN YUQATIL AL-MUSHRIKIN KAFFAT-AN FA KAN HADHA MIN AL-MANSUKH... UMIR BI QITALIHIM HAA YASHHADU AN LA ILAH ILL-ALLAH WA ANN MUHAMMAD RASUL ALLAH (T,25:144-5).

For the Muslims it was now "a Divine duty to wage Jihad against nonbelievers and be rough toward them" -- **WA FARAD JIHADAHUM WA'L-GHILZAT ALAYHIM** (T,25:145).

After referring to nations who had rejected earlier Prophets, the Quran told Muhammad about his Meccan adversaries:

...they are an insolent people. So turn thou from them; thou wilt not be reproached. And remind; the Reminder profits the believers (Q51:53-5).

The Prophet was told that once nonbelievers rejected his call he should simply ignore them and keep company only with believers, thus shunning and disregarding, disgustfully, the society beyond Islam. "And remind," i.e., in any case, continue to preach Islam. Similarly, Q53:29 told the Prophet to "turn from him who turns away from God's remembrance and desires only

the present life." These are Divine instructions to leave in disgust those who did not convert to Islam - not lessons of toleration. These and other verses condemn the nonbelievers of 53:29 for their disbelief in the Last Day, and for their lack of true knowledge. Q68:44-8 instructed the Prophet to be patient and leave a particular non-Muslim's affair to God, but it also said that the respite was "Divine guile" and that God intended to trap the nonbeliever into Hell.

Of 70:5, Tabari tells the readers that the instruction to "be patient" with nonbeliever was temporary. The later Divine decree to wage Jihad and be harsh overrode this instruction to be patient. Muslims are commanded to kill the 'pagans' unless they shunned their non-Islamic beliefs.

FA LAMMA AMARA BI'L-JIHAD WA'L-GHILZA ALAYHIM, UMIR BISH-SHIDDAT WA'L-QATL HAA YATRUKU, WA NUSIKH HADHA (T,29:72).

73:10 told the Prophet to "bear patiently" what nonbelievers said and "forsake them graciously." This advice is doubly canceled out. First, the Quran follows up with telling the believers that believers are "guaranteed" hell, with "fetters and (the) furnace and food that chokes, and painful chastisement" (73:11-12). Second, more importantly, as far as this world is concerned, Tabari tells the readers that 73:10 is abrogated by Q9:5 and others. Then the standing Quranic order is, Tabari clarifies, to fight infidels to the death until they declare

there is no God but Allah and Muhammad is the Messenger of God. Nothing else, (Tabari asserts,) other than this will be accepted -- **UMIR BIQITALIHIM HAA YASHHADU AN LA ILAH ILLA'LLAH WA AN MUHAMMAD RASUL ALLAH LA YUQBAL MINHUM GHAYRAHU (T,29:133-4).**

The beginning of surah 74, after exhorting the Prophet to continue his mission of warning the people and "magnifying the Lord," advises him to be "patient" (74:7), to "leave" a particular nonbeliever, al-Walid b. Hisham, whom the Almighty will deal with directly (74:11 cf. T,29:152). Tolerance is not the message. God ridiculed this nonbeliever, and assured the Prophet he would be handled suitably in Hell. 80:7, 10 which tell the

Prophet it is not his concern if a particular non-Muslim does not "cleanse himself" and that it is up to the one concerned to "remember it" (i.e., become a Muslim), aim to ridicule and condemn the nonbeliever rather than suggest moderation. The condemnation of 80:17-19, and other verses in the sura, tells believers that no relief for nonbelievers was intended (cf. T,30:53). 86:17 instructed the Prophet (and the believers) to "respice the unbelievers and tarry with them a while." Previous verses which say "they are devising guile and I am devising guile" clarify that no goodwill is intended. Here, the Prophet was told not to be impatient, to have confidence that the time for vengeance and divine retribution -- **WAQT HULUL AN-NAQAMAH** -- would soon come. Exactly this happened, Tabari tells the reader - God finally willed Muslims to be victorious by commanding them to wage jihād against nonbelievers, to fight them to the death and lambaste them, treat them harshly -- **LAMMA ARAD AL-INTISAR MINHUM, AMAR BIJHADIHIM WA QITALIHIM WA'L-GHILZAT 'ALAYHIM** (T,30:150).

The reader of Meccan events also sees this "respite" for nonbelievers was temporary and tactical, "a guile." Muslims were soon told to heap coals on the infidels and fight them. 92:12 tells the believers; "Surely upon Us rests the guidance." Does this mean God tells believers not to interfere with non-Muslims, and leave their guidance to God? No. It emphasizes the predestination to wretchedness of non-Muslims. The verses following 92:12 confirm that these wretched people who called Muhammad's Prophethood "lies" and turned away from Islam will roast in Hell (92:14-8 cf. T,30:216-27).

If read out of context, ignoring Traditional explanations and **NASKH**, without a proper understanding of Quranic terminology and the Islamic style of discourse, 22:39-41 together with 2:190-3 and 8:39 may suggest: 1) Muslims were to fight the Meccans for self-defense, or just to retaliate against expulsion, "persecution" and lack of religious freedom, and 2) Muslims respected and protected all worship-places, "cloisters, churches, oratories [synagogues] and mosques, wherein God's name is much mentioned" (22:40). The Quran tells the reader that Muslims were

permitted to fight because "they were wronged" and expelled from their habitations" for saying "Our Lord is God" (e.g., 22:39). Muslims were commanded to fight in order to end **FITNAH**, "persecution." Had Meccans "given over" -- **INTAHAU** -- "persecution" there would have been "no enmity save for evildoers" -- **AZ-ZALIMIN** (e.g. 2:193; 8:39). Certain Islamic meanings of "persecution," "giving over, persecution" and "evildoers" will enlighten us about this Quranic material.

The Quranic term **FITNAH**, usually translated as "persecution," means **SHIRK**, associating partners to God. Explaining 2:193 and 8:39, Tabari repeatedly tells us: **AMMA'L-FITNAT FA'SH-SHIRK**, "**FITNAH** means **SHIRK** (TS,3:570 passim) and **AL-FITNAT WA HIYA'SH-SHIRK**, "It is shirk that is fitnah", (T,9:248 passim). This was a reference to the paganism of Arabia. So, when God told Muslims to fight the Meccans "until there is no persecution," God told them to fight until there is no paganism in Mecca (or elsewhere - until God's religion, i.e., Islam, is adopted entirely and exclusively -- **HATTA LA YAKUN SHIRK BI'LLAH WA HATTA LA YUBAD DUNAHU AHAD-UN WA TADMAHILL IBADAT AL-AWTHAN WA'L-ALIHAT WA'L-ANDAD... HAA LA YAKUN SHIRK...**(TS,3:570 also see T,9:248). "Then if they give over, God sees the things they do" (Q8:39). "Give over" what - persecution in its common sense? No. It means "if they give up **FITNAH** [i.e., **SHIRK** (paganism, etc.)) and join, along with you (Muslims), the true religion of God, then indeed their act of abandoning heathenism and joining Islam will not be hidden from God" -- **FA IN INTAHAU ANI'L-FITNAT, WA HIA ASH-SHIRK BI'LLAH, WA SARU ILA'D-DINI'L-HAQQ MAAKUM FA INN ALLAH LA YAKHFI ALAYH MA YAMALUN MIN TARK AL-KUFR WA'D-DUKHUL FI DINI'L-ISLAM** (T,9:250). To be clearer, Tabari reminds us that this "giving up" by the non-Muslims does not merely mean a cease-fire, ceasing to fight or ceasing to be unfriendly toward Muslims. No. Above and beyond this, pagans must give up their religion and become Muslims, or believers must fight them to the death -- **LI ANN AL-MUSHRIKIN, WA IN INTAHAU AN AL-QITAL, FA INNAHU KAN FARD-AN ALA'L-MUMININ QITALUHUM HATTA YUSLIMU** (T,9:250). Who are the "evildoers," **AZ-ZALIMIN**, about whom it was said: "Then if they give over,

there shall be no enmity save for evildoers" -- **FA ININTAHAU FA-LA UNDWAN ILLA ALA'Z-ZALIMIN** (2:193)? Common sources fail us. For example, Hans Wehr's Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic does not offer a full explanation of the Quranic term **ZULM**. In common parlance, it means iniquity, injustice, unfairness, repression, tyranny, cruelty. For the Quran, however, **ZULM** means disbelief (in Islam to be sure). So, Tabari paraphrases this as follows:

If those among the heathen who fight you give up fighting you and enter your religion, and acknowledge the duties that God has enjoined you, and shun worship of the idols, then (you Muslims must) give up enmity with them and fighting them and waging Jihad on them. Because none but the **ZALIMIN** - those who associate partners to God and those who give up His worship, and worship other than their Creator [i.e., Meccan non-Muslims] are to be assaulted (TS,3:572; brackets and parentheses added).

Again it is the Meccans' disbelief in Islam and their adherence to un-Islamic religious traditions per se - not their treatment of Muslims - that earn lasting Muslim enmity for them. **AZ-SALIMUN**, "the evildoers," are those, Tabari repeats, who refuse to utter the Islamic Credo: "There is no God but God" -- **AZ-ZALIM ALLADHI ABA AN YAQUL LA ILAH ILL'ALLAH** (TS,3:573). In their commentaries on all these Quranic passages, later and contemporary orthodox and fundamentalist Muslim exegetes follow Tabari's understanding of **FITNAH**, **FA-IN INTAHAU**, **AZ-ZALIMUN** and other material.⁶⁴ This is not to say that Tabari and his successors have not cited sensible, nonsensical and exaggerated reports of mistreatment of Muslims by the Meccans. But they all come to the same conclusion: that **QITAL** and **JIHAD** on the Arab pagans was an absolute, Divine verdict, not necessarily conditioned by the pagan treatment of Muslims. No orthodox and fundamentalist ulama dare to say that Islam would have accepted pluralism and peaceful coexistence with paganism in Arabia if Muhammad and his followers had been allowed to practice Islam peacefully, without mistreatment.

Muslims know well that in Mecca or early Medina, Islam's aggression against Arab pagans was not necessarily reciprocal. The charges of mistreatment of believers, even if partly true, were not the only cause for Muslim antagonism against non-Muslims. The principle cause was the

heathen's refusal to accept Islam exclusively. Muslims know that along with such casi belli the Quran (2:216, 244; 9:1-28) and Tradition invoked war against non-Muslims as an inherent and perpetual duty, independent of any mundane reason. The very "self-defensive" 22:39-41 passage ends with an expansionist, exclusivist tone. Once Muslims are "established" in a "land," 22:41 predicts they will impose the Islamic way of life, outlawing non-Islam. For Tabari, the verse foretold Meccan's 'subjugation" by the believers -- **FA QAHARU'L-MUSHIRIKIN** (T,17:178). That Muslims after their "establishment in the land" would "call" its people to **MARUF**, honor, meant they would call them to the Muslim concept of monotheism -- **DAAU ILA TAWHID ALLAH** (ibid); the dishonor, evil -- **MUNKAR** -- that Muslims would outlaw was the dishonor of Mecca's non-Islamic religious traditions, **SHIRK...** **NAHAU AN ASH-SHIRK BI'LLAH** (ibid). So, the Quran 22:39-41 did not tell Muslims about to emigrate to Medina they should meekly find a place to practice their religion peacefully. They were instead coached and prepared for a triumphant return to subjugate Mecca and the whole of Arabia, impose their creed there, outlawing all other Arab religious traditions. Q2:216, 244 and 9:1-28 (and their accompanying Tradition reports) state this unapologetically for believers. While explaining 2:193, Muslims are reminded of what the Prophet said:

God commanded me to fight the people to death until they say "there is no god but God," perform salat (Islamic prayer) and pay zakat (Islamic tax). If they do this, their lives and property will be safe from me, (i.e., otherwise, I am commanded by God to kill them and confiscate their property) -- **QAL AN-NNABI...** **INNI UMIRT/INN ALLH AMARANI/AN UQATIL AN-NAS HAA YAQULU LA ILAH ILL-ALLAH WA YUQIMU'S-SALAT WA YUTU'Z-ZAKAT, FA IDHA FAALU DHALIK FAQAD ASAMU MINNI DIMAAHUM WA AMWALAHUM** (TS,3:572 cf. Q2:193; parentheses added).

Muslims are also told, unwittingly if not obliquely, that the charges of persecution against Meccans are exaggerated. They know the heathens tried their best to coexist peacefully and that only a few Meccans acted against a few Muslims on only a few occasions, in response to Islam's aggressive postures and demands. Muslims also know that, contrary to the charges, the decision to leave Mecca was taken by the

Prophet under Divine guidance. There was no "expulsion" by the Meccans, who actually (for their own reasons) opposed the hijrah. Muslims are well aware of the falsity and rhetorical nature of the Quranic allegation that Muslims were expelled from Mecca merely for saying "Our Lord is God." Meccans believed in the existence of the Lord, Allah as the Supreme Being. In the beginning, they were even happy this Lord had spoken to a fellow-Meccan. Later, they did not doubt the overlordship of Allah. What they doubted was Muhammad's unique relationship to the "Lord".

False or exaggerated, the fact is that the Quran and Tradition repeat these self-contradictory charges. How does a Muslim rationalize these contradictions, internalizing them in behavior toward non-Muslims? We may speculate. First, this mode of defamation is meant only to intensify condemnation of the heathen. The lesson the believer internalizes is: 'do not bother about textual or historical facts when the target of criticism is an infidel! Contemporary Muslim commentators, such as Maududi, aware of modern sensitivities, have added to the earlier exaggerated charges against Arab pagans. Though inconsistent with their own conclusions, they find it fit to project the defensive and retaliatory posture of early Islam as much as possible. Muslim scholars have yet to accept honestly the requirements of meaningful criticism. It is, perhaps, impossible to be an objective critic and a believer at the same time.

What about the verse that, apparently, projected Islam as the guardian and protector of not only the Muslim "mosques wherein God's name is much mentioned" but also of Sabeen cloisters, Christian churches and Jewish synagogues (22:40).⁶⁵ The last phrase, "wherein God's name is much mentioned", is related only to Muslim mosques -- **URID BI- DHALIK MASAJID AL-MUSLIMIN** -- (not to other institutions mentioned), Tabari concludes (T,17:177-8). "God's driving back some people by others to save cloisters, churches and oratories from destruction," is a mere example, Tabari implies correctly (T,17:175). Now we cannot expect Tabari the believer to admit that the verse was one of those hyperbolic Quranic Arabic statements which really do not mean

anything. Though the dominant and self-confident Islam of Tabari's 9th-10th Century did not need to show generosity toward other religions, had the verse been a lesson of Islam's respect and concern for protection of non-Muslim religious institutions, Tabari would have said so clearly, parading as usual, numerous Tradition reports as evidence.

Contemporary Muslim commentators, well aware of the need to demonstrate Islam's tolerance and reciprocal respect for non-Muslim places of worship, would definitely flaunt the verse as evidence along with their long commentaries. Because they cannot do so, they just pass over the verse quickly, or remark briefly, consistent with Islamic concepts. In his Urdu translation of the Quranic text of Iba Kathir's Tafsir, Ashraf Ali Thanavi adds, in parentheses, **APNE APNE ZAMANON MEN** "in their own times" to the verse. For him (and Ibn Kathir?) the verse reads: Had God not driven the people (in their own times) there had been destroyed cloisters... (IKU, 17/18:67). **IKU**, however, thinks it necessary to remind the reader of the superiority of the Muslim mosque over other worship places and of the "fact" that (only) the worshipers in an Islamic mosque possess the "right direction, and correct and pious intention and action" -- **PAS SUB SE ZIYADAH ABAD, SAB SE BARA IBADAT-GHAR JAHAN ABIDON KA QASD SAHIH, NIYYAT NEK, AUR AMAL SALIH HAY, WO MASJIDEN HAYN** (ibid: 69). This is to tell the believer not to be concerned about the "cloisters, churches and synagogues." In his brief commentary Maududi, following Tabari, simply tells the reader that sawmi, biyah and salawat mean "places of worship of... Christians and Jews," reminding that God protected some "every now and then" (Maududi, Meaning, 7:209). The addition of **APNE APNE ZAMANON MEN** by Thanavi (and Ibn Kathir?), and the mention of "every now and then" by Maududi, are, perhaps, allusions to Islam's concept of history well-digested by the believers. We know that according to Islam the Jews **APNE ZAMANE MEN**, "in their own time", i.e., before Jesus, were Muslims. So were the Christians before Muhammad. Consequently, reference in the Quran to God's protection of synagogues and churches relates to periods in which the worshipers therein were true

Muslims. How could God (a Muslim would think following Islam's logic, which replaces all other religions with Islam) care for non-Islamic worship places? Thanks to the British India of Thanavi and to Maududi's insistence that Islam is to be recognized as the system of world peace and tranquility, this could not be said clearly or less obliquely.

ENDNOTES

PART III: Belief In The Books And Messengers

Section 9: The Era of the Last Book, the Quran, and of the Last Messenger of God, Muhammad

Segment I: The Quran and Muhammad at Mecca: Before the Establishment of a Muhammadan Dar al-Islam

¹The question of whether Muhammad claimed at first to be the last Messenger should not concern us here. For a believer he indeed appeared as such. Muslim belief in Muhammad's superiority and in that he is indeed the last Messenger of God is based on numerous Quranic passages and Tradition reports. Much of this we have already seen in our discussions of the Messengers who came before Muhammad. The Quran 2:253 and 17:55, for example tell believers that God has preferred some Prophets over others. Explaining Q2:253, Tabari quotes the Prophet Muhammad confirming his own superiority over other Messengers in various ways (TS,5:378-9).

The Quran tells us that Muhammad is the "Seal of the Prophets -- KHATAM AN-NABIYYIN (Q33:40). For Tabari it means he (Muhammad) is the last of the Prophets -- BI-MANA ANNAHU AKHIR AN-NABIYYIN (T22:16 cf. Q33:40). For Tradition reports in the Sahah Sitta and other sources in this regard see A.J. Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition:164-5).

²For an outline of these concepts, and references to some primary and secondary sources, see A. Abel and D.B. Macdonald, "Dar al-Islam", "Dar al-Harb", "Dar al-Sulh", EL²,2:126-7, 131. The inclusion of a Muslim-majority country not ruled by the law of Islam into the category of Dar al-Harb may seem questionable. Abel, Macdonald and other authors base their discussions mostly on the so-called classical Islamic sources. None of these "classical" works on SIYAR, the Islamic law of nations, is a binding and ultimate source for directing Muslim conduct of relations with non-Muslims. The closest equivalent, in "classical" discussion, of a Modern Muslim country not ruled by Islamic law is one of many categories of the so-called Dar as-Sulh (Domain of Truce). Even in these classical sources, as Macdonald-[Abel] has correctly noted, "it is evident that the position (about Dar as-Sulh) was irregular and ambiguous" (EL²,2:131). In any case, the inclusion of Muslim countries not governed fully by the Shariah into Dar al-Harb is justified for two reasons.

1) Even "classical" Islamic sources do not necessarily contradict our assertion. These sources, in Abel's words, have defined Dar al-Islam and Dar al-harb as follows.

"(Dar al-Islam) is the whole territory in which the **LAW OF ISLAM PREVAILS**. In the classical doctrine, **EVERYTHING OUTSIDE DAR AL-ISLAM IS DAR AL-HARB...** Classically, the Dar al-Harb includes those countries where the **MUSLIM LAW IS NOT IN FORCE**, in the matter of worship and the protection of the faithful and dhimmis. A territory of the Dar al-Islam **RECONQUERED BY NON-MUSLIMS OF ANY DESCRIPTION, THEREBY BECOMES A TERRITORY OF THE DAR AL-HARB ONCE AGAIN**, provided that 1) **THE LAW OF UNBELIEVERS REPLACES THAT OF ISLAM...THE FIRST OF THESE CONDITIONS IS THE MOST IMPORTANT**" (EL²,2:126-7; stresses added).

In this whole definition, the application of Islamic law - or lack of it - is the factor determining a Dar al-Islam or a Dar al-Harb. In Turkey, Egypt and many other Muslim countries governed wholly or partly by secular systems - particularly in their conduct of relations with non-Muslims - "the law of unbelievers [has obviously] replaced that of Islam". Abu Hanifo, the founder of one of the four major Sunni Muslim schools of law (FIQH including SIYAR, the Islamic law of nations) is reported to have said that "the land becomes Dar al-Islam if there are

Muslims there". Abu Hanifa must have presumed application of Islamic Law by the Muslims in such a Dar al-Islam. Obviously, Abu Hanifa would not call Mecca a Dar al-Islam before it was conquered by Muhammad in 630 CE merely on the basis of Muslims present there during 610-630 CE. A fundamentalist may also argue that a Muslim country ruled by non-Islamic traditions is like "a territory of the Dar al-Islam, reconquered by non-Muslims of any description, thereby a territory of the Dar al-Harb once again". Contemporary nonconformists who conduct Muslim affairs in non-Islamic ways resemble the non-Muslims of a particular description - the **MUNAFIQUN** (Hypocrites/apostates) confronted by Muhammad.

2) This perceived resemblance is the raison d'être of the "Islamic Movement" and its demand for the Islamization of Muslim countries. The vast literature of the "Movement" has unequivocally likened Muslim countries not ruled by the Shariah with obvious Dar al-Harb. Abu'lAla Maududi refused to recognize Pakistan as a Dar al-Islam before it committed itself to an Islamic constitution and **ISLAMI NIZAM** (Islamic system of conducting affairs.) [See Charles J. Adams, "Maududi and the Islamic State", in J.L. Esposito (ed.) Voices of Resurgent Islam, Oxford University Press, 1983, pp. 108-9 passim.] We have already met the Pakistani Muslim poet who would put his homeland afire if Pakistan failed to adopt **ISLAMI NIZAM**.

In practice, however, a believer's treatment of a Muslim country governed by non-Islamic systems will conceivably be softer and more benevolent. Potentially, a "Muslim Dar al-Harb" is more likely to become a Dar al-Islam. In such cases, only those such as Ataturk, Muhammad Reza Shah, Anwar as-Sadat, Nur Muhammad Taraki and others, including non-Muslim minorities, who openly prefer a secular humanistic system to Islamic - those, that is, responsible for "reconquering", transforming Muslim land into a Dar al-Harb - will be the target of Islamic rage.

³This legacy of taking for granted the authenticity and sufficiency of the Quran and Tradition during discourses with nonbelievers and nonconformists has persisted among Muslims. Similarly, Muslims are quick to allege disbelief in God to those who may object only to a particular aspect of thought or behavior. Responding to a certain Dr. Abdul Wudud's concerns about the authenticity of certain Traditions ascribed to the Prophet, Abu'l-Ala Maududi was quick to allege refusal to worship God -- **KHUDA PARASTI SE INKAR** -- to Dr. Abdul Wudud who, apparently, claimed to be a Muslim. (See Maududi, SUNNAT:130 passim). This is, however, in line with Muhammad's (and Quranic) allegations that all non-Muslims, including Jews and Christians, do not believe in God.

⁴See, e.g., endnote following Appendix II in this study.

⁵1.1:111; Ibn Ishaq quotes the Quran.

⁶Abd al-Muttalib was the name of Muhammad's late grandfather.

⁷Khadija, Muhammad's wife, Ali his young cousin and Zayd b. Haritha, a freedman of the family were the only early converts within the household.

⁸1.1:118; IS-B,1: ; Q26:214; 15:94.

⁹LAM YABADU MINHU AWWAL MA DAAHUM ILAYH WA KADU YASMAUN LAHU, HAA DHAKAR TAWAGHITHAHUM... ANKARA DHALIK NAS-UN WA'SHTADDU ALAYH... FA'NSAFAQ ANHU AMMAT AN-NAS FA TARAKUHU... TS,12:539-40 cf. Q8:39.

¹⁰DAA RASUL ALLAH SIRR-AN WA JAHR-AN, FASTAJAB LI'LLAH MAN SHAA... HAA KATHUR MAN AMAN BIHI WA KUFFAR QURAYSH GHAYR MUNKIRIN LIMA YAQUL, FA KAN IDHA MARR ALAYHIM FI MAJALISIHIM YUSHIRUN ILAYH ANN GHULAM BANI ABD AL-MUALIB LA-YUKALLAM/YUKALLIM MIN AS-SAMA, FA KAN DHALIK HAA AB ALLAH ALIHATAHUM ALLATI YABUDUNAHA DUNAHU, WA DHAKAR HALAK ABATHIM ALLADHIN MATU ALA'L-KUFR, FA SHANIFU LI RASUL ALLAH IND DHALIK WA ADAUHU (IS- B,1:199).

¹¹See in this section, e.g., a Muslim, at-Tufayl's, harsh attitude toward his wife and parents, and Abd o62 Allah b. Masud's behavior disturbing some well-established social norms.

¹²"When one fair was due, a number of the Quraysh came to al-Walid b. Al-Mughira, a man of some standing, and he addressed them in these words: 'The time of the fair has come round again and the representatives of the Arabs will come to you and they will have heard about this fellow of yours, so agree upon one opinion without dispute so that none will give the lie to the other!' They replied, 'You give us your opinion about him'. He said, 'No, you speak and I will listen.' They said, 'He is a kahin (soothsayer).' He said, 'By God, he is not that, for he has not the intelligent murmurings and rhymed speech of the kahin.' 'Then he is possessed,' they said. 'No he is not that,' he said, 'we have seen possessed ones, and here is choking, spasmodic movements and whisperings.' 'Then he is a poet,' [they said. 'No, he is no poet, for we know poetry in all its forms and meters.' [The Quran was in none of these known forms and meters.] 'Then he is a sorcerer.' 'No, we have seen sorcerers and their sorcery, and here is no spitting and no knots.' 'Then what are we to say, O Abu Abdu Shams?' they asked. He replied, 'By god his speech is sweet [Muhammad spoke good Arabic], his root is a palm tree whose branches are fruitful [i.e. he belonged to a noble family], and everything you have said would be known to be false. The nearest thing to the truth is your saying that he is a sorcerer, who has brought a message by which he separates a man from his father, or from his brother, or from his wife, or from his family.' At this point they left him, and began to sit on the path which men take when they come to the fair. They warned everyone who passed them about Muhammad's doings" (1.1:121-2; brackets added).

¹³1.1:122 cf. Q74:11-25; 15:90 for example.

¹⁴"When Abu Talib feared the multitude would overwhelm him with his family he composed... (poetry) in which he claimed protection in the sanctuary of Mecca and by his portion therein. He showed his affection for the nobles of his people while, nevertheless, he told them and others in his poetry that he was not going to give up the apostle nor surrender him on any account whatever, but he would die in his defense" (1.1:122; for his poems combining flattery with threats see 1.1:122-7).

¹⁵1.1:131. Ibn Ishaq is not more specific.

¹⁶They said, "Depart, O Abu'l-Qasim, for by God you are not violent, **JAHIL**, "vulgar", (1.1:131). Qasim was Muhammad's son who died in Mecca. Abu'l-Qasim (Father of Qasim) was Muhammad's kunya name. Usually, in Arabic it is an affectionate way of calling some person by his kunya name. By this, they were telling Muhammad not to be so vulgar, **JAHIL**, and behave himself.

¹⁷Watt has appropriately used the term Senate for the **MALA**, a semi-formal assembly of Meccan leaders. See Watt, Mec. p. 8.

¹⁸According to Ibn Ishaq, most of Surah 18 and many passages in the Surahs 13, 17, 19, 25, 34 and 96 refer to the events mentioned above (1.1:137-41).

¹⁹Q18:23-4 cf. T; 1.1:137-141.

²⁰For the self-confirmation, and reward and punishment, see for example Q13:1, 5, 7, 18, 20-25, 34-6, 38, 41, 43; 17:8-10, 88, 105-6; 18:1-3, 27-31; 25:1, 4-11, 20-2, 33, 56; 34:28-42; also see 1.137-8.

²¹13:32; 17:58-60, 101-5; 18:29, 32-44, 56-9, 101-6; 25:30-42; 34:16-9, 45.

²²See 13:40, 43; 17:15; 18:6; 25:43, 56.

²³See for example, 13:11, 27, 31, 33; 17:13, 46, 82, 97; 18:17, 28, 55, 57; 25:43-4.

²⁴At the end, the Quran warned: "... We have prepared Gehenna for the unbelievers' hospitality. Say: Shall we tell you who will be the greatest loser in their works? Those whose striving goes astray in the present life, while they think that they are working good deeds. Those are they that disbelieve in the sight of their Lord and the encounter with Him; their works have failed, and on the Day of Resurrection We shall not assign to them any weight. That is their recompense - Gehenna - for that they were unbelievers and took My Messengers in mockery. But those who believe, and do deeds of righteousness - the Gardens of Paradise shall be their hospitality, therein to dwell forever, desiring no removal out of it". (18:102- 107).

²⁵This tactic of avoiding intellectual confrontation may be seen in various forms among believers of our time. The Tablighi Jamaat, or Jamaat at-Tabligh, a fundamentalist preaching organization, particularly tells its followers to avoid all forms of discussion and argument. Before starting the preaching round, the believers are told to recite the Quran or engage in some other Islamic chanting, such as repeating **SUBHAN ALLAH** (Praise the Lord), **ALLAH AKBAR** (God is the greatest), when asked a question or asked to discuss. Socratic discourse is avoided by all believers. Apparently, along with practicing Quranic injunctions, the believers echo Muhammad: he, instead of trying to answer Utbah's proposals, began to recite the Quran. Note also that discussion, in a nonbelieving or skeptical manner, of the basic tenets of Islam is taboo.

²⁶At this point see for example Q13:16-7; 17:11, 67; 18:54; 25:43-4, 50; 96:9-19.

^{26a} Q25:52: I have preferred Abdullah Yusuf Ali's translation of **LA TUTI** ("listen not") to A.J. Arberry's "obey not".

²⁷In his account of "persecution of the Muslims of the lower classes" by the Meccans, Ibn Ishaq mentions the following who were physically persecuted: 1) Bilal, eventually bought and freed by Abu Bakr; 2) An unnamed slave girl, persecuted by Umar b. al-Khattab before his conversion to Islam. Abu Bakr bought and freed her; 3) Ammar b. Yasir; 4) his father; and 5) mother who were persecuted by their masters by exposing them to the full heat of Mecca. Ibn Ishaq says "They killed his mother." It is not clear if she died of exposure in the heat of Mecca, or was killed in some other way. See 1.1:143-5. Note that the Meccans were upset with their slaves and alien residents not merely because they adopted a non-pagan faith. We know of Addas, a Christian slave of Utbah and Shaybah, who was not persecuted as long as he behaved accordingly. Even his verbal sympathy with Muhammad, though disliked, was ignored (1.1:193). Most probably the Meccans acted harshly against a few slaves and alien residents because of their persistent violation of well-known Meccan traditions. These traditions expected slaves to obey their masters, and alien residents not to act as rebels or fifth columnists against a society that gave them protection. After their conversion to Islam, the slaves not only rebelled, but also became useless to their masters. Islam had "corrupted" them, the masters said. For that reason they were eager to sell these slaves to Muslims, or exchange them for pagan ones (1.1:144). We today condemn slavery and discrimination in any form. But Islam was not acting then against slavery or against special demands per se by the masters. Islam maintained slavery as an institution. It upheld the masters' right to have obedience from slaves and to punish them physically if, particularly, they rebelled against Islam or did not perform Islamic duties (just as Muslims are duty-bound to physically punish their wives for Islam (Q4:34)). In Islam, even free citizens, if

they turn apostates (sing: **MURTADD**), must be punished by death. Thanks to more humane pagan traditions, the Meccans did not so treat their apostates. As for the treatment of aliens, we know well that even in most civilized countries, they do not enjoy all the rights and immunities of citizens.

²⁸According to Ibn Ishaq 83 "men" left for Abyssinia; some of them had their families with them. See 1.1:148.

²⁹I have adopted Watt's definition of hijra which is the closest to what Islam means by the term, and have borrowed his words with some adjustments. Watt has correctly pointed out the inadequacies of the traditional translation of hijra into "flight"; the words "migration" and "emigration" if unqualified, do not convey the full Islamic sense of the word hijra. See W.M. Watt, "Hidjra", EI²,3:366.

³⁰**LA-IN FAALTUM, THUMM ISTARAD AL-ARAB, (IDHAN YASTAGHWI AN-NAS ALAYKUM) LA-YAJTAMIANN ALAYKUM, THUMM LA-YATIYANN ILAYKUM, HAA YUKHRIJUKUM MIN BILADIKUM, WA YAQTUL ASHRAFAKUM...** (T,9:227-9).

³¹"Abu Jahl, so they say, met Hakim b. Hizam... with whom was a slave carrying flour intended for his aunt Khadija, the Prophet's wife,... He hung on to him and said, 'Are you taking food to the Banu Hashim [the Prophet's clan]? By God, before you and your food move from here I will denounce you in Mecca' [note the non-violent threat of retaliation.] Abu'l-Bakhtari [a non-Muslim] came to him and said, 'What is going on between you two?' When he said that Hakim was taking food to the Banu Hashim, he said: 'It is food he has which belongs to his aunt and she has sent to him about it. Are you trying to prevent him taking her own food to her? Let the man go his way!' Abu Jahl refused until they came to blows, and Abu'l-Bakhtari took a camel's jaw and knocked him down, wounded him, and trod on him violently while Hamza [the Prophet's uncle, who was a Muslim] was looking on near by... Meanwhile the apostle was exhorting his people night and day secretly and publicly, openly proclaiming God's command without fear of anyone" (1.1:160-1; brackets added).

³²1.1:163. Most probably, az-Zibara meant the Jews venerated and followed Uzayr (Ezra) and other prophets. The Quran, as usual, polemicized and exaggerated the Quraysh statements. On other occasions, the Quran charges that the Jews and Christians "worship" their rabbis and monks and (priests). It is plausible however that the Arabs thought Jewish concepts of their Prophets were similar to Christian images of Jesus.

³³1.1:167. Dates mixed with butter (and bread) called **CHANGAL** in Baluchi is a delicious food in Arabia and Baluchistan.

³⁴Hisham b. Amr, Zuhayr b. Abu Umayya, Mutim B. Adiy, and Abu'l-Bakhtari b. Hisham.

³⁵The episode is mentioned by our primary sources and modern scholars as the episode of "Satanic Verses". It is mentioned by Ibn Ishaq (165-7), Ibn Sad-B 1:205-6 and Tabari, Tafsir 17:186-91; Q22:52-3, 53:19-20. Also see Watt, Mec. 100-109; Rodinson: 105-8, 113. My reconstruction and tentative chronological ordering of related events and Quranic passages are primarily based on Ibn Ishaq (pp. 159-75), who without referring explicitly to the dates of the happenings has apparently implied a similar chronological order and relationship regarding various events during the boycott. Any change in the ordering of events resulting from further research, however, does not materially affect my inferences.

³⁶al-Aswad b. al-Muttalib, al-Walid b. al-Mughira, Umayya b. Khalaf and al-As b. Wail.

³⁷T,17:188. **QALAT QURAYSH LI RASUL ALLAH... FA LAU DHAKART ALIHATANA BI**

SHAY-IN JALASNAK, FA INNAHU YATIK ASHRAF AL-ARAB, FA IDHA RAAU JULASAUK ASHRAF QAWMIK, KAN ARGHAB LAHUM FIK... (T,17:188).

³⁸TAMANNA FI NAFSIHI AN YATIH/YATIHAU MIN ALLAH WA YUQARRIB BIHI BAYNAHU WA BAYN QAWMIHI, WA KAN YASURRUHU MAA HUBBIHI WA HIRSIHI ALAYHIM AN YALIN/YULAYYIN LAHU BAD MA GHALUZ MIN AMRIHI (T,17:187).

³⁹IS-B,1:205; parentheses added. For the full story of the Satanic Verses episode see also 1.1:165; T,17:187-9.

⁴⁰TILK AL-GHARANIQ AL-ULA, WA INN SHAPAATAHUNN LA- TURTAJA/TURDA, MATHALUHUNN LA TUNSA. IS-B,1:205; T,17:188. The third line is only in T above.

⁴¹Certain Quranic verses mentioning 'bowing before God' are called 'prostration verses'. Traditionally, Muslims are obliged to perform Islamic ritual of prostration before God when they recite or hear these verses.

⁴²Referring to Quranic verses, Ibn Ishaq writes: "Then Gabriel came to the apostle and said, 'What have you done, Muhammad? You have read to these people something I did not bring you from God and you have said what He did not say to you.' The apostle was bitterly grieved and was greatly in fear of God. So God sent him down (a revelation), for He was merciful to him, comforting him and making light of the affair and telling him that every prophet and apostle before him desired as he desired and wanted what he wanted, and Satan interjected something into his desire as he had on his tongue. So God annulled what Satan had suggested and God established His verses', i.e., you are just like the prophets and apostles. Then God sent down [Q22:52]: 'We have not sent a prophet or apostle before you but when he longed, Satan cast suggestions into his longing. But God will annul what Satan has suggested. Then God will establish his verses, God being knowing and wise'. Thus God relieved his prophet's grief, and made him feel safe from his fears and annulled what Satan had suggested in the words used above about their gods by his (sic) revelation... 'They are nothing but names which your fathers gave them (as far as the words "to whom he pleases and accepts", [Q53:19-26] i.e., how can the intercession of the gods avail with Him?" (1.1:166, brackets added; also see IS-B,1:205-6; T,17:186-94 cf. Q22:52-5; 17:73-5 cf. T,15:129-32; Q53:21-30).

⁴³KAN RASULALLAH... YASTALIM AL-HAJAR AL-ASWAD, FA MANAATHU QURAYSH, WA QALU: LA NADAHU HAA YULIMM BI- ALIHATINA, FA HADDATH FAFSAHU, WA QAL: MA ALAYYA AN ALUMM BIHA BAD AN YADAUNI ASTALIM AL-HAJAR, WA'LLAH YALAM ANNI LAHA KARIH... (T,15:130; parentheses and emphasis in translation added).

⁴⁴INNAMA KAN DHALIK AN RASUL ALLAH... HAMM AN YUNZIR QAWM-AN BI ISLAMIHIM ILA MUDDAT-IN SAALUHU'L-INZAR ILAYHA (T,15:130).

⁴⁵Two examples from our time: Maulana Abu'l-Kalam Azad was the most popular Muslim leader of British India during the first part of the twentieth century before the demand for the division of India on Muslim-Hindu line was put forward by the Muslim League led by Muhammad Ali Jinnah. Abu'l Kalam Azad was not only a great Islamic scholar but also a pious person even according to Islamic traditions. After openly opposing the idea of partition on religious lines and accepting enthusiastically Mahatma Gandhi's leadership in secular affairs, and after becoming a close friend of Jawahar Lal Nehru and supporting the idea of a united secular India, Azad lost his place in the Muslim community of India to Mr. Jinnah who, though less pious in his personal life, had become a loud voice in favor of separation of Muslim majority regions from India and establishment of a Muslim-dominated country, Pakistan. Similarly, President Anwar as-Sadat of Egypt, after calling Jimmy Carter sincerely

"my friend" and after shaking hands enthusiastically with Munahem Begin, lost his life.

⁴⁶I have adopted in part, M. Asad's translation of this verse; see Muhammad Asad, The Message of the Quran (1980), p. 430 cf. Q17:75.

⁴⁷FA'ZDADU SHARRAN ILA MA KANU ALAYH (T,17:188).

⁴⁸WA QAULUHU (LAKUM DINUKUM WA LIYA DIN) YAQUL TAALA DHIKRUHU: LAKUM DINUKUM FA LA TATRUKUNAHU ABAD-AN, LI- ANNAHU QAD KHATAM ALAYKUM, WA QADA AN LA TUNFIKU ANHU WA ANNAKUM TAMUTUN ALAYH, WA LIA DIN ALLADHI ANA ALAYH, LA ATRUKUHU ABAD-AN, LI-ANNAHU QAD MADA FI SABIQ ILM ALLAH ANNI LA ANTAQIL ANHU ILA GHAYRIH (T,30:330-1).

⁴⁹ADUHUM ILA AN YATAKALLAMU BI-KALIMAT-IN TADIN LAHUM BIHA'L-ARAB WA YAMLIKUN BIHA'L-AJAM. (TT,2:324; also see 1.1:191).

⁵⁰Q9:113. For the Traditions telling that this verse, though inserted in a late Medinan surah, was revealed in Mecca to tell the Prophet and Muslims not to pray for Abu Talib after his death, see T,11:40-53.

⁵¹The following piece is from a poem by Abu Talib addressed to the Quraysh before the boycott.

You lie; by God's house, Muhammad shall not be maltreated;
 Before we shoot and thrust in his defense,
 We will not give him up till we lie dead around him,
 And be unmindful of our wives and children;
 Until a people in arms rise and fight you,

 Until you see the enemy falling face down in his
 blood
 From the spear thrust weighed down and tottering.
 By God, if what I see should become serious
 In the hands of a young warrior, like a flame,
 Trustworthy, defender of the truth, hero,
 For days, months, a whole year,
 And after next year, yet another (1.1:124).

Abu Talib said in a poem during the boycott:

Do not provoke a long-drawn-out war,
 Often he who brings on war tastes its bitterness.
 By the Lord of the temple we will not give up Ahmad,
 To harsh misfortunes and times' troubles,
 Before hands and necks, yours and ours,
 Are cut by the gleaming blades of Qusas [a mountain 8
 containing iron mines]
 In a close-hemmed battlefield where you see broken 8 spears
 And black-headed vultures circling round like a 8
 thirsty crowd.
 The galloping of the horses about the scene
 And the shout of warriors are like a raging battle.
 Did not our father Hashim gird up his loins
 And teach his sons the sword and spear?
 We do not tire of war until it tires of us;
 We do not complain of misfortune when it comes.
 We keep our heads and our valour
 When the bravest lose heart in terror (1.1:160; explanations
 in brackets by A. Guillaume, ibid).

For more poems, on the same line, ascribed to Abu Talib see 1.1:142-7.

⁵²Abu Qays, a Medinan, had heard of Muhammad and sympathised with him before the people of his town contacted the Prophet. He is reported to have grieved when he heard of the tension between Muhammad and the Quraysh. The poem ascribed to him reflects otherwise appreciable anti-war sentiments. See 1.1:128-30.

⁵³Tufayl recalled proudly: "When I got down, my father came to me (he was a very old man) and I said, 'Be off with you, father, for I have nothing to do with you or you with me!' 'But why, my son?' said he. I said, 'I have become a Muslim and follow the religion of Muhammad.' He said, 'All right, my son, then my religion is your religion.' So I said, 'Then go and wash yourself and clean your clothes; then come and I will teach you what I have been taught.' He did so; I explained Islam to him and he became a Muslim. Then my wife came to me and I said: 'Be off with you, for I have nothing to do with you, or you with me.' 'Why?' she said, 'my father and mother be your ransom!' I said, 'Islam has divided us and I follow the religion of Muhammad.' She said, 'Then my religion is your religion.'..." (1.1:176).

⁵⁴For this story of Abu Dharr al-Ghifari see IS-B,4:219- 227; Mu-MFA,4:1919-22 (Book 44 Chapter 28); Bu-Mash,5:59- 60. Abu Dharr is one of a few Companions of the Prophet equally respected by the Sunnites as well as the Shiites, and equally popular among them.

^{54a}The above translation is based on explanations provided by Muhammad Fuad Abd al-Baqi, the Sahih's learned Muslim editor, in his note no. 6 on the same page. This is what Abd al-Baqi tells us in Arabic about "HAN-AN MITHL AL- KHASHABAH": AL-HAN... HUA KINAYAT-UN AN KULL SHAY-IN. WA AKTHAR MA YUSTAMAL KINAYAT-AN AN AL-FARJ WA'DH-DHAKAR. FA-QAL LAHUMA: AU MITHL AL-KHASHABAT FI'L-FARJ (Mu-MFA,U:1921 n.6).

⁵⁵FA YAQUL LA ARUDD ILAYKAUM MINHA SHAY-AN HAA TASHHADU AL-LA ILAH ILL'ALLAH WA ANNA MUHAMMAD RASUL ALLAH. FA IN FAALU RADD ALAYHIM MA AKHADHAHA MINHUM WA IN ABAU LAM YARUDD ALAYHIM SHAY-AN. FA KAN ALA DHALIK HAA HAJARA RASUL ALLAH WA MADA BADR WA UHUD; THUMM QADIM FA AQAM BI'L-MADINAH (IS-B,4:222-4).

⁵⁶W. Montgomery Watt could have used this episode and the Meccan fears mentioned earlier about the consequences of Muhammad's contacts beyond Mecca as an example to support his conjecture that Muslim emigrants to Abyssinia might have been undertaken to seek military help against Mecca. Watt could also use this and other events indicating Muhammad's indulgence in secrecy to say that, for whatever reasons, when obtaining military help from Abyssinia was not possible, Muhammad and the Muslims might have kept it as a secret with no record left in Islamic sources.

⁵⁷After all, Muhammad was a Quraysh. After the conquest of Mecca, his Qurayshite bias became obvious, displeasing even his old non-Qurayshite Medinan Companions. Even at Mecca before the hijra he tried to convince the Quraysh that their acceptance of Islam, i.e. his leadership, would bring other Arabs and non-Arabs under Qurayshite domination. (This is exactly what happened. During the whole medieval period after Muhammad's death, Qurayshite lineage was accepted by the majority of ulama as a prerequisite for imamate or caliphate. The Emigrants won the first debate over Muhammad's succession basically on the point that they belonged to the Quraysh while the Helpers, Medinan Muslims and major contenders for succession, were not Qurayshite.) So, Muhammad's Meccan Qurayshite prejudice was too strong to promise Banu Amir leadership after his death. Besides, Muhammad was shrewd enough to understand that such promise to one particular clan would alienate the rest. Apparently, it was this kind of consideration, along with others, that did not allow Muhammad to nominate, clearly, his successor, or fix rules of succession, leaving his followers to plunge in blood-baths for centuries on this issue.

⁵⁸The Helpers' representative had asked at al-Aqaba: "O apostle, we have ties with other men (he meant the Jews) (sic) and if we sever them perhaps when we have done that and God will have given you victory, you will return to your people and leave us?' The apostle smiled and said: "Nay, blood is blood and blood not to be paid for is blood not to be paid for. [i.e., according to A. Guillaume, 'he would treat blood revenge and its obligation as common to both parties.'] I am of you and you are of me. I will war against them that war against you and be at peace with those at peace with you" (1.1:203-4; brackets and emphases added). For a modern reader the passage is somewhat vague. Given the later decay of relations between Muhammad and the Jews, the vagueness in the passage perhaps comes from intentional meddling with the report to blur the Prophet's undertakings about the Jews of Medina. The friendly alliance between the Helpers and the Jews of Medina, however, is documented elsewhere in the same sources. It was, perhaps, based on promises at Aqaba that after Muhammad reached Medina the Jews were first treated as allies. Then, after relations deteriorated with the Jews, some Khazrajite and Ausite Medinans remembered the requirements of the alliance related to the Jews and were uneasy by Muhammad's violation of it. Most of the Medinan Muslims loyal to the Prophet, however, followed him when o62 he ignored what he had undertaken in the pact of Aqaba about the Jews. In Rodinson's words "loyalty to the cause took precedence over their sworn word" (MR, Mohammad:173).

⁵⁹1.1:204; literally "red and black men" as Guillaume notes.

⁶⁰These three Quranic passages are as follows:

Leave is given to those who fight because they were wronged - surely God is able to help them - who were expelled from their habitations without right, except that they say 'Our Lord is God. Had God not driven back the people, some by the means of others, there had been destroyed cloisters, and churches, oratories and mosques, wherein God's Name is much mentioned. Assuredly God will help him who helps Him - surely God is All-strong, All-mighty - who, if We establish them in the land, perform the prayer, and pay the alms, and bid to honour, and forbid dishonour; and unto God belongs the issue of all affairs (Q22:39- 41).

Fight them (to the death = **QATILUHUM**) till there is no persecution and the religion is God's; then if they give over, there shall be no enmity save for evildoers (2:193; parentheses added).

Fight them (to the death) till there is no persecution and the religion is God's entirely; then if they give over, surely God sees the things they do;... (8:39; parentheses added).

There is some controversy, if not confusion, in Islamic sources about the **SHAN NUZUL**, the circumstances/occasion of revelation, of 22:39-41, 2:193 and 8:39. Later commentators, including contemporaries such as Abu'l Ala Maududi, have generally treated these passages as early Medinan. Our treatment of the passages as relevant to the Meccan situation is based on the following: 1) Regardless of the definite occasion of revelation of these verses, their contents refer to events that happened in Mecca. 2) All Islamic sources agree that **BAYAT AL-HARB**, the Pledge of War, took place during the Second Aqaba talks at Mecca before the hijra. It was called the Pledge of War because God had given permission to fight. This permission must have been conveyed through some revelation. 3) Following this, Ibn Ishaq and Tabari in general treat the passages as Meccan and/or relate them to Meccan situations.

After referring to the Meccan occasions of revelation of 22:39-41 and 2:193, Ibn Ishaq (1.1:208-13) tells the reader more clearly: "When God had given permission to fight and this clan of the Ansar [Medinans]

had pledged their support to him in Islam and to help him and his followers and the Muslims who had taken refuge with them, the apostle commanded his companions, the emigrants of his people and those Muslims who were with him in Mecca, to emigrate to Medina and to link up with their brethren the Ansar" (1.1:213). Tabari in his Tarikh, after mentioning various reports concludes that 8:39 was revealed before the **BAYAT AL-HARB** at Mecca; the emigration of Meccan Muslims and that of the Prophet himself followed: **FA- LAMMA ADHIN ALLAH... LI-RASULIHI... FI'L-QITAL WA NAZAL QAULUHU: "WA QATILUHUM HAA LA TAKUN FITNAT-UN WA YAKUN AD-DIN KULLUHU LI'LLAH (8:39)", WA BAYAAHU AL-ANSAR ALA MA WASAFT MIN BAYATIHM, AMAR RASUL ALLAH ASHABAHU MIMMAN HUA MAAHU BI-MAKKAT MIN AL-MUSLIMIN BI'L-HIJRAT WA'L-KHURUJ ILA'L-MADINAH... WA AQAM RASUL ALLAH BI-MAKKAT YANTAZIR AN YADHAN LAHU RABBUHU BI'L-KHURUJ MIN MAKKAH...** (T,2:368-9 passim). In the Tafsir (T,9:248-50), however, Tabari is somewhat confusing about 8:39's **SHAN NUZUL**. In the beginning (T,9:248), Tabari connects the verse with the preceding passage relating to the early Medinan period. Then he quotes a long report summarizing Muhammad's Meccan career. This report maintains that 8:39 was revealed before the hijra from Mecca. Tabari does not reject the report. This, along with this treatment of the verse in the Tarikh, indicates Tabari accepts the passage as Meccan. About 22:39, "leave is given to those who fight..." Tabari mentions the report which agrees with Ibn Ishaq that it was the first verse authorizing **QITAL**, fighting to the death -- **HIA AWWAL AYAT UNZILAT FI'L- QITAL** (T,9:173, passim). Some of the reports around 22:39... (T,9:171-3) may also indicate the verse was revealed just after the hijra of some Muslims to Medina. The tone of these reports, however, indicates more of the Meccan occasion of the verse. It is in these reports that Abu Bakr predicted war after the verse was revealed. Tabari is non-committal about 2:193's occasion of revelation.

⁶¹For **TAGHUN** and its various forms see Q6:110; 7:186; 10:11; 23:75; 37:30; 38:55; 51:53; 52:32; 53:52; 68:31; 78:22.

⁶²In order for us to avoid repetition, the reader is requested to note the content of Q9:5 above. As Q9:29 which is mentioned repeatedly by Traditionist commentators as an "abrogating," **NASIKH**, verse against the earlier Quranic passages indicating a less harsh attitude toward the People of the Book, Q9:5 is referred to by Tabari and others as the invalidating, **NASIKH**, verse for the earlier less unkind treatment of 'pagans,' i.e. those other than Jews and Christians.

⁶³**FA TAWALL ANHUM YA MUHAMMAD ILA HIN MAJIY ADHABINA WA NUZULIHI BIHIM** (T,23:115-6).

⁶⁴For example, see IKU,1/2:44-6 cf. Q2:193, 9/10:93-6 cf. Q8:39, 17/18:67-69 cf. Q22:39-41; cf Q2:193; Maududi, Meaning, 1:136-9 cf. Q2:190-3, 4:132-7 cf. Q8:39, 7:204-10.

⁶⁵The cloisters, **SAWAMI**, according to Tabari refer to the cloisters of the monks, **SAWAMI AR-RUHBAN** (monasteries?) and/or to Sabean cloisters, **SAWAMI AS-SABIIN**. Oratories, **SALAWAT**, refer to Jewish synagogues -- **KANAIS AL-YAHUD** -- and/or to Sabean mosques -- **MASAJID AS-SABIIN** (T,17:175-7).

PART III: Belief in the Books and Messengers

Section 9: THE ERA OF THE LAST BOOK, THE QURAN, AND OF
THE LAST MESSENGER OF GOD, MUHAMMAD

Segment 2: The Quran and Muhammad After the Establishment
of a Dar al-Islam at Medina

a: A Study of Ideal Islam in Power

The First Muhammadan Dar al-Islam

This is a study of an ideal Muslim treatment of non-Muslims and nonconformists in a situation in which Muslim believers are in power and their desire to apply the Quran and the Sunnah on their conduct of relations with nonbelievers prevails. Such an ideal, Muslims believe, was provided by the Prophet Muhammad at Medina during 622 CE - 632 CE. For believers of all times, the Medinan model is a source of inspiration worthy of imitation. Note that Muslims are duty-bound to follow Quranic injunctions and Muhammadan Sunnah in every respect. Also note the Prophet's verdict: **KHAYR UMMATI QARNI...** "the best of my community are those of my age (,i.e., my contemporary Muslims)." The Medina of the Prophet -- **MADINAT AN-NABIY** (622 -632 CE) continues to symbolize, in Muslim imagination, the most ideal Dar al-Islam, the state governed by an Islamic regime. [Medina (Madinat/Madinah) means city in Arabic]. It is the Muslim version of the 'City of God,' and of the Ideal Republic, **MADINAH FADILAH**, "Superior City." For a believer, however, it is not a mere utopia. According to sacred Islamic historiography, the believers under Divine obligation have endeavored to recreate, preserve and live this ideal state. The so-called fundamentalists of our time - and all Muslim believers are fundamentalists in this regard - aim at establishing an Islamic state or states in Medina's image. Because, according to Muslim revivalists, this Islamic movement is relevant and applicable to our time, the questions we ask are influenced by contemporary concerns.

We take it for granted, as Muslim believers do, that after the hijra Islam ruled in Medina within certain initial limits. Under the Prophet's overall leadership Muslims formed the ruling class. For the believers determined to recreate in the image of Medina an **ISLAMI NIZAM/AN-NIZAM AL-ISLAMI/HUKUMAT-E-ISLAMI** "Islamic regime" or **NIZAME-E-MUSTAFA** "the system of the Chosen One" (Mustafa, "Chosen One" being an epithet of Muhammad), as the terms are used by modern Muslim revivalists, we will explore answers to the following questions:

1. How did the Prophet deal with non-Muslims and nonconformists within the existing jurisdiction of the Dar al-Islam? To what extent were these nonbelievers' basic human rights respected? Was pluralism in its modern sense possible in the Dar al-Islam established and run by Muhammad al-Mustafa? Answers to these questions will indicate to what extent the ideal Islamic regime was inherently hegemonic, authoritarian and totalitarian in its dealings with nonbelievers and nonconformists living in the Dar al-Islam.
2. What were Medinan Islam's expectations from believers who lived beyond the Dar al-Islam? Were such Muslims allowed to maintain a degree of loyalty to their un-Islamic lands?
3. Does the record of the Madinat an-Nabiy tell a believer that this ideal Dar al-Islam was inherently (and Divinely obliged to be) aggressive and expansionist - regardless of external threats or good-will - in dealings with the world beyond its initial boundaries?
4. As we will see, the Prophet and the believers had to deal with some existing norms and traditions that governed individual, inter- group and international relations regardless of differences. These were international laws of the time, the equivalents of present-day international commitments, agreements, charters and institutions. The believers also made specific pledges and treaties with and regarding nonbelievers. Muslims will learn how these undertakings, treaties, pledges, compacts, and agreements were disposed by the Prophet and his Companions.

In brief, the first sub-segment of our study here will deal with Medinan Islam's record regarding hegemony, aggression, expansionism and treaty relations with the world beyond Islam.

The second sub-segment of this section of our study of foundations of Muslim images and treatment of nonbelievers will center on the Prophet's and his Companions' treatment of non-Muslims on specific issues during periods of war and peace. Here Muslims learn to what extent Medinan Islam indulged in political assassinations and violence in various forms: the use of force, threats, terror, torture, espionage, subversion, scurrilous language and deception. We will also learn how the Prophet treated hostages and prisoners of war.

On Treaty Relations, Hegemonism and Expansionism.

In the course of our survey of the Prophet's Medinan career, detailed references to Muhammad's compacts with non-Muslims will be made. At present I ask that the reader keep in mind six categories of Islam's undertakings with non-Muslims during the Medinan phase.

1. International Norms. In Muhammad's Arabia some general and specific traditions were mutually respected by adversaries. For example, hospitality was to be extended even to enemies when they were peaceful guests. Adversaries' envoys and messengers were to be received respectfully. Peaceful negotiations and discussions between opposing parties were to be conducted in civilized and restrained diplomatic language. Regardless of the state of relations, pledges had to be kept and debts had to be paid. To these general traditions may be added religious toleration and pluralism. Muslim readers are aware that, as did the rest of Arabia, Medina adhered to religious pluralism. Before the Prophet reached Medina, Muhammad Hamidullah tells us, though contemptuously,

religion was a domestic [i.e. private-personal] affair there, and had not attained any political status [i.e. social behavior was not governed by religious faith]: persons belonging to different religions used to live in the same house.¹

How much Muhammad was clearly committed earlier to these norms is debatable. Except for religious pluralism, however, the Prophet and his followers did not reject the benefits of other traditions when they were the recipients. Nor did they explicitly deny their importance. Concerning religious toleration and pluralism, Abu Sufyan and Abd Allah b. Ubayy (discussed below) were shocked when their own Muslim children mistreated them because of religious differences. Apparently, this was unexpected by them. Similarly, subsequent bewilderment of many Medinans (including some Muslims) indicates that they had not expected gross violations of this tradition.

Foremost in this category was the specific tradition of **ASHHUR AL-HURUM** (sing: **SHAHR, HARAM**), "inviolable-sacred Months." According to

this international law, **MUHARRAM, RAJAB, DHU'L-QADAH and DHU'L-HIJJAH**, respectively the 1st, 7th, 11th and 12th months of the Lunar calendar year, were considered **HARAM**, inviolate, sacred, in which bloodshed and warfare were outlawed. Before and after Muhammad appeared on the scene, Arab pagans scrupulously respected this tradition of truce and peace, foregoing fighting and warfare -- **KANAT AL-JAHILIYYAT TUZZIMUHUNN WA TUHARRIMUHUNN WA TUHARRIM AL-QITAL FIHINN** (T,10:124). [The idea and practice of a permanent four-month truce period every year seems to be a unique pagan-Arab contribution to peace. This does not necessarily mean that the 'pagans' engaged regularly in fighting for the rest of the year.] Muhammad and the Quran recognized, and the Quran confirmed, the **HARAM**, inviolate, nature of these four sacred months. Until the incident of Nakhla in 624 CE, the Meccans thought Muhammad was committed to the AQD, compact, and AHD, covenant, regarding the inviolability of the four sacred months, and thus agreed to this international law of the Arab world (see Q9:36 cf. T,10:124-9; Q2:194, 217 cf. TS,4:307; Q5:2, 97; W:16 passim). A related tradition was the sacredness of the Sanctuary, the area around the Kaba in Mecca, equally recognized by Arab pagandom and Islam. No blood was to be shed in the Sanctuary. Muhammad later declared the JAWF, valley, of Medina **HARAM** an inviolable territory, in the same sense [see clause 39 of the Ordinance of Medina in Appendix No. II].

2. Khazraj-Aus-Jews Compacts.

The second category of Muslim undertakings concerns solemn pre-hijra compacts (sing: **HILF**) of mutual friendship, protection and assistance between Medinan Jews and non-Jews, mostly the Medinan tribes of Khazraj and Aus. At the second Aqaba, the Prophet assured the Medinan Khazraj-Aus converts (known along with other Medinan converts as **AL-ANSAR**, the Helpers) that he "would be at peace with those at peace with (Medinan Muslims)" (1.1:204). During later controversies, Medinan Jews and many Medinan Arabs - including Muslims - frequently referred to

these pre-hijra compacts and demanded observance. The Prophet and his followers never denied their existence. Nor did they claim that at Aqaba the Helpers had nullified their HILF with the Jews of Medina. The Prophet had to justify his violation of these compacts on other grounds.

3. JIWAR and AMAN.

The third category involves **JIWAR**, pledges of protection, and of **AMAN**, safe conduct, between individuals, or between an individual and a group, on a permanent basis, or for special occasions and purposes. These compacts were for fellowship, good-faith - cum- protection. Other members and groups within the larger community respected the **JIWAR** or **AMAN** promised by a particular member or group within the community. Based on this, many Meccans gave protection to Muhammad and his followers. Even after hijra, some Muslims sought and received "protection" from non-Muslims on the basis of such pledges (see e.g. W:19-20). The 40th clause of the Prophet's Medina Ordinance also authorized individual Muslims to extend such pledges - to be honored by the rest of the Muslim community. That certain Muslims tried to act according to the demands of such pledges, or were expected by nonbelievers to fulfill their obligations, indicates that this kind of compact was held binding by both sides.

4, 5 and 6. Ordinances and Treaties.

Because of their importance, the Prophet's "Ordinance of Medina" (the so-called "Constitution of Medina") and the Treaty of Hudaibia are treated separately here as the 4th and 5th items. In both documents the Prophet undertook certain obligations concerning non-Muslims. In the 6th item fall all the Prophet's other verbal and written pledges to various non-Muslim individuals, and groups, beyond Medina and Mecca during 622-632. Whatever the circumstances and methods, as the head of the Dar al-Islam the Prophet promised some rights and privileges to some non-Muslims. For example, some pagan Arab individuals and tribes were

implicitly or explicitly promised - for their cooperation, alliance, friendliness and neutrality - the right to religious freedom and the right to pilgrimage to the Kaba according to their own religious traditions. The Jews of Khaybar, Fadak, and Dar al-Qura etc. were promised, after the conquest, religious autonomy and the right to be, on their confiscated lands, share-croppers. The Christians of Najran and other parts of Arabia were promised non-interference in their religious affairs and the right to stay where they were as subjugated, but "protected," subjects -- **AHL ADH-DHIMMAH**, or (sing:) **DHIMMI**, dominated politically and militarily by Islam.

The following is a chronological survey of the Prophet's Medinan career as it concerns the extent of Islam's toleration of other creeds and Islam's treatment of solemn compacts and treaties etc.

The First Eighteen Months Before Badr.

In the Driver's Seat: the Ordinance of Medina.

Muhammad arrived at Quba, on the outskirts of Medina, on September 4, 622. This was the beginning of the Medinan phase of his career. Most of the Prophet's Meccan followers had already reached Medina. Thereafter they became known as **AL-MUHAJIRUN**, "the Emigrants," i.e. those who performed the hijra - left the Dar al-Harb. Muhammad consolidated his power gradually. But, as believers understand, an Islamic regime, a Dar al-Islam, under the supreme religio-political and military leadership of God's last Messenger, was immediately established in Medina. It began the first year of the Islamic era and thus the first (lunar) year of the Islamic calendar AH (After Hijrah).

Proclamation of an Ordinance was the Prophet's first major action governing believer-nonbeliever relations in the Dar al-Islam. This document, Muslims find, clearly discriminated against nonbelievers. According to this basic document, only Muslims - the Emigrants and the Helpers - were full citizens of the Dar al-Islam, though as Muhammad

Hamidullah correctly tells us

the total number of believers in Madinah, at this time, including the Meccan refugees, hardly exceeded a few hundred while the total population of Medina about this time is estimated at between five to ten thousand, to which Jews contributed nearly a half [MH, Const.:13.

This can easily be ascertained by taking into consideration statistics and names mentioned on various occasions by Ibn Ishaq, Ibn Hisham, Ibn Sad al-Waqidi, Tabari and other Muslim sources. A detailed study and analysis of statistics may indicate there were more Jews than pagans in Medina before the hijra.] Muslims, though at first only a minority, dominated Medina politically and militarily. Muhammad, speaking for God, was the sovereign of the Medinan State.

The first lesson of the Medinan model for believers is that Muslims must seize power and impose their hegemony, their Islamic regime, if possible, before the majority is willingly converted to Islam. Abu'l Ala Maududi, a prominent revivalist of our time, is obviously inspired by this model. In his words, the believer will have to be in a "driver's" seat. Once "passengers are in his hands," Maududi believes, "they will have to go in whatever direction the train goes." "Human civilization," Maududi proposes, "travels in the direction determined by the people who control the center of power."²

This determination to be in the "driver's seat," "in the center of power," "directing" the affairs of Medina along lines that served the cause of Islam, "to the exclusion of" whatever the world beyond Islam thought and wanted, was demonstrated by the Prophet's Ordinance of Medina. We will discuss this Ordinance in detail because it relates to Islam's position about both hegemonism and solemn undertakings. Basically, we will argue, the Ordinance aimed at establishing Islam's firm control for the believers' exclusive benefit, ignoring basic human rights of non-Muslim citizens of the Dar al-Islam, against whom the Ordinance was biased and discriminatory. The Ordinance tells the believers that the non-Muslim inhabitants of the first Islamic 'republic' established by the Prophet were not entitled to mutual

respect and equal rights. In this sense, the Ordinance teaches a believer the practice of Islamic hegemonism, disregarding others' rights to free choice, self-respect and equal treatment. The Ordinance, however, made some implicit and explicit promises to non-Muslims. These were pledges undertaken by the Prophet at a certain period of his rule. In their study of the Prophet's whole Medinan career, Muslims learn to what extent these promises were honored by Muhammad and his followers. Being committed to follow Muhammad's model, the believers are expected to do likewise in similar situations. In this sense the Ordinance is also a base of our study for an understanding of Islam's treatment of its own undertakings concerning non-Muslims. [For the text of the Ordinance and necessary explanations, see Appendix No. II. An analysis and discussion of the Ordinance follows.]

The Ordinance of Medina: An Analysis.

After Muhammad consolidated his power in the Medinan oasis, he promulgated particular ordinances governing relations among Muslims and relations between Muslims and non-Muslims there. Ibn Ishaq (1.1:231-3) puts some of these ordinances together, considering them as a single document issued by the Prophet in the first year after the hijra. Other early Muslim sources verify the authenticity of the contents of this document (see, e.g., MH, Const.:38-40). The document is usually divided into two parts and 47 clauses. Modern scholars agree that some clauses in part I (clauses 1 to 23) and the whole second part of the document (clauses 24 to 47) were issued after the Prophet's successful venture at Badr in 624 (e.g., ibid:23).

The document is usually mentioned by modern scholars as the Constitution of Medina. Some contemporary Muslim writers consider it as "the first written constitution of the world," projecting it as a social contract between the rulers and the ruled - long before Hobbes, Locke, or Rousseau conceived of one. They also tell believers implicitly that the "Constitution of Medina" was superior in various ways to all other

such legal-constitutional documents like the Indian Manu Smirti (500 BC) and Arthashastra (300 BC) of Kautilya-Chandragupta, Solon's works and the constitution of Athens (see, e.g., MH, Const: 6-11, 16-17). We consider the document an ordinance rather than a constitution.

A constitution in its modern sense is a secular document implying or registering (as by vote) voluntary approval by a significant majority of the peoples concerned, regardless of their differences. A constitution is also open to amendments by the people. Usually it provides checks and balances through a separation of powers between legislative, judiciary and executive branches - all of which are, eventually, responsible to the governed. The "Constitution of Medina" was an ordinance - not a constitution in its modern sense. Muhammad promulgated it and the Almighty ratified it. Muslims as believers accepted its validity, not as free citizens with the right to reject it. Medinan non-Muslims received it by imposition, some of them binding themselves under duress. Nonetheless, the Ordinance pledged some rights to nonbelievers. Our sources, and Hamidullah - regardless of his irrelevancies and rhetorical polemics - agree the document is divine and concur that nonbelievers concerned were not free, voluntary parties in the finalization of its terms.

Nor was the document a "pact" or treaty like other of the Prophet's undertakings. Ibn Ishaq and others tell us that the Pact of Aqaba and the Treaty of Hudaibiyah were concluded after thorough discussions between both parties. The proceedings and the names of participants and witnesses from both sides are recorded in minute detail. The text of the Hudaibiya Treaty begins clearly with a sentence indicating mutual agreement by Muhammad and Suhayl b. Amr, the authorized plenipotentiary of the Quraysh. After Muhammad and Suhayl approved the treaty, the Prophet "summoned representatives of the Muslims and polytheists to witness to the peace, (namely)... "(Eight persons from both sides are mentioned who formally witnessed the document (1.1: 505 passim). Similar details are found in our sources

about Muhammad's other compacts with various non-Muslims, such as the one with the Christians of Najran. Ibn Ishaq and other primary sources do not so treat the Ordinance of Medina. There is no report indicating prior consultation even with the Muslims such as those mentioned at the Aqaba. It is understandable, however, that Muslims as believers, already committed to follow Muhammad and God who spoke through him, had to agree with the terms of the Ordinance, though some of them were later perplexed by the way it affected their relations with non-Muslims. Ibn Ishaq begins unapologetically by telling us "the Prophet wrote [i.e., dictated or promulgated] the document" and that it was Muhammad who "established" the terms (see Appendix II). There is no mention - as there is regarding Aqaba, Hdaybiyah, and Najran - of parleys with non-Muslims preceding and following the announcement. The document begins with the assertion that it was "a **KITAB** from Muhammad the Prophet" (Clause 1) and ends with the Divine ratification: "God approves of this document," assuring only the believers that God is their protector and that Muhammad is indeed the Messenger of God (Clause 47). The document reminds us that the "believers enjoy the best and most upright guidance" (Clause 20/1), obviously by God through Muhammad. Therefore, there was no need for consultation with and approval by nonbelievers. It is also made clear that only God and Muhammad were fit to explain and interpret the document in cases of any dispute or controversy (Clause 23, 42).

Hamidullah, without indicating his sources, remarks that the document "was obviously written after consultation with the parties concerned" (MH, Const.: 16). Islamic primary sources do not make it so "obvious." In view of later clashes with Medinan pagans and Jews, Ibn Ishaq, Tabari and others would have gladly recorded, clearly and immediately, the voluntary non-Muslim approval and ratification - had there been any - and so Gabriel would have been saved the trouble of intervention. Although the Quran and Tradition blame the Jews only generally (and vaguely) of the violation of covenants, Hamidullah moves

a step further, asserting variously that "the Jews had acknowledged the authority of the Prophet and also acknowledged his decision as final in every matter of dispute, as has been clearly (sic) stated in Clause 42 of the document" (ibid: 31). Hamidullah also claims, on the basis of Clause 42, that "the Jews had gladly (sic) agreed that the Prophet should discharge the functions of the final court of appeal, even for themselves" (ibid: 35), and that the Jews "accepted the Prophet of Islam as their sovereign" (ibid: 36).³ Had "the Jews gladly agreed", with a document that begins with the belief in "Muhammad (as the Prophet)" (Clause 1), demands to refer controversies for decision only "to God (who spoke only through the Prophet) and to Muhammad" (Clause 23; parentheses added), and ends with "Muhammad is the Messenger of God" (Clause 47), we, along with Hamidullah, would have been saved from a large portion of our discussions regarding the Ordinance.

In the course of his discussion on "the World's First Written Constitution" Hamidullah contradicts himself. Demonstrating his knowledge of what the terms **KITAB** and **SAHIFA** mean - as used by Islamic sources to denote the document - Hamidullah correctly tells us that the document was "an **AUTHORITATIVE** constitution of a state **ISSUED** by the Prophet as the **SOVEREIGN** of the country" (ibid: 10) "Authoritarian" may be the more appropriate term here which Hamidullah has avoided intentionally, perhaps.⁴ Contradicting his own earlier allusions to its "Hobbesean-Lockean-Rousseauist" character, Hamidullah rightly observes that "the document under discussion was not of the type of a contract but was issued as a **PRESCRPTION** and **PROCLAMATION**." Referring to the Quranic usage of **KITAB** and **SAHIFAH** in Q4: 77, 103 and 83:7, 18, Hamidullah asserts "everyone knows that the word Kitab means **PRESCRIPTON** and **COMMAND**... (and) **ORDINANCE**..." (sic), (ibid:17). The Prophet proclaimed it following "the motto 'one ruler, one law'" (ibid). Hamidullah also knows that "in this document, the Prophet secured the highest judicial, legislative and executive powers for himself... He regarded God as the source of authority and considered himself as His

messenger and agent" (ibid:18). Had the "consultation" with nonbelievers for the making of the "constitution" been so "obvious," Hamidullah would not have taken the trouble to explain the "strangeness" of the nonbelievers' acceptance of a document that declares Muhammad a true Messenger of God. Hamidullah concludes correctly: "It does not seem reasonable to ascribe this fact to any possible acceptance by the Jews of the Prophethood of Muhammad" (ibid:31-2). After circumlocuting - mentioning vaguely and in a confusing way some historical facts and "using the right word for a wrong intent" -- KALIMAT HAQQ YURID BIHI'L-BATIL, Hamidullah admits that pagan Medinans were "compelled to follow" (ibid:20-22). As a true believer, and also aware of modern sensitivities, Hamidullah does not tell us how this compulsion came about. For example, he does not tell us the pre-Badr stories of Sahl b. Hunayf's subversion of pagan places of worship, and of how Amr b. al-Jamuh (Jumah?) was badgered into following Islam. Nor does Hamidullah tell us about the post-Badr treatment of the pagan Abu Afak and Asma, daughter of Marwan, by believers.

Of the Jewish acceptance, too, Hamidullah eventually tells half of the truth, though in a typically self-righteous and self-contradictory way. Hamidullah is right to conjecture that "the Jews could not gather courage enough to protest against it - as did the Quraysh later at Hdaybiah - in view of the dangerous political and war situation of the time" (ibid:32). Unlike Ibn Ishaq, al-Waqidi and at-Tabari, Hamidullah does not tell us of the existence of tension between the Jews and the Prophet and the Prophet's subtle propaganda against the Jews just after his arrival (see, e.g. ,2:397, 401; 1.1:235). Nor does Hamidullah tell us what happened to the Jews, such as Kab b. al-Ashraf, who expressed their opposition openly. He also does not tell us that "the dangerous political and war situation" was not only implanted in the threatening language of some clauses, but also was directly posed by the Prophet after Badr - preventing the Jews from expressing any open resistance to the Ordinance.

Several factors explain Jewish non-resistance to the whole first part of the Ordinance, not only to the phrases concerning Muhammad's Prophethood. Given these factors - the powerful and dominant Helpers' zeal as new converts and, as Arabs, their sensitivity to any threat to Muhammad whose protection they had just pledged, the resulting over-all revolutionary situation in Medina, the Prophet's earlier assurances to his followers to respect Khazraj-Aus-Jewish compacts, the existence of some clauses alluding to the acceptance of the Jews as a part of the Medinan Community (perhaps, based on Muhammad's earlier promises to the Helpers at Aqaba, and on his hopes that the Jews would soon acknowledge him as the Messenger of God), the existing rivalries among various Medinan groups, the promises of religious autonomy to the Jews, and, above all, the unpredictability of the future course of the Islamic coup d'etat - the Jews of Medina and other non-Muslims could simply not act decisively. The Jews also suffered from their loyalty to their religious teachings forbidding bloodshed. During the Qurayza affair, Az-Zabir ibn Bata, a Jewish realist, proposed to fight against Muhammad and his army. Almost all the Qurayza Jews argued angrily against the suggestion -- **FA SAHAT AL-YAHUD** -- because, they said, such an action would violate sacred commandments and thus displease God (W:502-3). They surrendered, unaware that the same God had now authorized Muhammad to slaughter them all, which he did.⁵ Hamidullah writes:

...the second part of the document, i.e. the code for the Jews was an event following the Battle of Badr which, on account of the **GLORIOUS VICTORY** achieved by the Muslims, had created an **IMPRESSION** on all minds in their favor... The PEOPLE of Medina had repudiated all treaty alliances with the Jews... The Prophet had made the strength of the Muslims immensely secure through his alliance with such tribes in the neighborhood of Medina as Banu Damrah and Juhainah... Cut off from all sides, they had become friendless and prey to any and every strong invader. Circumstances such as these **OBLIGED THEM TO SEEK THE PROTECTIVE COOPERATION OF THE PROPHET WHILE RETAINING THEIR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AS WELL AS INTERNAL AUTONOMY** (ibid:22; stresses added).

This is a half-truth, carefully garbled. We shall see in our treatment of Muhammad's confrontation with the Jews 1) what this "impression" was, and how it was created, and 2) who the "people" who

repudiated their pre-hijra treaties, were, as well as how Islam treated those who insisted on honoring their alliance with the Jews. We shall also see that after Badr the Jews did not "seek" the "protective" ordinance; it was imposed on them at the point of the sword. Moreover, even after the Jews accepted the imposed ordinance the so-called "protective" clauses were not honored by believers. As for the "strong invaders" whose fear motivated the Jews "to seek the protective cooperation of the Prophet," they exist only in Hamidullah's self-cultivated, too strong, imagination. History, including Islamic, does not tell us of such a phantasm.

The threatening sections are further evidence that the Ordinance was imposed. The Jews are warned that if they "behave 'unjustly' and 'sinfully'... they hurt themselves and their families" (Clauses 25-35). "Loyalty is a protection against treachery" (26, 37/1), the Jews are reminded. Clause 46, repeating the warning, adds: "He who acquires aught acquires it for himself." We shall see the full meaning and context of these threats.

Like most of Muhammad's acts, the Medina Ordinance was well-devised to serve his cause. It put believers under strict discipline and limited the maneuverability of nonbelievers. We have already noted that the final right to interpret the document was vested solely in the Prophet. "The right of seeking justice," using Hamidullah's words, "was transferred from individual to the community, i.e. (sic) the central authority," (Muhammad) (ibid:28). This is an interesting use of the word "community." Except for a few clauses which, if applied uprightly, gave the Jews some rights, most of the document was skewed to reinforce Islam's "central authority" and established the Prophet in 'the driver's seat,' providing relief only to believers and bounding the freedom of nonbelievers.

Part I - clauses 1 to 23 - mostly concerns the management of Muslim affairs, and the pagans negatively. Clauses 3 to 11 and 18 aimed at smooth management of inter-Muslim affairs, encouraging kindness and

justice only among believers. The pagan Arab "old systems of social insurance," as Hamidullah calls it correctly (ibid:26) was, however, now Islamized, working only for Muslims to "pay their bloodwit and redeem their prisoners within their numbers." That this 'care is only for the full citizens', the believers, is obvious also in 12/1 "(they) shall not leave anyone destitute among them." In 12/b "Muslims shall not take as an ally (the adversaries of another Muslim)." In 17 the peace of the believers is indivisible. In 19 (and 22), "the believers must avenge the blood of one another shed in the way of God." And in 47, "God is the protector of the good and God-fearing men" i.e., Muslims. This concern must not be shown for nonbelievers, the so-called "protected... DHIMMI" inhabitants of the Dar al-Islam. "A believer shall not slay a believer for the sake of an unbeliever, nor shall he aid an unbeliever against a believer" (Clause 14).

The Medinan nonbelievers and nonconformists were not only deprived (Clause 14) of any help from conscientious Muslims, or from nonconformists outside of the Dar al-Islam, they were also barred from any sympathetic contact and alliance with the world beyond Islam. They must collaborate solely with believers or, at least, remain neutral. "No separate peace shall be made when believers are fighting in the way of God" (Clause 17). Muslims believe the Prophet and his Companions never fought but "in the way of God." According to Clause 20/b, no Medinan pagan would give protection to the property or person of Meccan pagans, nor were Medinan pagans to intervene against believers taking action against nonbelievers. For example, when the Prophet and his followers began to raid Meccan caravans and started their campaign of political assassinations against various non-Muslim individuals, the Jews and other nonbelievers still in Medina had to remain inactive according to this clause (and others) of the Ordinance. "God's protection, **DHIMMA**, is one, the best of (believers could) give protection to a stranger on their behalf. Believers are friends one to another to the exclusion of outsiders" (Clause 15). A Muslim who missed

the second section of this clause and gave a limited guarantee of safe conduct, **AMAN**, to a helpless pagan at Badr soon realized this first section could not benefit a heathen if the Prophet or a Muslim mob had not authorized it. Believers may rightfully argue: how could a Muslim use Clause 15 to protect a nonbeliever while even non-Muslims were refused permission by Clause 20/b to protect another nonbeliever, and while Clause 17 stated clearly that "No separate peace shall be made when believers are fighting in the way of God?"

Part II of the Ordinance, and some clauses in part I, similarly curbed the Medinan Jews' freedoms of choice and action, compelling them to collaborate with the believers and support Islam financially. (Part II of the Ordinance alludes to the post-Badr tension, in which Meccan and other Arab pagans, with Medinan and non-Medinan Jews, spurred by growing hostility between them and Islam, were likely to cooperate against a common enemy, Muhammad.) While part I of the Ordinance neatly disposed of the pagans, assuring closed Muslim ranks against them, part II strengthened Islam's grip on the Jews. The Jews could not give protection to the Meccan non-Muslim "Quraysh and their helpers" (Clause 43). When Muslims so demanded, Jews were obliged "to make peace and maintain it" with any third party (Clause 45/a). They had to be puppets of a super-power. The second section of the same clause, if read improperly, appears to give the same right to the Jews: "and if they make a similar demand on the Muslims it must be carried out except in the case of a holy war." But all the Prophet's raids and battles were holy wars, believers would argue. Consequently this section was ineffective, if not nonsense, they would aver.

The Jews preferred peace with Mecca, definitely with the Jews of Medina, Khaybar etc. Hamidullah interprets the phrase "except in the case of holy war as a "favor" to the Jews, saying: "Of course the Jews would not be obliged to help the Muslims if the latter were involved in any religious war" (ibid:34). This is fallacious. First, Abu Ubayd's version translated by Hamidullah himself is closer to Guillaume's

translation of Ibn Ishaq (see Clause 45/1 in Appendix No. II). Second, Hamidullah, like any other believer, would agree that the Prophet did not fight any "irreligious" war. Third, even if it were an exemption, it was an insult - not a favor. Participation in the holy war is considered an honor by Muslims, not a disgrace. Moreover, the Prophet's exclusion of the voluntary Jewish contingent from the Muslims' army at Uhud was accompanied by an expression of denigration and distrust, not of benefaction and magnanimity.⁶ The Jews were barred from taking any military action, "save with the permission of Muhammad" (Clause 36/a). This not only crippled the Jews' ability to defend themselves or an ally, but also deprived them of the honor of being equal participants in defense of their city, Medina, against invaders.

Regardless of this questionable treatment of Medinan Jews by the Prophet, a Jewish contingent went out to defend Medina against Meccan invaders during the battle of Uhud. The Prophet rejected their participation, remarking contemptuously: **LA YUSTANSAR BI-AHL ASH-SHIRK ALA AHL ASH-SHIRD** "No help is sought from one polytheist (sic) group against other polytheists" (W:215-6). While Jewish money, their benign neutrality and inactivity were demanded by the Prophet, their military participation as equal and honorable allies was discouraged. That is why our sources seldom criticize the Jews specifically for their absence during Muslim raids and battles against other nonbelievers. Apparently, the Prophet did not want to see the emergence or survival of Jewish military might.

There was, perhaps, another reason. According to some Muslim jurists, Jewish responsibility for the "expenses" of the battles would have also given them "the right to get a share of the booty." [Abu Ubayd, Kitab al-Amwal:517; Suhayli, Al-Rawd al-Unuf II:7 in MH, Const.:31]. Jewish participation in battles would have entitled them to more. Muslim needs were too great to share any booty with the Jews, which would have allowed them further economic strength and social status. This is made clearer by Muhammad Fahmi as-Surjani. With

reference to the issue of Jews, which would have allowed them further economic strength and social status. This is made clearer by Muhammad Fahmi as-Surjani. With reference to the issue of Jews' participation in battles as Muslim allies and their share of booty, Surjani tells us on the basis of authentic traditional sources, about the whole document - our Ordinance of Medina - that "the Prophet wrote it at a time when Islam was weak" and that it (i.e., any portion favorable to the Jews) was abrogated by Q9:29. (See in Appendix II the note following Clause 47). The point that Surjani makes by adding the note is as follows: the Prophet was no longer bound by the terms of the document when Islam grew stronger than it was during the promulgation of the document. Later, the Quran 9:29, e.g., enjoined jihad against the People of the Book, the Jews and Christians. They were no longer to be treated on the basis of this document - which implies some equality, autonomy and reciprocity for the Jews. Now they had to convert to Islam or pay jizya as humiliated and subjugated inhabitants of the Dar al-Islam, as in Q9:29. Abu Ubayd, whom both Surjani and Hamidullah quote, perhaps taking into consideration the Prophet's later refusal to allow Jewish participation in battles along with Muslims, admits that only **then**, at a time when Islam was weak, jewish participation in battles and their share of the booty were authorized, (though it never happened); after they were declared jizya-prayers, such considerations, like other parts of the document, are **MANSUKH**, null and void.

Clauses 24, 37/a, 38, 44 and 45/b obliged the Jews to share the financial burden of wars and wrangles that were not theirs, and to defend Medina against attacks unrelated to them. Even so imposed, and even after serious Muslim-Jew tensions had started, the Jews abided by these requirements when the Prophet asked. Specifically during the siege of Medina by the Arab **AHZAB**, Confederates, the great amount of tools the jews provided were instrumental in digging a moat for the defense of Medina. Mentioning details of this Jewish 'technological' assistance, al-Waqidi also remarks that the Jews were at peace with the

Prophet and disliked the Quraysh invasion of Medina -- **WA'STAARU MIN BANI QURAYZAT ALAT-AN KATHIRAT-AN MIN MASAHI WA KARAZIN WA MAKATIL, YAHFIRUN BIHI'L-KHANDAQ WA HUM YAWMAIDH-IN SILM-UN LI-N-NABIY...YAKRAHUN QUDUM QURAYSH** (W:445-6). It was this **KHANDAQ**, moat, dug with Jewish technological support that frustrated the Confederate onslaught and saved the Dar al-Islam. Hamidullah also acknowledges Jewish payment of "subscriptions... on the strength of the provisions" in the Ordinance, and the

fact that when the Muslims went to war against some Jewish tribes or ordered their expulsion... not only the rest of the (Jewish) tribes remained quiet, but on certain occasions even rendered military help to the Muslims... (MH, Const.:33).

Instead of appreciation, however, Hamidullah, following the Quran, adds an anti-Jewish slur to his acknowledgement of Jewish observance of these "provisions." Explaining the reiteration of such obligations in the Ordinance, Hamidullah gives modern readers a dose of anti-Semitism in the form of a surmise:

Most probably the reason for this repetition was that in monetary dealings the Jews of Madinah had rather a bad name. It was the unsatisfactory manner of their dealings that had drawn such Quranic denunciations as 3:75 (MH, Const.:30-1).

As we will see, Muhammad's contemporaries, including some Muslims - as Islamic sources record - thought otherwise.

Contradiction of some apparent promises to non-Muslims is built into the vagueness of some phrases and spelt out in the explicitness of other, corollary sections. Along with the basic fact of the document, that gives God and Muhammad, who were hopelessly prejudiced, the final say about the Ordinance, it repeatedly asserts that certain people are automatically deprived of the 'rights' promised by the document. These inherent contradictions are stated in Clause 13: "(Muslims) shall be against the **REBELLIOUS** or him who seeks to spread **INJUSTICE** or **SIN** or **ENMITY** or **CORRUPTION** between believers; the hands of every man shall be

against him even if he be a son of them." Also in Clause 21 (and 19), "believers shall be against (one) convicted of killing a believer **WITHOUT A GOOD REASON** as one man, and they are bound to take action against him." further, in 14, "A believer shall not slay a believer for the sake of an unbeliever, nor shall he aid an unbeliever against a believer." Moreover, in 22, no "**EVILDOER**" shall be helped by the believers, in 25-35 "the Jews have their religion... except those who behave **UNJUSTLY** and **SINFULLY**," and above all, in the concluding Clause 47: "... this deed will not protect the **UNJUST** and the **SINNER**."

Two points beg further study. They reveal implicit contradictions. First, all these clauses, particularly 21, render 36/a ineffective - which promises that the Jews "shall not be prevented from taking revenge for a wound" i.e., an injury. The immediate cause of Muhammad's attack on the Banu Qaynuqa Jews was the killing of a Muslim by a Jew in retaliation for the same Muslim's killing of a Jew who allegedly had insulted a Muslim woman. That the murdered Muslim had first killed a Jew was apparently not a "good reason" for the Jews to take revenge. Second, the meanings of "enmity," "corruption," "rebellion," "injustice," "sin," "evildoing," etc., in the Islamic lexicon are problematic. (See Appendix III). According to Quranic-Islamic usage, such words primarily implied the rejection of the Muslim concept of God, and the lack of belief in Muhammad's Prophethood. Virtually no Muslim-Jewish controversy was caused by any rebellion, injustice, sin, evildoing or corruption in their mundane civil and social senses. These words almost always meant refusal to embrace Islam as the only divinely ordained faith. Once set in their ways by God (the Quran) and Muhammad, all believers were duty-bound to gang up on "evildoers." (Clauses 13, 14, 19, 231, 22, 25-35). No conscientious dissenter could speak without risk of being called **MUNAFIQ**, hypocrite-apostate.

Ibn Ishaq introduces the Ordinance as a "friendly agreement" with "reciprocal obligations." Since "those who followed... joined (and)

labored" with Muslims (Clause 1) were the cooperative pagan Medinans, their religious freedom was implicitly recognized. Consequently they had to be treated as equal members of the "one community, **UMMAH**" (Clause 2). Hamidullah, apparently, agrees that by "those who followed and joined... (the) Muslims" in Clause 1 is meant Medinan pagans. See MH, Const.:21 passim. The problematic word in Clause 1 is **JAHADU** translated by Gullaume as "labored" and by Hamidullah as "(took) part in wars.": Though **JIHAD** has the same root-word and, consequently, **JAHADU**, in an appropriate context, may also mean "took part in holy war", Guillaume's translation accords with Hamidullah's explanation. Pagan allies were not expected to participate in a holy war. It simply meant that they were expected to labor with Muslims in the general maintenance of the city's affairs. Medinan Jews were unequivocally declared members of the "one community" (16, 25-35). They were also promised they would be sought for "mutual advice and consultation" (37/1), and Muslims were obliged "to make and maintain peace" with a third party if the Jews so demanded (45/a). Together, this means the acceptance of religious pluralism and friendly coexistence with Jews in one state on an equal basis. On the basis of such sections, Hamidullah and other Muslim polemicists claim the document included "a detailed discussion" of Muhammad's "obligations" towards the parties concerned, along with his prerogatives (MH, Const.:10-11), and that the Jews' "rights to equal treatment have been explicitly admitted," and that "the Jews (and their allies) have been given equal political and cultural rights with the Muslims in clearest terms" (ibid:33).

Whatever the historical reasons for the inclusion of these sections, the believes taking Islamic sources into consideration as a whole do not reach such conclusions. The sources tell believers' that Medinan pagans (collaborators or not) were under constant pressure to convert to Islam. The sura 9 finally abrogated commitments of religious autonomy with all pagans. As for the Jews, the sources talk of them as villains, not friends, even just after Muhammad's arrival at Medina

(1.1:235). Our sources do not mention the Prophet's "seeking mutual advice" from the Jews, or having "consultation" with them on a "friendly" basis for running the affairs of Medina. Those who did consort with the Jews were dubbed "hypocrites" i.e., apostates (ibid).

A full reading of the document itself tells us that the believers were superior and the Prophet's exhortations for mutual help and kindness concerned only believers. About the sections in 2,25-35 that recognize the Jews and the pagan allies of Muslims as "one community" along with Muslims, Islamic sources always had reservations (see MH, Const.:39). However, following the orthodox, but straightforward, mode of discourse, they either doubted the existence of such sections in the original document or, using the principle of **NASKH** correctly, declared them **MANSUKH**, abrogated, by later Quranic injunctions and Muhammadan Sunnah. Thanks to the unwavering medieval self-righteousness and self-confidence, also thanks to their distance from modern sensitivities, they did not say yes or no simultaneously, unlike modern Muslim debaters. Of Clause 25, which declared Muslims and Jews as "one community," Hamidullah finally tells the truth.

"(It) has been interpreted recently by some as a recognition of composite Judeo-Muslim nationality by Islam. There is hardly any justification for it, ... (ibid:37).

After saying this, Hamidullah is confused again, briefly. He conjectures that the Prophet might have included the Jews in the same Ummah simply because the Jews were monotheists anyhow. He forgets that in Medina the Quran, as well as the Prophet, called the Jews **AHL ASH-SHIRK**, polytheists. Perhaps conscious of the Prophet's final verdict on Jewish monotheism and also, perhaps, aware of Muhammad's tactical reasons (which Hamidullah calls "political"), he resumes telling the truth:

The perusal of the whole constitution will reveal that a federation of Muslims and non-Muslims of Madinah was established **FOR POLITICAL REASONS**. Although Jews were given internal autonomy, they did not share in the foreign policy of the newly constituted City-State, in spite of the fact that the Jews formed

the largest single community on the arrival of the Prophet in Madinah. The Jews could not declare or wage war independently, nor could they join city militia without the permission of the Prophet, who was also their supreme court of appeal (ibid:37-8; stress added).

Hamidullah correctly says, after we ignore his wild guess about the necessary link between the Prophet's actions and the parentage of certain jews, about Clause 16 ("To the Jews who follow or help us belong help and equality. He shall not be wronged nor shall his enemies be aided"):

Some among the Madinite Arabs had embraced the Jewish faith. Particularly among these were those children whose parents had raised them as Jews in fulfillment of certain vows. There was a special section dealing apparently with such persons, saying that they were prepared for a **SUBORDINATE** cooperation, they would be given rights of citizens equal with Muslims. They would be given protection and help, and no manner of oppression would be allowed against them (ibid:29-30).

Islamic sources agree with Hamidullah. Such "subordinate" collaborators as Ibn Yamin we will soon meet, were appreciated and rewarded by the Prophet as long as their services were needed. When asked by the Prophet, one of them managed to assassinate a fellow-Jew in order to prove his "subordination" and loyalty.

Although the Ordinance of Medina curbed basic human rights of Medinan non-Muslims and imposed Islam's hegemony, some of its pledges, if honored, could benefit concerned nonbelievers. Foremost among them is the right the jews (and the pagans) received to life and to maintain their religion and property (Clause Intr., 16, 25-35). For our purpose, Clause 39 which declared Medina "a sanctuary for the people of this document" is equally important. This meant no blood of Jews and, according to Clause 1, pagans, at least those pagans who "followed," "joined" (or settled among) Muslims and "labored with them" could be shed. Declaration of a place as **HARAM**, a "sanctuary", implied that regardless of their differences individuals or groups would refrain from violence within the sanctuary against their adversaries. Killing of non-Muslim "people of the document" within the Medinan jurisdiction would be a gross violation of this clause. Clause 37/b states: "a man

is not liable for his ally's misdeeds." We will see how the real or alleged "misdeeds" of certain non-Muslim individuals affected others. We may also consider Clause 40 which protects a peaceful stranger given protection by any party to the document, and Clause 41 that allows the grant of protection to a woman only "with the consent of her family" as absolute. We continue our examination of Islam-in-power, to see the extent of its toleration or aggression concerning non-Muslims within and without the Dar al-Islam, and the modes of its treatment of accepted international laws and norms, and of its own undertakings, treaties, compacts, and pledges.

Medinan and Meccan Pagans: Target Number One.

After establishing Islam's hegemony in theory over Medina, the Prophet "prepared for war in pursuance of God's command to fight his enemies and those near at hand whom God commanded him to fight" (1.1:280). Note that no casus belli is mentioned. It was a Divine declaration of war against Muhammad's "enemies", the Meccans, as well as the pagans "near at hand," those close to Medina. It was also a Divine hint to deal with non-Muslims one at a time. Both the Almighty and His last Messenger were pragmatists. And excellent strategists, too. During the first eighteen months, only Medinan and Meccan pagans were direct targets. Having won to Islam the influential Arab sector of Medina, activities against the remaining leaderless and perplexed Medinan masses were subtle. Those who grumbled aloud were taken care of by other means after Badr. The campaign against Mecca was from the beginning openly provocative. As for Medinan pagans, those "near at hand" and the Meccans, our sources do not mention any hostile activity by them which endangered the newly established Dar al-Islam. Whether the acts against Medinan pagans violated the first part of the Medinan Ordinance, two events reflect Muslim pressure tactics against Medinan pagans as part of Islam's consolidation of power in the oasis.

First, Ali B. Abu Talib states approvingly that a certain Muslim

believer, Sahl b. Hunayf, at night, used to slip into the places of worship of those Medinan Arabs who had refused to acknowledge Muhammad as the Messenger of God, and steal their wooden idols, dash them in pieces and take them to a Muslim woman to be used as firewood (TT,2:382).

Second, when the Muslims reached Medina and most of the influential Medinan Arabs openly professed Islam, some old men of Medina "kept to their idolatry." Amr b. al-Jumah (or al-Jamuh), whose son Maadh was converted to Islam, was one such old men.

Amr was a tribal noble and leader, who set up in his house a wooden idol called Manat as the nobles used to do, making it a god to revere and keeping it clean. When the young men [of the tribe, including his own son] adopted Islam... they sued to creep in at night to this idol of Amr's and carry it away and throw it on its face into a cesspit. When the morning came, Amr cried, 'Woe to you! Who has been at our gods this night?' Then he went in search of the idol. when he found it, he washed it and cleaned it and perfumed it, saying, 'By God, if I knew who had done this I would treat him shamefully!' When night came and he was fast asleep, they did the same again, and he restored the idol in the morning. This happened several times, until one day he took the idol from the place where they had thrown it, purified it as before, and fastened his sword to it, saying, 'By God, I don't know who has done this, but if you are any good at all, defend yourself since you have this sword.' At night when he was asleep, they came again and took the sword from its neck, hung a dead dog to it by a cord, and then threw it into a cesspit. In the morning Amr came and could not find it where it normally was: Ultimately he found it face downwards in that pit tied to a dead dog. When he saw it and perceived what had happened and the Muslims of his clan spoke to him, he accepted Islam by the mercy of God and became a good Muslim (1.1:297-8; brackets and slight changes in English translation added).

We have no record of any criticism by the Prophet of these actions Muslims took. Our sources appreciate and rejoice over old Amr's eventually being harassed into accepting Islam. Believers understand that such treatment of nonbelievers living in the Dar al-Islam was not only authorized, but also encouraged by Islam. Muslim believers thought it appropriate to so demonstrate their disrespect for the beliefs and property of non-Muslims. Their methods, seem acceptable to a believer now. These methods receive explicit appreciation from our sources, rather than criticism.

Seven of eh eight Muslim expeditions before Badr were directed

against Meccan trade caravans. Muhammad avoided clashes with other pagans beyond Medina. He concluded non-aggression pacts with some of them, such as Banu Damrah, Banu Mudlij and Juhaynah, neutralizing them against his Meccan enemies. In theory, the Prophet had started the excursions against all "polytheists near at hand" and the Meccans; in practice, however, the operations followed a strategic schedule. We are told the first expedition of al-Abwa/Waddan, led in person by the Prophet, aimed at both the Quraysh of Mecca and the Banu Damrah clan of the Kinanah tribal confederation, "a polytheist group near at hand." But the Prophet signed a non-aggression pact with the clan during the expedition. The Banu Damrah pledged neither to mobilize against Muhammad, nor to aid his enemies. The Prophet in turn pledged not to wage war against the clan.⁷ Believers are told of the non-aggression pact with Banu Damrah just after they learn God had commanded Muhammad to fight all polytheists "near at hand," obviously, including Banu Damrah (1.1:280). The Muslim mind can interpret this in only one way: whatever the Banu Damrah might have thought, it was a tactical peace, one not to be kept permanently. Muhammad would not violate the Almighty's commandment. It had to be fulfilled first against the most formidable Meccan adversaries of Islam. The Banu Damrah and others would be settled eventually.

The actions of Sahl and "the young men" against Medinan pagans and this commandment of God are not the only evidence to show Medinan Islam's aggressiveness and determination, from the very beginning, not to tolerate un-Islam. All seven raids against peaceful Meccan trade caravans, our sources mention flatly and approvingly, were initiated by the Prophet. No mention is made of provocative or hostile Meccan activity.⁸ The only one of the eight expeditions not against the Meccans, and undertaken in retaliation, was the one against a certain Kurz b. Jabir al-Fihri. Kurz, apparently a plunderer, if not alarmed by the Prophet's aggressive acts beyond Medina, had raided a pasturing camels of Medina. "The apostle went out in search of him,...

escaped him..." (1.1:286). To what extent Kuz knew of God's commandment to Muhammad to 'attack polytheists near at hand one by one' and, thus, acted preemptively - and to what extent Kurz was inspired by the Prophet's adventures against others is a matter of speculation. The aggressive nature of the Prophet's raids against Meccans after the hijra is documented in several ways.

Ibn Ishaq, Ibn Hisham, Waqidi, Ibn Sad and Tabari concur that Muslim expeditions before Badr were participated in by Emigrants. The native Medinan Muslims, the Helpers, were not included in these seven expeditions because, according to the Aqaba pact before the hijra, the Helpers were committed only to defensive operations. Because these early expeditions were aggressive, the Helpers were neither obliged nor asked by the Prophet to participate (See, e.g., W:10; IS-B, 2:6).

Another way Muslims see Islam's aggressive mood after the hijra is to study recorded reactions of the believers and the nonbelievers about these first seven engagements. In a poem ascribed to Hamza regarding the first Muslim armed expedition (according to al-Waqidi and Ibn Sad), the Muslims obviously didn't justify their adventure on defensive grounds. Hamza, whom the Prophet appointed leader of the raiding party, justified his attack on the basis of the Meccan rejection of Islam:

But all we did was to enjoy chastity and justice
 And call them to Islam, but they received it not
 And they treated it as a joke.
 They ceased not so until I volunteered to attack them
 Where they dwelt, desiring the satisfaction of a
 task well done
 At the apostle's command - the first to march
 beneath his flag,

As for the future treatment of Meccan nonbelievers by the Muslims, Hamza warned:

Return to Islam and the easy path,
 For I fear that punishment will be poured upon you and
 you will cry out in remorse and sorrow (1.1:283-4).

The reported Meccan response continued to be reconciliatory and peace-seeking. Responding to Hamza, Abu Jahl said:

I am amazed at the cause of anger and folly
 And at those who stir up strife by lying controversy.

 They come to us with lies to confuse our minds,
 But their lies cannot confuse the intelligent.
 We said to them, 'O our people, strive not with
 your folk -
 Controversy is the utmost folly.

 If you give up what you are doing
 [raiding the Meccan trade caravans]
 We are your cousins, trustworthy and virtuous (1.1:284).

For a Muslim believer reading this kind of material in Islamic sources the ideal and praiseworthy personality is not Abu Jahl, who sought peace and reconciliation. What inspires a believer is the Prophet-inspired series of unprovoked raids against the non-believers, and the threatening, overbearing postures of Hamza the believer.

Regarding the second Muslim armed expedition, a believer finds Abu Bakr, reviving the Meccan sunnah of the use of unflattering language, telling the nonbelievers of Mecca why they were under attack by the Muslims:

When we called them to the truth [Islam] they turned
 their backs,
 They howled like bitches driven back panting to
 their lairs;

Abu Bakr in the same poem threatened more force against the nonbelievers:

If they follow their idolatry and error;
 God's punishment on them will not tarry

 I swear, and I am no perjurer
 If they do not quickly repent of their error,
 A valiant band will descend upon them,
 Which will leave women husbandless.
 It will leave dead men, with vultures wheeling round.
 It will not spare the infidels (1.1:281-82).

The Prophet never censured Abu Bakr for threatening to leave corpses of nonbelievers "with vultures wheeling round." On the contrary, Sad b. Abu Waqqas, a famous Companion is praised by our sources for having shot the first arrow for Islam -- **AWWAL SAHM-IN RUMIYA BIHI FI'L-ISLAM** (IS-B,2:7; W:10-11; 1.1:281-3). Sad b. Abi Waqqas was proud to boast in a poem to

the Prophet:

Has the news reached the apostle of God
That I protected my companions with my arrows?

Sad saw the truth and authenticity of Islam as the source of strength of him and four other believers and was sure the nonbelievers were doomed to punishment and destruction because of their disbelief:

No archer who shoots an arrow at the enemy
Will be counted before me, O apostle of God.
'Twas because thy religion is true
Thou has brought what is just and truthful.
By it, believers are saved
And unbelievers recompensed at the last (1.1:283).

Another text on this expedition of Ubayda b. al-Harith [the man the Prophet appointed leader] is voiced by a Meccan non-Muslim (Abd Allah b. az-Zibara). In a poem, he clearly indicates that nonbelievers were the target of Muslim aggression, and that the Meccans and their belief were on the defensive. Nostalgically, desperately and pessimistically, Abd Allah b. az-Zibara responds to Abu Bark's threatening and aggressive poem:

Does your eye weep unceasingly
Over the ruins of a dwelling that the shifting
sand obscures?
And one of the wonders of the days
(For time is full of wonders, old and new)
Is a strong army which came to us
Led by Ubayda called Ibn al-Harith in War,
That we should abandon images venerated in Mecca,
Passed on to his heirs by a noble ancestor (1.1:282).

The Expedition of Nakhlah⁹

Before the Nakhlah expedition, Meccan caravans had escaped serious harm from Muslim raiders. The Nakhlah is important because 1) non-Muslim blood was shed, 2) Muslims captured booty and hostages, and, most importantly 3) the believers violated the tradition of Sacred Months, a solemn international law previously recognized by Muhammad.

In January, 624, sixteen months after the hijra, the Prophet sent a group of about a dozen armed Emigrant Muslims led by Abd Allah b.

Jahsh al-Asadi toward Nakhlah, just south of Mecca. [Ibn Sad says the expedition numbered twelve; Ibn Ishaq ten; and al-Waqidi and Tabari, eight.] The Prophet dispatched them "in the name of Allah and His blessings" -- **ALA ISM ALLAH WA BARAKATHIHI**, bearing his orders to "look for" the Meccan trade caravan. This was during Rajab, one of the four sacred months.

Out of our seven main sources: the Quran, Ibn Ishaq, al-Waqidi, Ibn Hisham, Ibn Sad, Tabari (Tarikh) and Tabari (Tafsir), only the last (TS,4:299-320) implies that the expeditionaries were dispatched during the latter part of Jumadi al-Akhir, the sixth month of the Arab lunar year preceding Rajab, an inviolate month. The controversy about the exact day of the attack in Tabari's Tafsir is whether the attack took place to the last day of Jumadi al-Akhir or in the first day of Rajab. In other sources, the controversy about the attack is whether it took place on the last day of Rajab or the first day of Shaban, the eighth month of the year. In short, the Prophet had sent the party in Rajab, regardless. All other sources, including Tabari's own Tarikh, are unequivocal that the Prophet dispatched Abd Allah b. Jahsh and his party in the month of Rajab -- **FI RAJAB** (W:13, e.g.). Mahmud M. Shakir and Ahmad M. Shakir, the editors of Tabari's Tafsir, remind the readers in a footnote about the mistake in the manuscript of the Tafsir. They maintain that the version of Ibn Hisham (i.e., Ibn Ishaq) and the one in Tabari's Tarikh saying the event took place in Rajab are the most correct, **ASAHH**, versions (See Ts,4:303 no.5). As we will see, the Quran (2:217-8), the most authentic Islamic source for a believer, and Tabari's own final explanations in his Tafsir, render the whole controversy about the precise day meaningless. The fighting to kill, **QITAL**, took place in the inviolate month, **ASH-SHAHR AL-HARAM**, and Muslims were justified to do so, the Quran implied (2:217-8).

The Prophet's written instructions, as mentioned in our sources, do NOT advise Muslim expeditionists to respect the sacred month. Nor were they told to avoid physical engagement. Contrarily, Abd Allah b.

Jahsh after reading the Prophet's instructions told his Muslim comrades that he anticipated **SHAHADAH**, martyrdom, and **MAUT**, death i.e., the likelihood of fighting during the adventure (TS,4:303, 305; W:14). It is unlikely that Abd Allah b. Jahsh would have thought of fighting against Muhammad's instructions. The fear of first attack by the Meccans during the sacred month was equally unlikely.

At Nakhlah, Muslim expeditionists found one returning caravan accompanied by four Meccans. When they saw the Muslims, the four Meccans were wary. However, to mislead the pagans, the Muslims had shaved their heads to masquerade as pilgrims. Noticing this, the suspicions of the our Meccan nonbelievers subsided. They grew assured the Muslims had no dangerous intentions, and were only pilgrims. "**LA BAS; QAUM UMMAR** -- "No problem; they are pilgrims," the pagans reassured one another (W:14; TT,2:412). Deciding to rest, the Meccans started to prepare food. The Muslim expeditionaries had awaited this chance, and attacked by surprise. They killed one nonbeliever, Amr B. al-Hadramiy, and captured two more (Uthman b. Abd Allah and Hakam b. Kaysan), along with the caravan and its goods. The last pagan, Nawfal b. Abd Allah, escaped. The Muslims took their captives and spoils to Medina. This happened "while there was a compact (of non-aggression during the sacred months) between the Quraysh and Muhammad "--**WA KAN BAYN QURAYSH WA MUHAMMAD AQD-UN**, Tabari admits (TS,4:307). When they heard of the incident, the Quraysh exclaimed: **FI'SH-SHAHR AL-HARAM! WA LANA AHD!** "Damn! Such a thing happening in the sacred month! While we have a standing covenant (of nonviolence during the sacred months)"! (ibid).

The violation of the sacred truce time created a wave of anger and disgust among Meccans, who cried:

Muhammad and his companions have violated the sacred month, shed blood therein, taken booty and captured men (1.1:288; of the criticism of the act by Muslims and non-Muslims also see TS,4:304 passim; W:16-8).

The **Dar al-Islam**, Medina, was also outraged over this violation of the Sacred Month. It "churned like a boiler" -- **AL-MADINAT TAFUR FAUR AL-**

MIRJAL (W:16). The Jews thought the event would kindle uncontrollable wars and dangerous chaos (1.1:288). Even some "Muslim brethren reproached (the Muslim expeditionaries and indirectly the Prophet) for what they had done" (ibid; parentheses added); "there was much talk about it" -- **AKTHAR AN-NAS FI DHALIK** (TT,2:412; also see 1.1:288; W:16-7). A crisis confronted the Prophet. Our sources faithfully record his wavering on what had happened at Nakhlah. At first he would not accept his on-fifth share of the booty and suspended the distribution of captured goods among the Muslim expeditionaries. The Prophet also remarked he had not ordered the group to fight during the sacred truce month. He said he ordered them to gather information about the Quraysh (W:16).

However, by the end of the Nakhlah story in the Quran, Ibn Ishaq, Ibn Hisham, al-Waqidi, Ibn Sad, Tabari and other sources of Tradition, God tells Muslims (and the acts and final verdicts of the Prophet and his followers imply) that the Nakhlah operation was justified in spite of the sacred month. For a believer, the Prophet's vacillation was nothing but temporizing to let matters settle. It was a cooling-off strategy. The only message a believer will probably get from the Prophet's earlier tactics and his lukewarm response to the Nakhlah event is to pretend to be innocent and 'not responsible' for Muslim actions when they are morally unpopular and questionable by existing international and social norms. On such occasions, Muslim leaders may even verbally disown and condemn unpopular Muslim deeds, but still believe in their hearts that whatever the moral indignation and intentional outcry, Muslims acted correctly. Consequently, Muslims involved in such acting may not take their leaders' verbal condemnation seriously. This kind of affectation and stratagem are in accord with Islam's authorization of **TAQIYYAH**, **MAKR** or **KAYD** if performed by believers.

Soon after telling the readers about the Prophet's initial vacillation, our sources inform the believers that the Almighty

intervened to solve the crisis in favor of those who had violated the sacred month. "When there was much talk about it God sent down (Q2:217) to his apostle":

They will ask thee concerning the holy month, and fighting in it. Say 'Fighting in it is a heinous thing, but to bar from God's way, and disbelief in Him, and the Holy Mosque, and to expel its people from it - that is more heinous in God's sight; and persecution is more heinous than slaying.¹⁰

As Ibn Ishaq explains, the Quran authorized raiding and killing the heathen in the sacred month (1.1:288). The Almighty argues that although fighting in the sacred month was "a heinous thing," the Nakhlah operation was justified. God alleged, in His defense, that the Meccans had 1) "barred" (others?) from "God's way" and from the holy mosque, 2) disbelieved in God and in the holy Mosque (sic), 3) expelled Muslims, the only people entitled to own the Mosque, from it, and 4) committed "persecution," **FITNAH**. These offenses were a "more heinous" and worse crime than what Muslims did at Nakhlah during the sacred month -- **HUM MUQIMUN ALA AKHBATH DHALIK WA AZAMIHI** (TS,4:305; also see 306 passim). Thus, the Nakhlah operation was justified. In his commentary Tabari emphasizes **KUFR**, disbelief in God and Muhammad's Prophethood, and **FITNAH**, "persecution," as prime Meccan crimes justifying Muslim violation of the sacred month. **FITNAH**, "persecution:", as usual, means **SHIRK**, polytheism and **KUFR**, disbelief in God (and in the Prophethood of Muhammad), Tabari tells us repeatedly (TS,4:301-12). In short, because the Meccans were nonbelievers, Muslims were justified in doing what they did at Nakhlah. The Almighty did not bother to discuss the precise date of the attack, whether it took place a day before or after the sacred month. The verse 2:217 clearly implies unapologetically that "the heinous act" occurred in the sacred month. It is defended and justified.

We have already discussed the reality of the allegations, that the Meccans had expelled Muhammad and his followers from that city, that they had forbidden Muslims entry to the Kaba and had seduced Muslims to

return to disbelief. The Quran ignored even the most recent fact that Muslims at Nakhlah had posed as pilgrims to the Kaba, which means the Meccans, though under attack, allowed Muslim entry for pilgrimage.

The second part of Q2:217 is more than mere defense of the action. It warns:

...and whosoever of you turns from his religion, and dies disbelieving - their works have failed in this world and the next; those are the inhabitants of the fire; therein they shall dwell forever (Q2:217)

This warns those Muslims who had criticized their "brethren's" violation of the sacred month. There was no place in the community of Islam for conscientious dissent or objection against Muslim actions against non-Muslims. If they do so it will be tantamount to apostasy, "turning from their religion." Their former good "works" will be null and void and, above all, they will suffer in Hell forever. The subsequent verse (2:218), also relating to the Nakhlah operation, went further. It glorified the operations as holy war and encouraged the believers to undertake similar ventures (see TS,4:319-20 cf. Q2:218). "So God gave them great hopes (for the benefits of such actions)" -- **FA WAADAHUM ALLAH MIN DHALIK ALA AZAM AR-RIJA** (TS,4:320). The Prophet called Muslims undertaking such actions "the best of this community" -- **KHAYAR HADHIHI'L-UMMAH** (ibid).

A report in Tabari also tells the believers that God had never considered fighting in the sacred months a crime equal to the crime of disbelief in Him (ibid:312). Finally, Tabari tells us that as for the "heinousness" of fighting in sacred months, the Almighty changed His mind. His later commandments in Q9:5 and Q9:36 overruled His earlier dislike of fighting in sacred months expressed in 2:217 (ibid:213-5). Tabari also says that although the Prophet used to prohibit fighting during sacred months, he authorized it later (ibid:313), apparently beginning with the Nakhlah. As evidence, Tabari cites many examples of the Prophet's fights and his readiness to fight during various sacred months (ibid:314-15).

After this Divine sanction, the Prophet and the believers acted accordingly in handling the Nakhalah affair.

And when the Quran came down about that and God relieved the Muslims of their anxiety in the matter, the apostle took the caravan and the prisoners (1.1:288).

The Meccans got no apology. Al-Waqidi tells us definitively that no bloodwit was paid for a non-Muslim, Ibn al-Hadramiy, killed by the Muslim raiders -- **WA'L-MUJTAMA ALAYH INDANA ANNAHU LAM YUDA** (W:19). Authorized by God, Muhammad accepted his **KHUMS**, one-fifth share, of the booty, distributing the rest among the other Muslim raiders.

God divided the booty when He made it permissible and gave four-fifths to whom God had allowed to take it and one-fifth to God and his apostle. So it remained on this basis of what Abd Allah [b. Jahsh, the leader of Muslim raiders of Nakhalah] had done with the booty of the caravan (1.1:288; brackets added; this was further ratified by Q8:41).

Therefore, this Muslim performance was not only divinely sanctioned but also became the approved Islamic precedent for raids on nonbelievers, and for the ways of treating prisoners and booty taken from nonbelievers. Ibn Hisham adds, approvingly, rejoicing:

It was the first booty taken by Muslims, and Amr b. al-Hadrami was the first man that the Muslims killed, while Uthman b. Abd Allah and al-Hakam b. Kaysan were first prisoners (1.1:738 n. 360. As we shall see, Ibn Hisham could also add it was the first hostage taken by the prophet and the first time when a non-Muslim prisoner and hostage was threatened with assassination and kept under torture).

Al-Hakam, one of the two hostages, was told to become a Muslim. The Prophet had to talk much to convince him -- **FA ATAL RASUL ALLAH KALAMAHU**. Umar threatened to behead the prisoner and send him to "his mother," Hell -- **DA'NI ADRIB UNUQAHU WA YAQDAM ILA UMMIHI, AL-HAVIYAH** (W:15-16). The Prophet also kept the prisoners hostage and threatened to kill them. Hakam converted to Islam apparently under duress. The Prophet later reminded Umar that had he allowed Umar to kill the prisoner before he accepted Islam, he (the prisoner and a nonbeliever) would have gone to Hell. Put baldly, had there not been a hope of

converting the prisoner, he could have been slain and sent to Hell! The Prophet did not criticize Umar's idea of killing the hostage per se.

The Quraysh, instead of retaliating, sent a delegation to pay ransom. Two of the Muslim raiders, apparently lost, had not yet reached Medina. The Prophet thought they were in danger of being harmed by the Meccans. He told the Meccan delegation he would keep his hostages until the two Muslims reached Medina safely. He also threatened to kill the two prisoners if the Meccans killed the two Muslims (whose whereabouts were unknown) (W:17; 1.1:288). When the two Muslims finally reached Medina, unharmed, the Prophet charged a ransom of forty silver uqiya (about 12,000 g) for each hostage.

After paying the ransom and redeeming their one hostage (the second hostage had converted to Islam, perhaps thanks to the additional threat of being killed), the Meccans remained perplexed and unconvinced of the Prophet's righteousness. They grumbled:

Muhammad claims that he follows and obeys God, while he is the first who violated the sacred month and killed our man in Rajab (TS,4:306).

Whatever the Meccan complaints and public outcry, Muslim believers are further inspired and convinced by the response Abd Allah b. Jahsh records. Following the Quran he said in a poem, answering the Meccan complaint:

You count war in the holy month a grave matter
But graver is, if one judges rightly,
Your position to Muhammad's teaching, and your
Unbelief in it, which God sees and witnesses.

Though you defame us for killing him,
More dangerous to Islam is the sinner who envies.

Muslims further learn that Abdullah, the Prophet's Companion, his appointed leader of the Nakhlah operation, proudly talked of the bloodshed, of the lighting of "the flame of War" by Waqid, a fellow-Muslim member of the raiding party, of taking the non-Muslim Uthman as hostage, and of boasting to believers and nonbelievers about the torture

the non-Muslims hostage suffered:

Our lances drank of Ibn al-Hadrami's blood
 In Nakhlah when Waqid lit the flame of war
 Uthman ibn Abd Allah is with us
 A leather band streaming with blood restrains him (1.1:289).

After the Nakhlah affair, the Prophet again prohibited warfare during the sacred months (W:18). This prohibition, aimed at nonbelievers, was not a sincere determination to adhere to the international norm after an inevitable lapse. Tabari has already told us that after Nakhlah the Prophet and the believers under his guidance undertook many raids during the inviolate months. To a believer, knowing all this unilateral violation and manipulating of similar international institutions might look as meet and right. The whole record of how the Quran, the Prophet and his Companions handled the Nakhlah affair tell a believer Islam is above the need to observe strictly a solemn international law or tradition. Nakhlah began to institutionalize in the Muslim mind various dimensions of Islam's images and treatment of the world beyond Islam. The process was perfected within eight years, beginning with the events at Badr.

The Battle of Badr: A Turning Point¹¹

This survey of the battle of Badr continues our study of Medinan Islam's policy toward hegemony, expansionism and aggression, and of Muslim treatment of their own pledges and promises involving non-Muslims. The battle of Badr is important, specifically, regarding believer-nonbeliever relations because: 1) Badr tells the believers, approvingly of the continuation of Muhammad's unprovoked aggression against Mecca on a larger scale. In various ways, the story of Badr justifies and reinforces self-righteous and self-confident expansionism in the Muslim mind; 2) Badr triggered a series of Quranic revelations which established guidelines for the behavior of Muslims living beyond the Dar al-Islam, in a land not dominated by Islam; 3) Badr tells the believers that more was expected of Medinan Muslims than their previous

understanding of their duties when confronted with non-Muslims. Similarly, earlier pledges involving nonbelievers could be ignored; and 4) Badr also established important precedents for the Muslim treatment of nonbelievers.

In March, 624 CE, seventeen months after the hijra from Mecca, the Prophet, leading about 314 Companions including Emigrants and Helpers, left Medina to intercept a rich Meccan trade caravan, returning from Syria under the leadership of Abu Sufyan b. al-Harb. The caravan was an important trade venture. Almost every Meccan family invested some capital in it. Abu Sufyan was warned by friendly sources, some from Medina (T,9:221), of Muhammad's move against him. Abu Sufyan hurriedly sent a messenger to Mecca, beseeching help against Muhammad's imminent raid. About 1,000 Meccans set out to defend the caravan. Unsure of timely Meccan support, Abu Sufyan evaded the Muslim raiding party by changing his route. The Meccan support party, meanwhile, proceeded towards a place where they confronted the Prophet at Badr, a known resting point for the caravans and the site of occasional fairs along the Hijaz-Syria trade route.

The Prophet realized that his first target, the rich caravan, had slipped away and that he now confronted about one thousand armed men (Q8:7; T,9:184-9). Our sources tell us frankly that the Prophet thought the Helpers might not be willing to fight the Meccans at Badr because according to the Aqaba pact native Medinan Muslims were obliged to defend Muhammad only in Medina. They were not committed to aggressive adventures.

--WA DHALIK ANNAHUM HIN BAYA'UH-U ALA'L-AQABAT, QALU: YA RASUL ALLAH INNA BURA-UN MIN DHIMAMIK HATTA TASIL ILA DIYARINA, FA-IDHA NAMNA WASALT ILAYNA FA-ANT FI DHIMMATINA, NAMNAUK MIMMA NAMN'A MINHU ABNAANA WA NISAANA. FA-KAN RASUL ALLAH... KHAF AN LA TAKUN AL-ANSAR TARA ALAYHA NUSRATAH-U, ILLA MIMMAN DAHIMAH-U BI'L-MADINAT MIN ADUWWIHI, WA AN LAYS ALAYHIM AN YASIR BIHIM ILA ADUWW-IN MIN BILADIHIM... FA-TAKHAWWAF MIN AL-ANSAR AN-YAKHDHILUH-U WA YAQULU: INNA AHADNA AN NAMNAAK IN ARADAK AHAD BI-BALADINA... (T,9:185-6).

The Helpers' presence in the raiding party aiming at the Meccan caravan

was a sign of their agreement with Muhammad's aggressive ventures. But the Prophet exhorted his Medinan Companions to openly declare their readiness for a battle with the armed Meccans before he made a final decision to fight the Meccan army. Obviously, the Prophet expected more from Medinan Muslims than their leaders had promised at Aqaba. Had the Helpers refused to meet the Prophet's higher expectation, and stuck to the letter of the Aqaba pact, they would have been dubbed as MUNAFIQ, "hypocrite" i.e. apostates. True believers, the Helpers realized Muhammad's new desire overrode the legalistic aspects of Aqaba. The Quran had apparently indoctrinated most of the Helpers enough to ignore the limits of their earlier pledges. Sensing the Prophet's mood, they declared their readiness to fight (ibid passim). The disregard of limitations of the Aqaba, however, must have had its effects on the Muslim mind respecting the value of any treaties and undertakings. After the Helpers' reassurance, the Prophet decided to confront the armed Meccans who had come out to defend their caravan. The expedition of Badr was a part of the Prophet's total strategy of aggression. Our sources offer no defensive reason. God ordered the Muslims to fight either of the two groups, i.e., the caravan or the Meccan army (Q8:5-7 passim; W:59; T,9:181-9).

As usual, the Meccans were deeply divided on how to deal with Muhammad. After they realized the caravan had escaped his ambush, most of their leaders (except Abu Jahl) thought that because the caravan was safe they should return to Mecca, avoiding battle with Muhammad. Utbah b. Rabiah, a perennial pacifist, led the peace party. Utbah and others thought that, given the believers' zealotry, they would kill at least the same number of Meccans before they perished. Rationally, they thought it was not worthwhile. The Meccans were also not as eager to kill their former fellow-Meccans, now Muslims, as the latter were to kill them. When fighting began, Abu Hudhayfa, Utbah's own Muslim son, proudly volunteered to fight his father, an old man (W:70). Abu Hudhayfa eventually 'helped' his father, Utbah, to die "with a stroke

(of sword)", our sources tell the believers appreciatively -- AAN ABU HUDYHAYFA BIN UTBAH ALA ABIH BI-DARBAT-IN (ibid). Anticipating this zealotry and fanaticism, during his efforts to convince the Meccans not to fight, Utbah had pointed at the happy Meccan youths and cried:

I implore you, by God, look at these bright shining faces. Please do not exchange them with those (grim) viper-like faces [i.e., it will be a pity to lose joyful Meccan lives even if an equal number of fanatic Muslims are killed] -- **ANSHUDUKUM ALLAH FI HADHIHI'L-WUJUH ALLATI KA-ANNAHA'L-MASABIH AN TAJALUHA ANDAD-AN LI HADHIHI'L-WUJUH KA-ANNAHA WUJUH AL-HAYYAT** (W:64; brackets added).

The pagans as usual were more interested in this life here than in the Hereafter. Abu Jahl goaded Amir al-Hadrami to insist on a fight in order to avenge Amr, his brother killed at Nakhla by Muslims. 'Utbah and others offered to pay the bloodmoney, as well as reparation for the whole caravan Muslim raiders looted at Nakhla. Abu Jahl taunted 'Utbah and others, calling them cowards. However, Abu Jahl himself was interested more in a show of force than a real engagement; he thought the Muslims would retreat (1.1:296). Our sources make it clear that the Meccans would have retreated had Muhammad done so.

Sure of God's help, Muhammad insisted on a confrontation. Later Quranic revelations confirmed he took the right step; those among the Muslims who hesitated to take this aggressive step were condemned harshly by the Almighty (Q8:5-8, 16, 20-1, 27, 65, 74-5). As Utbah had anticipated, God told Muslims to fight the Meccans ruthlessly:

I shall cast into the unbelievers' hearts terror; so smite above the necks, and smite every finger of them! That, because they had made a breach with God and with His Messenger; and whosoever makes a breach with God and with His Messenger, surely God is terrible in retribution (8:12-3).

Their "breach with God and His Messenger" was their disobedience of God's commandments (conveyed by Muhammad) and of His Messenger, Muhammad -- **SHAQQULLAH WA RASULAHU: FARAQU AMR ALLAH WA RASULAH-U WA ASAUHUMA** (T,9:200). Whatever the factors from an historian's point of view, the Prophet and his followers won the battle. For a Muslim it was God's promise fulfilled.

Accounts of Badr occupy more pages in the Quran and Tradition than other engagements with nonbelievers. For Muslims, Badr is the most important victory, indicating that God was on their side against all others. Reported prayers and exhortations of the Prophet during the event clearly show the Prophet considered his followers the only true believers in all the world. Muhammad warned the Almighty that if the Muslims met defeat at Badr, no one would be left to worship Him. God apparently knew how much was at stake. He helped the 300 or so Muslims to overcome the 1,000 Quraysh. Badr was "the first battle in which God honored and exalted Islam and in which He made the heathen despicable and humiliated them" -- **AWWAL GHAZWAT AAZZ ALLAH FIHA AL-ISLAM WA ADHALL FIHA AHL ASH-SHIRK** (W:21). The Quran and Tradition tell Muslims God intervened directly in favor of the Prophet and his followers. Three thousand angels commanded by Gabriel, Israfil (Azrael?) and Mikail (Michael?), parading in regimented rows, fought for Islam. These angels were seen, our sources tell Muslims, by the Prophet, by the believers and even by some terrorized non-Muslims. The angels had distinct uniforms. Gabriel advised the Prophet to choose the appropriate terrain for the battleground. After the Muslims won, Gabriel went to the Prophet, wanting to be sure Muhammad was satisfied with the angelic performance against the nonbelievers. He said:

O Muhammad, indeed my Lord has sent me to you and has commanded me not to leave you alone until you are satisfied. Are you satisfied? (W:113).

The Prophet said: "Yes" (ibid). The Quran confirms and repeatedly reminds Muslims of miraculous Divine help variously bestowed upon the Prophet and his followers enabling them to overwhelm the nonbelievers. (For above mentioned miracles at Badr, and more, see e.g., Q8:9-19, 26, 42-4, 50-1 along with Tabari's commentaries). Muslims see the Prophet's victory at Badr as a sign of Islam's unique and superior position in the eyes of God. The Quran, drawing upon Badr, exhorts believers to fight nonbelievers, and assures Muslims that they, despite their smaller

number, will always enjoy God's support to overcome nonbelievers be they ever so greater (Q8:65-6).

The battle over, fourteen Muslims were "martyred". Seventy Quraysh - including many of their leaders, such as **'Utbah, Abu Jahl, Mutim b. 'Adiyy and Abu'l-Bakhtari** - were killed. Note that the three other than Abu Jahl were among the outspoken Meccan peace-seekers and had protected Muhammad on crucial occasions. About the same number were captured. The other Meccans retreated to their city. The Muslims sacked the defeated Meccans, gaining for the first time significant booty. The Meccan prisoners of war from Badr were taken to Medina. Most of them were freed after their relatives paid the Prophet and Muslims 1,000 to 4,000 dirham as ransom for each. Some captives were killed; a few were freed on other terms. The Quran confirmed that one-fifth, KHUMS, of the total plunder should go to the Prophet. The rest was divided among the Muslim participants and a few Muslims who had remained on duty at Medina with his permission. Thus, at Badr, God institutionalized for ever the appropriateness of taking **GHANIMAH**, "booty" - plundering and expropriating possessions and property of non-Muslims overwhelmed militarily -- **UNWAT-AN**, by Muslims (Q8:1 cf. T,9:168-78; Q8:41 cf. T,10:1-9).

As a whole, the story of Badr tells believers that the Almighty wanted fighting to take place. The Quran documents Badr's aggressive nature. Badr was meant to verify the truth of Islam and of "cutting off", annihilating, unbelievers, every last one (Q8:7-8 cf. T,9:188; TS,11:363; TS,12:523-4). Through the story of Badr, the Quran reinforced the idea of continuous war against nonbelievers, perpetual until Islam prevails, until there is no hindrance in the way of Islam and no other religion exists alongside Islam -- **LA YAKUN MAA DINIKUM KUFR WA YAKUN AD-DIN KULLUHU LI'LLAH** (Q8:39-40 cf. T,9:248-50). Believers so see they are duty-bound to fight pagans even if the latter cease to fight. Muslims should cease fighting them only when the pagans convert to Islam -- **WA IN INTAHAU AN AL-QITAL, FA INNAHU KAN FARD-AN**

ALA'L-MUMININ QITALUHUM HATTA YUSLIMU (T,9:ibid). Referring to Q8:61, which allowed Muslims to "incline to peace" if the pagans did so, Tabari reminds believers (T,10:34) of God's final overriding verdict in Q9:5 about the pagans to "slay the idolaters" unless they become Muslims.

The Quranic revelations related to Badr, and Traditional explanations that Muslims read, tell believers approvingly that the Almighty indoctrinated Muhammad and his Companions to prepare for an all-out war against all other non-Muslims also. This was done, first, by portraying all nonbelievers (including the Jews, Byzantines and Persians) negatively. The Quran called them hopeless, doomed to unbelief. Islam expressed the same attitude toward nonbelievers during the later Meccan phase of the Prophet's career. The pagans again were the worst target:

Surely the worst of beasts in God's sight are the unbelievers who will not believe. If God had known of any good in them He would have made them hear; and if he had made them hear they would have turned away, swerving aside (Q8:22-3 cf. T,9:212 passim, informing us that the passage mainly addressed the pagans; cf. 1.1:322-3).

According to al-Waqidi and Tabari, the Muslims, just after Badr, were warned against the treachery and evil intentions of the People of the Book (the Jews and Christians) and of the Persians. Our sources do not mention any evidence of "treachery" by the Jews related to the Period this Quranic passages was revealed. However, God encouraged Muslims to abrogate their undertakings unilaterally and treat these non-Muslims harshly. The Muslims were commanded to be prepared for war to terrify all nonbelievers.

Make ready for them whatever force and strings of horses you can, to terrify thereby the enemy of God and your enemy and others besides them that you know not... And if they incline to peace, do thou incline to it; and put thy trust in God (Q8:60-61).

Those against whom Muslims were asked to "make ready..." included (according to Tabari) Jews, Christians and Iranians (**AL-MAJUS**). As for the verse 8:61 " And if they incline to peace, do thou incline to it," Tabari tells readers that - as in the case of the pagans - it also no longer applied to the People of the Book: it was abrogated, **NUSIKHAT**,

by Q9:29 (T,10:31-5). **SILM**, peace, is no longer allowed with the People of the Book. They could survive only by 1) conversion to Islam or 2) the payment of jizya, the poll tax, (which meant accepting a humiliated status) -- **IMMA BID-DUKHUL FI'L-ISLAM WA IMMA BI ITA AL-JIZYAT** (T,10:33 cf. Q9:29). Explaining Q9:29, Tabari tells Muslims that the People of the Book, the Jews and Christians are not truly obedient to God because "they do not obey (Him) they way the People of Islam do" -- **WA LA YUTIUN ALLAH TA'AT AL-HAQQ Y'ANI ANNAHUM LA YUTI'UN TA'AT AHL AL-ISLAM** (T,10:109). Muslims are told that Q8:60-61 refers particularly to the Jews of Medina and the rest of Arabia. The "Others besides them you know not" 8:60 refers to included "all adversaries and enemies of Muslims" including the Persians, the jinn and the Jews, especially the Banu Quyayza Jews of Medina (T,10:31-3). According to al-Waqidi, the unknown enemies of Islam alluded to in 8:60 included particularly the three main Jewish groups of Medina, the Banu Qaynuga, Banu Nadir and Banu Qurayza, as well as the Jews of Khaybar (W:135). Keeping in mind the revelation of 8:60-61, a Muslims thus gathers God commanded the Prophet just after Badr to begin to terrorize all non-Muslims - particularly the Jews - and prepare for war against them. They were charged with bad intentions (with no evidence) against Islam (T,10:31-3). The passage was also an order by God to fight **AR-RUM** (the Christian Romans). According to this Divine Commandment, Tabari tells us, the Prophet eventually attacked Tabuk, a Byzantine territory in 631-2 CE (T,10:109).

Thus, through the story of Badr, a Muslim sees the Prophet and his followers as divinely authorized and obligated to wage aggressive raids and wars on the Jews and Christians of Arabia, citing as cause mere suspicions of disloyalty, to extend Islam's aggression for no reason, beyond the territories it controlled, against all non-Muslims. It also meant the limited guarantees of the pact of Aqaba and of the Ordinance of Medina given to the Jews were to be ignored.

Specific aspects of Muslim treatment of non-Muslims during the

battle of Badr are discussed in the following sub-segment of our study. Here we mention examples of Muslim treatment of pledges expected to be honored by them. An-Nadr b. al-Harith who used to compete in telling legendary stories with Muhammad in Mecca, claiming they were better than the Quranic stories of the Prophet, was a prisoner of war at Badr. When an-Nadr realized the Prophet intended to execute him, he looked at Musab b. Umayr, a Muslim, with whom he was closely related and had a pledge of mutual protection, **JIWAR**, based on Arab traditions. An-Nadr begged Musab to intervene and ask the Prophet to treat him the way other prisoners were treated, i.e., accept ransom rather than slaying him. Musab responded sarcastically to this appeal based on mutual Arab traditions: "You are the one who used to tease the Prophet's companions (in Mecca)." An-Nadr again reminded Musab of the obligation, saying: "Had you been a captive of the Quraysh, you would never have been slain as long as I was alive." Musab the believer did not deny the authenticity of such a mutual undertaking. He ignored the pledge, however, on a new unilateral basis. He said:

By God, you are right but I am no more like you. Islam has nullified the pledges (between the Muslims and non-Muslims).

Following this, on the Prophet's orders Ali b. Abu Talib chopped off the head of an-Nadr (W:106-7). Note that the Prophet and many of his followers, while in Mecca, openly sought and enjoyed the benefits of such traditional individual pledges of protection from Meccan non-Muslims. Just after the secret negotiations at Mecca between the Prophet and the Medinan /Muslim delegation, Sad b. Ubada, a leading Medinan Muslim delegate, was suspected and arrested by some Meccans while Sad was leaving the town. For having pledged at Aqaba to fight for Muhammad against the Meccans, Sad was a self-declared enemy of Meccan non-Muslims; his life was in danger. However it was the heathens' respect for their earlier "pledges of protection" -- **JIWAR**, that saved the believer's life and freedom. Let the believer speak for himself:

'... I despaired of fair treatment. As they were dragging me

along, a man took pity on me and said, "You poor devil, haven't you any right to protection from one of the Quraysh?" "Yes," I said, "I have. I used to guarantee the safety of the merchants of Jubayr b. Mutim... and protected them from those who might have wronged them in my country; also al-Harith b. Harb b. Umayya..." "Very well, then call out the names of these two men and say what tie there is between you," he said. This I did and that man went to them and found them in the mosque beside the Kaba and told them of me and that I was calling for them and mentioning my claim on them. When they heard who I was they acknowledged the truth of my claim and delivered me.' So Sad went off (1.1:206).

Abd ar-Rahman b. Awf, the Muslim, was an old friend of Umayya b. Khalaf, the non-Muslim. Umayya, an influential old man, had hesitated to go to Badr to fight the Muslims. A member of the "peace party" during the internal Meccan controversy on how to handle the Prophet's raids on Meccan trade caravans, but ridiculed and harassed by Abu Jahl, Umayya was compelled to fight. During the battle, Umayya, along with his son Ali, was apparently more eager to find an opportunity to surrender than to fight enthusiastically. Fortunately, at least for a while, Umayya confronted his old friend Abd ar-Rahman b. Awf, who in turn was more interested in plundering the dead nonbelievers of their coats of mail than in fighting Umayya and his son. Abd ar-Rahman was and remained during his Islamic career, famous for his shrewd business-mindedness. Umayya and his son convinced Abd ar-Rahman that a good number of milk-camels they could offer as ransom would be more valuable than the mail Abd ar-Rachman was collectiing. He agreed, and promised them protection. Umayya and Ali surrendered voluntarily, becoming prisoners of war with the hope that they would be set free after paying the promised ransom.

Abd ar-Rahman threw away the mail he had collected and took them, apparently, towards the Prophet, or to the camp where the captives were being held. Unfortunately for the captives, though obviously they were such, a group of zealous Muslims incited by Bilal attacked the prisoners. The Muslims "formed a ring round" them. One of the attacking zealots cut off Ali's foot; he fell down. The helpless father, Umayya, could only cry aloud in anguish seeing what was being done to his son. The Muslims kept attacking the helpless prisoners.

"They hewed them to pieces with their swords until they were dead." Unlike the Meccans who honored a fellow-heathen's individual pledge to protect Sad b. Muadh, a Muslim and a sworn enemy, fellow-Muslims ignored Abd ar-Rahman's pledge of protection just given to Umayya and his son. As for Abd ar-Rahman, he was not sorry for the deaths of the two captives and violation of his pledge. Abd ar-Rahman only grumbled: "God have mercy on Bilal. I lost my coats of mail and he deprived me of my prisoners," who if not killed would have earned him a rich ransom (1.1:302-3; W:82-5). The torn and dead body of Umayya was left in the sun to swell and rot.

There was no regret in the Muslim camp. The Prophet, after the battle, addressed the dead bodies of the fallen Meccans including those of Umayya and Ali, who were thrown into a pit: "O people of the pit, have you found what God threatened is true? For I have found that what my Lord promised me is true" (1.1:305; W:112). Long after the event, someone at Medina, apparently, had misgivings about the treacherous treatment of Umayya and son, and pointed at al-Hubab b. al-Mandhir, who had participated in the torturous killing of the two, saying to Umm Safwan, perhaps, the mother of Ali b. Ummayya: "This was the person who cut off Ali's leg." The mother, who had become a believer and indoctrinated, responded as a believer is expected to. She said:

Do not bother us with the stories of those who were killed as disbelievers. Indeed, God humiliated Ali (b. Umayya) with the blow rendered on him by al-Hubab b. al-Mundhir, and God honored al-Hubab by afflicting a blow on Ali" (W:85).

Badr also established permanent guidelines for Muslims living in lands beyond Islamic territories. They must collaborate with the Dar al-Islam and support its actions against their own country. If unable to do so, they must do hijrah - leave for Dar al-Islam. Those who fail to do so, particularly those critical of Muslim actions against the Dar al-Harb, are harshly condemned. Of such critics who claim to be Muslim the Quran remarks: **FI QULUBIHIM MARAD**, "there is sickness in their hearts." The Quran also bound the Dar al-Islam to support Muslims working for Islam in Dar al-Harb (Q8:49 cf. T,10:20-2; Q8:72-3 cf.

T,10:51-6).

Some of those Meccans who had accepted Muhammad's religion did not migrate to Medina. In defense of Meccan caravans under attack these Muslims had accompanied their fellow-Meccans to Badr. Obviously, they were among those Meccans who wanted to avoid an armed confrontation, particularly after they realized their caravan had escaped. They were disillusioned after they found Muhammad was determined to confront the Meccan army. Referring to Muslim intransigence these Muslim residents of Mecca remarked: "Their religion has deluded them" (Q8:49). They thought their fellow-Muslims led by the Prophet were acting fanatically. These Muslim residents of Mecca wanted peace between the Dar al-Islam and their country of citizenship, Mecca. They were wrong. Their criticism of Islamic zealotry and their desire for Islam's peaceful coexistence with pagandom were condemned by the Almighty who called them "hypocrites... in whose hearts was sickness" (Q8:49; see T,10:20-2 for confirmation of our claim here that these critics of Muhammad's actions at Badr were Muslim residents of Mecca -- **KAN NAS-UN MIN AHL MAKKAT TAKALLAMU AQARRU BI'L-ISLAM, FA-KHARAJU MAAL- MUSHRIKIN YAUM BADR.** The Quran declared them apostates, **AL-MUNAFIQUN**).

A following passage clarified further what was expected of Muslims living in a society not dominated by Islam, a Dar al-Harb.

Those who believe, and have emigrated and struggled with their possessions and their selves in the way of God, and those who have given refuge and help - those are friends one of another. And those who believe, but have not emigrated - you have no duty of friendship towards them till they emigrate; yet if they ask you for help, for religion's sake it is your duty to help them... As for the unbelievers, they are friends one of another. Unless you do this, there will be persecution in the land and great corruption (Q8:72-3).

In his detailed exegeses of this passage (T,10:51-6) Tabari tells us that active and enthusiastic participation of all Muslims, including those living in a Dar al-Harb, against nonbelievers is a necessary condition to qualify as true believers. They must act "as one hand" against nonbelievers -- **AYDIHIM WAHIDAT-AN ALA MAN KAFAR** (ibid:51). No dissent is allowed. To qualify as believers, Muslims must use their

"swords" against those who belie (Muhammad's Prophethood) and disbelieve -- **SHAHARU'S-SUYUF ALA MAN KADH-DHAB WA JAHAD** (ibid:52). Mere belief in Muhammad's creed and a passive attitude leading to peaceful coexistence with non-Muslims are unacceptable. Those among Muslims who continue to reside in the Dar al-Harb, do not shun their (non-Muslim) people and do not leave the heathendom -- **DAR AL-KUFR** for Dar al-Islam are no longer believers -- **WA INNAH-U LA YAKUN MUMIN-AN MAN KAN MUQIM-AN BI-DAR AL-HARB WA LAM YUHAJIR** (ibid:55). "Hearths" of a Muslim and a pagan can not exist side by side, i.e., Muslims and non-Muslims are not supposed to live as good neighbors -- **LA TARAAYA NAR MUSLIM WA NAR MUSHRIK** (ibid:55). Disregarding these instructions, the Almighty warns, would be tantamount to sedition, **FITNAH**, and "great corruption," **FASAD KABIR** (Q8:73 cf. T,10:55). Muslims are told the Prophet did not recognize as (true) believers those who did not perform hijra -- **WA LAM YAKUN RASUL ALLAH YAQBIL AL-IMAN ILLA BI'L-HIJRAH** (T,10:56). Referring to the passage, "As for the unbelievers they are friends one of another" in Q8:73, Tabari concludes: "It means God prohibits a believer's residence - disregarding (the duty of) hijra - in a land not dominated by Islam" -- **WA INNAHU DALALAT-UN ALA TAHRIM ALLAH ALA'L-MUMIN AL-MUQAM FI DAR AL-HARB WA TARK AL- HIJRAH** (T,10:56).

Jews of Medina as Target Number Two: Expansion and Violation of Pledges and Treaties.

The Jews of Medina, who formed at least half of the city's population, are mentioned in the Ordinance of Medina by the names of their sub-clans. In reports about post-Badr events these Medinan Jews are divided into three main groups: 1) Banu Qaynuqa, 2) Banu Nadir, and 3) Banu Qurayza. These three major Jewish configurations lived in separate autonomous settlements within what we may call Greater Medina. Their common religious identity did not necessarily form them into a united front against non- Jewish Medinans. In the past and at the time Muhammad reached Medina Banu Qaynuqa were allied with the Khazraj clan of Medina while Banu Nadir and Banu Qurayza had allied themselves with

the opposite and rival camp of the Aus clan. At the time of the Aqaba pact that resulted in the Islamization of Khazraj and Aus, now known jointly as al-Ansar, the Helpers, the two (Khazraj-Qaynuqa and Aus-Nadir-Qurayza) camps were at peace.

As elsewhere in Arabia interactions between the two camps were more peaceful and cordial than those among modern peacetime political-economic-military alliances. Nevertheless leaders of both Khazraj and Aus at Aqaba were conscious enough of their responsibilities to their allies, the Jews of Medina. In theory, these pre-hijra Medinan responsibilities to fellow-Medinan Jews were intact until Badr, though the Ordinance of Medina in particular and Islam in general had created a new alliance system, a new camp - the **UMMAH**, "community" of Islam - composed of Meccan emigrants and, Medinan Khazraj and Aus under Muhammad's new kind of leadership. Muhammad spoke for God. This gave him much more authority than any other tribal leader had ever enjoyed in Arabia. The Quran increasingly exhorted obedience to God and His Messenger, Muhammad. The Almighty spoke only through Muhammad. Although the pact of Aqaba had presumed and the Ordinance of Medina had granted the Jews' the right to continue adherence to their religion, the Quran and Muhammad increasingly pressured the Jews to acknowledge him as the Messenger of God, i.e. convert to Islam. Contradictions between loyalties to the new alliance system based on Islam and those based on earlier traditional alliances and commitments were becoming obvious. The post-Badr events exposed these inherent contradictions.

By the time of Badr, the Prophet had realized the impossibility of Medinan Jews' voluntary conversion to Islam. The change of **QIBLA**, "direction of prayers," from Jerusalem to Mecca, and that of **SIYAM**, "fasting" period from Jewish traditional days to Ramadan symbolized the Prophet's disappointment and dramatized the break with the Jews. Victory at Badr encouraged the Almighty and Muhammad to take decisive steps making pre-hijra and post-hijra undertakings concerning Medinan Jews more ineffective and meaningless.

The Almighty, through Badr-related revelations, had authorized the Prophet to "throw back" commitment to the Jews on the basis of "fear of treachery" (Q8:57-8). As the events unfold in our sources Muslims learn the Prophet was not supposed to document charges of treachery against Medinan Jews. These sources tell believers frankly that the only Jewish 'treachery' was their refusal to acknowledge Muhammad's Prophethood. Explaining Q8:57-8 Tabari tells us God instructed the Prophet to fight those with whom he had a covenant (of peace, protection and religious freedom) (T,10:25-6). This was a Divine authorization for the one-sided nullification of undertakings. The Quran followed up the pressure and indoctrination against concerns for loyalty to existing pledges. The Helpers were given two choices: 1) complete loyalty and obedience to God and Muhammad regardless of their non-adherence to the words and spirit of undertakings concerning the Jews or 2) face condemnation by God and His Messenger. Most of the Helpers opted for God and Muhammad. They are Muslim heroes. Some expected fair play. They are projected by our sources as villains, made known as **AL-MUNAFIQUN**, "hypocrites."¹² A chronological survey of the Prophet's treatment of Banu Qaynuqa, Banu Nadir and Banu Qurayza will explain how Muhammad applied the new Divine instructions about Medinan Jews.

Banu Qaynuqa¹³

Banu Qaynuqa was perhaps the most prosperous and peaceful Jewish group of greater Medina. Apparently, most of them were artisans. They also engaged in agriculture and animal husbandry. Al-Waqidi tells us they were among the Jews promised protection by the Prophet when he established himself in Medina (W:176-80). This is a reference, apparently, to the Prophet's proclamation of the Ordinance of Medina. In this brief reference it is clear it was the Prophet who "wrote" i.e. imposed the document governing relations between him and "all" the Jews of Medina -- **WADAATHU'L-YAHUD KULLUHA, WA KATAB BAYNAHU WA BAYNAHA KITAB-AN** (W:176). Al-Waqidi's preceding phrase claiming all the Jews had "reconciled," or "made peace (on a mutual basis)" with the Prophet,

suggesting a voluntary mutual agreement, is vague and not supported by the vast material in Islamic sources. In any case, the Prophet had given them AMAN "immunity" -- JAAL BAYNAHU WA BAYNAHUM AMAN-AN (ibid), that obviously meant religious freedom and protection from violence. The Prophet, al-Waqidi continues, imposed some conditions on them, one of these being (the condition) that they would not help an enemy against him (i.e. the Prophet) -- WA SHARAT ALAYHIM SHURUT-AN FA-KAN FI-MA SHARAT AL-LA YUZAHIRU ALAYH ADUWW-AN (ibid). Imposed or not or whether other conditions of this KITAB, "document," of the AMAN, "pledge of immunity" and of the MUADAAH "treaty of mutual peace" were honored by the Prophet or not, we will particularly look for any violation by the Jews of the condition that obliged them not to support Muhammad's enemy. If the Jews did so, we need to know the number of such violators, the time and the circumstances. Badr had changed the balance of power. Some Helpers anticipated the Prophet's change of mind about the limited guarantees given to the Medinan Jews. In order to avoid the embarrassment of treachery, these Helpers advised their Jewish allies to convert to Islam to escape the fate the Meccans had met at Badr -- LAMMA INHAZAM AHL BADR, QAL AL-MUSLIMUN LI-AULIYAIHIM MIN YAHUD: AMINU QABL AN YUSIBAKUM ALLAH BI-YAUM-IN MITHL YAUM BADR (TS,10:396 cf. Q5:51). These apparently nervous Muslims knew the Prophet had no other genuine complaints against the Jews and that he had decided to force them to believe in his Prophethood. They were right. The Prophet soon "assembled" the Banu Qaynuqa

in their market and addressed them as follows: 'O Jews, beware, lest God bring upon you the vengeance that he brought upon Quraysh. Become Muslims. You know that I am a Prophet who has been sent (by God) - you will find that in your scriptures and God's Covenant with you' (1.1:363; parentheses added; also see TS,6:227; W:176).

This was immediately followed by a Divine threat. Aimed at demoralizing the Banu Qaynuqa and encouraging believers to confront them, God revealed:

Say to the unbelievers: 'You shall be overthrown, and mustered into Gehenna - an evil cradling! There has already been a sign for you in the two companies that encountered, one company

fighting in the way of God and another unbelieving; they saw them twice like of them, as the eye sees, but God confirms with His help whom He will; surely in that is a lesson for men possessed of eyes (Q3:12-3).

Banu Qaynuqa were told their fate was sealed; they were predestined to be vanquished by the believers. The Jews were reminded of what had just happened with the Meccans at Badr. Muslims were told they were fighters for God and assured of help against Medinan Jews as God had helped Muslims against the Meccans. For example, God miraculously caused Meccans at Badr to see more Muslims than their actual number, "twice [the] like of them," and, thus, demoralized the pagans.

The Quran and Muhammad did not mention any violation of existing commitments by the Jews or by the Banu Qaynuqa. They had violated nothing as far as the Ordinance of Medina was concerned. They had not helped Muhammad's enemies. Apparently, along with exhortations to obey Him and Muhammad for rewards in the Last Day, God had to find a tangible incentive to brace the believers for action against their allies. The Almighty talked of what anti-Semites, i.e. anti-Jews, have always talked of to incite and motivate the mob: the Jews are rich; they "love their women and children"; they "heap-up heaps of gold and silver, horses of mark, cattle and tillage"; they "enjoy the present life" (Q3:14). The Quranic passage 3:12-15 was definitely related to the Prophet's sudden ultimatum to the Banu Qaynuqa just after Badr (TS,6:226- 263). Muslims also read in the immediately following verses that Islam is the only religion acceptable to God (3:19). Regardless of promises, religious autonomy on the basis of mutual respect does not make sense to a Muslim. God commanded Muhammad to tell pagans, Jews and Christians to surrender - to become Muslims or face the consequences of their refusal! (3:20 cf. TS,6:283). Jews are charged with slaying the Prophets in the past, and are told their good works are useless without belief in Islam (3:21-22).

The Quran further tightened the grip on the Jews by isolating them from those Medinans who were likely to honor their words and demands of solemn alliances. Such Medinans were warned against even quiet sympathy

for the Jews:

Let not the believers take the unbelievers for friends, rather than the believers - for whoso does that belongs not to God in anything - unless you have a fear of them. God warns you that you beware of Him, and unto God is the homecoming. Say: Whether you hide what is in your breasts or publish it, God knows it... (Q3:28-9)...

Tabari names particular Helpers to whom the above Quranic warning was addressed. They were commanded by God to shun their obligations (to) and intimacies -- **LUZUMAHUM WA MUBATINATAHUM**, with the Jews (TS,6:314 passim). Those who did not act accordingly, Muslims know, were called hypocrites, apostates. Q3:31-2 tells everyone there is only one way to express (belief in) and love of God: follow Muhammad; those who refuse are disliked by God.

Q3:12-13 which talked of the Banu Qaynuqa's imminent "overthrow" and told Muslims they were "fighting in the way of God" were to tell them to initiate the clash with the Qaynuqa regardless of any grievances caused by these Jews. There was none excepting their refusal to convert to Islam. Al-Waqidi tells us the Prophet did this because the Qaynuqa had violated the compact with Muhammad and fought (against) him -- **NABADHU'L-AHD ILA'N-NABI WA HARABU** (W:177). Al-Waqidi and other Islamic sources do not tell us how. His and other Islamic accounts tell us, unwittingly, that the breach was made by the Prophet and God i.e. the Quran.

Although the Quran had prepared the ground, the Prophet moved cautiously. He was uncertain about Medinan reaction to an unexcused violation of guarantees to the Jews based on the Aqaba reassurances and on the Prophet's own Ordinance. At Aqaba, referring to the Jews of Medina, the Prophet had promised he would be at peace with those at peace with the Helpers. The Ordinance had guaranteed Jews the right to their property and adherence to their own religion. Now, Islam was demanding conversion while the Khazraj and Aus were at peace with the Jews. The Prophet was also aware of persisting sensitivities of some Khazraj Muslims led by Abd Allah ibn Ubayy about their responsibilities to their allies, the Banu Qaynuqa. Muhammad waited for some excuse. It

was provided by a quarrel, obviously the result of the existing tension between the two groups. On the allegation of disrespect toward an Arab woman by a Jew in the "market of Banu Qaynuqa," a Muslim attacked and killed this Jew. Note that it was a Jew killed first by a Muslim. This Muslim in turn was killed by Jews. Though the first Jewish blood was shed by a Muslim, the Prophet ordered the Qaynuqa Jewish quarter besieged. The other main Medinan Jewish groups, Banu Nadir and Banu Qurayza, remained neutral. The 700 or so adult male Qaynuqa surrendered and their hands were tied on their shoulders. Abd Allah ibn Ubayy asked the Prophet, protesting, if he intended to slaughter them summarily -- **TURID AN TAHSIDAHUM FI GHADAT-IN WAHID?** (W:177-8; 1.1:363). This is exactly Muhammad wanted to do: kill them all -- **WA HUA YURID QATLAHUM**, Tabari tells us (TT-1,2:480). Medinans, particularly the Khazraj, were divided again, though not as dangerously as during the Nakhla incident. Most of the Khazraj led by Ubadah ibn as-Samit proved to be 'true believers.' Dissenting Khazraj, prisoners of conscience of the time, led by Abd Allah ibn Ubayy, formed, apparently, a small minority. Ubadah b. as-Samit .¹¹

who had the same alliance with them (i.e., the Qaynuqa Jews) as had Abd Allah, went to the apostle and renounced all responsibility for them in favor of God and the apostle, saying, 'O apostle of God, I take God and his apostle and the believers as my friends, and I renounce my agreement and friendship with these unbelievers (1.1:363; also see W:179; TS,10:395-408 cf. Q5:51-53 passim).

When Abd Allah b. Ubayy expressed his surprise and taunted Ubada for his treachery and one-sided abrogation of a solemn alliance with the Qaynuqa Jews, Ubada responded faithfully: **TAGHAYYARAT AL-QULUB WA MAHA'L-ISLAM AL-UHUD** -- "the hearts have changed and Islam has done away with the covenants" (W:179). Ubadah did not mention any violation of compact by the Qaynuqa. However, Abd Allah b. Ubayy, who had not yet lost all his influence, persisted in espousing the cause of the Qaynuqa. The Prophet partly changed his mind. Embarrassed, perhaps, by Abd Allah's harping on the treacheries of the Muslim action, the Prophet, obviously irritated, invoking God's curse on the Jews and Abd Allah, let

the Banu Qaynuqa leave Medina -- **KHALLUHUM, LAANAHUM ALLAH WA LAANAHU MAAHUM** (W:178). The Banu Qaynuqa were exiled to Syria; their enormous property in Medina was confiscated and distributed among the Prophet and the Muslims. Muslims find that God confirmed the breach of contract with the Qaynuqa as a laudable act; the Almighty condemned those who showed sympathy for the Jews and respect for the existing pledges. Then, according to Ibn Ishaq and Tabari the Quran exhorted:

O believers, take not Jews and Christians as friends; they are friends of each other. Whoso of you makes them his friends is one of them... [Referring to Abd Allah b. Ubayy's defense of the Jews:] Yet thou seest those in whose heart is sickness vying with one another to come to them, [cordially]... But it may be that God will bring the victory... [to the Muslims... [Mentioning those who sided with the Prophet, the Quran and the believers - the party of God, they are the victors (1:5:51-6, 59 passim. Explanations in brackets added on the basis of 1.1:363-4 and TS,10:395-435).

The Banu Nadir¹⁴

The determination to attack Banu Qaynuqa stemmed from intoxication of victory at Badr; the attack on Banu Nadir resulted from frustrations and further financial needs. 625 CE went poorly for the Muslims. In March they were defeated at Uhud by the Meccans; about 65 Muslims were killed. In July, about 16 Muslims sent to propagate Islam at Bir Mauna were assassinated by unruly Arab tribesmen (W:346-63). Again in July, the Prophet sent a band of seven Muslims to spy on the movements and activities of the Meccans. Going there they were ambushed by Arab Banu Lihyan tribesmen. Most of them were killed in fighting; two were captured and handed over to the Meccans, who executed them.

Amr b. Umayya, a Muslim fugitive from the Bir Mauna incident, on his way to Medina, treacherously killed two members of Banu Amir, an Arab clan. Although non-Muslim, Banu Amir had a mutual pact of immunity and protection -- **AMAN WA AHD**, with the Prophet, as well as an alliance of friendship with the Banu Nadir Jews -- **WA KANAT BANU'N-NADIR HULAFALI-BANI AMIR** (W:364). This is an example of the Prophet's pacts with some Arab pagans beyond Medina. These pacts implied commitment to

nonviolence and religious freedom for these pagans.

On the demand of the chief of Banu Amir, the Prophet agreed to pay compensation for Amr b. Umayya's innocent victims. The Prophet and some of his prominent Companions went to visit the Banu Nadir, to ask for contribution to this indemnity. **FA-SAR RASUL ALLAH ILA BANI'N-NADIR YASTAIN FI DIYATIHEMA** (W:364). This was unusual. Banu Nadir were allies of Banu Amir -- **KANAT BANU NADIR HULAFI LI BANI AMIR** (*ibid*); they were technically, the victims. It was impolite to ask them to pay for a crime committed by a Muslim. Banu Nadir were supposed to be on the side of those who demanded indemnity, not with those obliged to pay. However, apparently conscious of the Prophet's intention to look for some excuse, the Banu Nadir received Muhammad and his Companions with respect and promptly agreed to pay what the Prophet had asked for. The Prophet had no excuse which apparently he needed to initiate the clash. Banu Nadir had disarmed him by their warm reception and prompt positive response (W:365 *passim*). According to the traditions of ospitality the Jews cordially invited Muhammad and his companions to eat with them and began to prepare food. It was a tranquil meeting. The Prophet, however, suddenly and mysteriously left the meeting. After a long wait, his Companions went to ask the Prophet what the matter was. He told them Gabriel and God had warned him that some of the Banu Nadir were hatching a conspiracy to kill him by hurling a stone from the top of a roof. Had there been other witnesses, the Prophet would not have depended only on Gabriel to convince his followers. The charge was confirmed by the Almighty (Q59).

Muslims, as believers, must believe such information and commandments received from God through Gabriel. They must also believe that the Prophet was authorized to abrogate any existing treaty and act against Banu Nadir as he pleased. Our sources are unambiguous about the real causes of the Prophet's later actions. He declared war and besieged the Banu Nadir in their settlement. During the siege and in the course of some deliberations between Muhammad b. Maslama, the Muslim

representative, and Banu Nadir, it was clear that what basically caused the Prophet's onslaught was their refusal to acknowledge him as the Messenger of God and accept Islam as their religion. The Banu Nadir Jews well knew that by becoming Muslims their troubles would be over (W:366-7). The Quran also asserts clearly that Banu Nadir were so treated "because they made a breach with God and His Messenger; and whosoever makes a breach with God, God is terrible in retribution" (Q59:4). In Tabari's words, Muhammad's onslaught came because of "their opposition to God and His Prophet (Muhammad) in not following him, and because of their disobedience of their Lord who commanded them to obey and follow Muhammad" (T,28:32). Note that in principle, Badr- related and post-Badr Quranic revelations had already enjoined aggression against all non-Muslims, including the Jews, and authorized unilateral abrogation of treaties, pledges etc. Islam per se, as believers would repeatedly and proudly mention, had automatically "changed the hearts and cut off pledges" concerning nonbelievers. For these reasons and not necessarily by their breach of any contract, God authorized Muhammad to ignore his previous undertakings, expel Banu Nadir, confiscate their property - which included rich farm-lands - as an especial fief for himself (Q59:7; W377 passim). When asked by Umar about the distribution of the booty among the believers the Prophet, referring to Q59:7, remarked he would not share with the believers what Almighty God bestowed upon him exclusively -- **LA AJ'AL SHAY-AN JA'ALAHU'LLAH AZZ WA JALL LI DUN AL- MUMININ** (W:377). Obviously the Almighty was disregarding His earlier verdicts fixing only a KHUMS, "one fifth," of the booty for the Prophet. However, the Prophet, 'graciously' and voluntarily, gave portions of confiscated property and estates to some of his close Hashimite relatives and to some fellow-Meccan Companions, thus relieving the Helpers who were supporting financially these Emigrants. Muhammad kept the major part of these estates as his personal property (W:378-9 passim).

Before the Prophet gave his final verdict on Banu Nadir, some of

their leaders and Arab sympathizers (e.g. Abd Allah b. Ubayy) asked Banu Qurayzah, the third (and last) important Jewish group in Medina, for help. The Banu Qurayzah refused to step in. Stupidly, they remained faithful to the Prophet's **KITAB**, "document" or "Ordinance" obliging the Jews not to help the Prophet's **ADUWW**, "enemy." The Qurayzah disregarded the fact that this newly discovered, if not fabricated, 'enemy,' Banu Nadir, was a victim of the Prophet's own aggression. [When the **KITAB** was "written," all knew it referred to the Meccans as enemies]. Banu Qurayzah said that intervention in the Muslim-Banu Nadir confrontation "will be a violation of the compact between us and him (Muhammad)" (W:365). K'ab b. Asad, the Qurayza leader, declared categorically: "None among Banu Qurayzah will break the compact as long as I live" (W:369 passim).

The Banu Nadir were particularly allied with the Aus tribe. Now as a part of the Prophet's usual strategy to confront opponents with his loyalists in the same group, he sent Muhammad b. Maslama, a prominent Aus personality, to convey the ultimatum to Banu Nadir: Leave Medina within ten days. "The head of any one (from Banu Nadir) seen after that (in Medina) will be cut off," the ultimatum added. Referring to the existing covenants of mutual protection between the Aus and Banu Nadir, he said: "We never thought a person from the Aus would bring us such (a warning)." Muhammad b. Maslama, a true Muslim believer, was unmoved. He simply said: "the hearts have changed" -- **TAGHAYYARAT AL- QULUB** (W:367). When Banu Nadir, their women and children were leaving their town of Yuthrib, which had now become the Town of the Prophet (Medinat an-Nabiyy), many Medinan Arabs were sad. These were the ones Islam labeled (sing) Munafiq, hypocrites, and eventually disbelievers. Two of them, ad- Dahhak b. Khalifa and Nuaym b. Masud, could not control their emotions. They recalled the generosity and many other good sides of the Banu Nadir. Abu Abas b. Jabr, another Ausite true Muslim believer overheard them. Abu Abas the believer said sarcastically to Dahhak and

Nuaym: "Go and join them until you enter Hell along with them." Nuaym was perhaps too irritated to keep quiet. He said to Abu Abas: "What kind of reward are they (Banu Nadir) getting from you? You sought help from them and they helped you against the Khazraj, at a time when all the Arabs you approached for help refused it to you." Abu Abas could only say what the Muslims had learned to answer on all such occasions. He said "**QATA'AL-ISLAM AL-UHUD** -- "Islam has cut off all the contracts of compacts (between Muslims and non Muslims)." A Muslim would agree this was the right answer. The concerns of Abd Allah, Dahhak and Nuaym indicated their **NIFAQ** "hypocrisy" and disbelief in Islam.

The Banu Nadir story taught believers again the appropriateness of disregarding solemn pledges and undertakings concerning non-Muslims. The disappearance of another non-Muslim autonomous region and its annexation to the Dar al-Islam became another source of inspiration for believers of all times to justify Islam's expansionism. Muslims also find that those among the Prophet's contemporary Muslims who disagreed continued to lose their credentials as true believers. The Quran and the Prophet, to character assassinate such dissenters, had coined a new derogatory name for them: **MUNAFIQ**, "hypocrite", which is almost synonymous with apostate in Islamic usage. Following the Quran, a true believer would not regret Banu Nadir's fate. Had God not "predestined" Banu Nadir for expulsion, they should have been slaughtered and their women and children enslaved (Q59:3-4 cf. T,28:31). Muslims are, however, assured that the worst physical torture awaits the Banu Nadir in Gehenna (ibid). While predestining exile for Banu Nadir, the Almighty definitely knew His Messenger's pragmatic concerns. Given the rivalries between Khazraj and Aus, Muhammad would not deny a 'favor' to the 'allies' of one given to the allies of the other. In any case, explicit reports about the Qaynuga and the Quran 59:3-4 about Nadir tell believers that the Prophet would have preferred to eliminate them and enslave their women and children than let them go. This wish would be fulfilled in dealings with the Banu Qurayza.

Banu Qurayza.¹⁵

Although our sources know the Quran had authorized the Prophet to "throwback" the compacts and pledges, and that Islam per se had devalued undertakings concerning non-Muslims, the fact that such covenants existed and the difficulty of blaming the nonbelievers for the breakdown of treaties, etc. haunt our sources when they describe related events. Along with the repetition of the charges, not supported by evidence, that the Jews violated the compacts and declared war -- **HARABAT**, against the Prophet - our sources also devalue the very compacts the Jews are charged violating. Ibn Sad is an example. In his story of the Banu Qurayza, Ibn Sad admits the existence of a covenant with the Qurayza. Implicitly, Ibn Sad also admits the covenant was violated by the Prophets. To justify this, Ibn Sad tells the believers that it was "a weak and unbinding covenant" -- **WALTH MIN AL-AHD** (IS-B,2:77), without telling the reader in what sense or why. This could be taken as an apology for the tragic treatment of Banu Qurayza by the Prophet. It is a roundabout way of telling the believers the Prophet was not bound by any secular treaty with any nonbelievers.

It is interesting to note that our sources expect the Jews to have adhered to the same 'covenants' fully and enthusiastically that were **WALTH**, "weak and unbinding," and Divinely abrogated as far as Muhammad and the believers were concerned. It is with such expectations that our sources claim the Prophet had some objective reasons for complaint against the Banu Qurayza who, along with Banu Nadir and other Medinan Jews, had undertaken to support neither the Muslims nor their adversaries in a military confrontation -- **WA KAN RASUL ALLAH HIN QADIM SALAH QURAYZAT WA'N-NADIR WA MAN BI'L-MADINAT MIN AL-YAHUD AL-LA YAKUNU MAAHU WA LA ALAYH** (W:454). We have seen that during the Prophet's attack on Banu Nadir, the Banu Qurayza put the demands of solidarity with their Jewish folk aside and were faithfully neutral.

In April, 627 CE the Meccans loosely confederated with some other Arab tribes (e.g., the Ghatafan) and made a last-ditch effort to rid

themselves of Muhammad's continued raids on their trade caravans and other Arab tribal settlements. This was the famous battle of the Ditch, **KHANDAQ**, also known as the battle of Confederates -- **AHZAB**. Huyayy b. Akhtab, a Banu Nadir leader exiled to Khaybar, reportedly tried to help the Meccans. Without the knowledge and permission of the Banu Qurayza leaders, Huyayy assured the Meccans that Banu Qurayza would join them against Muhammad.

When the joint Arab army (led by the Meccans under Abu Sufyan) marched towards Medina, no Jews from Khaybar or elsewhere (except Huyayy b. Akhtab) accompanied them. However, Huyayy, a survivor of the Muslim onslaught against his people, the Banu Nadir, contacted the Banu Qurayza, pleading with them to break the treaty of neutrality and join the Confederates against Muhammad. At first, Islamic sources admit, all the responsible Banu Qurayza leaders refused even to meet Huyayy, and hated to see him enter their township -- **KARIHAT BANU QURAYZA DUKHULAHU DARAHUM** (W:455). When Kab b. Asad, the principal Qurayza leader, found Huyayy knocking at his door, he grumbled:

What shall I do with Huyayy, who wants to enter my home? He is an inauspicious man who brought sorrow to his own people (Banu Nadir); and now he is going to invite me to break the covenant (with Muhammad) (W:ibid).

Kab went to the door, and without inviting Huyayy in told him to leave the Qurayza alone, because what Huyayy was suggesting would result in "my annihilation and that of my people" (W:ibid). In response to Huyayy's further entreaties and assurances that all the Arabs were now united in besieging Medina, and that they were determined to "root out Muhammad and those with him," Kab said that he would not join Muhammad's enemies, no matter what -- **MA ANA BI-FAIL** (W:456). Kab violated well established norms of hospitality by not welcoming Huyayy as a guest. Huyayy in response tried to hurt Kab's pride by taunting him: "You have closed the door on me because you fear I will eat some of your corn" (W:ibid). This was too much for a Jewish noble of Arabia. Kab let Huyayy enter. At the table, Huyayy continued his entreaties until Kab

agreed "unwillingly" -- **KARIH-AN**, particularly when Huyayy offered to remain with the Banu Qurayza through thick and thin. Huyayy is reported to have asked for the written document of neutrality between Qurayza and Muhammad - and then tore it up. The Qurayza leaders and elders, when they heard of this, voiced their displeasure and fear of the consequences. Kab immediately expressed his regrets and repentance on allowing Huyayy to tear up the document which could have meant abrogation of the treaty (W:457). Whatever the uncertain situation in the Jewish camp, the news reached Muhammad. He must have had informers, besides Gabriel.

Unflattering verbal exchanges soon followed. From the Muslim side the Prophet, Ali, and Sad b. Maadh took an active part in the acrimony. To the surprise of the Jews, who did not expect the Prophet indulge in vulgarity, he called them "brothers of monkeys and pigs and devil-worshippers" -- **IKHWAT AL-QIRADAT WA'L-KHANAZIR WA ABADAT AT-TAWAGHIT**, whom God had disgraced (W:500; 1.1:461). Ali, the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law, called the Jews rascals (1.1:461). Usayd b. al-Hudayr called Kab "enemy of God" and "son of a Jew," obviously in a derogatory sense (W:458). Sad b. Maadh, soon to become a cut-throat 'judge' threatened the Qurayza that "the sword will do a more effective job than acrimonious exchange" (*ibid*). In a way, Sad had already decided the fate of Qurayza, which he delivered in the end.

Our sources do not indicate that Banu Qurayza moved aggressively against the Muslims except to gather in their fortresses and engage in defensive preparations. In any case, the Muslims besieged by the Arab Confederates were frightened, not knowing exactly what the Qurayza meant to do in their back yard. Whether they intended to join the Confederates against Muhammad, they were frustrated by a secret agent sent to Banu Qurayza and the Confederates.

Apparently, anticipating Qurayza's misfortunes and hoping for a share from their property, one Nuaym b. Masud, an outspoken Jewish sympathizer during the Banu Nadir affair and a well-known critic of

Muhammad (W:367), had decided to join the Islamic camp during the siege of Medina. The Prophet asked him to keep this secret, and told him to "go and wake distrust among the enemy to draw them off us if you can, for war is deceit."¹⁶ The Prophet allowed Nuaym to tell lies and use questionable methods (W:480-1). In brief Nuaym went back and forth between the Banu Qurayza and the Confederates, pretending to disbelieve in Islam and Muhammad (as before) while expressing his friendship and solidarity with both non-Muslim camps. Neither the Jews nor the Meccans knew of his recent contacts with Muhammad nor of his secret mission of sabotage. Pretending sympathy for the Jews, he warned them of dangers involved in siding with the Meccans and their Arab confederates without having any dependable guarantee from them. Whether the Meccans win or lose, Nuaym said, they will return to their town and leave Banu Qurayza to the mercy of the Medinan Muslims. He suggested to Banu Qurayza that they demand, before joining the Confederates, a number of Meccans remain as surety in the Qurayza township as long as they were needed for their security. The Banu Qurayza were convinced of Nuaym's wisdom and sincerity. Nuaym rushed in secret to the Meccan-Confederate camp where he was welcomed as a fellow non-Muslim. However, there he spoke a different language. He told the Confederates that the Banu Qurayza had hatched a conspiracy against them to please Muhammad. The Banu Qurayza were going to ask for hostages from the Meccans, Nuaym said, on certain pretexts. But, Nuaym warned, the real intention of the Banu Qurayza was to hand over these Meccan hostages to be beheaded by Muhammad. This was at a time when the Confederates anxiously awaited active support for the Banu Qurayza as Huyayy had promised and reassured. Abu Sufyan pressed for action on the Qurayza side. The Qurayza, as Nuaym had convinced them, demanded surety. Hearing this, the Meccans were sure of the 'treacherous intentions' of the Qurayza, just as Nuaym had warned. (The Prophet used other methods - such as offering a bribe to the Ghatafan tribe, a part of the Confederates - to destabilize and demoralize the confederation from within.) Finally, the

Qurayza refused to help the Meccans against Muhammad without having Meccan hostages and the Meccans were too frightened by the Muslim secret agent to meet the demand. The short-lived, theoretically united front of the non-Muslims collapsed. Abu Sufyan lifted the siege in disgust and left for Mecca, cursing Huyayy ironically as "Oh Jew" -- **YA YAHUDI**, and grumbling about the Qurayza: "It is futile to expect help from these brothers of monkeys and pigs" (W:485-6). Nuaym's tricks, masterminded by Muhammad, left the Qurayza to deal with the worst of their friends and foes.

Given the presence of Muhammad's informers in the Jewish camp, he must have known about Qurayza reluctance to accept Huyayy's proposal. It was disowned and, in practice, rejected by all the Qurayza. The Prophet and his followers knew perfectly well that the Jews of Banu Qurayza had remained neutral. Practically, the tilt was in favor of the believers and against the Meccans. The Banu Qurayza had gladly put their 'technological' resources at Muhammad's disposal to protect Medina against the Meccan-Confederate invaders.

They borrowed a large amount of instruments such as mattocks, hoes and large baskets from Banu Qurayza to dig the moat [that saved the besieged Medina during the Battle of the Moat, **GHAZWAT AL-KHANDAQ**] -- **ISTAARU MIN BANI QURAYZAT ALAT-AN KATHIRAT-AN MIN MASAHI WA KARAZIN WA MAKATIL, YAHFIRUN BIHI'L-KHANDAQ** (W:445; brackets added).

Al-Waqidi also admits that when the siege began Banu Qurayza were at peace with the Prophet and that they loathed the Meccan invasion of Medina -- **WA HUM YAUMAIDHIN SILM-UN LI'N-NABIY, YAKRAHUN QUDUM QURAYSH** (W:445-6). Also, after the siege was over, as contemporary Muslims in Medina saw it, no action was needed against the Qurayza. As Sad b. Ubada and al-Hubab b. al-Mundhir, the Prophet's two important Companions, later told him, the Aus, in view of their solemn alliance with the Qurayza, abhorred the massacre of Banu Qurayza -- **WA JAA SAD BIN UBADAH WA'L-HUBAB BIN AL-MUNDHIR FA-QALA: YA RASUL ALLAH, INN AL-AUS KARIHAT QATL BANI QURAYZA LI-MAKAN HILFIHIM** (W:515). Had Medinan public opinion supported the Prophet's following treatment of Banu Qurayza, he would not have waited for Gabriel to convey the Almighty's

instructions in this regard.

The Prophet, apparently in league with Gabriel and God, had to do something for three reasons: 1) During the verbal quarrel with the Qurayza, some Jews are reported to have used harsh language addressing the Prophet, though the Jews denied having done so. The Prophet was always sensitive to personal criticism. From among the prisoners of war at Badr he had particularly chosen an-Nadr for instant execution. During the Meccan phase an-Nadr had claimed his legends were superior or as good as those of the Quran, thus questioning Muhammad's claim that the Quran was the Word of God. The Jews had never believed that Muhammad received revelation from God, and had occasionally pointed to inconsistencies, from their point of view, between Muhammad's actions and his claim to be a man of God. The Prophet would not forgive such "rascals" and "enemies of God," as his followers had mentioned. 2) Something had to be done to compensate for the humiliation, losses and troubles the Muslims had experienced during the siege. After all, previously, with the downfall of Qaynuqa and Banu Nadir, the believers had inherited the property and rich lands of the Jews. Banu Qurayza were too prosperous not to be coveted. 3) At a time prominent Ausite leaders and their people were disgruntled about, if not openly against the Prophet's harsh treatment of Qurayza, it was a golden opportunity for Sad b. Maadh to demonstrate his firm loyalty to Muhammad and be promoted by the Prophet to the highest position among the Aus.^{16a} When the Ausite anger against Muhammad's harsh treatment of the Qurayza was reported, Sad b. Maadh put them in an embarrassing situation by remarking, addressing the Prophet speciously: "No Ausite with sound (character) would detest it (i.e., the massacre of the Qurayza); if any did so, God would frown on them -- **FA-QAL SAD BIN MAADH: YA RASUL ALLAH, MA KARIH MIN AL-AUS MAN FIH KHAYR-UN; FA-MAN KARIH MIN AL-AUS LA ARDAH'ULLAH** (W:515). This was like charging a comrade with high treason. It worked. The opponents were silenced.

Now this Sad b. Maadh, who had already threatened to treat the

Qurayza with the sword, lay badly wounded by a Confederate's arrow, at the verge of death. Before the siege ended, he prayed to God to keep him alive "to cool his heart and eyes by (massacring Banu Qurayza before his death" -- **DAA'LLAH AN LA YUMITAH-U HATTA YUSHFI SADRAH-U** (IS-B,2:77) **WA LA TUMITUNI HATTA TUQIRR AINI MIN BANI QURAYZA** (W:512). Al-Waqidi tells us: God indeed provided "coolness for his eyes by (massacring) them (i.e. the Qurayza)" (W:ibid). Apparently, even with all this provocation, there was not enough justification for what the Prophet wanted to do with the Qurayza. He needed another kind of casus belli, a Divine one. Let us quote Ibn Ishaq for a view of the event as a believer saw it. Just after the Confederates lifted the siege,

Gabriel came to the Apostle wearing an embroidered turban and riding on a mule with a saddle covered with a piece of brocade. He asked the Apostle if he had abandoned fighting, and when he said that he had he said that the angels had not laid aside their arms and that he had just come from pursuing the enemy. God commands you, Muhammad, to go to Banu Qurayza. I am about to go to them to shake their stronghold (1.1:461; also see W:497 passim).

Acting on this divine commandment, the Prophet mobilized the believers. They besieged the Jews of Banu Qurayza, who took to their fortresses.

The Banu Qurayza knew their fate was sealed. Though some of their leaders suggested they resist, they decided not to. On the basis of mutually protective relations, they appealed to their Ausite allies for help. Most of the Aus were now Muslims. As believers they were not expected to displease God and His Last Messenger; they had to disregard the call of their conscience. Yet, apparently, they were not ready to see their Banu Qurayza allies punished all out of proportion to their alleged crimes, if any. That the Prophet asked, though questionably, an Ausite leader, Sad b. Maadh, to decide the fate of the Jews rather than acting directly indicates that Muhammad understood the embarrassing situation.

The Banu Qurayza were ready to accept the fate of Banu Qanuqa and Banu Nadir: to be allowed to quit Medina, deserting their property. However, God, Muhammad and some of his followers (like Sad b. Maadh) had something else in mind. The Prophet demanded an unconditional

surrender. In order to know what was in the Prophet's mind the Banu Qurayza asked to meet an Ausite Muslim ally, Abu Lubaba (W:506-9). Abu Lubaba, moved by the weeping Qurayza women and children, and perhaps in a fit of moral duty, told them what he knew of the Prophet's intentions: that they were all going to be slaughtered. Abu Lubaba immediately realized that he had committed disloyalty to the Prophet by telling Banu Qurayza the truth. This would dub him as a **MUNAFIQ**, "hypocrite" and, thus, he would be character assassinated. The social pressure of the believer was too much to bear. He could be ostracized by the whole Muslim community. On his return to the Muslim camp, Abu Lubaba was so frightened that he bound himself to a pillar in the mosque and prayed for forgiveness. "I would not leave this place until God forgives me for what I have done," he said, and "promised God he would never go to the Banu Qurayza..." (1.1:462; 746). The Prophet left Abu Lubaba so tied to warn other Muslims against showing any sympathy for the Jews. During this period he was ostracized even by his own family. Six days of punishment for sympathizing with the Jews were enough. Abu Lubaba and others had had their lesson. Finally revelation came from God, as the Prophet said, forgiving Abu Lubaba, of course with a stern warning: "O ye who believe, do not betray God and the Apostle and be false to your engagements while you know what you are doing" (1.1(1.H):764, cf. Q8:27; 9:102).

When the Qurayza surrendered unconditionally and they were bound and confined, many Ausite Muslims became more concerned about the fate of their allies. Feeling their moral responsibility, they became increasingly disturbed and repeatedly asked the Prophet to show mercy to their allies. Reminding the Prophet of his 'concession' to the allies of the Khazraj Muslims (to the Qaynuqa), the Aus put forward a minimal request: to exile Banu Qurayza rather than kill them. Confronting this serious moral and political situation, in which his own previous undertakings and those of his fellow-Ausite Muslims were involved, the Prophet kept quiet, avoiding any response to the Aus entreaties. After

a while, he had a master stroke. He asked the Aus if they would agree to let one of their own decide the matter. The Aus agreed, obviously never thinking that Sad b. Maadh (an Ausite), an avowed enemy of the Qurayza, who lay on his death-bed, would be brought in to be a neutral judge. Sad had already vowed to teach the Qurayza a memorable lesson. As soon as the Prophet nominated Sad and ordered the dying man be fetched on a donkey, some Ausites rushed to their clans to tell them the fate of the Qurayza was sealed. However, they had given their word. The only thing some Ausites could do was to entreat the exhausted but vengeful Sad to "deal with his allies kindly" (W:512; 1.1:464). When Sad arrived, the Prophet, perhaps realizing the ambiguity some felt about his choice of a judge, took the unusual step of asking the audience to stand up in order to pay their respects to Sad. To be sure his verdict would be carried out unanimously, Sad asked the audience, particularly the Aus, if they "covenanted by Allah" to accept his judgement. The Aus said, apparently grumbling, that they had already done so, but added ironically and anxiously: "with the hope that you will oblige us by doing what was done by someone other than you about his Qaynuqa allies (i.e. sparing their lives)" (W:512; 1.1:564). On his way to the emergency Islamic court, responding to the entreaties of Qurayza sympathizers, Sad had already frankllytated whose desires were more important to him to fulfill. He had said:

The time has come for Sad, in the cause of God, not to care for any man's censure (1.1:463; W:511).

Sad's prompt verdict was as follows: "I give judgement that the men should be killed, the property divided, and the women and children enslaved" (1.1:464; W:512). The Prophet exclaimed: "You have given the judgement of Allah above the seven heavens" (*ibid*). Of course the Almighty soon confirmed that Sad and Muhammad did exactly what He wanted (Q33:26). Note that immediately after his report on Sad's decision and the Prophet's confirmation, al- Waqidi reminds the reader unapologetically, of Sad's previous desire to "cool his eyes" (with the

massacre of Banu Qurayza) (W:512).

Just before the slaughter began a brief crisis ensued. This was the time when Ubadah b. as-Samit and Hubab b. al-Mundhir had reminded the Prophet that the Aus detested the wholesale bloodshed of their allies, the Banu Qurayza (W:515). Sad b. Maadh had learned enough in the school of the Quran and Muhammad to subdue such a crisis of conscience. Sad b. Maadh denigrated such dissenting Ausites calling them people without KHAYR "good (character)," and warned them of God's displeasure (ibid). Usayd b. Hudayr, a loyalist (to Muhammad) Muslim came with a master stroke to involve all the Aus in the massacre, leaving no choice for the disgruntled Ausites but between outright rebellion and blindly following the Prophet and the Quran. Usayd proposed: "O Messenger of God, distribute them (i.e., the Qurayza to be slaughtered) among all Ausite households (and sub-clans)". Those who resent this, i.e. do not participate in the slaughter must bear the consequences before God, Usayd added (ibid). Usayd promptly volunteered to slaughter two of the Qurayza. The proposal was imposed. On the orders of the Prophet Muhammad about 900 Banu Qurayza adult males, along with a woman and Huyayy b. Akhtab who had bravely stayed with his people, were brought from confinement in batches, beheaded, and thrown in trenches specially dug in the market of Medina - most probably with the help of the tools borrowed from the Qurayza and now confiscated (1.1:464; W:513-20).

Usayd, as he had volunteered, was the first to chop off the head of a Qurayza. The second was beheaded by Abu Nailah, another member of Usayd's household or sub-clan. As Usayd had suggested each sub-clan or household of Aus was given two Qurayza Jews as their share to slaughter. It was done (W:515-6 passim). The honor to slaughter the leaders of the Banu Qurayza was reserved for Muhammad. Kab b. Asad, the most senior Qurayza leader, with his hands tied behind his neck was paraded before the Prophet who scolded him for disbelieving in his Prophethood. Muhammad did not mention any other reason, such as violation of any

undertaking, for his treatment of the Qurayza. Apparently the Prophet hoped Kab would yield in this last moment. Kab's response was polite but firm; "I follow the religion of the Jews" -- WALAKINNI ALA DIN AL-YAHUD, he said with calm and dignity (W:516). "Bring him forward so that I cut off his neck" -- QADDIMHU FA-ADRIB UNUQAHU, the Prophet commanded the Muslim guard (ibid). The guard brought Kab forward and the Prophet cut his neck -- FA-QADDAMAHU FA-DARAB UNUQAHU (ibid). Huyayy ibn Akhtab was, apparently, the second to be slaughtered personally by the Prophet. Huyayy was less polite than Kab. Just before he was beheaded, Huyayy again demonstrated his stubbornness. He addressed Muhammad: "By God, I do not blame myself for opposing you" (1.1:464 cf. W:516 passim). After slaying personally two other Qurayza leaders the Prophet told Sad b. Maadh: "It is your turn to deal with the rest" -- QAL LI-SAD IBN MAADH: ALAYK BI-MAN BAQA (W:516). Perhaps, the Prophet was tired or wanted to share the honor with Sad who had pacified the Aus for Islam.

Nubata, a Jewish woman, was among those beheaded, apparently, by the Prophet himself (see W:529 cf. W:516- 7). She loved her husband and her husband loved her -- YUHIBBUHA WA TUHIBBUHU (W:516). During the siege she wept and told her husband "(I know) you will soon leave me" (ibid), i.e., will be killed. Anticipating the fate of her husband she had intentionally acted during the siege in such a way that she could be killed after surrender rather than be enslaved. Nubata dislodged a millstone from the fortress that hit and killed a besieging Muslim. Apparently, this was the only active resistance by a Jew during the event. The Prophet decreed her execution (W:516-7, 529). The high morale of Nubata surprised Aisha, the youngest beloved wife of the Prophet. Aisha "used to say, 'I shall never forget my wonder at her good spirits and her loud laughter when all the time she knew she would be killed'" (1.1:465).

Thabit b. Qays, an Ausite Muslim, was supposed to behead az-Zabir b. Bata, a prominent elderly Qurayza Jew to whom Thabit was indebted.

Morally embarrassed by the situation Thabit did not want to kill his kind benefactor. Thabit asked the Prophet for clemency which was granted. Thabit informed his benefactor, az-Zabir, that his life was saved. Az-Zabir asked about many of his Jewish comrades mentioning eloquently their names one by one and their virtues. After he was told that all had been beheaded, Zabir rejected the offer. He was too high-minded to save his life while all of his men were deprived of theirs. Zabir the Jew was also too brave to beg for life. He said:

'Then I ask of you, Thabit, by my claim on you that you join me with my people, for life holds no joy now that they are dead, and I cannot bear to wait another moment to meet my loved ones.' So Thabit went up to him and struck off his head (1.1:465; W:518-20).

For believers, obviously, it is the response of the second-most-powerful man of Islam, Abu Bakr, which must be imitated when the victim of a tragedy is a non-Muslim. On hearing what Zabir said, Abu Bakr giped: "Yes by Allah he will meet them in hell for ever and ever" (*ibid*).

In the eyes of some contemporary Arab observers (such as Jabal b. Jawwal, the poet), the Muslims "were blind to shame" (1.1:482) by violating their undertakings with the Banu Qurayza and Banu Nadir. But what is important for a Muslim is to know how God, His Messenger and the true believers felt. The verdicts of God, His Prophet and some prominent believers have been seen. Hassan b. Thabit, the Prophet's poet laureate, with other Muslim poets and commentators, faithfully applauded the Muslim violation of the covenant with the non-Muslims. After Sad was dead, just after passing and executing his verdict on the Banu Qurayza, Hassan verified:

By pronouncing on the two tribes of Qurayza the same judgement/ which God had decreed against them you did not judge of your own volition.

Your judgement and God's were at one/ and you did not forgive when you were reminded of a covenant. / Though fate has brought you to your death/ among those who sold their lives for everlasting gardens/ yet blessed is the state of the true ones/ when they are summoned to God for favor and regard (1.1:479; stress added).

Apparently, rumors and misgivings about Sad's verdict on the Jews continued. For this very reason the Prophet had to go out of his way to

restore Sad's image. On irrelevant occasions the Prophet praised him, and mentioned his high status with God. Some of the critics who were carrying Sad's bier found his corpse lighter than they expected. Sad was a fat man. Referring to Sad's unfair treatment of the Qurayza they said something sarcastically about the transformation: "He is deflated (as divine punishment, for his judgment against Qurayza -- **KHAFF LI-ANNAHU HAKAM FI BANI QURAYZA** (W:528; parentheses added). When the Prophet heard this, he said that the bier seemed lighter because the angels were also carrying it. And then he said: "By Him Who holds my life in His hand, the angels rejoiced at receiving the spirit of Sad, and (God's) throne shook for him," i.e., in grief for his death (1.1:468-9; W:525-9). Long after that in December, 630 CE, the Muslims were covetously admiring a gown of brocade covered with gold which was part of the booty gained during their attack on Dumat al-Jandal (on the peripheries of the Byzantine empire). The Prophet then reminded the believers that the **MINDIL**, (headkerchiefs) of Sad in Paradise were more beautiful than this Syrian gown they were feeling so greedily (W:1026; 1.1:607-8).

The Treaty of Hudaibia: A Truce aimed at Peaceful Coexistence that Culminates in the Conquest of Mecca.

In February, 628 CE the Prophet and the believers in Medina left unexpectedly for Mecca. Pilgrimage was their declared intention. He invited the tribes around Medina and along his way to Mecca to join him. The Meccans were obviously surprised by the Prophet's move, for they were in a state of war. The Meccans, unsure of his intentions, decided to refuse the Prophet entry to their city. After they realized the Meccan decision, the Prophet, his followers and supporters stopped at Hudaibiyah, a plain at a short day's march to Mecca. During an exchange of messengers, the Prophet insisted he was there for the peaceful purpose of pilgrimage. To allow without permission their enemy in war

to enter their city was humiliating. They were also not sure about Muhammad's intentions. After an exchange of messages and talks, finally the Prophet and Suhayl b. Amr, representing the Meccans, signed the following famous treaty of Hudaibia which we have divided into six clauses.

This is what Muhammad b. Abdullah has agreed with Suhayl b. 'Amr: they have agreed

1. to lay aside war for ten years during which men can be safe and refrain from hostilities on condition that
2. if anyone comes to Muhammad without permission of his guardian he will return him to them; and if anyone of those with Muhammad comes to Quraysh they will not return him to him;
3. we will not show enmity one to another and there shall be no secret reservation or bad faith;
4. he who wishes to enter into a bond and agreement with Muhammad may do so and he who wishes to enter into a bond and agreement with Quraysh may do so. Here Khuza'a leapt up and said, 'We are in a bond and agreement with Muhammad,' and B. Bakr leapt up and said the same with regard to Quraysh, adding
5. 'you must retire from us this year and not enter Mecca against our will, and
6. next year we will make way for you and you can enter it with your companions, and stay there three nights. You may carry a rider's weapons, the swords in their sheaths. You can bring in nothing more (1.1:540; cf. W:611- 12).

Particular points in the Treaty of Hudaibiya are important: 1) A ten-year truce and cease-fire was agreed upon between the Muslims and the Meccan non-Muslims; 2) Both sides promised to refrain from any kind of hostilities; 3) the Prophet was bound to return to Mecca anyone leaving without the permission of his or her guardians. Muslims or their sympathisers living in Mecca could not leave to join the Prophet; 4) Both parties agreed to stop their antagonisms toward one another; they agreed to refrain from any secret or indirect attempt or activity to undermine the spirit of the agreement or to sabotage it in questionable ways -- **LA ISLAL WA LA IGHLAL, WA INN BAYNANA AYBAT MAKFUFAH** (W:611). That is what "We will not show enmity one to another and there shall be no secret reservation or bad faith" meant. Thus, the parties were bound not to intrigue; 5) the Muslims were asked to return,

but without trying to enter Mecca that year. However, they were allowed to enter Mecca after a year for pilgrimage without expecting to be entertained by the Meccans who would vacate the town; 6) the Muslims as pilgrims were allowed to remain only three days in Mecca; no procrastination was expected; 7) the non-Meccan third parties were free to join either one of the two principal groups as allies. However, the document does not specifically say that the principal groups (i.e. the Muslims and the Meccan Quraysh non-Muslims) will be responsible for the individual or group activities of their allies; 8) the Muslims returning the next year as pilgrims will carry only their riders' weapons, swords in scabbards, and no more arms. Note, too, that it was only a one-time permission for the Muslims to enter Mecca collectively as pilgrims. The Pact did not indicate a perpetual right for Muslims to do so without Meccan permission.

The following is an examination of the degree of seriousness and loyalty of Muslim believers shown in Islamic sources toward the Pact of Hdaybia. We will argue that the Prophet's and the Quran's treatment of this solemn pact, as described in Islamic sources, teaches Muslims disrespect and disregard of all similar covenants with non-Muslims. The material about Hdaybia can be divided chronologically into three segments: 1) Events related to the period before the Pact; 2) those during and just after the Pact; and 3) Muslim activities after they reached Medina, culminating in the conquest of Mecca long before the ten years of truce ended.

1) The Prophet Muhammad's decision to leave on pilgrimage to Mecca was inspired by a divine vision in which he saw himself entering the Kaba and obtaining its keys. When he left Medina, his 1500 or so companions were sure about their future conquest of Mecca -- **WA KHARAJ ASHAB RASUL ALLAH MAAHU LA YASHUKKUN FI'L-FATH** (W:572). It was not intended as a merely peaceful pilgrimage, as the Prophet later said. The Prophet's companions set forth bent on occupying Mecca as inspired by Muhammad's vision (1.1:505). This was the reason for Muslim

disappointment when the Prophet signed the Pact and returned to Medina without conquering Mecca that year (*ibid*). The Prophet had expected in vain many more tribesmen with needed provisions to accompany him (W:575). He had also expected that merely by his show of force, the Meccans would be too demoralized to resist his entry and occupation of Mecca. This was his very method twenty months later. It conquered the city. After confronting Meccan resistance, the Prophet spoke of his peaceful intent, i.e., he wanted to perform pilgrimage and return. This does not conform with what we know of the Prophet's vision and the Muslim drive to occupy Mecca. Obviously, believers have to interpret this untrue statement of intent as divinely sanctioned **KAYD, MAKR or HILAH**. The vision came true very soon. Muslim minds do not really care about the need for the Prophet to have honored the treaty during its run. The materialization of the vision was, and remains, more important for the believers than the demonstration of respect for the Pact in a literal and moral sense. Some other reports tell Muslims more about the Prophet's aggressive intentions.

Before the Prophet was convinced at Hadaybiya that he could not enter Mecca without a bloody confrontation (whose consequence was unknown), he did not cease to promise the followers God would help in the adventure. He ordered five hundred fires lit in the camp, which became one of his favorite tactics to exaggerate the number of his forces to the enemy, some distance off, and so terrorize them (W:585).

The Prophet had confidential parleys near Mecca with two of his Arab allies, Bishr b. Sufyan al-Kalbi and Budayl b. Warqa al-Khuzai. He told them frankly of his real intentions and strategies (W:593; 1.1:500-1). Confiding in Bishr, apparently a secret agent for the Prophet, the Prophet said that by entering Mecca and pretending to be a formidable force therein, he would leave the Quraysh for a time alone, i.e., would not compel them to become Muslims. Rather, he continued, he wanted first (exploiting the Meccan base?) to deal with the other Arabs. [He did exactly this after the conquest of Mecca.] "If they (the Arab

Bedouins) kill me," the Prophet said, "that is what they (the Quraysh) desire, and if God should give me the victory over them, they would enter Islam in flocks." However, the Prophet warned: "By Allah, I will not cease to fight for the mission with which God has entrusted me, until He makes it victorious or I perish" (1.1:500). The Prophet said similar things to his other secret ally and agent, Budayl al-Khuzai, adding that he would fight the Quraysh to death if they tried to block his way to Mecca, observing that the war had already harmed and exhausted the Meccans. The Prophet however, repeated his offer that the Quraysh (after Muhammad's establishment in Mecca?) would be given some protection time if they wanted it (until they decided to become Muslim, voluntarily), -- **FA MAN SADDANA ANHU QATALNAHU; WA QURAYSH QAUM-UN QAD ADARRAT BIHIM AL-HARB WA NAHAKATHUM. FA IN SAAU MADADTUHUM MUDDAT-AN YAMANUN FIHA...** (W:593; cf. 1.1:501). These secret agents of the Prophet went to frighten the Quraysh by exaggerating Muhammad's power and reminding the Quraysh of their weakness. But some of the hard-line Quraysh, such as Ikrima b. Abu Jahl and al-Hakam b. al-As, refused to talk, and called the agents what they were, spies for Muhammad. They simply told the agents to tell Muhammad to forget about entering Mecca as long as even one Quraysh was alive (W:594). The Quraysh, however, - were as usual divided and much less disciplined than the Muslims. Other elders, such as Urwa b. Masud, allowed Muhammad's agents to talk. The Quraysh became frightened enough to start negotiations. During the negotiations, the Prophet and his followers adopted severe "carrot-and-stick" methods which further divided and demoralized the Meccans, who gave Muhammad two important concessions: he could return to Mecca the next year, and have the freedom to make alliances and contacts in peace with other Arabs.

In describing these events, our sources emphasize for believers that the Pact of Hudaibia was not preceded by any real intentions among the Muslims for establishing long-term peace between the Muslims and non-Muslims. Believers are also told the Pact was acceptable not

because Islam desired a permanent, peaceful coexistence but for the chance it gave Islam to pursue its expansionist and aggressive objectives. Muslims were able to exploit the very instrument of a truce (1.1:507) which had resulted from the non-believers' desire for peaceful coexistence and their hope of getting rid of Muslim raids on their trade caravans.

2) The way the descriptions appreciate a particular incident in the Muslim camp at al-Hudaybia counters the respect one would expect for a solemn treaty just concluded. One clause of the treaty bound the Muslims to return any new fugitive to the Meccans unless the latter gave permission to keep him. Another clause read that the Pact would be obeyed faithfully; there will be no secret bad faith nor treachery -- **LA ISLAL WA LA IGHLAL**, the document had emphasized. Perhaps the Meccans thought of the likelihood of treachery by the other party. Hence this meticulous language.

Just after the Pact was signed, and before the meeting had dispersed, Abu Jandal, a young man from Mecca and the son of the plenipotentiary Suhayl b. Amr, entered the scene. Abu Jandal had become a Muslim and wanted to leave Mecca with the Prophet's party. Suhayl was quick to demand repatriation according to the agreement. told The Prophet, being in Meccan jurisdiction and having signed the pact, had no other choice but to agree. However, our sources note appreciatively some of the Prophet's gestures and Muslim intents. They will probably inspire believers to break such covenants with non-Muslims. The Prophet actually equivocated. First, apparently in a manner Sahl could hear, he told Abu Jandal that, having invoked God in the agreement, he could "not deal falsely" with the Quraysh; so, Abu Jandal had to go back to his guardians. Then the Prophet, perhaps whispering, assured Abu Jandal that "God will provide relief and means of escape for you and those of you who are helpless" (1.1:505, W:608). Umar b. al-Khattab was more explicit. He stood by Abu Jandal, encouraging him to take his (Umar's) sword and kill his father, who insisted on taking his son back,

according to the treaty. Umar was telling Abu Jandal the believer not - to hesitate to kill his own heathen father. Referring to Suhayl, Umar told Abu Jandal: "indeed they are polytheists, and the blood of one of them is like the blood of a dog" -- **FA INNAMA HUM AL-MUSHRIKUN, WA INNAMA DAM AHADIHIM DAM AL-KALB** (W:608-9). "Thus it is permissible for a man to kill his own father in the name of God. By God, had we (so) found our fathers we would have killed them for the sake of God," Umar added (ibid). Fortunately for the heathen father, and thanks, perhaps, to Abu Jandal's realization that being in Meccan jurisdiction he was not sure of escaping the consequences, he abstained from patricide.

The Prophet, however, did not reprove Umar for his treacherous provocation. Instead, he reassured Umar that the vision of conquering Mecca would indeed materialize, though not necessarily during that trip (W:609). One may genuinely argue that had Abu Jandal killed his father and escaped the immediate consequences, Abu Jandal and Umar would today be praised as Muslim heroes, rather than criticized for their treachery against the letter and spirit of a standing pact with nonbelievers. As a matter of fact al-Waqidi, Ibn Ishaq and other Islamic sources mention Umar's activities here appreciatively and then tell the readers to rejoice that just twenty months after the uncomfortable Hdaybiya treaty, all that the Muslim "hard-liners" yearned for did take place. They express no concern for the breakdown of the treaty long before its scheduled end.

The Quranic sura al-Fath (48), "The Victory," is an important source on the Treaty of Hdaybiya. Being the "Word of God," it carries more weight for believers than any other consideration of the Pact of Hdaybiya. The sura was revealed when the Muslims were on their way back to Medina from Hdaybiya. The sura was meant, among other purposes, to satisfy Muslim hardliners, who had failed to understand the Prophet's strategic and real objectives and intentions in signing the agreement. The whole sura, particularly the last three culminating verses (48:27-9), told the believers in various ways that they were not

going to wait for ten years in peace with the Meccans and other nonbelievers, nor were they supposed to live peacefully as friends with the non-Muslims.

The Quran reminded the believers of the Meccans' unforgivable crime, disbelief in Islam, and their alleged injustices: "They are the ones who disbelieved and barred you from the Holy Mosque" (48:25). In the same verse, the reason for the Prophet's decision not to fight and instead sign an apparent peace treaty was explained: It was not because the Prophet really wanted peace and tranquility between the Muslims and non-Muslims.

If it had not been for certain men believers and certain women believers, whom you knew not, lest you should trample them and there befall you guilt unwittingly on their account... had they been separated clearly, then We would have chastised the unbelievers among them with a painful chastisement (Q48:25).

As Tabari explains, Mecca sheltered some unknown followers of Islam detained by the Quraysh. Had the Muslims attacked Mecca then, these hidden Muslims might have been harmed and killed by the Prophet's companions unintentionally. God did not want this to happen. If these Muslims in Mecca could be distinguished, God would have indeed slaughtered the rest (i.e. the non-Muslims of Mecca) with the swords (of the believers) and would have destroyed them -- **LA QATALAHUM MAN BAQIA FIHA BI'S-SAYF** (T,26:102-3). Obviously with such Divine interpretation of the pact, it was devalued in the minds of the believers as far as the treaty's literal and moral obligations were concerned.

This was not enough, however. The Quran told the believers that God would indeed fulfill the vision He had vouchsafed to the Prophet: that the Muslims would soon enter Mecca in security and the Muslims would soon gain victory, not only over Mecca but also, as referred to throughout the sura and Tabari's relevant commentaries, over the Jewish region of Khaybar, other powerful Arab tribes (such as Hawazin and Thaqif), and over the empires of Persia and Byzantium -- **INN ALLAH FATIH-UN ALAYHIM MECCA WA GHAYRAHA MIN AL-BULDAN** which are named in

Tabari's relevant parts of the commentaries. The believers were told that Islam was the only true religion and God would impose it on all other creeds, making them null and void -- **WA YUZHIR AL-ISLAM ALA'L-ADYAN KULLIHA... LIYABTIL BIHI AL-MILAL KULLAHA** - There will soon be no other religion but Islam -- **HAA LA YAKUN DIN SIWAHU**. Contrary to the expected spirit of the Pact, the Quranic passage enjoined Muslims to be "hard against the unbelievers" -- **ASHIDDA ALA'L-KUFFAR** and "a (permanent) source of rage and wrath for them" -- **LI YAGHIZ BHIM AL-KUFFAR** (Q48:27-9; T,26:106-16).

The sura also denounced the so-called al-Munafiqun (hypocrites), who had misgivings about the Hudaibiya adventure, and the Bedouins who had refused to join the Prophet's expedition. The Muslims who had remained loyal to the Prophet and ready to fight the Meccans were praised and promised not only Paradise but also "large amounts of booty" to be gained in the near future during victories over various groups of nonbelievers. Those who had not cooperated with the Muslims during the Hudaibiya expedition were, however, given a chance to become involved in the forthcoming onslaughts against the world beyond Islam:

Say to the Bedouins who were left behind: 'You shall be called against a people possessed of great might to fight them, until they surrender (become Muslims). If you obey, God will give you a goodly wage; but if you turn your backs, as you turned your backs before, He will chastise you with a painful chastisement (48:16).

These powerful peoples whom the Muslims, according to the Divine prediction and commandment, were soon going to fight included, according to Tabari's sources, Arabian tribes, Persians, Byzantines and many other nonbelieving groups (T,26:82-84). Thus the sura al-Fath, instead of encouraging the believers to abide by the requirements of the Treaty of al-Hudaibiya, talked not only of the fulfillment of the vision of the imminent occupation of Mecca but also prepared the believers to undertake other aggressive and expansionist ventures as long as the maintenance of the truce with the Meccans served Muslim interests. The Meccan image portrayed by the Quran was not conducive to the creation and preservation of good-will between the two parties.

Thus, long before the Meccans were alleged to have violated the treaty, Muslim awareness of the occasion of revelation, the contents and the interpretation of the sura "Victory" (48) was less likely to encourage their faithfulness to the letter and spirit of the Treaty of al-Hudaybiya. We have no reason to think that believers, committed to following the Quran and Sunnah in their conduct of relations with non-Muslims, after reading such accounts and treatments of the Hudaybiya Pact will be more concerned about the letter and spirit of treaty agreements with the world beyond Islam.

The Abu Busayr Affair:17(A Discussion of Hudaybiya Continued).

The clause in the Hudaybiya Treaty obliging the Prophet to extradite any fugitive Meccan Muslim soon confronted the Muslims with a real test of their faithfulness to the treaty. The Prophet's reaching Medina, and the truce, had given hopes to the Meccans they could safely resume their trading, especially along the Hijaz-Syria route - which had been endangered by Muslim raids from Medina. The Meccans soon found that seventy Muslims, led by Abu Busayr, were wreaking havoc with the lives and property of Meccan caravans engaged in peaceful trade along that very road. Following their liberal traditions of debate, the Meccans could not unanimously evaluate the extent of the Prophet's responsibility for this new source of attack on their caravans; they remained divided on whether the Prophet and his followers had violated the relevant clause of the treaty.

Abu Busayr was a Muslim who went to Medina after Hudaybiya against the wishes of his Muslim guardians. Three days after he reached Medina, the Prophet having not acted to return him to Mecca or to ascertain whether his guardians had agreed to his departure from Mecca, a two-man Meccan delegation reached Medina with a letter demanding his return. The Prophet asked Abu Busayr to go with two Meccans expressing the need to be faithful to the treaty. However, he also said something to Abu Busayr that would inspire consequent actions of Abu Busayr, other

Muslims detained in Mecca and of some of the Prophet's close companions, such as Umar. These actions indicate bad faith and treachery -- **ISLAL WA IGHMAL**, towards a solemn treaty. Referring to the Prophet's handling of the Abu Busayr affair, Shuayl b. Amr the Meccan signatory of the Treaty, had remarked: "By God, we had not come to peace with Muhammad for this (kind of treatment of the peace arrangement)" -- **WA'LLAH MA SALAHNA MUHAMMAD ALA HADHA** (W:627). Our sources, however, convey to believing readers appreciation and satisfaction for the actions of the Prophet, his companions involved, Abu Busayr and his band of highwaymen. They tell us, with great satisfaction, that when Abu Busayr died a mosque was built on his grave and that the Prophet encouraged the Muslims at Medina to mourn the death of one of the Abu Busayr gang (W:629).

The Prophet told Abu Busayr to go with the two Meccan messengers. He also told him that "God will bring relief and a way of escape to those helpless like you" (1.1:507). Fortunately, al-Waqidi gives us more information about the way Muslims took these suggestive words. Before Abu Busayr left Medina with his two Meccan escorts, some Muslims whispered to him, referring to what the Prophet had said: "O Abu Busayr, take it as a good news (and a meaningful gesture). God is indeed going to make soon a way of escape for you." Then they continued encouraging Abu Busayr to grasp the real meaning of what the Prophet had said. They told him confidentially: "(Some times) one man can deal with one thousand men. Do it (man), do it!" (W:625). For any reader, it is obvious the Prophet's companions were advising Abu Busayr to kill his escorts on his way to Mecca and escape. They told Abu Busayr that was what the Prophet wanted him to do. During the journey back to Mecca, Abu Busayr cleverly gained the confidence of his two captors. In a stopping place, his captors, unaware, invited Abu Busayr to join them at lunch. Abu Busayr engaged them in conversation and asked one: "Can I have a look at your sword?" The captor said: "Yes." As soon as Abu Busayr took the sword, he killed his captor with it. The

second captor ran away and escaped to Medina.

As soon as the Prophet saw the desperate Meccan returning, he remarked ironically: "The man has confronted something terrible" (W:626). Apparently, the Prophet had expected what had happened. The surviving Meccan captor was soon followed by Abu Busayr with the unsheathed sword in his hand, on the camel and with the spoils he had looted from the two Meccans. Abu Busayr told the Prophet, "You did your duty by handing me over to the enemy." Then he said, "I did what I did to protect my religion." The Prophet responded in perhaps an encouraging tone. Pointing to Abu Busayr, the Prophet said: "Woe his mother; what a firebrand; would that others had been with him." It was a clear suggestion to do what Abu Busayr later did.¹⁸ Abu Busayr offered one-fifth of the loot to the Prophet. It was refused. The Prophet said that if he accepted it, he would be blamed for violating the treaty. The Prophet, obviously, wanted to remain covert. However, he authorized Abu Busayr to keep the loot and do whatever he wanted with it -- **WA- LAKIN SHANAK (SHANUK?) BI-SALAB SAHIBIK** (W:626). After the lone and frightened Meccan captor refused to accompany Abu Busayr to Mecca, the Prophet told Abu Busayr to go wherever he pleased. It is obvious, from Umar's succeeding secret contacts with the likes of Abu Busayr in Mecca, that Abu Busayr adopted the strategy Muhammad desired (or, most probably, had advised secretly). Abu Busayr stationed himself at AL-IS, at point on the Syrian-Meccan trade route. Meanwhile, Umar wrote to those Muslims in Mecca who, according to the treaty, could not leave for Medina, telling them where Abu Busayr was. Al-Waqidi tells us frankly, and appreciatively, that the underground Muslims in Mecca now realized the meaning of what they had already heard the Prophet say of Abu Busayr: "He would have started a war; would that others had been with him." Abu Busayr was soon joined by seventy like-minded Muslims, and the Meccan trade caravans were again beset with what the treaty of Hdaybiya was meant to end. The Abu Busayr Muslim gang "harried Quraysh, killing everyone they could get hold of and cutting to pieces

every caravan that passed them," our sources tell Muslims appreciatively (1.1:508; W:627). Al-Waqidi marvels that the groups selected Abu Busayr their **AMIR**, commander, who performed his Islamic prayers along with the group and was their religious guide and mentor. The groups heeded Abu Busayr (W:627).

The Meccans first debated the issue among themselves. The debate on this new external problem created by the Abu Busayr Muslim gang turned into internal wrangling among the Meccans. Just like our liberal democracies, they looked for clear-cut and sufficient evidence against an adversary who believed in perpetual war against the nonbelievers and in secret, underhanded methods as he had told Nuaym b. Masud: **AL-HARB WA'L- KHUDAH**. The Meccans had only one choice. Surrendering their right granted to them by a clause in the Treaty of Hudaibiya; they wrote to Muhammad, "begging him by the ties of kinship to take these men in, for they had no use for them" (1.1:508). The Prophet accepted the request magnanimously! He wrote to Abu Busayr and his comrades: Return to Medina (with honor) (W:629). The Quraysh neither complained formally nor abrogated the treaty of peace. They gave Muhammad the benefit of the doubt. Some of them, such as Abu Sufyan, argued that the Prophet and the Muslim community of Medina were not responsible for the acts of an isolated gang. Later, on the eve of the conquest of Mecca, Muhammad would not accept the entreaties of Abu Sufyan and other Meccan leaders that a much less serious incident, in which only a few Meccans were allegedly indirectly involved, was not sufficient justification to abrogate the treaty unilaterally and declare war on Mecca.

The extradition clause in the Hudaibia Treaty covered women as well as men. The Prophet later refused to return Meccan women who reached Medina by running away from their husbands and guardians. As usual, when there was no excuse to offer and no covert methods to use, the almighty authorized the believers to violate the norms and treaties. Ignoring the requirements of the treaty, the Prophet and his followers maintained that "God refused to allow them to be returned to

polytheists." That was "the judgment of God which He judges... and God is knowing, wise. So the apostle withheld the women...", in the process, unilaterally abrogating the clause in the treaty related to the return of the Meccan women -- **INN ALLAH NAQAD AL-AHD FI'N-NISA** (1.1:509; W:631; Q60:10). Believing Muslims are not supposed to ask why the omniscient God had not told His Messenger of this when the treaty was being signed. A Muslim appearing to follow God and His Prophet and imitate the Companions in one's treatment of the treaties with the nonbelievers finds a complete model: God, the Prophet and common Muslims such as Umar and Abu Busayr acted at will, never they found it convenient, against any aspect or clause of the treaty - not only with moral immunity (from a Muslim point of view) but also with applause and a sense of self-righteous justification. This is apparent in the mode and style of the descriptions of these events in sacred Islamic sources.

The Meccans, as they had agreed in the Hudaibiya Treaty, gave way after a year to the Prophet and his two thousand followers to enter Mecca for a three-day peaceful pilgrimage (for the full story see 1.1:530-1; W:731-41). The Muslims were bound by the Treaty to go unarmed to Mecca, except for their travel swords or daggers in scabbards. There is no indication that the Meccans had any intention of making trouble for the Muslims. However, the Prophet violated the Treaty by carrying a significant amount of unauthorized weapons with him when he left Medina. They apparently surprised even some Muslims, who were told by the Prophet he was doing so as a precaution and intended to store the weapons nearby before entering the particular sacred precinct, -- **AL-HARAM** (the Sanctuary), around the Kaba. When he was asked if there was any sign of danger from the Quraysh, the Prophet kept silent (W:733).

The Prophet entered Mecca ostentatiously. He did not try to reassure the heathen of his peaceful intent. Muslims were not interested in demonstrating to the Meccans that they could coexist

peacefully. Instead they talked aloud of "fighting" the Meccans soon, and of Muslims' "strokes that will remove heads from shoulders." Ibn Ishaq has proudly recorded for the believers that some Muslims at this time were more explicitly provocative. When the Prophet entered Mecca to perform the supposedly peaceful pilgrimage, one of his companions, Abd Allah b. Rawaha, who was holding the halter of the Prophet's camel, recited the following galling poem:

Get out of his way, you unbelievers, make way. Every good thing goes with His apostle. O Lord I believe in fight you about its interpretation. As we have fought you about its revelation with strokes that will remove heads from shoulders and make friend unmindful of friend (1.1:531)

The Quraysh were alarmed. They sent a delegation that met Muhammad's armed pilgrims at Yajaj, Marraz-Zaharan, north of Mecca. They reminded the Prophet of the relevant clause in the Treaty of Hudaibiya. The Prophet told them what he had already told his Muslim questioners at Medina. Although the Prophet stored the unauthorized weapons at Yajaj before entering the "sacred precinct" of Mecca, it must have frightened the Meccans and created questions in their minds. The Prophet's show of arms did not serve to reinforce the value of the Truce, nor reassure the Quraysh of Muhammad's sincerity towards the peace arrangement. The Prophet and Muslims were irritating and provocative during their stay at Mecca. His order to the Muslim pilgrims to "trot" -- **HARWALA**, during the pilgrimage rituals was intentional, meant to parade and flaunt the Muslim presence in the face of adversaries, who were also unhappy with the Prophet's continued harsh criticism of their creed and tradition. What the Muslims did by "trotting" was not only against etiquette in an already tense guest-host situation, but was, implicitly, and unexpected exploitation of a solemn truce. The Prophet was obviously less interested in performing prayers and worshiping God in a calm and quiet manner and more interested in disturbing Meccan tranquility.

The Prophet's decision to marry a Meccan relative (Maymuna, daughter of al-Harith) during the pilgrimage could not have been welcomed by the Meccans, who were already suffering from internal family and

social divisions caused by Islamic intervention. The Prophet irritated the Meccans further by expressing his desire to extend the authorized three-day period in order to celebrate his marriage. He annoyed the Meccans even more when he wanted them to attend his wedding feast. The Meccans were so irritated by the Prophet's procrastination, they had to tell him: "We don't need your food, so get out" (1.1:531).

The Final Breakdown of the Treaty of Hudaibiya and the Conquest of Mecca.

In this last portion dealing with the Muslim treatment of the Treaty of Hudaibiya, the charge that the Quraysh of Mecca were finally responsible for the break down of the treaty and the consequent Muslim occupation of Mecca is questioned.

The Muslim-Quraysh truce (March, 628 CE), meant to last at least ten years, broke down in January, 630. Not even two years had passed. During this period the Muslims had conquered the most prominent and prosperous Jewish city-states and settlements in Arabia, (i.e., Khaybar, Fadak, Dar al-Qura and Tayma). Their mostly successful raids had extended to central Arabia against some powerful Arab tribes, and to the peripheries of the Byzantine empire. The capture of the Jewish lands, property, and the expectation, perhaps, that the Prophet would eventually extend his raids to the wealthy territories of the two neighboring empires, had particularly convinced many Arab tribes to be willing to accompany him in his future undertakings. The continuing Quranic propaganda against the non-conformists, al-Munafiqun, was another factor. The Prophet must have also realized the Meccans were greatly divided and demoralized. All this encouragement - from the Divine promise of victory to the readiness of a multitude of Arab tribesmen to join him, - was on his mind when the Prophet decided to give Mecca the coup de grace. Apparently he was just waiting for an excuse, finally provided by a clash between the two sub-sections of Khuzaa and Banu Bakr. The believers in the predestined expansion and domination of Islam were not seriously interested in maintaining peace

between the Dar al-Islam and the most coveted Dar al-Harb that was Mecca. Regardless of the requirement of the peace treaty, the Prophetic vision which promised the conquest of Mecca had to be fulfilled, and soon.

The alliance of the Khuzaa tribe with the Muslims and that of the Banu Bakr with the Quraysh was a part of the Treaty of Hudaibiya. The two tribes, Khuzaa and Bakr, had background of mutual animosity before they declared their attachment at Hudaibiya to the two main parties of the Treaty. By the time of the treaty, the Banu Bakr, allied to the Quraysh, were the losers and the Khuzaa, the allies of the Muslims, owed Bakr the blood-wit of two prominent members of a sub-section of the Bakr tribe (1.1:540; W:782-3). In late 629, two incidents took place involving members of Khuzaa and Duil (ad-Dil?), a sub-section of Bakr. Anas b. Zunaym, a member of ad-Duil, disparaged Muhammad in a poem. A Khuzaa lad -- GHULAM, on hearing the poem, violently attacked the poet, giving him a serious skull fracture. The wounded poet went to his people and complained of the new Khuzaa violence. Thus new trouble was added to what already existed between the two tribes (W:783). As far as physical acts are concerned the series of events that culminated in the breakdown of the Hudaibiya treaty was triggered by a member of the Khuzaa, an ally of the Prophet, rather than vice versa. Note that here the alleged Bakr violation of the treaty, if so, was in the form of a verbal-poetic criticism of Muhammad. The pro-Muslim Khuzaa reacted by physically attacking the pro-Quraysh Bakrite critic, the loose-tongue poet, a less sophisticated Salman Rushdie of the time.

The sub-section of the Bakr tribe, which had two persons die before Hudaibiya and now had one person with a seriously injured skull, caused by the same enemy (Khuzaa), decided to take revenge. They attacked some Khuzaa members. In the fighting that ensued both sides apparently lost lives, but the Khuzaa lost more. Before acting, the Bakr sub-section had asked the Quraysh nobles and leaders (particularly Abu Sufyan, the over-all Meccan leader) for help. But they

categorically refused to give any aid, which they thought would endanger the Peace between them and Muhammad (W:783). Some individual Quraysh are charged by our sources with having secretly helped the Banu Bakr sub-section during the skirmish in and around Mecca. However, the sources admit that the Quraysh chiefs remained in their houses, lest the Prophet know them as participants in the fighting (W:784). Showing their honesty and concerns they also rebuked the Quraysh individuals suspected of having helped the attackers on the Khuzaa. They reminded these Quraysh of the treaty between the Quraysh and Muhammad, and admitted frankly, with obvious regrets, that the alleged action of the individual Quraysh violated the treaty (W:784). The individuals involved expressed their regrets, and admitted that involvement in the skirmish was a mistake (W:785). Abu Sufyan was sure the Prophet would exploit the situation and declare war on the Quraysh. Along with other Quraysh chiefs, he decided to do something to keep peace between the two main parties of Hudaibiya. Accordingly, Abu Sufyan was sent to Medina to convince the Prophet that neither he nor other Quraysh chiefs were responsible for what had happened. He requested the reconfirmation or renewal of the Hudaibiya peace treaty (W:ibid, passim; 1.1:543).

However, before Abu Sufyan reached Medina, the Khuzaa were there to ask for Muhammad's intervention against the Quraysh - Banu Bakr allies. The Khuzaa admitted the whole Banu Bakr tribe was not responsible or involved in the recent attack on Khuzaa; only a sub-section, they said, had attacked and killed about twenty Khuzaa men. They did allege, however, that the Quraysh had helped the Bakr sub-section. The Prophet immediately sent a messenger, one Damra, to the Quraysh with a three-point ultimatum, asking them either 1) to pay an indemnity to the Khuzaa for what the Bakr sub-section had done or 2) to disavow the subsection (so they could be dealt with directly by the Muslims and the Khuzaa, with no fear of Quraysh-Bakr involvement), otherwise 3) the Prophet would declare the Treaty of Hudaibia abrogated (W:786). This one-sided ultimatum of the Prophet left no room for

negotiation. The one person, Qurata b. Abd Amr al-Ajami, apparently a Quraysh, who responded to it, is relatively unknown in Islamic sources. It is obvious from the Quraysh decision by their known personalities, which immediately followed, that Qurata did not represent the Quraysh. Even Qurata's rejection of the prophet's first two demands was not based on a defense of the Bakrite clan. He called this clan a vicious, undependable and violent -- **URAM**, people. Qurata said the Quraysh would soon be bankrupt if they started paying indemnity for the crimes of this group and such irresponsible people. Qurata observed that the fulfillment of the second demand, the disavowal of the Bakrite clan, would also hurt the Quraysh economically and socially. This clan, he added, were among the most regular and faithful pilgrims of the Kaba. The pilgrimage to Kaba was the base of Quraysh economic and social power. Secondly, Qurata meant it was against existing traditions to denounce allies so easily. Having no other choice, Qurata had accepted the abrogation of the Hdaybiya Treaty (W:787).

After the Prophet's messenger left, the Quraysh regretted the Qurata's negative answer to the Prophet. They immediately dispatched their top leader, Abu Sufyan, to Medina, offering a peaceful solution to the dangerous crisis. They requested the renewal and extension of the treaty of peace (ibid: passim; 1.1:543-4). The Quraysh were interested in maintaining the peace. The Prophet's treatment of the incident had endangered the Treaty of Hdaybiya, indicating he was looking for an opportunity to dispose of it and occupy Mecca. His tactics, however, were not straightforward.

Before Abu Sufyan had reached Medina, the Prophet told the Khuzaa delegation confidentially to prepare for an imminent attack on Mecca; they left to do so (W:791). On his way to Medina, Abu Sufyan met the returning Khuzaa. Abu Sufyan was anxious about the Khuzaa-Muslim decision. his query, the Khuzaa said they had not been to Medina. Abu Sufyan knew the Muslim allies were simply lying and prefabricating. He resumed his journey for peace to Medina anyhow. Unlike the

respectful treatment the Prophet's messenger had received from the Meccan non-Muslims, Abu Sufyan was refused the promise of protection, i.e., diplomatic immunity, and was humiliated by Muslim believers - including his own daughter, Umm Habiba, married to the Prophet. She did not allow her father to sit on the Prophet's mattress and called him, perhaps adopting an ideal Islamic behavior, "a dirty untouchable heathen" -- **IMRA NAJAS MUSHRIK** (W:792-3; 1.1:543-4). Instead, she gave him a harsh lecture on how despicable he was - refusing to become a Muslim and sticking to the nonsense creed of his forefathers. Responding to Abu Sufyan's request for a promise of protection in Medina, Umar told him that he, as a matter of fact, was ready to help anyone to fight against the Meccans. The Prophet was apparently dodging Abu Sufyan. As Muhammad had confided to the Khuzaa delegation, he had expected Abu Sufyan to come and beg for the renewal of the treaty and extension of the armistice. The Prophet had assured the Khuzaa that Abu Sufyan "shall return (to Mecca) in exasperation" i.e., the armistice would not be extended (W:791).

Abu Sufyan finally met the Prophet and requested the reverification and extension of the treaty. The Prophet feigned surprise, asking: "Why? Has anything wrong happened from your side?" Abu Sufyan replied: "God forbid!", meaning the Quraysh had not violated the treaty. The Prophet responded: "Then, we are bound by the time and terms of our Hdaybiya peace agreement; we do not change nor alter (any term of it)" (W:792). The Prophet knew he was not telling the truth. When Abu Sufyan found none ready to promise him protection while in Medina, and that he was avoided and humiliated by all believers, he realized there something was spurious. During his entreaties for protection, Ali, the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law, gave him strange advice. Ali told Abu Sufyan to declare to the Prophet that he (Abu Sufyan) gives protection to the People. Abu Sufyan so announced, and left for Mecca (W:794). This actually meant Abu Sufyan had given immunity to Muslims in his jurisdiction, Mecca. As Hind, his shrewd

wife, remarked when he reported the results of his peace trip, "Ali made a fool of you" (1.1:544).

The Prophet marched with 10,000 armed men - Muslims and his tribal allies - towards the south. Until he reached the outskirts of Mecca, he told only a few of his confidants what their destination was. Indeed, the Prophet, on his way south, intentionally maneuvered to create the impression that some place other than Mecca was the target (W:796-7). Misled by these maneuvers and the Prophet's assurance to Abu Sufyan that he had not changed his mind about Hdaybiya undertakings, the Meccans did not prepare to defend themselves. Ironically, Abu Sufyan, by "Promising protection to the people," obviously in Mecca, had unwittingly committed himself to non-resistance. That is what Hind meant when she said Ali had made a fool of Abu Sufyan. Of this promise of protection, some other Quraysh had observed that Ali had acted fraudulently (W:795).

The extent of the Prophet's direct encouragement to Ali to play the game, and his share in the stratagem, remain a matter of speculation. We definitely know the Prophet authorized (NUAYM, for example) and justified deceit, **KHUDAH**, when in war against nonbelievers. The Prophet and his followers not infrequently used secrecy and misdirection during their expeditions. But the Prophet's assurance to Abu Sufyan that the Hdaybiya treaty was intact was affected when Muhammad realized that sufficient and convincing evidence to justify his open abrogation of the treaty was not available. Abu Sufyan could prove that, first, the overwhelming majority of the Quraysh were not responsible for what the members of a sub-clan of the Banu Bakr had done. Secondly, the Quraysh were ready to apologize and were keen to continue the peace by renewal or extension of the treaty (or by any other means). Even Aisha, the Prophet's wife, when the Prophet indicated he was going to act against the Quraysh for what had happened to the Khuzaa, seemingly had some difficulty appreciating the justification for such a move. Referring to the Treaty of Hdaybiya,

Aisha asked: "O Messenger of God, is it conceivable that the Quraysh would dare to violate the standing covenant between you and them while the sword has (already) exhausted them?" Aisha meant to say the Quraysh were too weak to risk the violation of the treaty and invite war. The Messenger of God did not try to convince Aisha objectively; he could not. "They shall break the treaty for what God wants to do with them" and this will be "good" (obviously for the Muslims), he added (W:788). What he told Aisha rally meant that the Quraysh were predestined by God to break the treaty. It meant, in our language, that regardless of the absence of any justification the Prophet was determined to ignore the Treaty of Hudaibiya and act the way he or his God wanted to.

Finally, regarding the Prophet's treatment of Hudaibiya, note that after he entered Mecca triumphantly with almost no resistance, the whole Bakr vs. Khuzaa affair, the supposed *raison d'être* for Muhammad's expedition, was dealt with summarily and was soon forgotten. Of our four main sources (i.e., Ibn Ishaq, Ibn Hisham, Ibn Sad and al-Waqidi), only Waqidi tells us (in one line) that the Khuzaa were allowed only briefly -- **SAATAN**, to pursue their enemies, the Banu Bakr. There is no mention that the Khuzaa killed any (W:839) except one of their old foes. As soon as the Prophet heard of this killing he said: "Stop this killing, Khuzaa; there has been too much killing... I will pay the compensation for the man you have killed" (1.1:554). According to another report, the Prophet ordered the Khuzaa to pay the blood-money - which they did (W:845). To the surprise of Abu Sufyan, the Banu Bakr joined the Prophet's invading army. Abu Sufyan scoffed: "What a sinister people; these are the ones who caused Muhammad to fight us" (W:820). We find Nawfal b. Muawiyah, the leader of the Bakr sub-clan, in the forefront during the attack on Khuzaa - the pretended cause of the Muslim occupation of Mecca - having won the Prophet's trust after the conquest (W:790-1). Zunaym ad-Dili (ad-Duili?), the Bakr poet whose satire of Muhammad had ultimately led to the fall of the Quraysh, was forgiven. The saucy poet apologized and recited a flattering eulogy

glorifying the Prophet. Zunaym disowned what he had said against Muhammad, for which the Prophet had once passed orders the poet should be slain by anyone wherever he was found -- **HADAR RASUL ALLAH DAMAHU** (W:789- 91; 1.1:559-60). Safwan b. Umayya is one of those few Quraysh particularly named by our sources to have secretly helped the Bakr against the Khuzaa. Safwan was also among those few Meccan resisters who vainly took up arms to stop Muhammad's entry into Mecca. He was not only forgiven before he accepted Islam, but also became an influential backer and banker of the Prophet's forthcoming onslaught against the powerful Arab confederation of Hawazin. The Prophet needed Safwan's resources. The other Quraysh named as helpers of the Bakr against the Khuzaa were also forgiven by the Prophet, and they converted to Islam (W:825, 850-5 passim). The Prophet executed about ten Meccans after the occupation who had nothing to do with the Khuzaa-Bakr controversy. They were all among those who had betrayed and insulted the person and family of the Prophet before Hudaibiya was signed (1.1:550-1).

All this material in Islamic sources about the Treaty of Hudaibiya does not inculcate respect among believers for pledges, treaties and undertakings concerning nonbelievers. Knowing all the material about Hudaibiya, a believer realizes with undisturbed conscience that the reason for beginning the venture which unilaterally abrogated a solemn treaty was an excuse. The end justified the means. By the end of these accounts it is the Divine and self-righteous right of the Prophet and, ultimately, of his followers to do and undo things for the expansion and domination of Islam at the expense of solemn treaties and other creeds.

A Disavowal of All Remaining Treaties: the Declaration of an All-out War Against the World Beyond Islam.¹⁹

From a web of confusing and sometimes contradictory details in Tabari's commentaries and other Islamic sources on those passages in Sura 9 (**AT-TAUBAH**, "Repentance" also called **BARRAH**, "Disavowal") of the Quran (Q9:1-40), which relate, mostly, to the abrogation of treaties

with the nonbelievers, and to the Munafiqun, "Hypocrites, one can make certain deductions safely.

After the conquest of Mecca and surrounding countries in 630 CE, the non-Muslims, particularly the Arab pagans, held to mostly unspecified contracts between them and the Prophet, maintaining the right to keep their religion (though under Islam's ever-extending domination) and to perform pilgrimage to the Kaba following their own rituals and traditions. Tabari and Ibn Ishaq refer to the Treaty of Hudaibia so as to give the impression that the Prophet and the non-Muslims still considered some parts of the treaty to be operative. The sources also refer to treaties between Muhammad and various pagan tribes that were in force before the revelation of the sura "Disavowal"

-- KAN QABL AN TANZIL BARAAT QAD AHAD RASUL ALLAH NAS-AN MIN AL-MUSHRIKIN AHD-AN (W:1077). This is a reference to the Prophet's compacts of neutrality and voluntary friendship with Khuzaah, Mudlij and other pagan Arab tribes in the peninsula since his hijra to Medina (e.g. TS:14:100). These solemn compacts guaranteed immunity from violence and implied that (particularly after Islam's conquest of Mecca) these Arabs would be allowed to perform pilgrimage, obviously, according to their own pagan rites. Before the sura "Disavowal" was revealed, Tabari tells us,

there existed solemn covenants between Muhammad and the pagans confirming that none will be prevented from going to the House (i.e., the Kaba) and that none will be harassed during the sacred month (of pilgrimage). This was a universal compact between him (Muhammad) and pagan people at large. Meanwhile, there were special covenants between the Messenger of God and some (pagan) Arab tribes for specific periods -- MA BAYN RASUL ALLAH WA BAYN AL- MUSHRIKIN MIN AL-AHD ALLADHI KANU ALAYH FIMA BAYNAHU WA BAYNAHUM: AN LA YUSADD 'AN AL-BAYT AHAD-UN JAAHU, WA AN LA YUKHAF AHAD-UN FI'SH- SHAHR AL-HARAM. WA KAN DHALIK AHD-AN AMM-AN BAYNAHU WA BAYN AN-NAS MIN AHL ASH-SHIRK. WA KANAT BAYN DHALIK UHUD-UN BAYN RASUL ALLAH WA BAYN QABAIL AL-ARAB KHASAIS ILA AJAL-IN MUSAMMA (TS,14:96-7; parentheses added).

The revelation of the "Disavowal" of the treaties and undertakings concerning nonbelievers proves they existed. Also note that the subjugated Jews of Khaybar, Dar al-Qura etc., north of Medina, were allowed to maintain their religion and live on their confiscated lands

as share croppers. Similarly the Christians of Najran in southwest Arabia, obliged to pay tribute to the Prophet, were given written guarantees of religious autonomy and the right to their estates and property. (See, e.g., IS-B,1:357-8).

The events that took place between early 630 CE and the first quarter of 631 explain the all-out disavowal of these covenants made with nonbelievers. During this period, in addition to the tribes who had helped Muhammad to overwhelm Mecca, the Quraysh of Mecca joined ranks with the Prophet for all practical purposes. Though hesitantly, Abu Sufyan had declared his faith in Muhammad as the Prophet and supreme leader. With the help of his fellow-Meccans the powerful Arab confederation of Hawazin and Thaqif were subdued. After subduing or harassing some lesser groups the Prophet undertook the bold Tabuk expedition in October-December 630 CE, thus making an armed intrusion for the first time into Byzantine territory. Tabuk, however, became a turning point in Muslim treaty relations with pagan Arabs.

The Prophet confronted unusual aversion when he told the people to prepare for the expedition of Tabuk. "The people prepared with feelings of disgust about the expedition" -- **FA TAJAHHAZ AN-NAS ALA MA FI ANFUSIHIM MIN AL-KURH** (-1,3:101). Just after the Prophet's chaotic legion moved for Tabuk, Abd Allah b. Ubayy whose "army" -- **ASKAR** was not less than the one under the Prophet's direct command -- **LAYS BI AQALL AL-ASKARAYN** returned to Medina, refusing to go along (ibid:103; also see W:995). Tabari does not tell us exactly how many of his people returned with him. Apparently, most of them - if not all - did likewise. Tabari and all other sources, however, tell us that many influential "Hypocrites" refused to accompany the Prophet in this expedition. Even the Prophet's dangling of "pretty Roman girls and women" including "the daughter of the Emperor" before their eyes had failed to motivate Arab tribesmen and many Medinans to join the expedition of Tabuk --**QAL RASUL ALLAH: UGHZU TABUK TAGHNIMU BANAT AL-ASFAR WA NISA AR-RUM** (TS,14:287 cf. Q9:49)... **ALA TAGHZU BANI'L-ASFAR? LAALLAK AN TUSIB BINT AZIM**

AR-RUM; FA-INNAHUNN HISAN (ibid:426 cf. Q9:95; also see -1,3:101-7 passim; W:992 passim). A long Quranic passage (9:38-105) is the most authentic document which records (and condemns) this noncooperation of "the Hypocrites" and "the Bedouins," i.e., Arab tribesmen of the Peninsula (cf. T,10:133-213; T,11:1-21). The lengthy accounts of the expedition of Tabuk deal more with the difficulties and tensions caused by the Hypocrite-Bedouin noncooperation, their lack of enthusiasm to contribute physically and financially and by their alleged or real conspiracies than with details of confrontation with the Rum (see, e.g., 1.1:602-15; W:989-1078; -1,3:100-11). The Arab tribesmen's non-participation in Tabuk hurt the Prophet so much that the Almighty had to condemn them in stornng words:

The Bedouins are most stubborn in unbelief and hypocrisy, and after not to know the bounds of what God has sent down on His Messenger... Some of the Bedouins take what they expend for a fine, and await the turns of fortune to go against you. Theirs shall be the evil turn... and some of the Bedouins who dwell around you are hypocrites... (Q9:97-101).

The home front was not tranquil. The Prophet's favoritism toward his fellow Quraysh, after the conquests of Mecca and Hunayn, had put a damper on Medinan enthusiasm to fight for Islam. Even some of Muhammad's great Helper Companions such as Sad ibn Ubadah had verbally clashed with the Prophet and his Meccan Emigrant Companions, protesting his grant of a much greater part of the booty to the new Meccan converts than what the Helpers had received (see, e.g. TS,14:181 passim cf. Q9:25). Compared to the Helpers' active presence during the conquest of Mecca, their lukewarm participation at Tabuk - and the apparent increase of the hypocrite's influence - indicated the Helpers' diminishing enthusiasm. This disaffection must have emboldened and reinforced the known Medinan "Disaffected," the so-called "Hypocrites."

The latter had increased their nonconformist activities, and were becoming a bother and danger for Muhammad. They are alleged to have conspired to kill him during the Tabuk expedition, and to have established a rival mosque just outside Medina wherein to plot against the Prophet (Q9:42-878, 107-110, 124-7 cf. T relevant to these verses).

As for pagan Arabs, the Bedouins, they thought of their authorized religious freedom and did not deem it obligatory to accompany the Prophet in his apparently never ending jihad campaigns. All were tired of engagement in Islamic perpetual revolution and less interested in "pretty Roman girls" than the Prophet had thought (Q9:90-105, 120-3 cf. T relevant sections). The Prophet's power was evidently crumbling. All this hurt Muhammad. Islam had to find a solution before it lost its recently gained power and prestige.

The Munafiqun problem (discussed in the following sub-segment) was too complex to solve decisively. The "Hypocrites" were native Medinans having close family and clan relations with the Helpers, native Medinan Muslims. The post-Hunayn disaffection of many Helpers had increased complications. Direct action against the "Hypocrites" could result in rebellion among the Helpers against the Prophet. The Prophet and the Almighty confronted the Munafiqun and disaffected Helpers the way they had handled the Meccans before the hijra: with a biting tongue (see Q9:42-96, 107-110, 120-2 and Tabari's relevant commentaries). Although the Quran enjoined Holy War, jihad, against disbelievers as well as the Hypocrites -- **JIHAD AL-KUFFAR WA'L-MUNAFIQIN** (Q9:73), in practice jihad against al-Munafiqun was limited to **JIHAD BI'L-LISAN**, "holy war with [the] tongue" and **JIHAD BI'L-QALB**, "holy war with [the] heart" (TS,14:358-60 cf. Q9:73). This harshness -- GHILZAH short of physical attack included pressure tactics, allegations, threats of Divine chastisement here and Hereafter and character assassination. Mere **JIHAD BI'L-LISAN** and **JIHAD BI'L-QALB**, however, could not overcome the crisis Muhammad had confronted. Only a revival of Islam's power and prestige beyond Medina and Mecca could demoralize the "Hypocrites" and reunite Medina and Mecca under his leadership. This was possible only by disregarding existing treaties and undertakings concerning non-Muslims beyond the two cities. This was also a road to Islam's further expansion. [This Muhammadan model, Sunnah, of action provides believers with yet another sacred instance of the 'external' solution to

'internal' political problems.]

First the Prophet concentrated on the Bedouins, the pagan Arabs who had failed to join the Tabuk expedition. Islam had to change its attitude towards the idea of freedom of religion, equality of status and mutual respect, and do away with the pluralistic use of an Arabian international institution, the pilgrimage to Mecca. In order to accomplish this "God and His Messenger" declared an unwarranted unilateral "disavowal" of their earlier solemn pledges.

It was early 631 CE. The Muslims, led by Abu Bakr, left Medina on annual pilgrimage to Mecca. As usual, non-Muslims from different parts of Arabia had also arrived at the city to perform the pilgrimage and participate in the annual fair, according to their age-old customs. The Prophet remained in Medina, perhaps contemplating the problems he had confronted and considering his future line of action. We know that in many cases, such as the changing of the gibla from Jerusalem to Mecca, Muhammad and God thought alike; as Aisha, Muhammad's wife, had once remarked, the Almighty followed the desires of His last Messenger. After the Muslim pilgrims had left, the Prophet received a revelation, the Sura "Disavowal" or "Repentance," from God, authorizing him to disregard all existing treaties and undertakings concerning all non-Muslims including pagan Arabs. The Prophet dispatched Ali, his cousin and son-in-law to declare "God's and His Messenger's BARAAH, disavowal," of existing treaties. When Ali reached Mecca unexpectedly, Abu Bakr thought he had been sent by the Prophet to replace Abu Bakr as leader of Muslim pilgrims. Ali told him,

No. He (,i.e., the Prophet) has sent me to announce the "Disavowal" to the people, and throw back all the treaties to the Parties concerned -- LA WALKINNI BAATHANI AQRA-U "BARAAT" ALA'N-NAS WA UNBIDH ILA KULL DHI' AHD- IN AHDAHU (W:1077).

Ali recited the Quranic passages 9:1-40 and "threw back the covenants to all parties concerned" (W:1078; see TS,14:100, 113 informing us that the passage concerned consisted of verses 1 to 40 of sura 9). Thus, representing Muhammad who represented God, Ali declared arbitrarily the

abrogation of all treaties, compacts, and guarantees Muhammad had previously undertaken with pagan Arabs. This newly revealed Quranic passage had also new and decisive verdicts about relations with the People of the Book, enjoining harsher *treatment of Jews and Christians.²⁰ The gist of this revelation, as explained by Tabari, Ibn Ishaq and al-Wawidi, and by the Prophet and his Companions' actions, is as follows:

1) All earlier Muslim covenants with pagan Arabs guaranteeing them nonviolence, freedom of religion, unhindered access to Mecca and the Kaba and performance of pilgrimage according to their own traditions were nullified. Pagan Arabs were now to convert to Islam or die. The Almighty had "commanded His Prophet to kill them unless they enter Islam," i.e., "witness there is no God but Allah and that Muhammad is indeed the Messenger of Allah; nothing but this will be acceptable from them" (TS,14:99 passim). Along with stern warnings, a four-month respite, from the day the Disavowal was recited to them by Ali, was granted to the pagans. Failing conversion to Islam within this period the pagans were to be "ambushed," "besieged," "taken captive" and "slain wherever found" (9:5). Those few pagans having specific treaties for a fixed period (9:4), i.e., those with whom Muslims had made a treaty at Mecca (Q9:7) and had remained friendly with the Prophet could remain pagans "tell their term." As Tabari tells us this exception applied only to the friendly Banu Bakr, allies of the Quraysh, on the basis of the Treaty of Hudaibia (TS,14:142 passim). According to some reports Tabari quotes, it also applied to the remaining pagan Quraysh, the main party to the Pact of Hudaibiya, which had a fixed term and had implied nonviolence and freedom of religion. Although Tabari rejects these reports arguing that the Quraysh and Khuzaah were already converted to Islam (TS,14:144), it is likely that "God and His Messenger" had some individual Quraysh and friendly Khuzaah in mind who had not yet formally declared their adherence to Islam. In any case, though Hudaibiya was a thing of the past, the Prophet was always careful in dealing with his

fellow-Meccans and their powerful allies. There was no need to hurt Banu Bakr's pride and challenge Quraysh sensitivities. Besides, Banu Bakr and remaining non-Muslim Quraysh, if any, were on the verge of conversion to Islam. That is what happened soon. 2) The "Disavowal" outlawed pagan access to Mecca and participation in pilgrimage. This was all-inclusive. In practice, the concessions given to friendly pagans having treaties for fixed terms were rendered ineffective as far as the right to pilgrimage was concerned. After that year, no pagan was to be allowed to enter Mecca or to perform pilgrimage -- **LA YADKHUL MAKKAT MUSHRIK BAD AMIHI HADHA... WA LA YAHIJJ BAD AL-AM MUSKRIK-UN** (*ibid*: 106, 108 *passim*). The decree was applied strictly, Tabari tells us. "The pagans did not (,i.e., were not allowed to) perform pilgrimage after that year" -- **WA LAM YAHIJJ AL-MUSHRIKUN BAD DHALIK AL-AM** (TS,14:99).

The "Disavowal" spoke in a harsh and derogatory language. The pagans were barred from the Kaba because they were **NAJAS**, "unclean" (9:28). Occasionally, they are charged with "disregard of pacts" with Muslims and "debarring" people from Islam (Q9:8-9). Tabari, in his seven-page commentaries on these verses and elsewhere, and our other sources, do not document the allegation (see TS,14:145-51). As justification for the Disavowal the Quran 9:13 refers to the alleged violation of Hudaibia by the Meccans and their allies, to the Prophet's alleged expulsion by the Quraysh from Mecca, and to the pagans' "first attack" against Muslims (cf. TS,14:158-9; Tabari specifies Badr as an example of the Pagans' "first attack"!). All this seems irrelevant to the situation. For a believer, however, it is a familiar (and acceptable) Quranic style of undocumented allegations against nonbelievers. The most convincing argument, for a believer, is expressed in Q9:7:

How should the idolaters have a covenant with God and His Messenger?

Who are these "unclean" measly pagans to talk of Islam's treaty

obligations towards them? "The believers have (only one) obligation toward them: to slay them wherever they find them" -- **WA ANN AL-WAJIB ALA'L-MUMININ QATLUHUM HAYTH-U WAJADUHUM** (TS,14:141; parentheses added).

3) Q9:29-35 abrogated whatever concessions and guarantees the People of the Book had and established new and everlasting guidelines for Muslim treatment of Jews and Christians. They also were to convert to Islam or accept **SAGHIRUN**, "humiliated" status and pay tribute, Jizya, or put to death (9:29 passim). We know that the concession for the People of the Book to live in Arabia, even as third-class citizens, was abrogated by the Prophet's last verdict in 632 CE. From his death bed he said: **LA YAJTAMI BI JAZIRAT AL-ARAB DINAN** --"Two religions shall not coexist in the Arabian Peninsula" (W:717; 1.1:689), i.e., none but Muslims would live in Arabia. It was on the basis of this verdict that, after the Prophet's death, Umar expelled the Jews of Khaybar, Dar al-Qura etc., and the Christians of Najran, from Arabia, thus, completing Islam's expansionist and segregationalist plan as far as the Arabian Peninsula was concerned. These remaining lands cultivated by the Jews and those owned by the Christians were distributed among Muslims (W:717-21). Q9:23-4 forbade Muslims to have any ties with non-Muslims, including their fathers and brothers if the latter happened to be non-Muslims.

As Abu'l Ala Maududi notes, the sura Disavowal fulfilled the Prophet's desire

1) To make the whole Arabia a perfect Dar al- Islam, 2) to extend the influence of Islam to the adjoining countries, 3) to crush the mischiefs of hypocrites and to prepare the Muslims for Jihad against the non-Muslim world (Maududi, Meaning, 4:165).

About the direct correlation of the achievement of power, political needs or aspirations and the abrogation of treaties Maududi tells us unapologetically:

Now that the administration of the whole of Arabia had come in the hands of the Believers, and all opposing powers had become helpless, it was necessary to make a clear declaration of that policy which was to be adopted to make her a perfect Dar-ul-Islam.

Therefore the following measures were adopted: a) a clear declaration was made that all the treaties with the Mushriks (pagan Arabs) were abolished and the Muslims would be released from the treaty obligations with them after a respite of four months (VV. 1-3). This declaration was necessary for uprooting completely the system of life based on shirk (Arab un-Islam) and to make Arabia exclusively the center of Islam so that it should not in any way interfere with the spirit of Islam and not become an internal danger for it. b) A decree was issued that the guardianship of the Kaabah, which held a central position in all the affairs of Arabia, should be wrested from the Mushriks and placed permanently in the hands of the Believers, (VV:12-18) that all the customs and practices of the shirk of the era of ignorance should be forcibly abolished: that the Mushriks should not be allowed even to come near the "House" (the Kaba) (V. 28) (ibid: 165-6; parentheses added).

Explaining 9:29, Maududi maintained that

in order to enable the Muslims to extend the influence of Islam outside Arabia, they were enjoined to crush with the sword the non-Muslim powers and to force them to accept the sovereignty (i.e., domination) of the Islamic state. As the great Roman and Iranian Empires were the biggest hindrances in the way, a conflict with them was inevitable (ibid:166; parentheses added).

As the verse makes clear, a Muslim state would tolerate the People of the Book only when they pay jizya "as a sign of their subjugation to the Islamic State" (ibid:9:73, Maududi correctly maintains that the Quran 9:73 aimed to crush internal dissent, and 9:81-96 prepared "the Muslims for Jihad against the whole non-Muslim world." According to this passage, "the sole criterion of a Muslim faith shall be the exertions (jihad) he makes for the conflict between Islam and Kufr," that is all other creeds and philosophies (ibid:166).

Like all other important medieval and modern ulama Maududi follows the Tafsir of Tabari and other primary Islamic sources in his understanding of the meaning of the sura Disavowal as it relates to 1) Islam's treatment of treaties with non-Muslims, 2) Islamic expansionism, and Islam's policy toward internal dissent. Maududi also follows the Quranic style of using words for other than their common meanings (see Appendix III), and of undocumented and irrelevant allegations. His assertion that Islam wanted to "force non-Muslim powers," i.e., Iran and Byzantium, "to accept the sovereignty of Islamic State" could be misleading. The Islam of the sura Disavowal did not merely seek acceptance of the new Medinan-Meccan entity's sovereignty and, then,

accept peaceful coexistence with the world beyond its borders. By "sovereignty," (**HAKIMIYYAT**, as the word is in Maududi's original Urdu text), he means Divinely ordained Muslim right to induce conversion to Islam or to subjugate and keep "humiliated" or annihilate "the whole non-Muslim world" as enjoined in Q9:5, 29 and elsewhere in Islamic sources. Similarly, Maududi does not tell the readers how and when the "great Roman and Iranian empires" created hindrances in the way of Islam in Arabia before the Quran, the Prophet and his followers declared war against the whole world.

PART III: Belief in the Books and Messengers

Section 9: THE ERA OF THE LAST BOOK, THE QURAN, AND OF
THE LAST MESSENGER OF GOD, MUHAMMAD

Segment 2: The Quran and Muhammad After the Establishment
of a Dar al-Islam at Medina

b: Methods Used by the Ideal Islam in Relationship
With Non-Muslims

In 661 CE, Abd ar-Rahman ibn Muljim al-Muradi, a Kharijite, assassinated Ali ibn Abi Talib. Ali was the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law, the first Divinely Guided imam (spiritual and political leader) after the Prophet, according to the Shiites, and the fourth Rightly Guided caliph (true successor of the Prophet) according to the Sunnites. Both Sunnites and Shiites consider Ali and his sons, particularly those from the Prophet's daughter Fatima, among the highest-ranking Companions, worthy to be followed and imitated. Both Sunnites and Shiites consider the Kharijites as disbelievers or, at least not true believers.

Abd ar-Rahman, however, was not a simple killer. He and other fellow-Kharijites thought they had a cause and genuine grievances. A group of the Kharijites decided to eliminate Ali, Muawiyah and Amr ibn al-As, whose contest for power, the Kharijites thought, was unjust and had caused a prolonged bloody civil war. [Whether the Kharijites came to this decision in a particular meeting is immaterial. Their opposition to Ali, Muawiyah and Amr b. al-As is certain.] By eliminating the three contenders for power, Abd ar-Rahman and his comrades thought, they would be relieving the masses from continuous bloodshed -- **WA YURIHANN AL-IBAD MINHUM** (IS-B,3:35). Besides, Abd ar-Rahman killed Ali in revenge for the Kharijites slain at an-Nahrawan. After their refusal to fight for Ali, and their declaration of neutrality, the Kharijites had become the victims of Ali's ruthless aggression. In July 17, 658 CE at Nahrawan Ali's forces had slaughtered a great number of the Kharijites. As L. Veccia Vaglieri correctly notes, at Nahrawan Ali had engaged in "a massacre rather than a battle" ("Ali b. Abi Talib," El²,1:384). Among those massacred were "many sincere believers, of well-known piety" (ibid). The father, brother and most of the family of Qatam (or Quttama), Abd ar Rahman's fiance, were among those killed by Ali's army. Further discussion of related issues does not concern us here.²¹ Ibn Sad has recorded the following for our purpose.

Abd ar-Rahman was captured. After Ali was buried, Hasan, Ali's son and successor as imam and caliph (and the Prophet's grandson), ordered Abd ar-Rahman to be brought out of the prison to kill him before a crowd at Kufa. "The people," obviously the Prophet's family's supporters, had brought "naptha, wood and hay, and fire" ready to burn him alive. Abd Allah b. Jafar (Ali's nephew), Husayn (Ali's son and the Prophet's grandson, and Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyyah (Ali's son from a wife other than Fatima, the Prophet's daughter) were present. They did not want simply to burn Abd ar-Rahman to death. Abd Allah, Husayn and Muhammad said:

'Let us satisfy our thirst for revenge (by doing something more) with him (before burning him to death).' So, Abd Allah cut off his hands and legs. [Abd ar-Rahman remained quiet.] He did not show anxiety nor did he talk. Then, Abd Allah smeared his eyes with a heated glowing peg. (Abd ar-Rahman) did not make any hue and cry; [he kept his demeanor and only] said: 'You indeed paint your uncle's (,i.e., my) eyes with a tormenting pin'; and then he began to recite (the Quran) while his eyes were melting and flowing down. Then he [obviously one of the four, most probably Hasan or Husayn] ordered (Abd ar-Rahman's) tongue to be heaved out so that he would cut it. At this point, Abd ar-Rahman spoke out. They said to him: 'O enemy of God, when we cut your hands and legs and smeared your eyes you did not utter a word. Why this hue and cry now that we are reaching your tongue?' He said, 'I am not making a hue and cry. I only loathe being a gasping dying person, unable to remember God (by reciting the Quran) as long as I am in this world (IS-B,3:39-40; brackets and parenthesis added).

Obviously, Abd ar-Rahman's claim to have faith in God was nonsense as far as the AHL AL-BAYT, members of the Prophet's family, were concerned. Ignoring Abd ar-Rahman's entreaties to save his tongue

they cut his tongue and threw him in the crematory (the believers had already prepared) and burned him alive -- FA-LAMMA MAT ALI... WA DUFIN, BAATH AL-HASAN BIN ALI ILA ABD AR-RAHMAN BIN MULJIM, FA-AKHRAJAH-U MIN AS-SIJN LI-YAQTULAH-U; FA'JTAMA'N-NAS WA JAUH-U BI'N-NAFTWA'L-BUARIY WA'N-NAR FA-QALU: NUHRIQUH-U. FA-QAL ABDALLAH BIN JAFAR WA HUSAYN BIN ALI WA MUHAMMAD BIN AL-HANAFIYYAH: DAUNA HATTA NASHFI ANFUSANA MINHU. FA-QATAA ABD ALLAH BIN JAFAR YADAYH-I WA RIJLAYH-I FA-LAM YAJZ'A WA LAM YATAKALLAM, FA-KAHAL AYNAYH-I BI-MISMAR-IN MUHM-AN FA-LAM YAJZ'A WA JAAL YAQUL INNAK LA- TAKHUL AYNAY AMMIK BI-MULMUL-IN MADD-IN, WA JAAL YAQUL: "IQRA... (Q96) WA INN AYNAH LA-TASILAN, THUMM AMAR BIH-I FA-ULIJ AN LISANIH-I LI-YAQTAAH-U FA-JAZAA, FA-QIL LAH-U: QATANA YADAYK WA RIJLAYK WASAMALNA AYNAYK YA ADUWW ALLAH FA-LAM TAJZA FA-LAMMASIRNA ILA LISANIK JAZAT? FA-QAL: MA DHAK MINNI MINJAZA-IN ILLA ANNI AKRAH AN AKUN FI'D-DUNYA FUAQ-AN LAADHKUR ALLAH. FA-QATAU LISANAH-U THUMM JAALUH-U FI QAUSARAT-IN WA AHRAQUH-U BI'N-NAR (ibid; brackets and parenthesis added).

When they first landed in Spain, in 711 CE, the Muslim army led by

Tariq b. Ziyad captured a number of Spanish peasants and took them into camp. As Tariq ordered, the Muslim holy warriors, mujahidin, slaughtered one of these unfortunate farmers in front of the other Spanish captives, cut him into pieces, put them in a cooking pot alongside the other kettles and began to cook. It was meal time. The shocked Spaniards looking on did not know the other pots contained normal animal meat. In a way that the peasants could not see, the Muslims threw away the cooked human flesh and began to eat. However, as the Muslims intended, the captives got the impression the invaders were ruthless cannibals. They were sure the flesh of their unfortunate brother was a part of the Muslim fare. After this cruel exhibition was over, the Muslims let the captives go - who, as the Muslims desired, spread the news among the people of Andalus (Spain) that the invaders were man-eaters! "So God filled their (Spaniards') hearts with terror" -- **FA MALAALLAH QULUBAHUM RUB-AN.**²²

One may, genuinely, assert that from a strict Islamic legal point of view Muslims are not obliged to follow the sunnah of the Prophet's grandsons and that of Tariq ibn Ziyad and his Muslim mujahidin. Here, we disregard the fact that Muslims in general and Shiites in particular will not dismiss Hasan and Husayn as worthy models to be respected and imitated by believers. The Shiites as well as the Sunnites believe that Hasan and Husayn were declared by the Prophet to be the joint-chiefs of youths in Paradise -- **SAYYIDA SHABAB AHL AL-JANNAH**. Sunnites and Shiites recognize Hasan and Husayn as true Companions, **ASHAB**. The Prophet tells Muslims that these Companions' righteousness and character are sanctified by God. The Prophet commanded Muslims never to criticize his Companions; Muslims, if they love Muhammad, must love the Companions; hard feelings toward the companions is like having hard feelings toward the Prophet -- **ALLAH ALLAH FI ASHABI. LA TATTAKHIDHUHUM GHARAD-AN MIN BADI. FA-MAN AHABBAHUM FA-BI-HUBBI AHABBAHUM; WA MAN ABGHADAHUM FA-BI- BUGHDI ABGHADAHUM ()**.

Similarly, the Prophet's maxim **KHAYR UMMATI QARNI**, "the best of my

community are my contemporary (Muslims)" (Mu-MFA,44:52:208-16) puts Hasan and Husayn beyond reproach. For the Shiites Hasan and Husayn are the infallible, Divinely-inspired and Divinely-guided second and third imams, ideal spiritual-cum-political leaders of the ummah, Muslim community. However, in order to see to what extent the Quran and the Sunnah of Muhammad themselves could be sources of inspiration for such coldblooded murder, torture and terror, and also to study Islam's position on political assassination, hostage-taking, treatment of captives and prisoners of war, use of violent language and disingenuous methods etc., we turn to the Quran and the Prophet's own Sunnah for guidance. For this purpose we return to our survey of the Prophet's Medinan career and Quranic injunctions. Generally, we adopt al-Waqidi's chronological order of events and Montgomery Watt's (Med.:339-43) specified dates when mentioned in this segment.

A: Political Assassinations

After victory at Badr (March 15, 624 CE), Muslims read, the Prophet engaged in a series of political assassinations. Pagan Arabs and the Jews were among the victims. In about a dozen cases, the Prophet encouraged and instructed some of his followers to kill some individual non-Muslims. Almost always the victims were outspoken critics of the Prophet and Islam. They had not committed any crime proportionate to the punishment they received from the founder of Islam. The stories of these political assassinations meant to eliminate outspoken non-Muslims are described appreciatively by our sources.

1. **ABU AFAK** (W:174-5; 1.1:675) was eliminated in April 624 CE, one month after Badr. Abu Afak was one of those old Medinans who was not impressed by the Prophet when he established himself there. According to al-Waqidi, Abu Afak was a 120-year-old poet. He used to talk against the Prophet, and particularly criticized him for killing a certain al-Harith b. Suwayd. The old man was also displeased with those Medinans' "blindly" following Muhammad, who, he thought, had divided the

community. Ridiculing the Quranic style, its commandments and prohibitions, the poet stubbornly remarked:

A rider who came to them split them in two (saying) 'Permitted,' 'Forbidden' of all sorts of things. [This is an allusion to Islamic injunctions on authorizing some actions and prohibiting others].

Even the Prophet's victory at Badr could not silence Abu Afak, now more than ever enraged. It was too much for the Prophet, who finally said: "Who will deal with this rascal for me" (1.1:675). Salim b. Umayr, a Muslim believer, volunteered. One night, when Abu Afak slept, Salim crept in and pushed his sword through the chest of the old man until it reached the ground. "The enemy of God (i.e. Abu Afak) screamed" (W:175) and was thus disposed of. There was no regret in the Muslim camp for so treacherous a killing. The way our sources appreciate the deed, and the commandments of the Prophet about the "rascal" and "the enemy of God" are unambiguous. As a contemporary Muslim poet put it, such missions deserved to be appreciated and copied by the believers. Umama b. Muzayriya, the Muslim poet, was proud to rebuke the dead Abu Afak, while praising the staunch believer for killing the old heathen critic of Islam:

You gave the lie to God's religion and the man Ahmad (the Prophet)!
By him who was your father, evil is the son he produced! A HANIF
(good Muslim) gave you a thrust in the night, saying Take that,
Abu Afak, in spite of your age! (1.1:675).

2. ASMA daughter of MARWAN (1.1:675-6: W:172-4).

Asma, a Medinan lady and the mother of several children, also resisted the Prophet's Islamization of her town. Apparently, even after Badr, most of her clan had resisted conversion. She had given vent in poetry to her feelings about her fellow-Medinans who had followed Muhammad and Islam. She was more disturbed after she heard of the assassination of her ideological comrade, Abu Afak. Like Abu Afak, she had also criticized the expulsion, by the Prophet, of Medinan Banu Qaynuqa Jews (Watt, Med:18). Criticizing Medinan followers of the Prophet, and, perhaps, referring to the assassination of Abu Afak (among others), Asma said:

You obey a stranger who is none of yours...
Do you expect good from him after the killing of your chiefs, (1.1:676).

Though Asma incited others in her poetry to rise against Muhammad and eliminate him, no real danger to the Prophet is even hinted by the sources. However, the Prophet's reaction to what Asma had said was: "Who will rid me of Marwan's daughter?" Umayr b. Adiy, a Muslim believer, accepted the challenge. In the night Umayr entered Asma's house while her children slept around her. One baby had fallen asleep sucking her breast. Our Muslim believer was kind enough to part the child from the mother quietly before he spitted her on his sword, which came through Asma's back. Thus the critical non-Muslim poetess was eliminated. After they performed the morning prayer, the Prophet asked Umayr anxiously: "did you kill the daughter of Marwan?" The answer satisfied the Prophet, who exclaimed: "You have helped God and his Messenger, O Umayr!" (1.1:676). The Prophet also reassured Umayr not to fear any dangerous consequences of the murder. The emboldened Umayr passed intentionally by the sons and family of his victim, Asma, who were burying her, and boasted: "I have killed Bint (daughter of) Marwan... Withstand me if you can."

Umayr further threatened to do the same to anyone else daring to criticize Muhammad and Islam. None responded. They all knew that the Prophet and the power of the new Islamic state were with the fanatic killer. Instead they were terrorized into accepting Islam. Islamic sources express pride in such actions with the believers by saying: "That was the first day Islam became powerful among" Asma's clan; "before that, those who were Muslims concealed the fact... The day after Bint Marwan was killed, the men of (Asma's clan) became Muslims. They saw the power of Islam" (1.1:676 cf. W:173-4).

Referring to Asma's assassination, Hassan, the Prophet's poet laureate, boasted as usual:

When she called for folly, woe to her in her weeping.
She stirred up a man of glorious origin,
Noble in his going out and his coming in.
Before midnight, he dyed her in her blood,

And incurred no guilt thereby (1.1:676).

3. K'AB B. AL-ASHRAF (1.1:364-9, (IH)751-2; W:184-93; TT,2:487-92) the third important victim of the Prophet's campaign of political assassination, was another poet, and also a political activist. Kab was born of an Arab father from the Tayyi tribe and of a Jewish mother from the Banu Nadir. From the first, he opposed the Prophet's religio-political domination of Medina. After the defeat of the Quraysh at Badr, Kab left for Mecca and tried, through his poetry and parleys, to keep Meccan resistance to Muhammad alive. Kab is also accused of having composed "amatory verses of an insulting nature about the Muslim women." The Prophet prayed to God to dispose, in whatever way He wanted, of this "evil" embarrassing poet-activist - Ibn al-Ashraf -- **ALLAHUMMA AKFINI IBN AL-ASHRAF BIMA SHITA FI IILANIHI ASH-SHARR WA QAULIHI AL-ASHAR**. And then, as if God told him how to do that, the Prophet addressed some followers; "Who will rid me of Ibn al-Ashraf, who has plagued me so?" -- **MAN LI BI IBN AL-ASHRAF, FAQAD ADHANI** (W:187; cf. 1.1:367). Muhammad b. Maslama, a believer responded to the Prophetic call and assured the Prophet that, with the help of three other Muslim comrades, he would accomplish the desired mission. This death squad, however, told the Prophet they "(would) have to tell lies." The Prophet answered: "Say what you like, for you are free in this matter" (1.1:367). So authorized by the Prophet, Abu Naila Silkan, one of the Muslim gang of four, who was also Kab's foster-brother, went to him and pretended to oppose the Prophet. Complaining about Muhammad Abu Naila said: "The coming of this man is a great trial to us. It has provoked the hostility of the Arabs, and they are all in league against us. The roads have become impossible so that our families are in want and privation..." (1.1:367). Abu Naila also said that he had friends sharing the same opinion of Muhammad and the situation. He asked Kab to keep the secret. Kab was duped. He was overjoyed to see his foster-brother on his side. Kab said he had already warned of such dire consequences of Muhammad's domination of their town. In order to gain

Kab's confidence, Abu Naila also talked poetry. What could be more flattering to an enthusiastic poet like Kab than to talk poetry and exchange poems? Abu Naila had prepared the ground, and soon came to the point. Kab was a trader. Abu Naila asked him to sell him and his secret friends food on credit. He offered to bring Kab "enough weapons for a good pledge." Ibn Ishaq tells readers that Abu Naila's "object was that he (Kab) should not take alarm at the sight of weapons when they brought them" (1.1:367). Kab accepted the deal, telling Abu Naila to bring the weapons with his friends in order to buy their provisions.

After this agreement the Muslim foursome went to the Prophet and revealed the plan. In the night the Prophet sent the group off to accomplish the perfidy, saying: "Go in God's name; O God help them" (1.1:368). It was September 624 CE. Kab was recently married when Abu Naila called for him; Kab's wife quailed at the idea of his going out alone, at night, in a place where he had so many enemies. Kab tried to convince her it was Abu Naila, his foster brother; and then, in the mood of a poet-chevalier, he said: "Even if the call were for a stab, a brave man must answer it" (ibid). Kab went down to receive the surety of weapons and supply the food. The gang had indeed brought enough weapons. But they kept Kab busy in idle talk, which he did not suspect, and made him walk a distance from his house. Smelling the perfume the newly-married Kab had used, Abu Naila said he had "never smelt a scent finer than" that. When Kab, our talkative poet, felt fully at ease, and "suspected no evil", Abu Naila gave the sign to his three Muslim comrades, and was the first to cry: "Smite the enemy of God!" "(And) they smote him." Muhammad b. Maslama, the leader of the gang, thrust his dagger "into the lower part of his body... until it reached his genitals, and the enemy of God fell to the ground" (ibid). They beheaded Kab and returned at dawn to the mosque where the Prophet was waiting. He had been praying all night for their success. They threw Kab's head in front of the Prophet and all chanted: Allah Akbar, "God is great." The Prophet congratulated them and praised God, and the

murder squad. The gang in turn congratulated the Prophet (W:170). In order to terrorize the Jews further, the Prophet announced to the Muslims the next morning: "kill any man of the Jews that falls into your power -- **MAN ZAFIRTUM BIHI MIN RIJAL AL-YAHUD FA'QTULUH** -- and so, al-Waqidi adds, approvingly, "the Jews were frightened and none of their leaders came out or uttered a word; they were afraid to meet the fate of Ibn al-Ashraf" (W:191).

One of the four in the death squad later recalled proudly: "Our attack upon God's enemy cast terror among the Jews, and there was no Jew in Medina who did not fear for his life" (1.1:368). Kab b. Malik, a Muslim poet of the time, set the correct view of the incident for the believers of the future. He said with the pride of a believer:

Sword in hand we cut him down
 By Muhammad's order when he sent secretly by
 night
 Kab's brother to go to Kab.
 He beguiled him and brought him down with guile
 Mahmud (the Prophet) was trustworthy, bold (1.1:369).

4. **IBN SUNAYNAH**. Inspired by Muhammad's call to kill any Jew who fell into Muslim power, Muhayyisa b. Masud, a companion of the Prophet, killed Ibn Sunayna, a Jewish merchant. Muhayyisa the believer had social and business transactions with him. Huwayyisa, the elder brother of the Muslim killer, reproached his believer brother, reminding him of his indebtedness to the victim and the victim's generosity to him. Huwayyisa said: "You enemy of God, did you kill him when much of the fat on your belly comes from his wealth?". The reader should note that it is not the response of Huwayyisa the non-believer that is supposed to impress Muslims. Our sources record it in order to compare and contrast it with the believing brother's, Muhayyisa's, ideal Islamic reaction. Muhayyisa replied that had the Prophet ordered him to kill his brother (Huwayyisa), he would have cut his head off too. The sources proudly tell believers that "this was the beginning of Huwayyis's acceptance of Islam," for he "exclaimed, 'By God, a religion which can bring you to this is marvelous!' and he became a Muslim" (For the Muhayyisa -

Huwayyisa story see 1.1:369; W:192).

5. ABU SUFYAN and the ONE-EYED SHEPHERD (1.1:673-4).

After Abu Jahl's death at Badr Abu, Sufyan had emerged as the first among equal leaders at Mecca. He was, for all practical purposes, the president of this Dar al-Harb. The Prophet sent Amr b. Umayya, an Emigrant Muslim, and a Helper "telling (them) to go (to Mecca) and kill Abu Sufyan (1.1:673). This was an underground assassination mission. Before entering Meccan jurisdiction Amr had to leave his Medinan comrade behind because of a leg injury. At Mecca, before he could manage to reach Abu Sufyan, Amr, who carried "a dagger like an eagle's feather", was seen and suspected of evil intent. Amr was known in Mecca for his "violent, unruly nature when he was a non-Muslim. Amr decided to leave before he could be further exposed. However, before reaching Medina, Amr killed some other non-Muslims at different points on his return journey and took one hostage, whom he brought to the Prophet. The Prophet blessed Amr for what he had done although Abu Sufyan, the original target, had escaped.

The first victim of Amr, whom he ambushed and killed with his dagger, was Uthman b. Malik, a Meccan cutting grass for his horse outside the city. The second victim was a shepherd belonging to Banu ad-Du'il (a section of Banu Bakr). Banu Bakr were friendly with the Quraysh and were opposed to Islam. Amr introduced himself as a member of Banu Bakr to the shepherd, and thus concealed his identity. During the night the one-eyed shepherd lay down beside Amr and began to sing:

I won't be a Muslim as long as I live
Nor heed to their religion give

Amr said to himself, "You will soon know." Amr tells us what was in his mind and what he did with the unsuspecting shepherd, who had most probably entertained our believer. "As soon as the badu (the Beduin shepherd) was asleep and snoring, I got up and killed him in a more horrible way than any man has been killed. I put the end of my bow in his sound eye, then I bore down in it until I forced it out at the back

of his neck" (1.1:674). His next victims were two Meccan Quraysh travellers. He shot (with arrow) one to death. The other surrendered. When the Prophet saw Amr with his captive, whose thumbs he had bound with a bowstring, he (the Prophet) laughed aloud in appreciation "so that one could see his back teeth." The Prophet thus expressed his extreme pleasure with Amr. Because the Prophet blessed Amr after hearing of his adventures, such descriptions as these are not meant to express any regrets for the 'horrible' treatment of the nonbelievers. They are mentioned by our sources as a source of inspiration and pride, worthy of imitation on similar occasions.

6. AMR B. JIHASH. When the Prophet confronted the Banu Nadir Jews and they were deported from Medina, two of them, Yamin b. Umayr and Abu Sad b. Wahb became Muslims. They did so, as Ibn Ishaq says ironically, "in order to retain their property" (1.1:438). Yamin's cousin, Amr b. Jihash, who was expelled from Medina along with other Banu Nadir, was an outspoken critic of the Prophet. 'Amr b. Jihash was also the one who, as God and Gabriel had told Muhammad, wanted to kill the Prophet during the meeting with the Banu Nadir. The Prophet wanted to eliminate Amr. Perhaps also to test Yamin's loyalty, Muhammad told him what he thought about Amr. Yamin assured the Prophet he would take care of Amr for the (satisfaction of the) Messenger of God -- **ANA AKFIKAHU YA RASUL-ALLAH** (W:374). Yamin gave money to a third party to kill Amr, who was ambushed and killed. Yamin gave the news to the Prophet, who was glad of it -- **FA SURRA BI-DHALIK** (W:ibid).

7. ABU RAFI SALLAM B. ABU'L-HUQAYQ (1.1:482-4; W:391-5; TT,2:493-9; IS-B,2:91-2).

Abu Rafi Sallam b. Abu'l-Huqayq was one of the deported Medinan Banu Nadir Jews who had taken refuge in Khaybar. Sallam is alleged to have continued his anti-Islamic activities by inciting the Meccans and the Ghatafan Arab tribe against Muhammad. In Medina the Aus and Khazraj Muslims competed to please the Prophet by taking action against non-

Muslims. The Aus Muslims had taken a leading part in the elimination of Kab b. al-Ashraf. Now, the Khazraj believers "asked themselves: what man was as hostile to the apostle as Kab? And then they remembered Sallam... and asked and obtained the Prophet's permission to kill him" (1.1:482). Five men of the Khazraj formed a death squad. Abdullah b. 'Atik among them was appointed leader by the Prophet, who saw them off after charging them appropriately. Abdullah b. Atik's mother lived in Khaybar. He knew the place and the "Jewish language," or dialect, which, apparently, was Hebrew or a form of it, spoken by the Jews of Arabia along with Arabic. When at Khaybar, Abdullah's mother helped the group, willingly, to learn the whereabouts of Sallam. It was she who told her son and his comrades that the Jews, in order not to disappoint any strangers and guests did not close at night the doors of the walls surrounding their houses. She also told them to go at night when all were asleep and as they reached the house-door tell whomsoever they confronted that they had some gift for Sallam (W:392, passim). Abdullah himself was known to Sallam's family and, most probably, some other Khaybarians. The believers thus utilized all their knowledge, expertise and acquaintances about the nonbelievers' land and citizens in order to serve the cause of Islam.

On a dark night in May 626 CE, the group knocked at the door of Sallam's house; his wife went to answer. She recognized Abdullah's voice, who told her in "Jewish language" from behind the door that he and his companions were Arabs in search of supplies and that he had a gift for Sallam. As soon as she opened the door, the gang of five seized her and threatened to kill her if she refused to tell them where Sallam was. The startled and shocked woman had no choice; she told them where Sallam was asleep. They all jumped on the sleeping Sallam together and pierced his body with their swords. After the Muslim death squad left the house one of them went back to be sure "that the enemy of God was dead." It was dark and he could not be seen from a safe distance. By that time some Jews had gathered round the dead body. The

Muslim heard the wife with a lamp in hand and peering into Sallam's face, saying: "By the God of the Jews he is dead." The Prophet's follower who wanted to be sure of Sallam's death, on hearing the wife wail that he was dead remarked later to his fellow Muslims: "Never have I heard sweeter words than those" (1.1:483). It was an appropriate reaction for the believers of all time to the news about the death and destruction of a heathen, a Jew. The five men of Khazraj returned to Medina where the Prophet was keenly waiting for the news of Sallam's death. They told the Prophet that the mission was accomplished; he congratulated them and they congratulated him -- **QAL AFLAHAT AL-WUJUH! FA-QULNA AFLAH WAJHUK YA RASUL ALLAH** (W:394). There was some squabble among the members of the death squad on the point of whose sword stroke had finally killed Sallam; every one of the five was claiming the honor. The Prophet had to intervene personally. After having a look at the five swords, he decided that it was the sword of Abdullah b. Unays that had killed the enemy of God; the Prophet could "see traces of food on it" (1.1:483).

What can believers in the necessity and obligation for following the model (Sunnah) of the Prophet learn in this regard? Hassan, the Prophet's poet laureate, has left a poem for the direction of the Muslim believers' attitude and behavior in their dealings with the perceived adversaries of Islam.

God, what a fine band you met,
 O Ibnu'l-Huqayq and Ibn al-Ashraf!
 They went to you with sharp swords,
 Brisk as lions in a tangled thicket,
 Until they came on you in your dwelling
 And made you drink death with their swift-
 slaying swords
 Looking for the victory of their Prophet's religion
 Despising every risk of hurt (1.1:483-4).

8. **MIQYAS** was a Muslim during the Prophet's raid of al-Muraysi' against the pagan Arabs of Banu'l-Mustaliq tribe. Miqyas's Muslim brother, mistaken for a non-Muslim, was killed by another Muslim. The Prophet asked Miqyas to accept blood-money which he did. Miqyas was, apparently, not happy with the Prophet's verdict and with his

affiliation with Islam. He killed his brother's murderer and fled to Mecca, proudly announcing in a poem his return to paganism -- **WA KUNT ILA'L-AUTHAN AWWAL-A RAJI-I** (W:408). As above line tells us Miqyas was the first openly to announce his apostasy. The Prophet promptly declared Miqyas **MAHDUR AD-DAM**, one whose blood could be shed with Islamic immunity by anyone. On the basis of this decree, Numayla, a Muslim, killed Miqyas when he was found in Mecca during the conquest (ibid).

9. **SUFYAN AL-LIHYANI** was the chief of Banu Lihyan, a pagan Arab tribe. He was one of the Prophet's outspoken opponents beyond Mecca and Medina. The Prophet decided to eliminate Sufyan. Muhammad appointed Abd Allah b. Unays to accomplish the mission. Muhammad advised Abd Allah to pretend to be a member of the Khuzaah tribe, use whatever false methods necessary to gain the confidence of the enemy, and then kill him. Following the Prophet's instructions, Abd Allah gained Sufyan's confidence. He pretended to be a Khuzaah, talking against Muhammad and Islam, while pleasing the duped tribal chief with sweet talk and recitation of poetry. It was September 625 CE. When the night came and the deceived Sufyan's people fell asleep, Abd Allah attacked. He fled for Medina carrying the head of Sufyan, leaving the body for the screaming, mourning family of the victim. In the mosque of Medina, the Prophet, as usual, greeted the successful believer by saying: "May you prosper" -- **AFLAHA'L-WAJH**. Abd Allah said: "may the Messenger of Allah prosper," and set the head of Sufyan before the Prophet (W:533). To encourage Muslims of all times to deem such deeds desirable and appropriate our sources further tell the believers that as an immediate reward, the Prophet gave Abd Allah an **ASA**, a staff (or a stick), bidding the latter keep it as a sign of special friendship between the two on the Day of Resurrection. The Prophet told Abd Allah there would be few men carrying such a stick of honor. Abd Allah was so convinced that he always kept the stick with him and at his request it was put in his winding sheet and buried with him when he died. (For the

full story see 1.1:666-7, (IH)789;W:531-3). Before his death, Abd Allah (referring to this assassination) was proud to say in poetry

I said to him, 'Take that with the blow of a
noble man
Who turns to the religion of the Prophet
Muhammad?
Whenever the Prophet gave thought to an
unbeliever
I got to him first with tongue and hand
(1.1(IH):789).

10. YUSAYR B. RIZAM AND HIS 29 COMRADES.²³

After the assassination the Prophet ordered of Abu Rafi Sallam b. Abu'l-Huqayq at Khaybar, the Jews of the region appointed Yusayr b. Rizam their leader. After what had happened with the Jews of Medina and his predecessor, Yusayr was obviously unfriendly toward Muhammad. The Prophet sent a thirty-man Muslim band to solve the problem. The method the Prophet adopted was this time somewhat different. It was to be a mass assassination of leading Jews of Khaybar.

The thirty-man band was duly dispatched by the Prophet with special instructions. Abd Allah b. Rawaha was the leader and Abd Allah b. Unays, the assassin of Sufyan, was an important member of the gang. Just before Ibn Unays left Medina to join the mission, the Prophet told him: "I don't want to see Yusayr ibn Rizam (alive)! I mean kill him -- **LA ARA YUSAYR IBN RIZAM! AY UQTULHU** (W:568). The Muslim band reached Khaybar on a pretence of peace. They sent a message to Yusayr asking for a promise of safety so that they could talk face to face. Yusayr agreed, on the condition that the Muslim band would also behave peacefully. The Muslims agreed, and negotiations began. The Muslims told Yusayr the Prophet proffered him the governorship of Khaybar and friendly treatment if he, Yusayr, went to visit the Prophet at Medina. Yusayr "was tempted by the offer" as our sources say sarcastically (IS-B,2:92; W:567). In council over this, some Jews opposed the visit. They warned that Muhammad had never appointed a Jew as **AMIL** (governor). But Yusayr insisted that he accept, and he, along with twenty-nine or thirty other Jews, apparently unarmed, accompanied the thirty Muslims

toward Medina. (That Yusayr when attacked used a branch of a tree to defend himself indicates he was unarmed. Also see Watt. Med.:213). Six miles outside Khaybar, the armed Muslim band fell suddenly on the unarmed thirty Jews. They killed them all, beginning with Yusayr, save one who managed to escape. It was February or March 628 CE. No Muslim was injured, except Abd Allah b. Unays, by a wooden stick that Yusayr carried. The Prophet came from Medina to greet the band. On hearing their story of success, the Prophet remarked: "God saved you from a wrong-doing people" (IS-B,2:43; W:568).

On the way to Medina, the sources say, Ibn Unays suspected that the enemy of God, Yusayr, riding the same camel, was trying to purloin Ibn Unays's sword, with evil intentions. Abd Allah Ibn Unays attacked Yusayr and killed him. This description may tempt modern Muslim apologists to make the thirty Jews responsible for their own deaths. It is possible to speculate. Yusayr might have changed his mind about visiting Medina, and as a result might have shifted uneasily, trying to find a way to return to Khaybar. This might have given Abd Allah and other Muslims reason to carry out the Prophet's wish expressed to Abd Allah, before it was too late, or before reaching the time and place of killing of the Jews they might have had in their minds. The Prophet's instruction was clear. The other thirty or so unarmed Jews riding the same camels as the Muslims were not charged with threatening gestures, but they were killed anyhow. At Medina, the thirty Muslims were congratulated rather than blamed. From a Muslim believer's point of view, it was Islam's prerogative that justified this mass political assassination, not necessarily the mere suspicion of Ibn Unays that al-Yusayr was trying to touch his sword. Even if proof were clear that Yusayr did not so act, a Muslim believer is not expected to condemn the action, unless he is told of the Prophet's condemnation of the same action. Because the Prophet planned the beginning and praised the end, the episode inspires, or at least sanctions, similar deeds against nonbelievers.

11. RIFAAH B. QAYS AL-JUSHAMI (1.1:671-2).

Ibn Abu Hadrad al-Aslami, a Muslim, was in jeopardy because he had failed to deliver the two hundred camels as the dowry to the woman of his choice. Ibn Abu Hadrad went to the Prophet and asked for financial help. The Prophet was unable to help immediately but he kept the believer's need in mind. Soon, the Prophet thought of an opponent, a pagan tribal chief, Rifaa b. Qays al-Jushami. The Prophet summoned Ibn Aub Hadrad and two other apparently poor and needy Muslims, gave them a camel and dispatched them to dispose of Rifaa. The group proceeded until it reached near Rifaa's settlement. Under Ibn Abu Hadrad's leadership the three hid at different points waiting for an appropriate moment to attack by surprise. The three Muslims were lucky. Rifaa left the settlement to look for his shepherd and animals that had not reached the camp on time. It was night. As Rifaa passed by the point where Ibn Abu Hadrad was hiding in ambush the latter "shot him in the heart with an arrow, and he died without uttering a word." Ibn Abu Hadrad "leapt upon him and cut off his head and ran in the direction of the camp shouting 'God is the greatest' -- **ALLAH AKBAR**". The other two members of the group did likewise. The men, women and children of the camp fled in panic. Ibn Abu Hadrad was glad to report the end result:

We drove off a large number of camels and sheep and brought them to the apostle and I took Rifaa's head to the apostle, who gave me thirteen of the camels to help me with the woman's dowry, and I consummated my marriage (1.1:671-2).

It was apparently appropriate for the Prophet to use Muslim incentives and needs to execute his plans of assassination and war. Hence believers are likely to be encouraged to look for occasions on which they can solve their financial problems by making the non-Muslims targets of their attacks.

B: Terror, Torture, Intimidation,...

Certain Medinan Quranic passages authorize terror, torture and other harsh treatments of non-Muslims. Muslims find that one of the

Almighty's ways in dealing with nonbelievers was terrorization. Also, the Prophet and his Companions used the method. The Battle of Badr and Muslim treatment there of non-Muslims are instructive. Muslims were encouraged to be ruthless. God said:

I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve, so strike off their heads and cut off their fingers, because they opposed God and His apostle, and he who opposes God and His apostle (will find) God severe in punishment (Q8:12-13. Guillaume tr. in 1.1:322).

Clearly, the Muslims must be the Almighty's tools by being ruthless towards the enemy, so to accomplish His purpose of 'casting terror in the hearts of nonbelievers.'

The RU'B, terror, in Muslim treatment of the Banu Nadir Jews of Medina was appreciated by God:

It is He who expelled from their habitations the unbelievers among the People of the Book at the first mustering. You did not think they would go forth, and they thought their fortresses would defend them against God; then God came upon them from whence they had not reckoned, and He cast terror into their hearts as they destroyed their houses with their ownhands, and the hands of the believers; therefore takeheed, you who have eyes (59:2; cf. 1.1:438; W:380-1; T,28:27-31).

As Tabari explains, God's "casting terror into the hearts of the Jews" was caused by the Prophet's surprise attack and the Muslim destruction of the houses of the Banu Nadir.

Similarly, God promised believers (in Q3:151) to cast terror into the hearts of non-Muslims because they defied God by not accepting Muhammad's Prophethood (TS,12:279-80). Tabari gives the Prophet's show of force against the Meccans just after the Muslim defeat at Uhud as an example of the means by which God terrorized the nonbelievers (*ibid*). After the defeat at Uhud and a day's stay at Medina, the Prophet decided to pursue the returning victorious Meccans keeping a safe distance. He aimed at terrorizing the Meccans lest they decide to attack Medina at a difficult time. Along with only those wounded and exhausted Muslims who had fought at Uhud, the Prophet halted at a point (Hamra al-Asad) where he thought the campfires could be seen that night by the returning Meccans. He ordered his five hundred companions to scatter and make

five hundred campfires. This gave the impression that the Muslims were many more than their actual number, "God terrorized the enemy" of the Muslims (W:338).

The Prophet also sent a spy to deceive the returning Meccans. He told them that those in Medina who had not participated at Uhud had now joined the Prophet and that all the Muslims and Medinans who sought the Meccans "like a fire" had taken a vow never to return until they had taken revenge. So, the Meccans were frightened and continued their return journey to Mecca (W:334-40). The Almighty decreed that nonbelievers who "fight against God and His Messenger" are to

be slaughtered, or crucified or their hands and feet shall alternately be struck off, or they shall be banished from the land. That is degradation for them in this world; and in the world to come awaits them a mighty chastisement, except for such as repent, before you have power over them. So know that God is all-forgiving, All-compassionate (5:33-4).

Tabari's long discussion of this passage (TS,12:243-89) leaves no doubt that the suggested forms of treatment apply to at least known non-Muslims. Most of the discussion deals with punishments for Muslim renegades, highwaymen and rebels. In any case, the use of physical torture and amputation are Divinely authorized. Though, as usual, the passage refers to certain specific situations, Tabari tells us it applies in all similar situations -- **WA FI NAZAIRIHIM** (ibid:251). Tabari's explanation (of Q3:34) "except for such as repent...", also makes it clear that harsh punishment undoubtedly is prescribed for those who do not believe in Islam. "Only those who repent by no longer fighting against God and the Messenger and spreading 'corruption' in the earth, by (accepting) Islam and entering in the Faith before the believers overwhelm them" may escape the Quranic punishment as prescribed in the passage (ibid:277). Muslims are authorized to perpetrate such treatment on non-Muslims who have not already surrendered to Muslim domination, particularly those beyond the borders of Islam.

The Prophet and his comrades used harsh and abusive language,

various kinds and degrees of tricks, deceptions and mistreatment, terror and mental and physical torture against non-Muslims in times of war and peace. Only a few of the incidents were preceded by genuine Muslim grievances against their adversaries. Even in these cases, however, the punishment was disproportionate to the alleged crimes. In most cases, our sources relate the events as if to say the Prophet and his companions had a divine right to do what they did. Islamic sources describe the events with approval and appreciation. A Muslim believer, while reading about these events, is supposed to appreciate, and be inspired by, the way the founder of Islam treated non-Muslims, rather than to express sympathy for the victims. From a Muslim perspective, they got what they deserved.

During the armed expeditions and wars of the Prophet and his companions, **ALLAH AKBAR**, "God is great," and **YA MANSUR AMIT AMIT** "O the helped one (by God) slay, slay" were popular Muslim war cries. War cries like **AMIT AMIT** "slay, slay," must have terrorized their adversaries. This Muslim ruthlessness made them petrifying to the sober Meccans, such as Utba b. Rabiah, who before the battle of Badr had advised his people to avoid confronting "those grim serpent-like faces." Even before Nakhla, Muslim believers like Abu Bakr anxiously waited to "leave (the) women (of the nonbelievers) husbandless" "(and to) leave their dead men, with vultures wheeling round" (1.1:282).

Direct Muslim engagements with the non-Muslims outside Medina began with the incident of Nakhla. There, the Muslims, by shaving their heads, pretended to be peaceful pilgrims, thus fooling their victims before the surprise attack. It was also then that a non-Muslim captive, used by the Prophet as a hostage, was threatened with decapitation unless he converted to Islam (W:15-7; 1.1:286-7).

Our sources praise some Muslims who remained in Mecca after the Prophet's migration to Medina, and some of the Prophet's Meccan relatives for working as spies for Muhammad. Just before the battle of Badr, Atika and Makhzama b. Abd al-Muttalib, Muhammad's close

relatives, told the Meccans of their dreams, which said the Quraysh would soon be faced with a bloody catastrophe. On the battlefield one Addas, a reported sympathizer of the Prophet, with the enemy as a slave, repeatedly spoke of the invincibility of the Prophet, who was helped by God. Such rumors and whispers divided and demoralized the Quraysh before they engaged in real battle. How far the dreams of Atika and Makhzama (1.1:290-1, 295) and the whispering campaign of Addas (W:33) were linked to the Prophet's secret instructions, we cannot say definitively. What we know is that the Prophet did plant rumors through secret agents on various other occasions to terrorize and demoralize the enemy. Whatever the link to the Prophet the believers read about and appreciate what terrors these rumors worked on the enemy. Abu Lahab, a staunch opponent of Muhammad, was so shaken by Atika's dream, we are told, that he refused to participate in the battle (W:30-33). Some Muslims, such as Sad b. Maadh, who went to Mecca before Badr for pilgrimage, were already engaged in psychological warfare. Sad told Umayya b. Khalaf, a Meccan leader, that Muhammad had vowed to kill Umayya some day. The threat was so effective -- **FA WAQAA FI NAFSIHI**, believers are told, that Umayya was already scared to death during Badr. This peril, our sources tell us, led Umayya to join the peace faction among the Meccans (W:35- 6). Similar accounts of enemies being **MARUB**, terrorized, such as the one about Nawfal b. Khuwaylid, are given to reinforce believers' appreciation for the use of **IRAB**, "terrorization" against nonbelievers (W:91).

God's terror against non-Muslims was carried out also by angels and forces of nature. The angelic forces were at Badr, believers are told, to terrorize non-Muslims (W:95). Punishment of one group of non-Muslims is to be used to terrorize other nonbelievers. Al-Waqidi notes approvingly that the victorious Muslim return from Badr with non-Muslim prisoners in bondage terrorized the Jews and other Arab non-Muslims of Medina (W:121). The more outspoken critics had to be told explicitly to be still, otherwise they would be taken to the Prophet to lose their

heads. The persons concerned in each case apologized and were thus silenced by the threat (W:115). During Badr, Umar threatened to kill a Muslim (Abu Hudhayfa) suspected of having expressed some misgivings. Abu Hudhayfa had questioned the Prophet's soft treatment of his Meccan relatives compared to his ruthless treatment of the other Meccans - including Abu Hudhayfa's father. The threat worked. Abu Hudhayfa apologized (1.1:301).

The Prophet was stopped on the way to Badr by an old Bedouin and asked him if he knew of anything about the Quraysh and the Muslim armies. The old man did not know who his questioner was, but agreed to guess where the two groups were on condition that the questioner (Muhammad) would tell him to which party he belonged. Muhammad agreed. The Bedouin told the Prophet exactly where each group should have been at that time. Then the Bedouin asked, expecting his questioner would honor the promise: 'Of whom are you?.' The Prophet said: "We are from Ma" (the water or river, which meant nothing). Thus believers learn that the Prophet simply dodged the unbelieving old man and did not care to honor his promise (W:50; 1.1:294). This is acceptable, a believer might argue, because the Prophet meant to safeguard the interests of Islam.

During the journey toward Badr, another non-Muslim Bedouin who unfortunately demonstrated his indifference towards the Messenger of God got a harsher treatment. In response to the Prophet's question about the Quraysh party, this nomad said he had no news. The Companion, in order to intimidate the non-Muslim nomad, ordered him to "Salute God's Messenger". The independent Bedouin, perhaps, irritated, asked Muhammad sarcastically: "If you are God's Messenger, then tell me. What is in the belly of my she camel here?'" One of the enraged Muslim companions, Salama b. Salama, said: "Don't question God's apostle; but come to me and I will tell you about it. You leapt upon her and she has in her belly a little goat from you!". The Prophet however, stopped Salama from further obscenity (1.1:293; W:46). We know that the Muslim

comrades of the Prophet several times thereafter abused the nonbelievers, and that Salama b. Salama is included among the Prophet's high ranking Companions (IS-B,3:439- 40) to be respected by the believers.

Before the two parties confronted each other at Badr, the Muslims captured three water-camel men of the Quraysh and took them to the Prophet. After the captives were thrashed and exhausted, the Prophet himself interrogated them and got valuable information about the number and status of the enemy (1.1:295; W:51-2).

Among descriptions of the Badr, a nonbeliever is described as having an (ugly) face like that of Satan (W:75). During the battle, Ali ridiculed one of his counterparts and called him **IBN ASH-SHATRA**, "the son of a cracked-lip person" (W:93). It was a slur. After the war Umar called Umayr b. Wahb 'a pig', "this dog" and asked other Muslims to "keep off the dog" -- **DUNAKUM AL-KALB** -- meaning Umayr. Umayr had left for Medina to free his captive son by paying ransom, and was also suspected of having gone there to assassinate the Prophet. Umayr was a mercenary type of gangster and a troublesome person. He was paid and sent by a Meccan to do away with Muhammad. At Medina he was suspected and arrested and brought to the Prophet, who told Umayr of his mission. (Thanks, perhaps, to the Prophet's agents at Mecca. According to the believers, the Prophet was told of this by God). However, Umayr, under duress, accepted Islam and returned to Mecca to announce this. Our sources gladly inform believers that once back at Mecca, Umayr used his violent qualities for Islam and thus a "lot of people" were converted to Islam (W:125-7; 1.1:318-9).

The battle of Badr makes the merciless Muslim attitude towards nonbelievers more obvious. But let us provide one more incident before Badr to show the Muslim attitude towards the lives and property of non-Muslims. (For the following story see W:22-47).

On his way to Badr, the Prophet met two chiefs of the Banu Salima tribe. This tribe, apparently opportunistically, entertained the

Prophet and his party. As the tribal chiefs and the Prophet chatted they told him that their present settlement, Husayka, formerly belonged to the Jews, who had many houses therein. Then, the chiefs added, they armed every member of the Banu Salmia tribe and attacked the Jews of Husayka - the most famous and respected among the Jews. "And then," continued the report of their aggression. "We slaughtered the Jews to our satisfaction" -- **WA QATALNAHUM KAYF SHINA** "and so, other Jews were humbled before us until this day" (W:23). "The chiefs then wished a similar victory for Muhammad over Quraysh." The Prophet listened approvingly. It, perhaps, inspired him further to do to the Jews of Medina what he did after Badr. The Prophet, however, changed the name of Husayka to as-Suqya, perhaps to Arabise or Islamise it. Apparently, the settlement of Husayka, now as-Suqya, was prosperous, with well-built houses. The efforts by some Muslims to buy some of the homes showed they were valuable (W:22-4). Reading the story, as a part of the Prophet's biography, a believer is likely to get a strong dose of anti-Jewish feelings, without questioning why the Prophet condoned a pre-Islamic, apparently unjust and unprovoked raid by heathen Arabs against the so-called People of the Book. Here the boundaries between Arab chauvinistic and Islamic anti-Jewish sentiments disappear: the two become one.

Before and during the battle, the Prophet prayed and asked his God for what Noah had asked: the complete annihilation of his ideological opponents (W:46; 1.1:297, 301). Such prayers and desires were repeated throughout the centuries - and continue in almost every Friday congregational prayer and on other Muslim occasions: "O God, help those who help the creed of Muhammad; O God, humble and humiliate those who humble the creed of Muhammad. O God, shatter the unity of the non-Muslims and destroy their lands" -- **ALLAHUMM UKHDHUL MAN KHADHAL DIN MUHAMMAD... ALLAHUMM SHATTIT SHAMLAHUM. ALLAHUMM MAZZIQ JAMAHUM. ALLAHUMM DAMMIR DIYARAHUM...** During prayer at Badr the Prophet said: "O God, if this band perishes today thou wilt be worshipped no more"

(1.1:300), and thus believers of all times were told that only the followers of Muhammad were the true God-worshippers. The rest of the world consisted of rebels against God deserving the worst kind of treatment from the hands of the Muslims. At Badr, certain enemies were wounded and fallen, unable to harm the Muslims further. The reports of Badr and other Muslim battles indicate that Muslims showed no concern for their fallen enemies; they were further tortured until their last breath. The news or the sight of the death of non-Muslims was a cause for rejoicing rather than regret or sympathy. The Prophet and his followers did not show restraint on such occasions. Even the dead bodies of fallen non-Muslims were disrespected; they were rebuked even after death. Nor was there a sense of forgiveness. In the descriptions of Badr, a believer finds examples of all such treatments of non-Muslims.

Before the battle, the Prophet occupied the wells at Badr, diverting their water into a cistern under Muslim control. Apparently it was the only source of drinking water in and around the battlefield. The Prophet denied the enemy the use of this sole source of water. The Quraysh apparently began to fight because they were pressed by growing thirst and decreasing water reserves. A desperately thirsty non-Muslim, al-Aswad, moved towards the cistern under Muslim control and vowed: "I swear to God that I will drink from their cistern, destroy it or die before reaching it." However, the Muslims showed no mercy. Hamza, the Prophet's uncle, "smote" the thirsty nonbeliever "and sent his foot and half his shank flying as he was near the cistern. He fell on his back and lay there, blood streaming from his foot towards his comrades. Then he crawled to the cistern and threw himself into it... but Hamza followed him and smote him and killed him in the cistern" (1.1:299; W:68). When the Muslims had decided to monopolize the drinking water, the Prophet said: **AL-HARB WA'L-MAKIDAH** -- "the war justifies deception" (W:53). We know that, theoretically, Muslim believers are perpetually at war with the non-Muslims, particularly

those not yet subjugated to Muslim political domination. So, the believers are perpetually in a state of **MAKIDAH** (from the root word **KAYD**), disingenuousness, in their relations with nonbelievers. The Prophet used the same method of denying water, together with food, during his siege of Taif and Khaybar, to bring non-Muslim adversaries to their knees.

Abu Jahl, the arch-adversary of Muhammad and Islam was seriously wounded in the battle, and fell on the ground waiting for his death; his foot and half his shank were cut off. Muawwidh, a Muslim passed by and smote the wounded man further. Then came Abd Allah b. Masud, the fanatic Emigrant. He found Abu Jahl taking his last breath, though conscious enough to see and speak a few words. Ibn Masud proudly told the Prophet later that when he met the wounded Abu Jahl, he put his foot on the fallen man's neck and said "I praise God who humiliated you, you enemy of God." While the stubborn Abu Jahl grumbled in defiance, Abd Allah turned the half-dead body from side to side disrespectfully and plundered him, taking off his helmet, then beheading him. Abd Allah b. Masud took his prize to the Prophet, anxious for the news of Abu Jahl's death. Abd Allah threw Abu Jahl's head before the Prophet and said: "Have good news, O Prophet of God; Abu Jahl, the enemy of God is killed." The Prophet said: 'Are you sure O Abd Allah (that it was the head of Abu Jahl)?' (The severed head and face must have been mutilated beyond recognition). When the Prophet was convinced, he thanked God and remarked that it was the best news he had received (W:90 cf. 86-91; 1.1:304). Later, more than one Muslim claimed in pride to have killed Abu Jahl. Indeed, after Abu Jahl had fallen many believers had tried their hands. The Prophet decided the issue by recognizing gratefully that all - including some unseen angels - had a share in torturing to death this enemy of God, Abu Jahl (W:91). The wounding, killing, and deaths of many other Meccans at Badr are described similarly and graphically with utmost glee (See, e.g., W:86,92, 1.1:295-316).

The battle over, surviving Meccans having escaped, no respect or

mercy was shown to the dead bodies of the enemy. The Prophet "ordered the dead to be thrown into a pit. They were all thrown in, except Ummayya b. Khalaf. His body had swelled within his armour so that it filled it; when they went to move him, his body disintegrated. So they left it where it was and heaped earth and stones on it." The Prophet had no consolation; instead, he rebuked the dead: "As they threw them into the pit the apostle stood and said, 'O people of the pit, have you found that what God threatened is true? For I have found that what my Lord promised me is true'" (1.1:305 cf. W:111-2). Following their Prophet, other Muslims also went around the corpses thrown into the pit and reviled them, calling each dead man by name (W:112). It seems the Prophet was unhappy to see some wounded enemies escape sure death. When he saw Hubayra b. Abu Wahb, a frightened, injured Meccan, being carried away by two of his comrades, the Prophet remarked disgustedly: "two of his dogs protected him" (W:95). A contemporary reader may use terms such as jingoistic, male chauvinistic and sexist for the kind of feelings Muslims expressed at Badr. Some of them, ridiculing the Quraysh, remarked, while the Prophet was listening joyously: "By God, we met only some bald women like the sacrificial camels, hobbled, and we slaughtered them!" The Prophet smiled and said sarcastically, referring to the fallen Quraysh: "But nephew, those were the chiefs" (1.1:308). The Prophet was happy to see Meccan "chiefs slaughtered" so easily.²⁴ Among the fallen were personalities such as Abu'l-Bakhtari who had extended their generous protection to Muhammad on critical occasions in Mecca.

C: Treatment of Prisoners of War

Our sources count about seventy Meccans taken as prisoners of war by the Prophet and his followers at Badr. They are, apparently, in addition to those captives massacred by the believers (W:105) before the Prophet temporarily suspended the slaughter of prisoners of war. Out of the seventy known captives, two (Umayya b. Khalaf and his son Ali)

were tortured and killed gruesomely by the Muslim mob before the Prophet left the battlefield (1.1:303; W:75, 83-4). Mabad b. Wahb was also executed before the Muslims left for Medina (W:105). An-Nadr b. al-Harith and Uqba b. Abu Muayt were beheaded during the victorious return to Medina. Suhayl b. Amr, a prominent Meccan, was among the captives. He escaped after he was brought to Medina. The Prophet declared him **MAHDUR AD-DAM**, i.e., to be killed wherever and by whomever found. The Prophet thus authorized and approved the execution of six Badri prisoners of war. The rest of the captives were taken in bondage to Medina, to be freed on various terms. Most were freed after their Meccan relatives paid 1,000 to 4,000 dinars in ransom. The Prophet and the Muslims were willing to extort as much as possible before they released anyone (1.1:309, 11; W:129). One Meccan died a prisoner at Medina before he could be released (W:140). Some, like Abu Izza the poet, were released on the condition that they would stop their anti-Islam activities and would not support Muhammad's enemies in the future. They were thus neutralized (W:110; 1.1:318). The son of Umayr b. Wahb was released after his father had converted to Islam, and sworn to return to Mecca and use his impetuous image and behavior for Islam, which he did (W:142, 125-8).

The shrewd Abu Sufayn, conscious of Muhammad's plans of extortion, urged in vain his fellow Meccans not to hurry to free their captives. Abu Sufyan's son was among the captives. He refused to pay ransom, saying the Muslims could "keep him as long as they liked." Abu Sufyan had decided to discard the usual liberal Meccan policy towards Muslim pilgrims to Mecca - another example of the fact that even when Muslims were at war with the Meccans and other non-Muslims, the Muslims used to go to Mecca for pilgrimage unmolested. The "Quraysh did not usually interfere with the pilgrims, but treated them well" Ibn Ishaq admits (1.1:313). However, Abu Sufyan detained a Muslim pilgrim in retaliation for his captive son, Amr. The retaliation worked. When the Prophet was informed, he let Amr go in exchange for the Muslim detainee (ibid). It

is surprising other Meccans did not adopt the same method. Apparently, hostage-taking was not so common among these heathens before Islam. The pilgrimage to Mecca was an international institution. Though in power, the Meccans they did not want to exploit or violate unwritten rules. Perhaps, the liberal Meccans respected international norms too well.

Meccan captives related to Muhammad, such as his son-in-law Abu'l-As uncle Abbas, and others from Banu Abd al-Muttalib (the Prophet's grandfather) received softer treatment. During their imprisonment, they were exceptionally well-handled. Except for Abbas, famous for his wealth, they were all released with no ransom (W:138, 1.1:314). In the case of Abbas, the Prophet set a precedent for believers on how to treat the debts they owed the nonbelievers when they held power. When the ransom for Abbas was being negotiated, he reminded the Prophet that Muhammad owed him twenty okes of gold from a previous transaction, perhaps at Mecca before the hijra, and asked the Prophet to accept that amount of gold for the ransom. The Prophet said: "that has nothing to do with it. God took that from you and gave it to us" (1.1:312). Following this sunnah, a believer, when possible, could refuse to pay what he owed a nonbeliever, i.e. cancel debts unilaterally. However, Abbas had to pay all over again to redeem himself (ibid).

The treatment of the Badri prisoners by the Muslims and the Quranic verdicts in this regard are more likely to reinforce ruthlessness among believers towards prisoners of war in similar situations. The captives of Badr were mishandled, ridiculed and humiliated in different ways, and the Muslims were strictly forbidden to show any sympathy for them. Some such as Suhayl, were threatened: "pull out their front teeth so that their tongues will stick out and they will never be able to speak against the Prophet again" (W:118 121; 1.1:309, 312).

Mabad b. Wahb was one non-Muslim captive who could not keep his mouth shut. Though in bondage, Mabad irritated Umar by asserting that the Muslims would lose eventually. Umar was so enraged that he incited

the Muslims there, saying: "O God's Muslim servants, (do you hear?)" (W:105). This 'impoliteness' of the heathen prisoner of war was enough justification to silence him forever. Umar, who was to become the second Rightly Guided caliph and conquerer of Iran and parts of Byzantium, cut off Mabad's head (ibid).

We have already mentioned Umayya b. Khalaf and his son Ali who had surrendered on a pledge of **AMAN**, "protection: by a Muslim and promise of acceptance of ransom for their freedom." They were treacherously tortured to death by a mob of Muslim zealots. The Prophet expressed his happiness over their tragic death, and they were among those thrown in the pit and rebuked by the Prophet even after they were dead. Abd ar-Rahman, the Muslim who had promised protection, was sorry only because he had lost his collection of mailcoats without having gained the much coveted milk-camels the captives had promised (W:75, 83-4; 1.1:303). A famous Meccan story-teller who used to challenge and compete with the Prophet in telling tales of the ancients was beheaded by Ali, the Prophet's son-in-law, as ordered by Muhammad. His pleas to be treated like other prisoners, i.e., freed by ransom, were rejected (W:106-7; 101). Uqba b. Abu Muayt was beheaded, as Muhammad ordered, for his "animosity to God and His Messenger." Before he was killed, Uqba begged for his life, requesting the Prophet to accept ransom. He also said: "O Muhammad, (I have) small children; who will look after them (after I am dead)?" The Prophet responded: "hell," and then the Prophet bade Asim, a companion: "cut off his head," which he did (W:113-4; 1.1:308).

Towards the end of the battle of Badr, a controversy developed among the Muslims on the treatment of the prisoners of war (T,10:42-51; W:106-10 passim; 1.1:326 passim): Soft-liners, like Abu Bakr, favored releasing captives after receiving an appropriate ransom. They had had kinship with the Meccans. He thought the money thus gained would be a source of strength against the nonbelievers (T,10:44). Abu Bakr also hoped the Meccans left alive would eventually convert to Islam. Hard-

liners, like Sad b. Maadh and Umar, insisted on slaughtering the captives. Abd Allah b. Rawaha represented a very tough group, who also suggested burning captives alive (T,10:43). The Prophet was vaguely neutral, somewhat inclined towards the soft-liners (those who preferred to save the captives for their much-needed ransom, to better the impoverished Muslim community, particularly **AL-MUHAJIRUN**, the Emigrants). Perhaps this concern was in the Prophet's mind when he said: "Today, you are impoverished, do not let any one of them (the captives) escape until they either pay ransom or they are beheaded -- **ANTUM 'ALAT-UN FA-LA YANFALITANN-A AHAD-UN MINHUM ILLA BI-FIDA AU DARB UNUQ** (T,10:44). When the Prophet halted the mass massacre of the captives, it was clearly ransom, rather than any humanitarian concern, that influenced him. He took exception to his own ruling by giving the order to behead an-Nadr and Uqba. Thus, the order to save the captives for ransom was not unequivocal. The Prophet told the believers the angel Gabriel had authorized both kinds of treatment of the non-Muslim prisoners of war (W:107). But he did not condemn the hard-liners during the debate. The Prophet did appreciate their zeal against nonbelieving captives. The Prophet likened Umar, who advocated outright slaughter, to Noah, who said, as the Prophet recited: "My Lord, leave not upon the earth of the unbelievers even one," and as Noah wished, God destroyed the whole world by flooding and drowning every one but a few followers of the old man (T,10:43; W:109 cf. Q71:26). To Abd Allah b. Rawaha, who had urged that all the captives be put in a thicket of dry wood to be burned alive, the Prophet said appreciatively: "You are like Prophet Moses, who had prayed to God about the nonbelievers (as in the Quran): 'Our Lord, obliterate their possessions, and harden their hearts so that they do not believe, till they see the painful chastisement' (T,10:44; cf Q10:88). Abu Bakr, and of course himself by implication (who approved of a more pragmatic strategy as the angel Gabriel had suggested) the Prophet likened to Abraham, the dean of Islamic Prophets before Muhammad, who had told God: "...whoso follows

me belongs to me; and whoso rebels against me, surely thou art All-forgiving, All-compassionate" (cf. 14:36) and to Jesus (according to the Quran) who had said to God "If Thou chastisest them, they are thy servants; if Thou forgivest them, Thou art the All-mighty, the All-wise" (T,10:44; W:109; cf. Q5:118). We remember that Islamic Abraham had preferred material compensation to the destruction of the King who wanted, mistakenly, to marry the Prophet's beautiful wife, Sara. A Muslim believer reading these Islamic sources even before he is told of the Quran's final verdict realizes that the Prophet was not seriously against capital punishment for non-Muslim prisoners of war.

Apparently after this whole affair of prisoners of war was disposed of, the Quran criticized the policy of freeing disbelieving captives on any terms. It suggested they should have been slaughtered with no mercy, with no other concern whatsoever. The Prophet was, however, forgiven for what he had already done by accepting ransom for the freedom of the unbelieving captives. The Quran declared admonishingly:

It is not for any Prophet to have prisoners until he make wide slaughter in the land. You desire the chance goods of the present world, and God desires the world to come and God is All-mighty, All-wise. Had it not been for a prior prescription from God, there had afflicted you, for what you took a mighty chastisement. Eat of what you have taken as booty, such as is lawful and good; and fear you God; surely God is All-forgiving, All-compassionate (8:67-9).

According to Tabari, the Quran said: "the slaughter of nonbelievers who were captured during the battle of Badr pleased God more than their freedom by ransom." The Prophet should have shed much more blood of non-Muslim captives than he did, the Quran added. God desires the world to come for the Muslims in the sense that if believers kill nonbelievers ruthlessly and shed much nonbelievers' blood on the earth, they will have gardens in the Hereafter. So believers should desire what God desires for them and act accordingly (T,10:42). That is, had the Muslims killed all their captives rather than freeing some via ransom, God would have been more pleased with them. One of Tabari's sources

says: "When you take captives, do not release them for ransom until you have killed most of them" (ibid:43). Although the Quran told the Prophet and other "soft-liners" that they were forgiven for ransoming most of the prisoners, because, as God said, it was predestined by Him, Umar and other "hard-liners" were congratulated for having desired what the Almighty did. Recalling what Umar had said, the Prophet remarked after the above Quranic revelation (8:67-9): "O Umar, had God decided to chastise us for the matter none would have escaped (His chastisement) except you." The Prophet paid similar compliments to Sad B. Maadh, who had said: "O Prophet of God, I love shedding blood by slaughtering (the non-Muslim captives) more than leaving the men (them) alive: (T,10:48). [To what extent the belated revelation of Q8:67-9 was calculated and aimed at terrorization, only the Almighty knows; we can only speculate.]

For believers seeking guidance from the Quran, there is nothing in it, at the literal level and as explained by Tradition, that is in any way compatible with more modern ideas and practices respecting the treatment of prisoners. The Quran's final verdicts and the Prophet's and his Companions' over-all behavior at Badr indicate to a believer that Islam does not prefer amnesty and mercy. The Prophet delayed executions for a single purpose, Ibn Isahq tells us frankly:

Among the prisoners was Abu Wadaa... The Apostle remarked that in Mecca he (Abu Wadaa) had a son who was a shrewd and rich merchant and that he would soon come to redeem his father. When Quraysh counselled delay in redeeming the prisoners so that the ransom should not be extortionate al-Muttalib b. (son of) Abu Wadaa - the man the Apostle meant -said, 'You are right. Don't be in a hurry'. (but) he slipped away at night and came to Medina and recovered his father for 4,000 dirhams and took him away (1.1:311; also see W:129).

Ibn Hisham in his notes tells us that "the ransom of the polytheists was fixed at 4,000 dirhams per man, though some got off with 1,000. Those who had nothing the apostle released freely" (1.1-IH:741). However, as Ibn Isahq tells us just before the above note, there was a price for the poor too. They had to undertake not to resist Islam any more and talk and work for the Prophet. In modern terms, they had to surrender their

conscience and confess their 'crimes' under duress and work for the enemy.

Abu Azza... was a poor man whose family consisted of daughters, and he said to the Apostle: 'You know that I have no money, and am in real need with a large family, so let me go without ransom.' The Apostle did so on the condition that he should not fight against him again (1.1:318).

Abu Azza had to compose a poem praising Muhammad and Islam: calling the Prophet a "true and the divine King," warning Muhammad's enemies of a "miserable death," and confessing "sorrow and a sense of loss" for having fought Islam at Badr (ibid).²⁵ The fact that Abu Izza returned to fight the Prophet at Uhud (discussed below) indicates that what Abu Izza said was not voluntary.

Our sources do not explain why Gabriel had earlier authorized both kinds of treatment of prisoners of war. Perhaps, the angel had misread the Almighty's mind or the Almighty, as usual, reading His Messenger's mind, revised the verdict. After the hijra the Prophet and his Meccan Emigrant Companions depended on Medinan Helpers' generosity. The Prophet's and the Emigrants' financial situation was deteriorating. Along with Islam's general long-range expansionist goals, the Prophet's raids on Meccan caravans culminating in Badr also aimed at booty as an immediate goal. The rich Meccan caravan's escape was a disappointment. This had to be compensated by extorting ransom. Now that this immediate purpose was achieved to whatever extent it was possible, the Prophet had to keep the pressure on his enemies. Terror was the means. The Quran 8:67-9 aimed at terrorization, telling the Meccans and others that next time they might not have the good fortune of escaping death by paying ransom. Some Tradition reports explaining apparent discrepancies in this regard support the idea that terrorization when necessary was an appropriate means to bring nonbelievers to their knees.

Referring to a later Quranic verse that also allows the freeing of prisoners for ransom, one of Tabari's sources suggests a criterion for desirable Muslim conduct (T,10:42). According to this interpretation, by Ibn Abbas, the Muslims were told by the Quran that they should have

killed the captives of Badr because Muslims were then small in number. When later their number grew, as their power, and domination increased and strengthened -- **FA LAMMA KATHARU WA'SHTADD SULTANUHUM** -- God gave the Prophet and the believers three choices, either to 1) kill the captives, 2) enslave them, or 3) release them for ransom money (ibid). Note this: while Muslim power is not dominant and well-established, slaughter and large-scale murder of the enemy (in order to decrease their number and also terrorize them) is the preferred way Muslims must treat the world beyond Islam. Perhaps for this reason, the Prophet said:

NUSIRT-U BI'R-RUB -- I have been helped/made victorious by (adopting) terror (as a method) (T,10:47).

D: After Badr: The Jews of Medina

The description of the battle of Badr and related events as they proceeded towards 632 CE (when Muhammad died), have a formative effect on the Muslim mind. Muslims believe it is God's help, via three thousand or so angels, and other means, that fundamentally made a few believers victorious at Badr over about three times as many nonbelievers - clear proof of Muhammad's claim that the Almighty favored Muslim believers. As the believing reader proceeds, he seeks and finds additional evidence of God's help and favors which the Prophet and his followers enjoyed. The believers were also certain that death in battle would earn them eternal luxurious life in Paradise, also victory. They were also certain of rewards during this life of property confiscated from nonbelievers and domination established ideologically and politically over non-Muslims.

Excepting the battle of Uhud and the Ditch, the Prophet initiated almost all other strife with non-Muslims after Badr. Islamic sources do not demur at this. The post-Badr Medinan Quran told Muslims unequivocally that Islam was to dominate the whole world. It was the duty of every Muslim believer to make war to materialize the goal. During the brief period between Badr (624 CE) and 632 CE, the Prophet

and his followers engaged in more than seventy armed confrontations with nonbelievers (W:2-7). These may be divided into five main categories and phases:

- 1) the conquest of the Jewish settlements at Medina, Khaybar and other parts of Arabia;
- 2) continued confrontations with the Quraysh and other non-Muslim Arab tribes, culminating in the conquest of Mecca;
- 3) the subjugation of the two main tribal confederations of Hawazin and Thaqif, ending with the capitulation of Taif, the third most important city of central-west Arabia, Hijaz;
- 4) the "bandwagon" period following the conquest of Mecca and Taif, when Arab tribes and Christian settlements within the peninsula came under the Prophet's authority; and
- 5) the three-dimensional resumption of the Prophet's expansionist moves towards the north (against the Byzantine territories), towards the south (Yemen) and towards the south-east of Arabia (touching upon Iranian spheres of influence).

Islamic sources also talk of dispatches of envoys to the rulers of Byzantium, Egypt, Abyssinia, Iran, Yemen and elsewhere in the Arabian Peninsula, bidding them in writing to submit to Islam's authority (see, e.g., IS-B,1:258-91). These sources tell believers that most of those, save the Iranian emperor, who received the Prophet's ambassadors were impressed by Islam and paid their respects to the Prophet. The Negus is reported to have converted to Islam -- **ASLAM WA SHAHID SHAHADAT AL-HAQQ...** (ibid:258-9). The ruler of Egypt, though still a non-Muslim, sent two beautiful slave girls as a gift and a sign of friendship to the Prophet (ibid:260). (Maria, the Prophet's concubine-wife, was one of the two, our sources tell believers.) Heraclius, the Byzantine emperor, was ready to convert to Islam and pay allegiance to the Prophet, but some of his courtiers and bishops were intransigent. The Iranian emperor who had insulted the Prophet's ambassador, torn up the Prophet's letter and ordered his governor at Yemen to send Muhammad under arrest

to the Iranian court, soon died. He was succeeded by a man more conciliatory to the Prophet of Islam. Descriptions in Islamic sources reinforce the sense of self-righteousness among the believers, giving them the impression that almost every contemporary who came to know about the Prophet surrendered to him in some way or other. Conversely, believers see that those who refused him or showed disrespect were punished and destroyed, either at the hands of the Muslims or by some divine, miraculous happenings. Having in mind this summary picture of the Prophet's historical and legendary career after Badr, we concentrate on events related to Islam's position on the use of terror, torture, disingenuousness and other forms of harsh and questionable treatment of non-Muslims during the above-mentioned five categories and phases of confrontations.

Al-Waqidi tells believers approvingly that the Muslim victory at Badr, with the assassinations of Kab al-Ashraf and Ibn Sunayna (and obviously those of Asma and Abu Afak) terrorized the Jews and other nonbelievers. But the Prophet was not content with this. He gathered the Jews of Medina and told them threateningly, referring to the elimination of Kab: "He troubled us and satirized us in poetry. Whosoever among you does the same will be confronted with the sword." Then, the Prophet asked them to declare in writing that they would stop what they were engaged in (i.e. their expression of disbelief in Muhammad's prophethood). So they wrote the document (W:192; parenthesis added). Thus the Jews were terrorized and compelled to write a promise not to oppose Muhammad in his claim to prophethood and supreme political and military authority.

Our sources praise the use of **RU'B/IRAB**, terror, during the siege of the Banu Qaynuqa. "God struck terror in their hearts when they were besieged by" the Prophet (W:177). The Banu Nadir were terrorized into surrender by explicit means. The Prophet ordered trees owned by the Jews cut down and had their palm trees set on fire. When the Jews, shouting from atop their besieged houses, protested, reminding Muhammad

that by burning the trees and perhaps trying to put all of Banu Nadir afire he was contradicting his own previous assertions against such ruthlessness, the Prophet did not respond. He continued until the Banu Nadir surrendered. God meant the operation to cast terror into their hearts (1.1:437-8; W:372-4). The Quran immediately justified this terrorization (Q59:1- 6). We need not repeat the tragic story of the Banu Qurayza in detail. All men were beheaded. Their women and children enslaved, spread among Muslims, and sold in the markets of Najd and Syria as their property and lands were confiscated. All were reviled and humiliated; some were tortured before they were beheaded (W:514).

During one night they were herded into a compound, to be beheaded the next morning. They were given dates to eat, but in a very humiliating way. Al-Waqidi tells believers how the captives were fed in style which was supposed to give the Muslims glee over the humiliation, helplessness and painful conditions of the Banu Qurayza, making a joke of their religious tradition. "The Prophet ordered some dates to be carried (to the prisoners on death row). The fruit was strewn over their heads. They gorged like donkeys during the night and kept on reciting the Torah, encouraging each other to remain faithful to their religion and the Torah" (W:513). Their hands were tied behind their necks (W:509) when they were huddled together. Their manner of consuming these dates - which must have been of an inferior kind usually reserved for animals - is described sadistically. The captives "gobbled them like the donkeys do" -- **YAKDUMUNAHA KADM AL-HUMUR** (ibid). Given the fact that their hands were tied behind their necks, it is not farfetched to speculate that the Qurayza captives had to pick up the scattered dates with their mouths - "like donkeys." We are not told if one was allowed to leave the crowded place to answer the call of nature or his hands were untied for this purpose.

E. After Badr: The Jews Beyond Medina (For the following see 1.1:510-

30; W:633-721; IS-B,2:106-17, 200-3, 240-2; IS-B,8:52-81, 86-96, 120-9; TT-1,3:5-23, 160-8, 193, 215).

Descriptions of the Prophet's conquest of Khaybar indicate that the Jews of Khaybar were unprepared and already terrorized. The earlier assassinations of Ibn Jihash, Abu Rafi Sallam b. Abu'l-Huqayq, Yusayr b. Rizam/Razim and 29 other leaders by the Prophet's guerrillas had demoralized the Jews of Khaybar. Besides, they were still unconvinced, perhaps, that their different religion could be sufficient reason for the Prophet's surprise attack. It was, Muslims are told. Prepared enough, the Prophet with his army marched quietly toward Khaybar. In June 628 CE, the Prophet reached the outskirts of Khaybar by night and waited for an "(Islamic) call to prayer," **ADHAN**, from the Jewish land. It had become a usual practice, Ibn Ishaq tells us: when "the Prophet raided a people he waited until morning. If he heard **ADHAN** (an Islamic call to Islamic prayer) he held back; if he did not hear it he attacked" (1.1:511). That is, if no Muslims lived in a settlement or town, action against them was justified by Islam. At Khaybar, Muhammad gave no warning. Nor did he mention any other reason for the attack. For a believer its non-Muslim character was reason enough. The next morning, the surprise Muslim attack began with these frightening and terrorizing war slogans:

God is great (Allah akbar); Khaybar is destroyed; it is a frightening morning for those who have been warned (by God)... slay, slay O the ones (Muslims) who are helped (by God)... (W:643-4; 1.1:511; parentheses added).

The Prophet frequently told his holy warriors that God had promised him the conquest and booty of Khaybar (e.g., W:634). Though the people of Khaybar took to their various fortresses, resistance was minimum. Surprisingly (but not unlike the various Jewish groups of Medina), there was no united front or collaboration between the various settlements of Khaybar against the Muslims. Most of the fortresses surrendered one by one after they were besieged and attacked. In one case the Muslim

attackers cut off the source of drinking water. The dwellers had two choices: die of thirst, or make a desperate exit and fight. They chose the second. The pangs of thirst made them fight bravely. They were defeated (W:667). During the Khaybar campaign, the Muslims lost fifteen of their comrades; ninety three Jews were killed.

Apparently just before the Muslims reached Khaybar, a Jew or a Bedouin was captured and suspected of being a spy for the Jews. During interrogation, he was beaten by a Muslim until he agreed to give up all he knew about Khaybar - on the condition he would be given a safe conduct, **AMAN**, by the Muslims. This actually meant he would no longer be pressured, and would be set free. Muslims agreed. He told them whatever he could. However, the Prophet ordered that he be tied fast and kept under arrest. After entering Khaybar the Prophet demanded that he become a Muslim; Muhammad warned him that he would be strangled to death by the rope he was tied with if he refused after the Prophet bade him thrice to comply. The Bedouin surrendered and was converted to Islam (W:640-1).

Some Muslims such as Muhammad b. Maslama cut off various organs of some Jews, injuring and amputating them without trying to kill them instantly. This left them to suffer longer before they took their last gasp - or before other Muslims would go and strike again to kill. Muhammad b. Maslama proudly told the Prophet of this method of dealing with the Jews; the Prophet did not disagree. He only decided how the spoils from the victim should be divided among various participants - who wounded and killed the same victim (W:656).

Abu Rafi Sallam b. al-Huqayq, his nephew, Kinana b. ar-Rabi b. al-Huqayq, Sallam b. Mishkam and Huyayy b. al- Akhtab were among the prominent Banu Nadir (expelled by the Prophet from Medina) who had settled at Khaybar. As we know, Abu Rafi Sallam was already assassinated by the Prophet's Companions. We also know that Huyayy was among the Banu Qurayza slaughtered by the Messenger of God at Medina. By the time the Prophet reached Khaybar Kinana, Sallam b. Mishkam and a

certain al-Harith had emerged as leaders of their people. Al-Harith "the Jew," as our sources mention (W:1153), fought bravely and was killed during the first stages of the Prophet's attack on Khaybar. Al-Harith had a daughter, Zaynab who was married to Sallam b. Mishkam. Sallam was very sick when the Prophet attacked Khaybar. Just before the Muslim attack, Kinana had married Huyayy's beautiful daughter, Safiyya. She was among the Banu Nadir expelled from Medina.

After al-Harith's death, Kinana seems to have acted as the most prominent leader. Al-Waqidi's detailed accounts of the Prophet's Khaybar Expedition indicate that Kinana and his comrades were most concerned about the women and children. Their enslavement was worse than their men being killed, Sallam b. Mishkam had remarked during the Prophet's attack on Khaybar (W:530). Perhaps, they had the misfortunes of Qurayza women and children in their minds. The Prophet was attacking various fortresses and settlements of Khaybar one by one. Before a certain fortress was besieged and attacked by the Muslims (or before it was about to fall) Kinana and his men evacuated the women and children to other fortresses. At a certain point, there were "more than two thousand women and children" in one such fortress (W:669).

Kinana, finally, realized his hopeless situation. "The Almighty God having cast terror in their hearts" the Jews "realized their destruction was inescapable" (W:670). Kinana sent a messenger expressing his readiness to talk in person with the Prophet about the terms of surrender. The Prophet accepted, graciously -- **FA ANAM LAHU** (*ibid*). This was a pledge of **AMAN**, safe conduct. Along with his brother and some Jewish elders and leaders, Kinana left the fortress for the Prophet's camp. Kinana's requests were minimal: he asked the Prophet "to spare the lives of his men in the fortresses and let them, along with their women and children, leave Khaybar only with their clothes on them, leaving everything else - movable property (including weapons) wealth and lands - for the Messenger of God" (W:671). The Prophet agreed (*ibid*). With apparently something in his mind, however, the

Prophet added: "God and His Messenger will be under no obligation (i.e., your men will be killed and families enslaved) if you hide anything" (ibid; parentheses added). This means the Jews had to wait until the Prophet's holy warriors found and took everything in custody. Kinana accepted the condition (ibid). Kinana and his comrades were kept in the Muslim camp. The Prophet sent his people to collect the booty (ibid). The loot had begun, obviously, before the eyes of the Jews, men, women and children, watching helplessly. In their detailed descriptions, our sources marvel at the wealth and variety of goods and possessions, including weapons, Muslims collected at Khaybar (W:664-700; 1.1:515-23).

While the plunder was in progress, the Prophet asked Kinana and his brother about a particular family "treasure". Kinana said they had spent it helping the needy during the war. (The Prophet's operations against Khaybar had continued for about two months. "This war and the need to help the people has left nothing of it," both brothers swore (W:671). The Prophet warned them again: "God and His Messenger have no obligation towards you two if it is found. I will be justified to confiscate your property and (also) shed your blood. You two will have no guarantee (of life and freedom as given before)" (W:671-2; parentheses added). The Prophet was preparing the ground to violate his pledge of safe conduct -- **AMAN** he had just given. Kinana and his brother again assured the Prophet that they had told the truth (W:672). As if the Prophet knew where the "treasure" was buried (IS-B,2:112; 1.1:515). Our sources claim that a turncoat Jew "who was a weak man -- **WA KAN RAJUL-AN DAIF-AN** (W:672) - and, according to another report, the Almighty God Himself - told the Prophet where the "treasure" was -- **INN ALLAH AZZ WA JALL DALL RASULAH-U ALA DHALIK AL-KANZ** (W:627 passim; 1.1:515 passim; TT-1,3:14-5). Those sent by the Prophet to look at a particular place for the "treasure," our sources maintain, soon returned with a part of it. These sources, which are so particular about the details of other captured items at Khaybar, however, do not give the

details of this "treasure" Muslims had found. The rest of the story is gruesome.

When the Prophet asked Kinana about the rest he refused to produce it, so the Prophet gave orders to (his cousin,) az-Zubayr b. al-Awwam, 'Torture him until you extract what he has'; so az-Zubayr kindled fire with flint and steel on Kinana's chest until he was nearly dead. Then the Prophet delivered Kinana to Muhammad b. Maslama (whose Muslim brother was killed during the Khaybar operations) and he struck off his head (1.1:515; pronouns replaced with names they refer to and parentheses added; also see W:672; TT-1,3:14-5).

Then, the Prophet ordered the other son of Abu'l-Huqayq, the brother of Kinana, to be tortured -- **WA AMAR BI-IBN ABI'L-HUQAYQ AL-AKHAR FA-UDHDHIB** (W:673). After torture, his head was cut off and the Prophet declared that the property of these two brothers was to be confiscated and their women and children captured and enslaved (*ibid*). After the demise of Kinana and his comrades, al-Katiba, the last of Khaybar settlements, surrendered. More than two thousand Jews including their women and children had taken refuge in the fortress of al-Katiba. The Prophet spared the lives of men, women and children of al-Katiba. However, they had to surrender to the Prophet everything they had (which they did): their wealth and possessions, silver, gold, weapons and clothes except the clothes they had on -- **AMMAN AR-RIJAL WA'DH-DHURRIYYAT WA DAFAU IALYH AL-AMWAL WA'L-BAYDA WA'S-SAFRA WA'L-HALQAT WA'TH-THIYAB ILLA THAUB-AN ALA INSAN** (W:669).

As for the property and possessions, we know that the Muslims confiscated everything they found at Khaybar. This included the rich farming lands, gardens and date- palm trees. "The Prophet gave Ibn Luqaym al-Abasi (a Muslim holy warrior) the hens and domestic animals which were in Khaybar" (1.1:517; parentheses added). The Prophet distributed the booty among the believers who, along with the Prophet, became the absentee landlords of Khaybar (see, e.g., W:690-9 *passim*; 1.1:521-30 *passim*). As advised by archangel Gabriel (W:696), the Prophet's wives and his Hashimite relatives received generous shares. Having distributed the booty, and before the Muslim army left Khaybar, the Prophet allowed the Jews to remain on their confiscated lands as

tenant farmers warning them, however, "If we wish to expel you we will expel you" (1.1:515; also see W:690). The Prophet agreed to this arrangement for obvious reasons, as Ibn Sad tells us: The Prophet's Companions had no other laborers to work on these lands -- **WA ASHABUH-U LAM YAKUN LAHUM MIN AL-UMMAL MA YAKFUN AMAL AL-ARD** (IS-B,2:114).

Apparently, for this reason and perhaps, because the Prophet had agreed not to enslave women and children of the last two settlements (where most of the women and children had seemingly gathered), we find that excepting the families of Kinana and his brother, women and children are not mentioned much in the detailed accounts of distribution of the booty. We do not know much about what happened with the women and children just before and after Kinana and his brother were tortured to death, while the believers were plundering the settlements. What we know are some scattered reports within the accounts of Khaybar expedition.

In the beginning of his account of Khaybar, al-Waqidi tells us that the expedition was a blessing for many poor Muslims. Abd Allah b. Abu Hadrab was one of them. Abd Allah reported proudly that he had nothing except two pieces of clothes he wore when he joined the Khaybar expedition. The expedition, however, brought him God's blessings, he said. Among the booty he captured at Khaybar, Abd Allah reported, was a woman he sold for money (W:635). Also, according to al-Waqidi (W:646-7), during the siege of a certain strong fort which was difficult to enter, Muslims captured a Jew whom Umar wanted to behead instantly. The Jew requested to take him to the Prophet. He told the Prophet of some secret ways leading into the fort, requesting his life be spared and his wife (who was in the fort) freed after Muslims captured the fort. The Prophet agreed. When the believers entered the fort there was "none but women and children." As promised the Prophet allowed the helpful Jew to find his wife. "He took the hand of a (i.e., his) beautiful woman (and went away) (W:647; parentheses added). Al-Waqidi does not tell us what happened with other women and children. Al-Waqidi, however, does tell

us that after Muslims entered the fortress they found the Jews there "behaving like sheep and goats, (frightened and) running away in every direction" (W:663; parentheses added). "So we killed anyone within our reach, and some we took as captives" (W:663-4). Al-Waqidi does not specify here the gender or age of those killed and captured. While the Muslims were "roaming" in various parts of the fortress, they found a Jew hiding behind (lit. "in") a food-storage shelf (W:666). "He was brought down and they cut off his head." The believers were amazed by "the blackness of his blood" (ibid).

It was in this fort that the Muslims had found an enormous amount of a variety of food including wine in large vessels and skin containers, utensils, clothes, fabric and weapons (W:664 passim). Abd Allah "the Drunkard/wine merchant," one of the Mujahidin, could not abstain, as usual, from drinking -- **ABD ALLAH AL-KHAMMAR, WA KAN RAJUL-AN LA YASBIR AN ASH-SHARAB** (W:664-5). So, he went on a spree. The intoxicated holy warrior relapsed, apparently. "He was lifted up" -- **RUFIA** and taken to the Prophet who beat him with his shoes (ibid). Umar cursed "the Drunkard" and wanted to beat him more, but the Prophet intervened in favor of the intoxicated holy warrior. The Prophet said, "O Umar, do not (curse and beat Abd Allah); he indeed loves God and His Messenger" (ibid; parentheses added). Abd Allah soon regained his senses and was seen (in the same meeting) enjoying the Prophet's company like his other companions (ibid); i.e., as if nothing had happened. Obviously, the Prophet was careful enough not to harm the believer when he was beating him with his shoes. The believer's sincerity of faith - his love for Muhammad and his God, was more important than his character.

After Kinana and his brother were killed "the captives were brought to the Prophet's camp. Dihya al-Kalbi looked at Safiyya and asked the Prophet to give her to him. The Prophet promised al-Kalbi that he will receive a concubine from the captives of Khaybar -- **JARIYAT-AN MIN SABY-Y KHAYBAR**. So the Prophet gave al-Kalbi the female

cousin of Safiyya" (W:674). According to Ibn Ishaq, the Prophet

took captives from them among whom was Safiyya daughter of Huyayy... who had been the wife of Kinana... and two cousins of hers. The Prophet chose Safiyya for himself... Dihya b. Khalifa al-Kalbi had asked the Prophet for Safiyya, and when he chose her for himself he gave him her two cousins (1.1:511).

Safiyya and her female cousins were clearly "among" other captive women. The sources do not mention the details. In the same context Ibn Ishaq mentions that it was "on the day of Khaybar" that "the Prophet prohibited carnal intercourse with pregnant women who were captured," declaring that it was "not lawful for a man who believes in Allah and the last day to mingle his seed with another man's (meaning to approach carnally a pregnant woman among the captives)..." (1.1:512; parentheses in the text). Why the Prophet had to announce this on "that day," only, as Muslims say, God knows the facts. We can only speculate. We know that the Prophet did not wait much after his "right hand possessed" Safiyya.

As the bodies of tortured and beheaded Kinana, his brother and, apparently, some other Jews lay around the Prophet's camp, Kinana's widow

Safiyya was brought to (the Prophet) along with another woman. Bilal who was bringing them led them past the Jews who were slain; and when the woman who was with Safiyya saw them she shrieked and slapped her face and poured dust on her head. When the Prophet saw her he said, 'Take this she-devil away from me'. He gave orders that Safiyya was to be put behind him and threw his mantle over her, so that the Muslims knew that he had chosen her for himself (1.1:515).

Ibn Ishaq adds that according to a report "the Prophet said to Bilal when he saw this Jewess behaving that way, "Had you no compassion, Bilal, when you brought two women past their dead husbands?" (ibid). Bilal replied: "O Messenger of God, I did not think you will dislike this (what I did); I wanted them to see their dead people (so that they were tortured mentally and demoralized.)" (W:674; parentheses added). According to Ibn Sad, another Muslim who had apparently accompanied Bilal told the Prophet he had intentionally shown Safiyya her dead men to agonize her -- **AHBABT AN UGHIZAHA** (IS-B,2:112). Ibn Sad does not

record any response by the Prophet except that he told Bilal and another Companion to take Safiyya away from the scene (ibid). The Prophet's other Companions did not feel the need to express any sympathy for the grieved women. They were more interested to have a share from this part of the booty God had bestowed upon them. This was the occasion when Dihya al-Kalbi had asked for Safiyya and had received her cousin, the "she-devil" who had disturbed the Prophet's mood.

The Prophet chose Safiyya as his **SAFIYY** "leader's share of the loot," lion's share of the booty (IS- B,8:121). During jihad expeditions the Messenger of God had always a **SAFIYY** from each captured booty before distribution -- **FA KAN LI-RASUL ALLAH SAFIYY-UN MIN KULL GHANIMAT** (ibid). Besides, a **KHUMS**, "one fifth," of the total booty was his usual share. When the enemy (as those in the fortress of al-Katiba) surrendered without fighting the booty belonged to the Prophet exclusively.

After picking Safiyya as his **SAFIYY**, the Prophet had asked Bilal to take her to the Prophet's tent (W:675). The same evening (ibid), the Prophet went to the tent and called Safiyya. She walked towards the Prophet bashfully -- **HAYIYYA** (ibid) and sat before him. The Prophet told her that it would be better for her to become a Muslim. "I will not dislike you if you keep your religion" -- **IN AQAMT-I ALA DINIK-I, LAM UKRIHUK-I**, the Prophet added. Safiyya knew what it meant according to Islamic traditions. As a Muslim, she could be freed and become a formal wife; as a non-Muslim she would be the Prophet's concubine. Safiyya preferred to return to her hometown, Medina (from where she was expelled along with the Banu Nadir), as a free woman and respected as the Prophet's full wife. Safiyya chose Islam. The Prophet freed her instantly and declared her as his full wife, giving her this manumission as her dower. Payment of dower symbolized acknowledgement of her status as a formal wife. Note that according to Islam the Prophet, as her owner, could charge Safiyya or her guardians for her freedom, as the Prophet had charged Juwayriya's father for her freedom. In this case,

the transaction meant that the amount which Safiyya or her guardians were supposed to pay, the Prophet was returning as her dower. Though through a form of **HILA**, it was important to follow the divine law. The Prophet knew that Safiyya's guardians were dead and their possessions and property were already confiscated.

Having settled the matter with Safiyya, the Prophet gave orders for the return journey. As it was the month of June, a very hot season, according to the norms of journey in Arabia (and similar places like Baluchistan) it was, perhaps, late evening. The Prophet wanted to halt at Thibar, six miles from the starting point. He intended to sleep with his bride, Safiyya, who refused -- **ARAD AN YUARRIS BIHA HUNAK, FA ABAT** (W:707-8). The Prophet continued the journey for six more miles and halted at Sahba. He told Umm Sulaym, a chambermaid, to beautify Safiyya and make her things ready. Attaching two cloak-like wraps and two broad garments with the branches of a tree, Umm Sulaym improvised some kind of privacy in a crowd of 1600 holy warriors -- **FA AKHADHT KISAAYN WA ABAATAYN FA-SATART BIHIMA** (W:708). While they were "beautifying" the bride, Umm Sulaym and other women marveled at Safiyya's natural beauty and how well-suited her skin was for cosmetics. "I never smelt such a pleasant fragrance after that night," Umm Sanan remembered later (IS-B,8:121).

Safiyya was "beautified and combed and got in a fit state for the Prophet" (1.1:517). Enchanted by Safiyya, the women forgot to leave the improvised alcove. The Prophet, however, entered the make-shift tent approaching the bride who stood up and walked towards him. She had been told by the women who beautified her to do so (in order to demonstrate willingness and show respect for the Prophet) -- **YAMSHI ILAYHA FA QAMAT ILAYH-I, WA BI-DHALIK AMARNAHA** (IS-B,8:121-2). The chambermaids left. The Prophet asked Safiyya why she had refused at Thibar. Safiyya said she was afraid for him because the Jews were so close (W:708). The Prophet was very pleased with this explanation (ibid). Ibn Sad's sources tell us that the Prophet (was so enchanted with Safiyya that he)

did not sleep that night, continuously talking with her for the whole night (IS-B,8:121-2; parentheses added). As other Medinan women, lovingly, and the Prophet's other wives, grudgingly, remarked later "she was indeed graceful and charming" -- **INNAHA LA-ZARIFAT-UN** (W:709).

While the couple was in the tent

Abu Ayyub... passed the night girt with his sword, guarding the apostle and going round the tent until in the morning the apostle saw him there and asked him what he meant by his action. He replied, 'I was afraid for you with this woman for you have killed her father, her husband, and her people, and till recently she was in unbelief, so I was afraid for you on her account...' The Prophet said 'O God, preserve Abu Ayyub as he spent the night preserving me' (1.1:517).

According to Maxine Rodinson, after persuading Safiyya to embrace Islam, the Prophet

being violently attracted to her took her into his bed that very night. By so doing he was violating his own previous commands according to which his supporters had to wait until the beginning of the next menstrual cycle before having intercourse with their captives. But she was so very beautiful! (Rodinson, Mohammad:254).

Although Rodinson's scholarly integrity is above doubt and his sympathetic treatment of Muhammad and Islam is obvious, his assertion that Muhammad took Safiyya to bed the first night after she was captured is questionable for the following reasons. First, it must have taken a day or two (or more) to settle the affairs of al-Katiba which surrendered after Safiyya was captured, 2) to distribute the booty and 3) to make final arrangements with the Jews as tenant farmers. Second, it is clear that it was after the Prophet left Khaybar for Medina that he asked Umm Sulaym to "beautify" Safiyya before approaching her. Safiyya must have been in a squalid condition during the whole operation after she was captured. On the other hand, the Prophet is well-known for his cleanliness and for his personal civility in such affairs. Personally, Muhammad never acted as an unrestrained vulgar barbarian in his dealings with women. Third, for both reasons of decency and fear, Muhammad and Safiyya preferred to go to bed at some distance from the camp at Khaybar. As for the "next menstrual cycle," Ibn Sad insists

that the Prophet did not leave Khaybar until Safiyya had menstruated and that he did not sleep with her before they left Khaybar (IS-B,8:121). Like all other Arab gentlemen, the Prophet had a kind and loving attitude toward his women. As Maxime Rodinson has noted correctly, the Prophet's love for Safiyya was extraordinary (see Rodinson, Mohammad:254). This, however, did not protect Safiyya from his wives' verbal violence and their anti-Jewish disparagements inspired by the Quran and the Prophet's earlier statements.

During the journey from Khaybar to Medina, the Prophet had to follow his usual schedule: staying a day with Umm Salama (one of his wives who had accompanied him in this expedition) and the other with Safiyya. [Generally, the Prophet used to divide his time equally among his present wives.] Once, the Prophet approached Safiyya's howdah (a covered sedan-like structure put on a camel for women) and began talking with her thinking that Umm Salama was in the howdah (IS-B,8:95). Noticing this, Umm Salama rushed (her camel) toward the Prophet and, obviously, shouted, "How dare you talk with (this) daughter of a Jew in my day and (yet) you (call yourself)/are the Messenger of God?" -- **TATAHADDATH MAA IBNAT AL-YAHUDI FI YAWMI WA ANT RASUL ALLAH** (ibid:95-6; parentheses added).

A curious mob including the Prophet's wives had gathered just outside Medina to have a glimpse of the returning victorious jihad caravan loaded with precious booty including Safiyya. The Prophet's wives were enraged to see Safiyya riding behind the Prophet on the same camel. It meant she was a full formal wife, not a concubine. Perhaps disturbed by the hue and cry of the excited crowd, the camel carrying Muhammad and Safiyya stumbled and fell down. The Prophet's wives watched angrily and grumbled (loud enough for our sources to record): "God banish the Jewess; he did it with her (i.e., married her)!; he did it (again, i.e., took another wife)!!!" -- **WA AZWAJ RASUL ALLAH YANZURN FA-QULN: ABAD ALLAH AL-YAHUDIYYAT; WA FAAL BIHA; WA FAAL** (ibid:123; parentheses added). The slave-maids of the Prophet's wives were less

scrupulous about decency. Acting obviously for their mistresses and encouraged by them, they "made fun of Safiyya by simulating her fall to the ground, taking malicious pleasure in her mishap -- **YATARAYAYNAHA WA YASHMITN** (ibid:124. Ibn Sad does not necessarily condemn them by reporting this).

Having Safiyya settled in a borrowed house, the Prophet unveiled - **IJTALA** her for the Helper, i.e., native Medinan women who had gathered affectionately there to see the bride. These native Medinan women, most probably, missed Safiyya and other Jewish women of their town after they were banished by Islam. Many native Medinans were openly grieved when the Jews were exiled. For some, Medina was a desolated place after Banu Nadir had left (W:376). Because of her older age and lesser social status, Umm Salama had calmed down, but the following four elite Arab wives of the Prophet were at the fore-front of anti-Safiyya campaign. 1) Aisha, the daughter of Abu Bakr, destined to be the first caliph of Islam; 2) Hafsa, the daughter of Umar, the second caliph; 3) Zaynab daughter of Jahsh, the Prophet's cousin who was honored directly by the Almighty to be divorced by the Prophet's adopted son (Zayd) so that His Messenger could marry her (Q33:37 passim); and 4) Juwayriya whom we will meet soon.

Aisha, the youngest and most senior of the Prophet's living wives was more restive than others. When she knew of Medinan women's gathering around Safiyya, Aisha sent her maid, Barira, to Umm Salama to pretend that she (Barira) was there to offer her greetings on Umm Salama's return from Khaybar. And then Barira asked about Safiyya what Aisha had instructed her to ask: Is she (really so) beautiful?" -- **A ZARIFAT-UN HIA** (W:709). Umm Salama told Barira she knew Aisha had sent her, and then told Barira more than what Aisha wanted to hear. Umm Salama said "Upon my life, she is indeed charming, and indeed the Messenger of God loves her" (ibid). Barira conveyed the unpleasant news to Aisha. Aisha rushed out of her house and entered in disguise -- **MUTANAKKIRAH** the house in which native Medinan women had gathered around

Safiyya and the Prophet (ibid; also see IS-B,8:126). Though masqueraded, Aisha was recognized by the Prophet. He seized a part of her covering and jested, **YA SHUQAYRA KAYF RAAYT-I** -- "O Blondy, how do you see (i.e., what do you think about Safiyya?)". Aisha was too confident of her status and too stubborn to be crushed. (She also knew that the Prophet was never violent to his women). "I don't see anything extraordinary; she is just a Jewess among other Jewesses," Aisha fired back (ibid). The Prophet said, meekly, "O Aisha, do not talk like this; she is now a Muslim, a good Muslim indeed" (ibid). We do not know how did Safiyya feel. Apparently, she kept her demeanor. Aisha returned and told Hafsa of Safiyya's charm (ibid). Hafsa could not wait. She went to the same gathering and looked at Safiyya. "As you said, she is really pretty," Hafsa reported back to Aisha. This grudging recognition of Safiyya's charm was, however, not a declaration of cease- fire as far as Aisha, Hafsa, Zaynab (daughter Jahsh) and Juwayriya were concerned.

During a travel Safiyya's camel fell ill. The Prophet asked Zaynab politely to give one of her extra camels to Safiyya. Zaynab refused, remarking "Shall I give (my camel) to this Jewess?" (IS-B,8:127). Aisha used to call Safiyya names (ibid). Once, vituperating Safiyya, Aisha also reviled Safiyya's father. Safiyya, responding in kind, vilified Aisha's father. The Prophet never allowed his genuinely kind treatment of his women influence his political and ideological priorities. He had no reason to care about the dead Huyayy (Safiyya's father whom the Prophet had killed for Islam) being abused by Aisha. However, he could not allow Safiyya execrate Abu Bakr, second only to the Prophet in Islamic community. Addressing Safiyya, Muhammad exclaimed twice, "How dare you abuse Abu Bakr! How dare you abuse Abu Bakr!!" (IS- B,8:80-1). To be fair with the Prophet, he complained to Abu Bakr in a friendly tone about Aisha's behavior. Abu Bakr, a believer par excellence, struck a blow on Aisha's chest. Muhammad had not expected his father-in-law to go that far. He said, "O Abu Bakr, God forgive you; this is not what I wanted" (ibid).

In an anti-Safiyya muck-raking session of the golden gang of the four (Aisha, Hafsa, Zaynab and Juwayriya), Zaynab said, "I am afraid she would soon outrank us." "Never," Juwayriya remarked, "Because she is one of those women who are seldom satisfied with their husbands" (IS-B,8:126). This was a sexual slur.

Safiyya disappointed Juwayriya. The charming Jewess remained loyal to her loving husband and loved him, though the other wives never reconciled with her as long as the Prophet lived. When the Prophet was dying his wives had gathered around him. Addressing the Prophet, Safiyya said, "By God, I wish what is happening to you happen to me" (ibid:128). Safiyya was offering her life to save that of the Prophet. The other wives present winked to each other casting aspersion on Safiyya's sincerity and ridiculing her. The Prophet saw them doing this. He said, "Rinse (your mouths because you defiled them by saying something wrong)... By God she is sincere" (ibid).

Safiyya lived for a long time after the Prophet's death in 632 CE. In 628 CE, when the 59 year old Prophet had captured and married her, Safiyya was sixteen years old (IS-B,8:129). She died (in 665 CE) at an age of 53 during (exactly what Ibn Sad mentions:) the reign of Muawiya (661-680) (ibid). Safiyya remained and died in Medina. The Almighty had prohibited remarriage of the Prophet's wives after his death (Q33:53). Safiyya had nowhere to go. The remnants of her people, the Jewish tenant farmers of Khaybar and elsewhere, were expelled by Umar (r. 634-644 CE) from the Arabian peninsula as willed by the Prophet (1.1:523). We do not know much about Muslim treatment of Safiyya after the Prophet's death. A report in Ibn Sad (IS-B,8:128) indicates that she was mistreated. Her will does not indicate that she was much obliged by the completely Islamized Medina. Like other wives of the Prophet as recipients of shares from jihad- booty, Safiyya owned significant wealth. When she died, her possessions and property valued 100,000 dirhams (ibid). In her will Safiyya had instructed that her (Jewish) relatives should inherit what she owned. Two of her relatives,

an old Jewish man and the son of her sister were found. Ibn Sad does not clarify where (ibid). Because of Safiyya's legal status as the Prophet's widow, the two Jews had, most probably, lingered on in Medina.

Those responsible for the distribution of Safiyya's inheritance refused to give the old man any share; because he had accepted Islam after Safiyya's death, they said (ibid).

The nephew was also denied this right to inherit Safiyya's property because he was a Jew. Ironically it was Aisha, mellowed with advanced age and by bloody Muslim civil wars (and also because of Medinan politics and rivalries of the time which we can not explain here), who sent a brusque message telling those concerned, "Fear God and give him his bequest" (ibid). They gave him a third of Safiyya's heritage worth "thirty three and some thousand dirhams" (ibid).

Had "Zaynab the Jewess" not done what she did at Khaybar, the Prophet's love for Safiyya might have become a "blessing" for her people as the Prophet's love for Juwayriya (discussed below) was for hers. Zaynab, the daughter of al-Harith "the Jew" was apparently one of those Jewish women who were captured along with Safiyya and her cousins. Or, maybe, she was at al-Katiba which surrendered peacefully. Her husband, Sallam b. Mishkam was seriously ill when the fortress Natat was about to fall. His comrades wanted to evacuate him along with the women and children to the fortress of al-Katiba. Being seriously sick he was not obliged to fight, they told him. Sallam was too proud to be evacuated with women and children. He told his comrades "I will never do this -- **LA AFAL ABAD-AN** (W:679). While Zaynab's father, al-Harith, her uncles, Yasar, Zabir and Marhab, were killed fighting the believers, Sallam was killed on his bed as a sick man -- **FA QUTIL WA HUA MARID** (ibid). "He was their commander during the war, but God made him sick," al-Waqidi remarks (W:680). After the conquest of Khaybar was finalized, we find Zaynab among the women who prepared food for their uninvited guests. It was, apparently, just after the last fortress al-Katiba, had surrendered.

When the Prophet had rested Zaynab... prepared for him a roast lamb, having first inquired what joint he preferred when she learned that it was the shoulder she put a lot of poison in it and poisoned the whole lamb. Then she brought it in and placed it before him. (The Prophet) took hold of the shoulder and chewed a morsel of it, but he did not swallow it. Bishr b. al-Bara... who was with him took some of it as the Prophet had done, but he swallowed it, while the Prophet spat it out, saying, 'This bone tells me that it is poisoned.' Then he called for the woman and she confessed, and when he asked her what had induced her to do this she answered '[You killed my father, my uncle and my husband and;] you know what you have done to my people' (1.1:516; the sentence in brackets is included by W:678 as a part of Zaynab's response).

According to Ibn Sad, Zaynab also told the Prophet she did this to relieve her people of him -- **RAHAT AN-NAS MINK** (IS-B,2:200).

Bishr, the Prophet's Companion, "died from what he had eaten" (1.1:516). Ibn Ishaq tells us that the Prophet "let her off" (ibid), but according to a report in al-Waqidi, as "ordered by the Messenger of god (Zaynab) was killed and then crucified -- **AMAR BIHA RASUL ALLAH FA QUTILAT THUMM SULIBAT** (W:678). For Ibn Sad, "it is well-established" - - **WA HU ATH-THABT** that the Prophet handed over Zaynab to the relatives of Bishr and ordered them to kill her; "so, they killed her -- **FA QATALUHA** (IS-B,2:200-3).

According to our sources, the Prophet suffered from the aftereffects of this poisoning for the remaining part of his life. Affected by the poison he used to recoil, occasionally (IS-B,2:200-3). On his deathbed, the Prophet said that he always suffered from what he had eaten at Khaybar (ibid:203). Ibn Sad's detailed accounts of the Prophet's last illness ending in his death (ibid:200-334) begin with a four-page note on how he was poisoned by Zaynab "the Jewess." According to all Islamic sources, it was on his death bed that the Prophet ordered the expulsion of all non-Muslims from the Arabian peninsula. As clarified by the Prophet's exhortations and carried out after his death, the injunctions aimed at the Jews of Khaybar and other Jewish and Christian settlements in Arabia. How the Prophet issued these injunctions on his deathbed is interesting.

As expected, the Prophet's wives had gathered around to comfort

him. During the chitchat one of the wives who had traveled to Abyssinia mentioned appreciatively the beauty and fine decorations of Abyssinian **KANISAs** synagogues and/or churches. Obviously, the Prophet's wife did not expect their appreciation of these synagogues and churches would disturb the Prophet. They were wrong. The Prophet remarked angrily,

God's curse is on the Jews and the Christians... Goddamn the Jews; they have changed their Prophet's graves into places of worship... No two religions (i.e. no religion other than Islam) should be allowed to remain in the land of Arabs (IS, 2:240) Jews and Christians from the peninsula of Arabia" (ibid:242; also see TT-1,3:193, 215).

This apparently out-of-order outburst particularly against the Jews makes sense only if we assume that the Prophet suffering from acute pain (recorded by all of our sources), was thinking acrimoniously about what (he thought) Zaynab "the Jewess" had done to him to avenge her people, the Jews. Ibn Ishaq has obviously this relationship between the Prophet's above-mentioned exhortations and Zaynab's poisoning of the food in mind when he inserts these injunctions the Prophet uttered in 632 within his account of Khaybar expedition of 628.

The Ghatafan tribe had promised to help the Jews of Khaybar. They were promised, by the Jews, half of the date crop of Khaybar as reward. (The pagan Arabs, generally, did not think of expelling or massacring the Jews, expropriating their estates and property and enslaving their women and children). When the Muslims were in Khaybar the Ghatafan, led by the maverick and enigmatic Uyayna, had mobilized their forces in the region. Before they could intervene against the Muslims, they heard, perhaps during the night, someone whom they could not see, shouting loudly, telling them their own village, their women and children at Hayfa (near Medina) were in danger. In desperation, Uyayna pulled his forces back and rushed homewards, thus depriving the Jews of much-needed support. When the Ghatafan reached their settlements, nothing had happened. They marched back to Khaybar but too late. The Jews were already subdued. The "mysterious" voice was most probably a trick of the Muslims. Uyayna was sure it was a deception by Muhammad and his

companions. "By God" he said, "it was one of the **KAYDs**, tricks, of Muhammad and his fellows who deceived us, by God" -- **HADHA WA'LLAH MIN MAKAIID MUHAMMAD WA ASHABIHI, KHADAANA WALLAH** (W:250-2). Al-Waqidi or our other sources do not contest the charge.

Another trick the Prophet authorized to be played on the nonbelievers of Mecca is also related to the Khaybar expedition. Al-Hajjaj b. Ilat as-Sulami was a rich merchant and the owner of some gold mines in the Banu Sulaym region. His conversion to Islam was unknown to the Meccans. Al-Hajjaj had ongoing business transactions with the Meccans, and his wife lived in the city. He was with the Prophet during the Khaybar expedition. Hajjaj thought of collecting money which some Meccans owed him, and depositing it with his wife. Apparently he needed the Meccan elders' friendly cooperation to collect the money more easily. Hajjaj went to the Prophet and told him what he wanted. Apparently, the Prophet permitted Hajjaj to keep his Muslim identity a secret. Hajjaj told the Prophet that in order to collect the money from the Meccans he "must tell lies." The Prophet said: "Tell them" (1.1:519) and permitted him to say whatever he needed to say (W:702). With this Prophetic authorization, Hajjaj went to Mecca. The Meccans were anxious about the news from Khaybar. Thinking that Hajjaj was still a non-Muslim roving merchant coming from Khaybar, the Meccans gathered around him, asking him eagerly about the results of the "highwayman's (**AL-QATI**)" i.e., Muhammad's attack on Khaybar. Hajjaj, according to his secret plan, said: Muhammad had "suffered a defeat such as you have never heard of, and his companions have been slaughtered; you have never heard the like, and Muhammad has been captured." And, then he added that the people of Khaybar had decided to send Muhammad as a captive "to the Meccans and let them kill him among themselves in revenge for their men whom he has killed." This was great news for the Meccans. Elating the Meccans further, Hajjaj said: "Here is news for you! You have only to wait for this fellow Muhammad to be sent to be killed in your midst." Then Hajjaj came to the point. He

said: "Help me to collect my money in Mecca and to get in the money owed to me, for I want to go to Khaybar to get hold of the fugitives from Muhammad and his companions before the merchants get there." Hajjaj's Islamically-authorized trick worked. As he recalled later, the Meccans "got up and collected (his) money for (him) quicker than (he) could have supposed possible." He told his wife a similar story and convinced her to hand over the money so that he could use it in his business. After Hajjaj left with his money and the Meccans realized that they were deceived by the Prophet's companion, they could only say remorsefully: "O men of Allah, the enemy of Allah has escaped. Had we known we would have dealt with him." It was too late (1.1:519-20; W:702-6).

Fadak was another Jewish settlement in north Arabia. It was occupied by the Prophet after he disposed of Khaybar. How terror worked there is fearsome. We simply quote from Ibn Ishaq:

When the apostle had finished with Khaybar, God struck terror into the hearts of the men of Fadak when they heard what the apostle had done to the men of Khaybar. They sent him an offer of peace on condition that they should keep half of their produce. (The Prophet) accepted their terms. Thus Fadak became a private property [of the Prophet] because it had not been attacked by horse or camel, i.e., had surrendered without resistance (1.1:523; also see W:706-7).

F. After Badr (Events related to the Pagan Arabs).

We have concentrated on events relating to the Jews of Medina, Khaybar and Fadak. Next, we consider events concerning the Prophet's confrontations with pagan Arabs outside Medina between the battle of Badr, 624 CE and the conquest of Mecca in 630 CE.

In March, 625 CE, the Meccans marched towards Medina to avenge their defeat at Badr. The Prophet decided to confront them at Uhud, where he was defeated. There the Muslims lost some comrades, including the Prophet's uncle Hamza. The Prophet himself was wounded in this battle. During their advance towards Uhud, the Prophet and his army passed through the privately owned (walled?) quarter of an old and blind

Bedouin who apparently did not like the Prophet and Islam. When the old man realized that Muhammad's expeditionists were trespassing on his property he shouted in protest: "If you are the Messenger of God, do not enter my quarter." The Prophet's companions could not remain indifferent about the heathen Bedouin's disrespect of their leader. A Muslim companion attacked the old man and beat him with an arrow; blood began to flow from the head of the blind man. Some men of the blind old man's tribe meekly protested. The Muslims involved, instead of apologizing, threatened to cut off the heads of the protesters. This was enough to silence them, and the Muslims moved on. The Prophet obviously observed all this, but is not reported to have said anything. It is the "blind hypocrite" and his non-Muslim sympathizers who are implicitly condemned by our sources, while the Prophet's companions, who acted offensively against an old man who simply did not want the Muslims to trespass across his land, are praised (W:218).

Hind, the daughter of Utba and the wife of Abu Sufyan, was enraged by the loss of her father, two sons and other close relatives, and the treatment of their dead bodies by the Muslims at Badr. During the battle of Uhud, she dismembered the dead body of Hamza, the Prophet's uncle. When the Prophet saw this dismembered corpse, he said: "If I overcome the Quraysh, I shall indeed mutilate thirty of them" (W:290). However, we are told that Q16:126 was revealed on this occasion. In it, God advised that when the Prophet or the Muslims "took their turn they should punish the like of that with which they were afflicted. But if the believers show patience it is certainly best for the patient" (MMA tr. adopted with slight changes). The Prophet, we are told, "used to forgive after the revelation of this verse and did not mutilate anyone" (W:290). The Quran, at any rate, did not pass a clear verdict against mutilation of the nonbelievers. Indeed, some later Quranic passages recommended some forms of mutilation. We also know that after Uhud torture of the enemy continued.

At Uhud the Muslims did not conceal their joy in the killing of

non-Muslims, nor did they hesitate to use abusive language about the dead. A believer recalled that after killing a Meccan, he stood on the dead body of the "wicked" victim, and when a Muslim comrade passed by and saw the enemy dead he prostrated [himself] to express his thanks to God" (W:269).

The Muslims returned from Uhud with only one prisoner of war, Abu Izza. Apparently, the Quraysh who had defeated the Muslims did not try to take prisoners. When the Prophet reached Medina, he found another Meccan, Muawiya b. al-Mughira, under Muslim control. This happened because at Uhud the Muslims seemed to be winning in the beginning. Muawiya deserted the field and reached Medina to seek protection from Uthman, the Prophet's son-in-law, the third caliph of Islam. Abu Izza, we know, had been released by the Prophet after Badr on condition he would never again fight against the Muslims. He was executed instantly. The second captive, Muawiya, was killed mysteriously. After the Prophet reached Medina and before Uthman told him, he heard that Muawiya, the fugitive, was seen in Medina. The Prophet ordered a search for Muawiya. He was found hiding in Uthman's house, arrested and brought to the Prophet. Uthman, in the meeting, asked the Prophet to give Muawiya safe conduct, **AMAN**. The Prophet accepted, and gave him three days to leave for Mecca. The Prophet and his army left the day after they had come from Uhud, pretending to pursue the returning Meccans. This he did in order to make a show of force lest the victorious Meccans return to attack Medina, and, perhaps to keep Medinan morale up. Muawiya accompanied the Prophet's party leaving Medina because they were on the move toward Mecca. On the third day of his safe-conduct period, Muawiya left the Muslim camp and apparently started for Mecca alone, as the Prophet had approved. When the Prophet learned Muawiya had left the Muslim camp, he (for reasons not mentioned in our source) sent a band of Muslims to look for him. They found Muawiya on his way to Mecca. One of the two Muslims who captured Muawiya beat him first; the other shot him with an arrow and killed him. We are not told why all this was done

except that the two Muslims who had captured, beaten and killed Muawiya came back to the prophet to report (W:332-4). It was treacherous. The prisoner was let loose with the intention of killing him on the grounds he was a fugitive.

During the Prophet's raid on Dhat ar-Riqa, (ca. June, 626 CE) a Muslim killed a pagan woman. Her husband secretly followed the Prophet's party and during the night, injured by arrow one of the two Muslims who were guarding the Muslim army (1.1:447). According to Waqidi, the pagan Bedouin who followed the Muslim army for revenge was the husband of a beautiful woman whom he loved very much. She was captured with other pagan women by the Muslims to be enslaved, as usual, and distributed to the believers (W:395-402). However, in Ibn Ishaq no concern is shown for the killing of a woman by the Muslims. It is considered normal. Capturing, enslavement and distribution of non-Muslim women was usual during most of the Muslim raids. The Muslims who received these women as booty could - and usually did - establish sexual relations with them as their concubines.

For those committed to follow the Prophet's ideal model of the treatment of non-Muslims Islamic accounts of the Expedition of al-Muraysi/al-Mustaliq provide multi-dimensional guidance. (For the full story see 1.1:490-9; W:404-40; IS-B,2:63-5; TT-1,2:604-19.) Banu al-Mustaliq was a rich clan residing around a place called al-Muraysi near the Red Sea north-west of Mecca. Our above sources mention that al-Harith, the chief of Banu Mustaliq, was reportedly encouraging other clans in the area to fight Muhammad in a united front. However the Prophet took the first step.

Before the march against the Banu Mustaliq tribe, the Prophet sent Burayda, a Muslim, to spy on the enemy. He was advised by the Prophet to conceal his Muslim identity and tell lies to serve the purpose. The Muslim agent, following instructions, told the enemy he was there to join them along with his tribe in order to "uproot" Muhammad. After gathering enough information, Burayda told the Mustaliq he was leaving

for his tribe in order to collect and bring them to join Banu Mustaliq, who "became so happy to hear that." And so, Burayda returned to the Prophet and submitted his report (W:404-5).

In early 627 CE, the Prophet moved with a large force against Banu Mstaliq. On their way towards al- Muraysi under the Prophet's leadership, the Muslim holy warriors captured an Arab nomad suspected to be a spy for the enemy. The Prophet's Companions interrogated him about the enemy's strength and position. When the nomad said he had no information, Umar threatened to cut off his head. The intimidated Bedouin told them everything he knew. Then the Bedouin was taken to the Prophet, who asked him to become a Muslim; the nomad refused. Umar was enraged again, and said: "O Messenger of God, I am going to cut off his head." The Prophet agreed, and handed him over to Umar, who beheaded the Bedouin. When the news of how the Muslims treated the nomad reached the Mustaliq tribe, Waqidi adds smugly, they were terrorized, and the other Arab tribes who had joined the defense were so frightened that they deserted. The Mustaliq tribe was left alone to face the Muslim invaders (W:406). The Prophet's army attacked with the war cry, "slay, slay."

God put the Banu Mustaliq to flight and killed some of them and gave the apostle (Muhammad) their wives, children and property as booty (1.1:490).

For a Muslim believer looking for the Prophet's and his worthy Companions' exemplary treatment of non-Muslim women captured on such occasions, Islamic sources have recorded the following accounts of the Banu Mustaliq jihad expedition under the Prophet's ideal leadership.

The booty that "God... gave the Messenger" on this occasion was enormous: 5,000 goats (and sheep?), 2,000 camels and 200 families -- **AHL BAYT** (consisting of women and children) (W:410 passim). Juwayriya, the Banu Mustaliq chief, al-Harith's enchanting daughter, was among the captives. Her father had escaped. The booty including the women was distributed among the believers who, as Abu Said al-Khudri's anxieties indicate, immediately raped their **MA MALAKAT AYMANUHUM**, captive women -- **UQTISIMU WA MULIKU WA WUTIA NISAUHUM** (W:411; also see the Quran, e.g.,

4:3, 24, 25 sanctifying such use of captive women). Abu Said al-Khudri, a great Companion of the Prophet (and a famous transmitter of Hadith reports tells us unapologetically

Being pressed by distance from our wives and by a strong desire for women (we could not wait) after we possessed the captive (women) -- **FA-ASABANA SABAYA, WABINA SHAHWAT AN-NISA, WASHTADDAT ALAYNA'L-UZBAH** (W:413).

Along with a clear report by Ibn Hisham (1.1:768) this indicates that the captives were distributed before the believers' return to Medina, otherwise they would not have mentioned **UZBAH**, distance from their wives and the resulting **SHAHWAT AN-NISA**, "lust for women." As al-Khudri confesses the believers had only one concern: in order to be able, later, to release the women for ransom money from their relatives or to sell them, they preferred to use the **AZL** technique of intercourse. It was authorized by the Prophet -- **WA AHBABNA'L-FIDA FA-ARADNA'L-AZL FA-QULNA NAZIL. WA RASUL ALLAH BAYN AZHURINA... FA-SAALNAHU FA-QAL MA ALAYKUM ALLA TAFALU** (W:413). [**AZL** means coitus interruptus, to have intercourse with a woman in such a way that she might not conceive. As E. Lane (AEL, 5:2036) explains, 'one adopted **AZL** (technique)' "means **PAULO ANTE EMISSIONEM, [PENEM SUUM] EXTRAXIT, ET EXTRA VULVAM SEMEN EMISIT.**"] After Abu Said reached Medina he took his Banu Mustaliq slave girl to the market for sale -- **WA KHARAJT-U BI-JARIYAT-IN LI ABIUHA FI'S-SUQ** (W:413). A Jew taunted, "O Abu Said, you, perhaps, intend to sell her while she might have conceived a child from you" (ibid). When Abu Said told the Prophet, he said **KADHABAT AL-YAHUD, KADHABAT AL-YAHUD**, "the Jews lied; the Jews lied" (ibid). Obviously, based on his divine knowledge, the Prophet was sure that Abu Said had used **AZL** in a perfectly safe way.

Juwayriya, the stubborn daughter of the Banu Mustaliq chief was in trouble.

When the Prophet distributed the captives of Banu Mustaliq, Juwayriya fell to the lot of Thabit b. Qays (and) his cousin... She was a most beautiful woman. She captivated every man who saw her (1.1:493).

Thabit bought his cousin's half share of Juwayriya for ten ounces of gold and thus became the sole master of the girl (W:410-11). Perhaps noticing Thabit's greed for money, Juwayriya "gave him a deed for redemption" (1.1:493). Apparently, this proud tribal Arab woman was trying to escape the disgrace. She soon realized that for her freedom Thabit had charged an enormous amount; she was unable to pay immediately -- **FA KATABANI THABIT ALAYYA MA LA TAQAT LI BIHI WA LA YADAN** (W:411). Her father would eventually come to pay the ransom but it would be too late to avoid the **AZL**. As Aisha, the Prophet's wife reported later, "Juwayriya was so sweet a woman that as soon as a man saw her (he almost) died for her" -- **KANAT JUWAYRIYAH JARIYAT-AN HULWAT-AN, LA YAKAD YARAHA AHAD-UN ILLA DHAHABAT BI-NAFSIHI** (W:411).

Juwayriya thought of a way to escape these believer-lovers who must have surrounded her, 'dying', as our al-Khudri confessed, of the pressure of **SHAHWAT AN-NISA** "lust for women." Aisha, Muhammad's wife, who along with Umm Salamah (another wife of Muhammad) accompanied the Prophet in this expedition, tells the story.

(Juwayriya) came to the Prophet to ask his help in the matter. As soon as I saw her at the door of my room I took a dislike to her, for I knew that he would see her as I saw her. She went in and told him who she was -daughter of al-Harith..., the chief of his people. 'You can see the state to which I have been brought. I have fallen to the lot of Thabit or his cousin and have given him a deed for my ransom and have come to ask your help in this matter' (1.1:493).

"FA AINNI FI MUKATABATI -- (Please) help me to gain my freedom," she said (W:411). According to al-Waqidi, Juwayriya also said, "I am (now) a Muslim woman; I witness there is no god but God and that you are indeed the Messenger of God" (W:411). She did not know that according to Islam her conversion to the Prophet's creed after she was captured did not change her concubine-slave-girl status. Juwayriya was not aware that the Quran (e.g., 4:24) allowed a believer sexual intercourse with a woman of her status even if she was wedded to another man (see also TS, 8:151-69 cf. Q4:24). Juwayriya was what the Quran (4:3, 24, 25, 36; 23:6; 24:6; 24:31; 33:50, 52, 55; 70:30...) calls **MA MALAKAT AYMAN** "one

the (believers') right hands possess," a captured enslaved woman. She was not a Muslim before she was captured.

Aisha was right. Although Juwayriya had expected Muhammad to be her guarantee and recommend to Thabit to accept a deferred payment for her ransom (- or she might have thought, after knowing that she was now a Muslim and the daughter of a great tribal chief, Muhammad would let her go for free), the Prophet said, "'Would you like something better than that? I will discharge your debt and marry you,' and she accepted him" (1.1:493). Muhammad sent for Thabit, paid the ransom, freed her and married her (W:411). "The Prophet departed from the raid with Juwayriya and... at Dhat al-Jaysh he entrusted her to one of the Ansar and went forward to Medina," Ibn Hisham tells us (1.1:768, IH n. 739). Juwayriya's father, al-Harith, soon went to Medina with an unspecified number of camels as ransom for her daughter's freedom. Just before he reached Medina, al-Harith

looked at the camels he had brought as her ransom and admired two of them greatly; so he hid them in one of the passes (ibid).

The Prophet was informed (by God, Ibn Hisham implies), and asked al-Harith about the two camels he loved and wanted to spare. The Prophet mentioned exactly the place in which al-Harith had hidden the two camels (ibid). Al-Harith was convinced the Almighty did not want His Messenger to lose any camel. Ibn Hisham makes al-Harith exclaim

'for none could have known of this but God.' He and his two sons who were with him and some of his men accepted Islam and he sent for the two camels and brought them and handed all of them over to the Prophet (ibid).

In any case, the Prophet received perhaps more than he had paid to Thabit for Juwayriya as a slave-girl. Ibn Hisham, at the end of his report, mentions that after the Prophet accepted the camels he asked al-Harith to let Juwayriya marry him. Al-Harith agreed. Knowing Arab tribal sensitivities and the fact that now al-Harith and his men had converted to Islam, most probably, the Prophet asked for formal consent as a face-saving maneuver for all. Like any reader of our sources, the

Prophet knew well that for a respectable Arab chief such as al-Harith it would be embarrassing to return with a disgraced daughter. Having paid for Juwayriya's ransom - and technically freed her - it was important for al-Harith to pretend that his daughter was in Muhammad's chamber as a free woman. Besides, Juwayriya and her father knew well that what she could do for their other captured women and children as a 'free' wife of the Prophet could not be done otherwise. As Aisha reported

The news that the Apostle had married Juwayriya blazed abroad and now that Banu Mustaliq were the Prophet's relations by marriage the men released those they held. When he married her a hundred families were released. I do not know a woman was a greater blessing to her people than she (1.1:493).

As both al-Waqidi and Ibn Sad tell us, however, these captured women and children were freed after their guardians went to Medina and paid for their ransom -- *FA QADIM ALAYHIM AHLUHUM F'AFTADAUHUM* (W:412 passim; IS-B,2:64).²⁶

During the siege of Medina (the Battle of the Moat, April, 627), Nawfal b. Abd Allah, a non-Muslim, was killed and his corpse fell into the hands of the Muslims. The Confederates offered money to the Prophet for the return of their comrade's dead body. The Prophet did not accept the money but returned the corpse with this remark: "This is the corpse of a donkey and its price is loathsome" (W:474).

Long before the final conquest of Mecca, the Prophet occasionally feigned in the direction of Mecca during his raids on other Arab tribes specifically to frighten the Meccans. During his raid on Banu Lihyan in July, 627, the Prophet sent a band under Abu Bakr to al-Ghamim, toward Mecca. This party returned without any confrontation. Explaining, the Prophet said: "the news will reach the Quraysh, which will terrify them... the news of my march will make them afraid" (W:536).

On their way to raid al-Ghamr (in September, 627 CE) the Muslims captured a Bedouin shepherd alone sleeping. They interrogated him. In order to be sure their captive told them the truth, the Muslims beat him and threatened to behead him. The shepherd saved his life by telling

the Muslim raiders what he knew (W:550).

During the raid under Ali's leadership on the Banu Sad of Fadak (December, 627 CE), a 'spy' of the enemy was captured by Ali before the raiders reached their target. After the captive's initial denial that he was a spy, he was tortured. He then told the Muslim party what it wanted to know. During the whole expedition, the captive was kept bound. After the expedition was over they let him go (W:562-3).

One of the most horrible cases of torture and killing happened in early 628 CE during the raid of Zayd b. Haritha against an Arab tribe. Zayd was appointed by the Prophet as leader of the raiding group, with special instructions. During this successful raid, a very old woman -- **AJUZA KABIRAH**, called Umm Qirfa, and her beautiful daughter were among the captives taken as spoils of war. The beautiful daughter fell into the hands of a Muslim, Slaama b. al-Akwa', who took her to Medina. The Prophet heard about the extraordinary beauty of the young captive woman. He asked Salama what kind of concubine he had obtained. The Prophet repeated the same question until Salama realized that the Prophet wanted her. Salama offered the woman as a gift to the Prophet -- **FA-AADA RASUL ALLAH MARRATAYN AU THALATHAF-AN YASALUHU: MA JARIYAT-AN ASABTAHA? HATTA ARAF SALAMA ANNAHU YURIDUHA FA WAHABAHA LAHU** (W:565; also see IS-B,2:90). The Prophet, perhaps, later, gave the apparently much-sought-after woman to another Muslim, Hazn b. Abu Wahb, as a gift.

As for her mother, Umm Qirfa, the "very old woman," we are told "she held a position of honour among her people, and the Arabs used to say, 'Had you been more powerful than Umm Qirfa you could have done no more'" (1.1:665; W:565). After the Muslims captured Umm Qirfa, Zayd, the Prophet's designee to lead the expedition, "ordered Qays... (a Muslim comrade) to kill Umm Qirfa, and he killed her cruelly by putting a rope to her two legs and to two camels and driving them until they rent her in two" (*ibid*; cf. W:564-5). Our sources do not mention or care to discuss the reason for such a sadistic treatment of an old and honorable woman. Whether Umm Qirfa had angered the Muslim commandant by

protesting aloud the Muslim army's questionable treatment of her daughter and other respectable tribal women, we do not know. We also do not know to what extent Zayd's apparent sadism toward this woman was the result of the dislike for him and the eventual loss of his beautiful wife, Zaynab, whom God had recently commanded to divorce so that the Prophet could marry her (Q33:37, 50). Within the eighteen months after the Prophet married Zaynab, he sent Zayd to head seven jihad expeditions. According to al-Waqidi these seven expeditions led by Zayd took place within a period of six months (W:5). This frequency of sending expeditions under Zayd's leadership was unusual. Zayd was wounded during the expedition before the raid on Umm Qirfa's people. "He was carried wounded from the field... Zayd ... swore that he would use no ablution until he raided Banu Fazara; and when he recovered from his wounds the Prophet sent him with a force" (1.1.664-5; for the circumstances of the Prophet's marriage with Zaynab, particular dates and the raids under Zayd's command see TT-1,2:563-4; IS-B,2:86-90; 8:101-15; T,22:12-6 cf. Q33:37 passim; Watt, Med.:341). Obviously, Zayd was an angry man.

The Prophet's Companion must have been watching and enjoying the scene. No expression of displeasure by any Muslim present is reported. We know that neither Zayd, nor any other Muslim participant in the terrifying act, was ever reproached. This diabolical killing is mentioned by Islamic sources as normal and unimportant. We also know that when Zayd came to Medina with other captives, including Umm Qirfa's beautiful daughter, the Prophet received him enthusiastically. He "embraced and kissed him," and Zayd informed the Prophet how God had bestowed victory upon him during the expedition (W:565). The Prophet continued to appoint Zayd and his son Usama commanders of jihad expeditions against the non-Muslims (1.1:664-5; W:564-5; IS-B,2:90-1).

In February-March, 628 CE, a group of Urayna Arab tribesmen entertained by the Prophet at Medina clashed, for unspecified reasons, with a group of Muslims including one of the Prophet's freed slaves.

During the fighting the Urayna tribesmen horribly tortured to death the Prophet's freedman and ran away. The Prophet dispatched a group of twenty horsemen under the leadership of Kurz b. Jabir to pursue the treacherous tribesmen. On their way the Muslim expeditionists captured a woman innocently passing by. Under interrogation, the woman told the Muslim of a group taking its night-halt nearby. The Muslims marched towards the group and besieged it. The besieged group of non-Muslims, who had just taken their dinner, had no other choice but to surrender. It is not clear in al-Waqidi that the non-Muslim group captured consisted of the Urayna tribesmen the Muslim horsemen were pursuing. However, Ibn Sad indicates that they were the same culprits (IS-B,2:93). However, the captives were taken to Medina. On the Prophet's order, the captives were mutilated, then crucified: "Their hands and legs were cut off; their eyes were gouged out and they were crucified," while other Muslims watched (W:570). Soon thereafter al-Waqidi tells us, the following Quranic passage was revealed - perhaps to justify the self-contradiction by the Prophet of a previous assertion ascribed to him. It was said the Prophet had changed his determination to mutilate thirty nonbelieving Quraysh to avenge the mutilation of Hamza at Uhud. It was also reported by al-Waqidi that the Prophet did not mutilate anyone after that (W:290). However, now that a number of Urayna had been mutilated and crucified to avenge the similar crime against one Muslim, justification came from the Almighty.

From a Muslim believer's point of view, the Quran is the Word of God, applicable for all times in similar situations. In fact the Quran contradicted itself. During Uhud (625 CE), the Quran had advised "to punish the like of that with which they were afflicted" or better to forgive (Q16:126). We were also told that the Prophet used to forgive after the revelation of the above verse in 625 CE, and did not mutilate anyone (W:290). But now we find the Almighty in 628 CE justifying the mutilation to death of a number of non-Muslims to avenge a single Muslim victim. This is what God now said:

This is the recompense of those who fight against God and His Messenger, and hasten about the earth, to do corruption there: they shall be slaughtered, or crucified, or their hands and feet shall alternately be struck off or they shall be banished from the land. That is a degradation for them in this world; and in the world to come awaits them a mighty chastisement, except for such as repent, before you have power over them... (Q3:33; cf. W:570; cf. IS-B,2:93).

However, because gouging of eyes was not mentioned in the Quranic passage, al-Waqidi maintains that no more eyes were scooped out after that and the Prophet ordered that no one should go beyond the cutting off of hands and legs (of non-Muslims (W:570)). Apparently, the Prophet's grandsons did not take this exception seriously. They gouged out the eyes of the perceived nonbeliever and the perceived enemy of God, Abd ar-Rahman b. Muljim. Had the Muslim God opposed the gouging of eyes of the non-Muslims, He would have said so specifically, the Prophet's grandsons must have thought.

Our final example of harsh treatment of nonbelievers, until the pact of Hdaybia, is the Muslim raid on al-Kadid. The raiders were, as usual, dispatched by the Prophet - against the Banu al-Mulawah of al-Kadid. On their way, the Muslims captured a certain al-Harith, who claimed he had decided to become a Muslim and that he was going to meet the Prophet. The Muslim raiders however arrested and tied him with ropes, saying "if he was a Muslim it would not hurt him to be tied up for a night, and if he were not we should make sure of him." They "bound him tightly and left him in charge of a young negro (sic) and told him to cut off his head if he tried to attack him" (1.1:660-1; W:750-2; IS-B,2:124-5).

G: From Hdaybia to the Conquest of Mecca and Taif

(March, 628 - Feb. 630 CE).

During the negotiations between the Prophet and the Meccan messengers at Hdaybiya, some aspects of Muslim treatment of the non-Muslims were notable. When Urwa B. Masud ath-Thaqafi, the Meccan representative, respected among his people, complained mildly, saying

Muhammad had brought "mixed people," referring to the native Medinans and various other tribesmen who accompanied the Prophet, to destroy his own fellow Meccans, Abu Bakr, the greatest personality in Islam after Muhammad according to Sunni Muslims, intervened. He told Urwa to "suck the clitoris of al-Lat" (W:581, 95; 1.1:502). This was not only obscene talk in a diplomatic gathering but also extremely disrespectful to the symbol of the deity (al-Lat) whom the non-Muslims respected religiously. Urwa the nonbeliever responded to this obscene, violent language in a polite, diplomatic way. He said to Abu Bakr: 'By Allah, had I not owed you a favor I would pay you back for that, but now we are quits" (1.1:502).

During his discussion with the Prophet, Urwa made some physical gestures which perfectly accorded to the traditions; indeed, the gestures symbolized intimacy. For example, Urwa touched the Prophet's beard as a sign of appeal to come to some settlement. Al-Mughira b. Shuba, a Muslim Companion clad in mail, stood by threateningly. He hit Urwa's hand at this touch, saying, "Take your hand away from the apostle's face before you lose it." Urwa protested diplomatically: "Confound you, how rough and rude you are!". The Prophet smiled (1.1:502; W:595-7), perhaps proud to create new, i.e., special Islamic traditions for the treatment of nonbelievers on such solemn diplomatic occasions. When Urwa reminded the Prophet that Mughira was infamous for his rowdiness and irresponsibility, the Prophet was unimpressed. Whatever Mughira's past, he was now serving the cause of Islam. Before joining Islam, Mughira had killed thirteen innocents of another tribe - Urwa had to pay the blood- money for them in order to stop further bloodshed. But this was not the first or last time the Prophet welcomed to Islam desperadoes of questionable character and reputation, i.g., Umar, Kurz b. Jabir and the notorious Uyayna we shall soon meet.

Besides the action of Abu Bakr and Mughira, the Prophet performed and authorized other activities during the Hudabiya negotiations that implied subtle terror and deceit. Muslim loyalty to the Prophet was a

matter of fact, but it appears this loyalty was intentionally and unusually demonstrated at Hudaibiya to create a particular image in the minds of non-Muslims. The maneuvers were effective. Returning to the Quraysh, the Meccan representative reported what he had seen in the Muslim camp and how Muslims treated Muhammad. He said:

Whenever he (the Prophet) performed his ablutions they ran to get the water he had used; if he spat they ran to it; if a hair of his head fell they ran to pick it up... I have been to Chosroes in his Kingdom, and Caesar in his Kingdom and the Negus in his Kingdom, but never have I seen a king among a people like Muhammad among his companions. I have seen a people who will never abandon him for any reason, so form your opinion (1.1:503).

From a Muslim reader's point of view, this show of fanaticism worked. (Such reports have also left a legacy of worship of Islamic authority in the Muslim mind. Note the believers' frenzied treatment of Khomeini in life and death.)

Hulays b. Alqama was another Meccan messenger. The Prophet was aware of his naive religiosity. When the Prophet saw him coming to negotiate, he said sarcastically, "This is one of the devout; send sacrificial animals to meet him so he can see them." Hulays was impressed accordingly. The Prophet was trying to convince the Meccans that he wanted to enter the city for pilgrimage, the sacrificial animals being a part of the rituals. The Prophet intentionally tried to exploit Hulays's sincerity towards pilgrims, including Muslims. When Hulays reported sympathetically on the Muslims, some Meccans thought he was duped by Muhammad - exactly what Muhammad intended when he said Hulays was "devout" (1.1:502; W:599).

Hudaibiya was another occasion when the Prophet took hostages. The Prophet sent Uthman to the city for negotiations. He was well received and entertained. Other companions of the Prophet were also permitted to enter the city to visit their relatives. A clash took place between Muslim guards at their camp and some Meccans. The Muslims arrested some Meccans and took them to the Prophet, who detained them. The Meccan representative came to apologize, telling the Prophet that

the ones who had clashed with the Muslims were "idiots" and that no responsible Meccan had told them to do so. Then, the Meccan messenger requested their release. The Prophet refused, keeping the captives hostage until Uthman and other Muslims returned safely from Mecca (W:602-5).

While at Mecca as a diplomatic representative enjoying the usual immunities, Uthman engaged in open propaganda for Islam, trying to convince the Meccans to convert to Islam. Uthman also did covert work, contacting and encouraging underground Muslims in Mecca (W:601). He confided to these clandestine Muslims, who were not allowed to leave the city: "Indeed the prophet gives you the good news of the conquest (of Mecca)," and the day when none will be compelled to conceal his faith in Islam in that city. The underground Muslims were extremely happy to hear the Prophet's message. They sent through Uthman their greetings and secret messages to the Prophet (ibid).

H. Towards the Conquest of Mecca and Taif.

The Prophet's campaign in 630 CE to conquer Mecca, the powerful Hawazin and Thaqif tribes, and Taif, gave the Muslims another opportunity to show how they treated non-Muslims in war and peace.

The Prophet planned the Meccan expedition in complete secrecy. The Meccans saw the Prophet's intentions when the Prophet's army reached their city's outskirts. But during the preparations, some Muslims with close relatives at Mecca suspected the Prophet's target was there. One of them, Hatib, wrote a letter and dispatched it with a hired woman to Mecca, to urge his Meccan son and family to act prudently. The Prophet "received news from heaven" of Hatib's action, and sent Ali and az-Zubayr b. al-Awwam after her. The woman had concealed the letter in her plaited locks. Ali and Zubayr overtook the woman, "made her dismount and searched her baggage but found nothing. Ali, the greatest figure in Islam, after the Prophet, for the Shiites and the fourth for

the Sunnites, told the woman that "if she did not produce the letter they would strip her." When the woman realized Ali and Zubayr were serious, she produced the letter (1.1:545; W:797). Most probably, these two great Companions of the Prophet would not have hesitated to strip the woman had she not obeyed. Umar, as usual, was ready to cut off Hatib's head. The letter, however, convinced the Prophet that he was a true believer, one who had participated at Badr, and that Hatib only wanted to protect his son and family without trying to harm Islam. Hatib was forgiven, but with a stern warning from the Almighty against any friendly relations and sympathy with nonbelievers. According to Ibn Ishaq, it was on this occasion that Q60:1-4 was revealed. [The Prophet might have recited the same Quranic passages on various appropriate occasions. It is consistent with Islamic belief that the Quran is relevant for all occasions and times.]

O believers, take not My enemy and your enemy for friends, offering them love, though they have disbelieved in the truth that has come to you expelling the Messenger and you because you believe in My way and seek my good pleasure, secretly loving them, yet I know very well what you conceal and what you publish; and whosoever does that, has gone astray from the right way. If they come to you, they will be enemies to you, and stretch against you their hands and their tongues, to do you evil, and they wish that you may disbelieve. Neither your blood-kindred nor your children shall profit you upon the Day of Resurrection; He shall distinguish between you. And God sees the things you do. You have had a good example in Abraham, and those with him, when they said to their people 'We are quit of you and that you serve, apart from God. We disbelieve in you, and between us and you enmity has shown itself, and hatred forever, until you believe in God alone (Q60:1-4 cf. 1.1:545).

Thus the Muslim sense of perpetual enmity towards non-Muslims was reinforced by God at a time when the peace of Hudaibiya theoretically yet in tact, had promised peaceful coexistence. The believers, however had begun the mission that would eventually conquer most of Arabia during the Prophet's life. During the siege of Taif, in this spirit of venom and ruthless indifference, Amr b. al-As rebuked Uayyana, a powerful Muslim mercenary and ally. Uayyana said some good things about the enemy. Amr told Uayyana: "How dare you praise disbelievers against the wishes of the Prophet!" (W:937).

A lack of respect for the non-Muslim dead was again demonstrated by the Muslims during the campaign. At Taif, Abu Bakr pointed to the grave of a non-Muslim and remarked: "God curse the dead in this grave; he opposed God and His Messenger." The two sons of the dead man protested. The Prophet suggested to the Muslims the use of a general formula for the nonbelievers' dead. He said to curse the disbelievers in general, not by name, which might hurt their survivors (W:925). This was obviously to reconcile the two sons, who had already joined the Prophet. Otherwise just before the Taif engagements, during the battle against Hawazin, when the news of the murder of Dhu'l-Khimar by a Muslim reached the Prophet, he exclaimed joyfully: 'God curse him! He used to hate Quraysh' (1.1:572). Here, the Prophet was also talking ethnocentrically. After all he was a Quraysh and the Meccan Quraysh were now under his leadership. The Prophet would curse the Jews, even on irrelevant occasions when he had to forbid an Islamically-undesirable habit ascribed to the Jews. During the Taif expedition, a Muslim asked the Prophet about the use of the tallow obtained from dead animals. The Prophet responded: "May God destroy the Jews! God forbade them consumption of the fat from dead animals but they began to sell it and eat its price" (W:865). Such words repeated in the basic, sacred Islamic literature do not encourage believers to be modest and polite toward nonbelievers, dead or alive. They serve to create and reinforce a dark image of non-Muslims, encouraging like treatment.

Readings in the annals of the Mecca-Taif conquest also encourage Muslim indifference towards non-Muslims, particularly their right to life and property. Although the Prophet's treatment of vanquished Meccans was unusually generous after the conquest, it is not relevant to discuss in detail the reasons and methods for this. This 'amnesty' was, however, based on the expectations that Mecca surrender and cooperate actively with the Muslims in the subjugation of other Arab tribes and nonbelievers. In any case, the blood of non-Muslims was shed after the conquest of Mecca. There were more than half a dozen persons,

including women singers, who were beheaded immediately. Most were the Prophet's personal enemies in the sense that they had composed satirical poetry against the Prophet and the two women singers sang them for the Quraysh. Some of these condemned to death, including one singing girl, escaped and later surrendered, apologized and became Muslims, so that they could escape death (W:846, 856-62; 1.1:550-2).

Habbar b. al-Aswad, who had insulted the Prophet's daughter Zaynab when she migrated from Mecca, was on the list of those condemned to death. The Prophet had previously declared him MAHDUR AD-DAM and ordered him to be burned to death. Then he changed his decree, saying that only God had the right to torture and kill by burning. (Why the Prophet's grandsons who burned the amputated Ibn Muljim alive did not remember this is a question to be answered by the believers.) Instead, the Prophet said: "Whenever you get hold of him, cut off his two hands and his two legs and then kill him" (W:857-8). However Habbar remained a fugitive. Later he went to Medina and surrendered as a Muslim, only so could he escape mutilation and death (ibid).

Other than those killed in the course of fighting during the Mecca-Taif expedition, a number of non-Muslims or alleged non-Muslims were coldbloodedly killed by the Muslims while prisoners of war, or after they had surrendered. Also during these expeditions a number of non-Muslim women, children and at least one very aged man, (Durayd, reportedly 130 years old, who could not and did not defend himself) were killed by the Muslims.

After the situation at Mecca stabilized, the Prophet sent troops to adjoining districts to preach Islam. Khalid b. al-Walid commanded the group that went to the Banu Jadhima tribe. Khalid asked Banu Jadhima to lay down their arms, which they did. "Khalid ordered their hands to be tied behind their backs and put them to the sword, killing a number of them" (for the full story, see 1.1:561-5; W:875-84). A young captive whose hands were tied to his neck (while the women of the condemned stood by in a group), requested his Muslim executioner to take

him closer to his sweetheart, Hubaysha, so he could say his last words to her. Addressing his beloved, the captive said: "Fare you well, Hubaysha" and then gave vent to his love and emotions in poetry:

Tell me when I sought and found you in Halya
Or came on you in al-Khawaniq,
Was I not a lover worthy to be given what he
 asked,
Who undertook journeys by night and noonday?
I did no wrong when I said, when our people were
 together,
Reward me with love before some misfortune
 befalls!
Reward me with love before distance divides
And the chief goes off with a dear one thus
 parted.
For I was never disloyal to our secret troth
And my eye never looked admiringly at another.
When the tribe's troubles distracted me from
 love,
Even then the attraction of love was there (1.1:564).

While Hubaysha was praying for her lover: "May your life be prolonged seven and ten continuous years and eight thereafter" the young lover was taken away and beheaded by the Muslim executioner. After the decapitation, Hubaysha, the wife "bent over him and kept kissing him until she died at his side" (1.1:564).

The reports tell us that the Prophet, when informed of the massacre, reproached Khalid verbally, disowned his action and sent Ali to pay blood-money for the murders. But these accounts do not change, for two reasons, our categorization of the incident as exemplifying Muslim treatment of the nonbelievers, in such a way: 1) the Prophet was reportedly sorry because Banu Judhayma had accepted Islam before they were massacred so treacherously. That is, had they been non-Muslims, the Prophet and some of his more conscientious comrades would not resent Khalid's massacre. The verbal protest some Muslims made against Khalid was based on the point that the victims had already converted to Islam. No report in our Islamic sources indicates Muslim sorrow or regrets for non-Muslim victims. 2) Khalid remained as commander during the Meccan-Taif campaigns, repeatedly committing atrocities against perceived nonbelievers. Muslims also read that, the Prophet defended Khalid openly. During the fighting with Hawazin, Khalid killed a woman.

The Prophet is reported to have sent word not to kill a child or a woman in the future (1.1:576; W:883-4), but there was no reproach at all. Apparently after this, the Muslims killed a number of Hawazin children, and the Prophet vaguely expressed his displeasure. The Prophet's disfavor, however, was based on his hope that such children would some day have become Muslims (W:905). The Prophet also passed by the dead body of another non-Muslim woman killed by a believer. When the killer told Muhammad the woman wanted to kill him, the Prophet seemed convinced (W:912).

The 130-year-old Durayd was found in a **HAWDAJ**, a wooden bar seat on the camel, particularly arranged for women or the feeble. Durayd was too old to take part in the fighting. The passive old man, however, was attacked and killed by a believer (W:915). Al-Waqidi tells us that a Hawazin prisoner of war and, at Taif, another non-Muslim war captive were executed by the Muslims (W:903, 926-7). Whenever, during the campaign, the Prophet heard of the deaths of non-Muslims, he expressed his pleasure (W:929- 30). Terror was appreciated, as usual (W:905), and the captive nonbeliever women were raped by the Muslims, as **MA MALAKAT AYMANUHUM** after they were distributed as shares of booty to the Muslims (W:919; 943-4). The booty during the Hawazin-Taif campaign was so great that Abu Sufyan perhaps grudgingly remarked: "O Messenger of God, You have become the richest of the Quraysh." The Prophet just smiled (W:944). He enjoyed the loot.

A word about the Prophet's defense of Khalid. Apparently Khalid continued his ruthlessness against the nonbelievers, contrary to the Prophet's occasional slaps on the wrist. There was apparently some misgiving about Khalid's atrocities. The Prophet made it clear on whose side the Messenger of God was. The Prophet announced: "Do not abuse Khalid b. al-Walid; he is indeed a sword from the swords of God who has extended it against the disbelievers and hypocrites" (W:883). Muhammad was subtly telling the critics those treacherously killed by Khalid were not true Muslims; they were "hypocrites." The Prophet also said, "What a

fine servant of God Khalid b. al-Walid is; he is a sword among the swords of God who has pulled it out against the disbelievers and hypocrites" (ibid).

The Prophet sent Khalid to attack the Banu Kinana tribe. When Khalid did not hear the call for Muslim prayer from the Banu Kinana settlement, he attacked and killed, and took prisoners. Lest they forget, believers are told "the Messenger of God did not reproach him for what he had done, and remained as a commander until he died" (ibid). And then al-Waqidi correctly tells us how Khalid worked as a Muslim general during the latter conquests (W:883-4). With this kind of explanation, the ruthlessness of Khalid and other Muslims during the campaign seems quite justified in Muslim eyes, projected as a source of inspiration rather than regret.

Deceit and terror mainly brought the Meccans to their knees. Once they surrendered and found the commonality of interests between them and the Muslims, the Prophet who needed Meccan cooperation for the expeditions ahead, did not hesitate to manipulate and bribe them according to the Divine authorization of **TALIF AL-QULUB**, "winning the hearts (by giving generous concessions)." Islam continued to match the stick with the carrot.

When the Muslim army reached the outskirts of Mecca, Abu Sufyan the most responsible figure, tried to reach the Prophet through his uncle, Abbas, until then a double agent. However, after the Prophet's conquest of Khaybar etc., Abbas and many other Hashimites and underground Muslims were turned decidedly for the rising star of Islam. They had never forgotten what Uthman, Umar and other unspecified Muslim secret agents had told them: the Prophet's "good news," his intent to conquer Mecca very soon.

The Quraysh were caught unawares. When the Prophet reached Marr az-Zahran, they "were completely ignorant of the fact and did not even know what he was doing" (1.1:546; W:802 passim). Inside Mecca, Abbas apparently knew the plan was to frighten and encourage his fellow

citizens to surrender to his nephew, Muhammad, without any resistance. Abbas said, "Alas, Quraysh, if the apostle enters Mecca by force before they come and ask for protection that will be the end of Quraysh for ever" (ibid). Abbas said to the Quraysh, particularly Abu Sufyan: "If he (Muhammad) takes you, he will behead you" (1.1:547). Abbas finally convinced Abu Sufyan, who was already frightened by the great Muslim army (gauged by the fires they had lit at a short distance from Mecca), to go to the Prophet, surrender, seek protection and cooperate with him. No resistance was offered. While in the Muslim camp under Abbas's protection, Abu Sufyan, virtual head of the Meccan city state, was threatened and humiliated by the Muslims before he began a dialogue of peace with the Prophet, his Medinan counterpart. Before the Prophet, Umar asked him to let him "take off" the head of Abu Sufyan and "continued to remonstrate" Abu Sufyan (1.1:547). The Prophet kept Abu Sufyan waiting before the dialogue. He asked Abbas to take Abu Sufyan away from him and bring him back in the morning (ibid). The next morning, Abu Sufyan was asked to confess: "there is no god but God; Muhammad is the Messenger of God." Abu Sufyan was still hesitant about the second part of the confession. Declaration of faith in one God was all right for him, but he was not yet convinced about the unique relationship between God and Muhammad. He said, "By God, I thought that had there been another god with God, he would have continued to help me." As to Muhammad being God's Messenger, Abu Sufyan remarked, "I still have some doubt." Abbas who was working as an intermediary, but obviously for the cause of Muhammad, pressed Abu Sufyan by saying, "Submit and testify that there is no god but God and that Muhammad is the apostle of God before you lose your head" (1.1:547; W:817-19). Abu Sufyan did not want to lose his head; so he did submit to Muhammad's Prophethood. However the submission of Abu Sufyan to Islam did not mean that he was left to rule Mecca as an equal or even as a subordinate. He was sent back with both concessions and warnings: those in Mecca who would enter Abu Sufyan's house and those who remain locked in their

houses without showing resistance to the victorious Muslims would be given amnesty (1.1:548; W:818; IS-B,2:135). Just after Abu Sufyan left the Prophet's headquarters to convey the terms to his fellow Meccans, the Prophet confidentially told Abbas, his uncle, to detain Abu Sufyan "in the narrow part of the wadi where the mountains projected, so that God's armies would pass by and he would see them." Abu Sufyan realized he was being unnecessarily detained by his "friend" Abbas, compelled to pass through a certain passage. For a moment, he thought treachery was involved. He asked Abbas why he was detained and forced to pass by a certain wadi, and said: "Is it another Hashimite treachery?" --

GHADR-AN BANI HASHIM? This was to say that it was not the first time that the Hashimite Muhammad had engaged in treachery. Abbas, however, made some excuses, and followed the Prophet's instructions (W:818-20). The Prophet meant to show Abu Sufyan the 'march-past' of the huge Muslim army in full colors to terrorize and demoralize him. This was accomplished and when Abu Sufyan rushed back to Mecca he did what the Prophet wanted him to do. Reaching Mecca, "he cried at the top of his voice, 'O Quraysh, this is Muhammad who has come to you with a force you cannot resist.'" Then he told the terms of safe conduct. Abu Sufyan's wife Hind, the daughter of Utbah the Great, was so enraged she seized Abu Sufyan's mustaches and cried "kill this fat greasy bladder of lard! What a rotten protector of the people" (1.1:548; W:822-3). But, the Meccan chiefs could see their helplessness and the 'Burhan al-Qati (the cutting and decisive evidence),' as Abu Sufyan had. They did what Abu Sufyan told them: Locked themselves in their houses or took protection in Abu Sufyan's house. The Prophet's army entered Mecca in triumph. A few diehards, led by Ikrima b. Abu Jahl and others, tried to resist, but they were soon overwhelmed by the Prophet's army (for the full story of the conquest of Mecca see 1.1:540-60; W:780-872; IS-B,2:).

After the subjugation of Hawazin in a bloody war (with the help of the Meccans, many Meccans were allowed to remain non-Muslims for awhile. The Prophet adopted more explicit methods of terror in his confrontation

with the Thaqif of Taif. Taif offered so brave a resistance that the Muslims had to lift their siege, return to Jirana, and distribute the huge spoils of war looted from Hawazin and other tribes. After appointing administrators at Mecca, Muhammad left for Medina to use means other than war so that Taif would surrender.

During the war against Hawazin, the Thaqif tribe fought against the Muslims and their new Meccan allies. Malik b. Auf, the chief of the Hawazin, had a QASR, "palace," at Taif, apparently outside the main Taif bastions. The Prophet had already taken Malik's wife and others of his family captive, holding them hostage until Malik surrendered (W:955). Before this happened - during the siege of Taif - the Prophet ordered Malik's palace to be set afire; it burned a full evening (W:925). The Prophet then ordered the vineyards and gardens surrounding Taif to be destroyed and put afire. He told the Muslims, who apparently coveted these gardens hoping to have them as booty, that in reward they would get as many vines in Paradise as they destroyed at Taif (W:928). The Muslims obeyed, cutting down as many vineyards as they could before Abu Sufyan intervened for reasons of his own. Some Quraysh women lived in Taif. Abu Sufyan and al-Mughira, another Meccan having property there, went inside the Taif fort to negotiate the transfer of some Quraysh women, including Abu Sufyan's daughter from Taif who were married to Taifans. They feared that with the entry by assault -- UNWAT-AN, of the Prophet these women would be enslaved according to Islamic traditions. Perhaps as a part of the deal, the Taif elders asked Abu Sufyan to ask Muhammad to accept the vineyards as his own (Muhammad's) property, or to award their ownership in the name of God to his close relatives instead of destroying them. They also reminded the Prophet honestly that the vineyards had been cultivated with much difficulty and their restoration after destruction would be impossible. The Prophet accepted the offer and forbade further destruction of the gardens (W:928-9).

At one point during the siege of Taif, Umar threatened to blockade

the city's food supply so the citizens would starve to death or be compelled to get out of their "hole" (W:935).

Uyayna b. Hisn was an interesting personality in the Muslim camp. During the Taif expedition he frankly admitted he was not there to fight the Thaqif, the tribe that inhabited Taif. "What I intend," he said,

is to capture a Thaqif girl, after Muhammad captures Taif, and to make intercourse with her so that she bears a son for me -- **INNI WA'LLAH MA JIT MAAKUM UQATIL THAQIF-AN, WA LAKIN ARADT AN YAPTAH MUHAMMAD AT-TAIF, FA-USIB JARIYAT-AN MIN THAQIF FA-ATAAHA, LAALL-ALLAHA TALID LI RAJUL- AN** (W:937; TT,3:85).

Tabari does not record the Prophet's response. According to al-Waqidi, when the Prophet was told of this candor, he smiled and remarked: "what an idiot follower" -- **FA-TABASSAM WA QAL: HADHA'L-HUMQ AL-MUTA** (W:937). The Prophet, however, did not discard Uyayna. Unfortunately for Uyayna, Taif - whose Thaqif beautiful young girls he had coveted - resisted and the Prophet had to lift the seige. However, from among the booty taken from the Hawazin and distributed after the seige was lifted, the Prophet did award Uyayna a captive woman along with 100 camels. Our too shrewd Uyayna voluntarily selected an older woman because, as he thought, of her respectable position in the clan, he expected that her honorable folk would offer an extraordinary sum for her freedom -- **LA-ALLAHUM AN YAGHLU BI-FIDAIHA, FA-INNAHU ASA AN YAKUN LAHA FI'L-HAYY NASAB.** On close inspection Uyayna soon realized the woman was too old and ugly, "with no swelling breasts, incapable of bearing a child, nor with cooling (voluptuous) mouth, nor (someone) missed by her husband" -- **AJUZ-IN KABIRAT-IN... MA THADYUHA BI-NAHID, WALA BATNUHA BI-WALID, WA LA FUHA BI-BARID, WA LA SAHIBUHA BI-WAJID.** The woman's son - who had first offered 100 camels for her freedom and Uyayna had refused demanding more - exploited our holy warrior's belated change of mind. Trying to bargain in desperation, Uyayna was now ready to accept ten camels. The son refused. Eventually, Uyayna gave up the woman for nothing because she was a burden and liability to carry rather than an asset, cursing the son: "Take her; may God not bless you; I do not need her" -- **KHUDHHA; LA BARAK ALLAH LAK FIHA; WA LA HAJAT LI FIHA.** (For the

full story see W:946, 951-4).

In April 630 CE, three months after Taif, the Prophet honored Uyayna by appointing him commander of the Muslim expedition against Tamim (W:974-5; Watt, Med:342). Uyayna brought eleven captured Tamim women for the Prophet (W:975). Uyayna is occasionally condemned (Q9:101 cf. T; cf. W:1025, 1072) not for his lust for the nonbelievers' women, but for his continued flirtation and friendship with some pagan Arabs (ibid). The Prophet sent the same Uyayna as messenger to the people of Taif, and encouraged him to tell lies in order to terrorize them into surrender. Uyayna was a double agent of a different kind, not so loyal to the Prophet. When he entered the fort, he encouraged the non-Muslims to resist the siege and refuse to surrender, although the Prophet had charged him differently (W:932-3).

Taif, terrorized, finally surrendered. After his return to Medina, the Prophet sent a delegation to Taif. He authorized the delegates to tell whatever false statements and lies were necessary to intimidate and frighten. The delegates dutifully told the Taifans that Muhammad was

a ruthless, crude person -- **FAZZ GHALIZ**; he can do what he wants to do; he has always been victorious with the (help of the) sword. Arabs and others have been compelled to be humiliated and subjugated to him.

The Prophet's messengers added,

to the extent that the Romans (Byzantines) are terrified in their forts by him; every one has been compelled to enter his religion willingly or by the fear of the sword.

This was quite frightening. The result was as desired.

After a day or two of consultation and trying to bargain, al-Waqidi reports, "God put terror in their hearts and they said,

'we have no power to face him; all Arabs have surrendered to him; so return to him and give him what he wants, make peace with him and write a document (of surrender and peace) between you and him before he marches towards us and sends his armies'" (W:970).

After Taif was so terrorized into surrender the Muslim messengers tried to reconcile the People of Taif by assuring them that the Prophet was after all not such a fiend as they portrayed him just to frighten them to give in (ibid).

The Prophet occasionally used, or wanted to use, an indirect method of eliminating individual non-Muslim adversaries without getting directly involved in the operation. Abd Allah b. Sad b. Abu Sarh was a Muslim and one of the Prophet's scribes at Medina. The Prophet used to dictate the Quran to Abd Allah when it was revealed by God, as Muslims believe. Apparently, Abd Allah had some suspicion about such revelations truly being from God. He occasionally, but intentionally, changed some words during the dictation. The Prophet, after listening to Abd Allah read back his notes, did not notice the changes and would confirm that was what God had revealed. Abd Allah lost faith in the authenticity of Muhammad and his Prophethood, apostasized and left for Mecca, where he told others Muhammad was a fraud and his claim to have received revelation from God was unfounded. Had it been God's word, and the Prophet, as he claimed, had direct link to Him, he would have recognized the change, Abd Allah argued. This happened before the conquest of Mecca. The Prophet had already declared Abd Allah **MAHDUR AD-DAM**, an apostate and renegade to be killed when found. During the Meccan conquest he was marked for death. When the Prophet conquered Mecca, Abd Allah, certain he would die, took refuge with his foster brother Uthman, an influential Companion, and sought protection. Uthman took Abd Allah - who was ready to apologize and again be a Muslim - to the Prophet, requesting the he forgive and accept Abd Allah's allegiance to Islam. The Prophet did not respond to Uthman's repeated requests and turned his face away from him. The Prophet did not want to forgive one who had challenged his link to God, the very basis of his claim to supremacy. As a matter of fact, Waqidi, tells us, the Prophet remained silent and turned his face so that some Muslim would stand up and cut off Abd Allah's head because the Prophet had not declared safe conduct

for Abd Allah (W:856). No one realized that, however, and Uthman continued his entreaties on behalf of Abd Allah. The Prophet finally accepted Uthman's request unwillingly and acknowledged Abd Allah's allegiance. Apparently just after Abd Allah left, the Prophet said in obvious anger to his comrades: "Why did not one of you stand up and kill this dog (Abd Allah)?" One or more of the Muslims said that had the Prophet told them by some gesture they would have cut off Abd Allah's head. The Prophet said: "I do not kill by gesture" (ibid). He would have liked to see the dirty job done by others without his involvement. Uthman, the Prophet's son-in-law, was too influential to have been disappointed directly.

During the battle of Hunayn (Hawazin), the Prophet forbade a particular Muslim, Abu Barda, to kill a particular enemy. Abu Barda openly encouraged other Muslims to eliminate this non-Muslim, saying that he could not do so because of the Prophet's order. When the Prophet heard of Abu Barda's incitement, he (the Prophet) expressed appreciation rather than condemnation (W:291-2).

The spoils from the Hawazin expedition helped the Prophet convince his fellow Meccans and other new Arab allies that the new creed, was not indifferent towards their this-worldly needs and desires. The Prophet's booty included 6,000 women and children, 24,000 camels, 4,000 uqiya of silver, and many kine, impossible to count exactly (W:944-6; 1.1:592-7). During the sharing of the booty, those new Muslims and allies whose hearts the Prophet wanted to win were given a lavish first pick -- **ATA MUALLAFAT AL-QULUB AWWAL AN-NAS**. Even the notorious Uyayna received 100 camels and an enslaved woman. The Prophet frankly admitted he had "treated them generously so that they may become Muslims" (1.1:595).

Many of the Hawazin women distributed to the victors were instantly raped by the believers such as Abd ar- Rahman b. Auf, Safwan b. Umayya, Uthman b. Affan (the Prophet's son-in-law), Talha b. Ubayd Allah and Ubayda b. al-Jarrah, most of them among the Prophet's famous Companions. Note that Muslims do not call this rape. Islam authorizes

sexual intercourse with slave girls one purchases, inherits or receives as a share of booty. Thanks to his pro-Ali leanings, al-Waqidi particularly tells us the Hawazin woman awarded by the Prophet to Uthman and so raped by Uthman abhorred him -- **WA ATA UTHMAN BIN AFFAN JARIYAT-AN... FA WATAAHA FA KARIHATHU** (W:944). Later, when some of these women, including the one awarded to Ali, the Prophet's other son-in-law, were given a choice to stay with their Muslim masters or concubines or return to their families, all but the one given to Sad b. Abu Waqqas chose to return (W:952). Apparently, they shared the feelings of Uthman's concubine.

After the spoils were divided a delegation from the sub-tribe of Hawazin related to Halima, the Prophet's foster-mother, appealed for mercy. They reminded the Prophet how kind they had been to him during his childhood (W:949-52). Perhaps embarrassed, the Prophet authorized the Muslims and allies to release - if they volunteered to do so - the enslaved women and children. The Prophet offered to release his share of the enslaved and that of the members of the Banu Abd al-Muttalib family. Our sources tell us all the old guard, the Emigrants, and Helpers volunteered to free the Hawazin women and children. Some women were given a choice as mentioned above. Most of the new Muslims and allies ignored the call. The Prophet authorized them to do so.

At Jirana, near Mecca, during the division of the spoils, the Prophet kept the family of Malik b. Awf, the chief of Hawazin as hostages. He sent a message to Malik that "if he came to him as a Muslim he would return his family and property to him, and give him a hundred camels" (91.1:593). When Malik surrendered as a Muslim, the Prophet fulfilled his promise. The Prophet appointed Malik chief of those among his people who had converted to Islam. Malik the Muslim began his raids on the surrounding non-Muslim tribes, killed them and confiscated their property. In the absence of the Prophet, Malik the Muslim became a scourge of the Hawazin and Thaqif non-Muslims. From the loot he gained, once he sent 100 camels and another time 1,000 goats

to the Prophet as his one- fifth tithe (W:954-5).

After the Prophet established Muslim power in Mecca, Taif and the surrounding regions, the various steps taken by the Prophet and his followers showed that Islam was unwilling to coexist peacefully with any other creed. This was even before the revelation of the passages in suras 9 and 3, enjoining Muslims to declare all-out, perpetual war on the world. The semi-general amnesty given Meccans and some other friendly tribesmen did not mean the recognition of their religion. It was temporary, based on calculated pragmatism if not opportunism.

On the day Mecca was occupied, the Prophet cleared the Kaba of all signs of pluralism. He entered the Kaba reciting the Quranic passage Q17:81), "the truth has come and falsehood has passed away; verily falsehood is sure to pass away." "Then he ordered all the idols [in and] around the Kaba to be collected and burned with fire and broken up" (1.1:552). "Commemorating the day of the conquest," a Muslim poet, Fadala b. al-Mulawwih al-Laythi recalled proudly

Had you seen Muhammad and his troops
The day the idols were smashed when he entered
You would have seen God's light become manifest
And darkness covering the face of idolatry (ibid).

The Prophet also saw in the Kaba the figures of angels and other beings and a picture of Abraham, with divining arrows in his hand. "God slay them," he said, "they have pictured our shaykh as a man divining with arrows. What has Abraham to do with such things?" Then he recited the Quran: "Abraham was not a Jew nor a Christian, but he was a Hanif, a Muslim, and was not a polytheist." The Prophet "gave orders that all those pictures should be erased" (1.1(IH):774). Although the Prophet did not formally force the Meccans to convert to Islam just after the conquest, the Kaba, hitherto an international pluralistic institution, was now exclusively Islamic. Meccans chafed at the change. Some vented their resentment in private meetings, but many were so frightened that they preferred to keep quiet. At such a meeting, Abu Sufyan, remarked: "I say nothing. If I were to speak, the very stones would tell him

(Muhammad) of it" (ibid). Abu Sufyan was most probably referring to Muhammad's informers who, now, had infested Mecca. In the basically liberal Arabia, there was no segregation between men and women. Meccan women used to mix and talk freely with men on social occasions and in public places. But social rules changed after the Prophet occupied the city. A believer recalled: "I passed by a woman with whom I used to converse, and when she asked me to join her I refused...

She said, come and talk, and I said,
 God and Islam make it unlawful.
 If you had seen Muhammad and his victorious entry
 The day the idols were smashed
 You would have seen God's religion shining plainly
 And darkness covering the face of idolatry (1.1(IH):775).

In the words of another Muslim poet, Abbas b. Midras,
 recalling the day of the conquest of Mecca,

With us on the day Muhammad entered Mecca
 Were a thousand marked men-the valleys flowed
 with them

 They split the enemies' heads like colocynths.
 Their hooves had traversed Najd beforehand
 Till at last black Hijaz became subject to them.
 God gave him the mastery of it
 The judgement of the sword and victorious fortune subdued it to us
 (ibid).

The Prophet also dispatched Khalid and other Muslims to destroy the non-Muslim worship places around Mecca, such as those at Nakhla, Dhi'l-Kaffayn and Taif (1.1:565; W:923 passim). The spirit of Islam and its stance towards the world beyond Islam after the conquest of Mecca and Taif is best expressed in Muslim poetry preserved by some of our sources. Two pieces are vivid examples (for the rest see 1.1:568-602 passim). 'Abdullah b. Wahb, one of B. Tamim of the clan of Usayyid, said:

By God's command we smote those we met
 In accordance with the best command.
 When we met, O Hawazin,
 We were saturating heads with fresh blood.
 When you and B. Qasiy assembled
 We crushed opposition like beaten leaves.
 Some of your chiefs we slew
 And we turned to kill both fugitive and standfast.
 Al-Multah lay with outstretched hands,
 his dying breath sounding like a gasping young camel.

If Qays 'Aylan be angry
My snuff has always subdued them (1.1:586).

Ka'b b. Malik said:

We put an end to doubt in the lowlands and Khaybar,
Then we gave our swords a rest.
We gave them the choice and could they have spoken
Their blades would have said, Give us Daus or Thaqif.
May I be motherless if you do not see
Thousands of us in your courts.
We will tear off the roofs in the valley of Wajj
And we will make your houses desolate.
Our swiftest cavalry will come on you
Leaving behind a tangled mass.
When they come down on our courts
You will hear a cry of alarm
With sharp cutting swords in their hands like flashes
of lighting
By which they bring death to those who would fight
them
Tempered by Indian smiths - not beaten into plates.
You would think that the flowing blood of the
warriors
Was mingled with saffron the morn the forces met.
Good God, had they no adviser
From the peoples who knew about us
To tell them that we had gathered
The finest blood horses and that we had brought an
army
To surround the walls of their fort with troops?
Our leader the prophet, firm,
Pure of heart, steadfast, continent,
straightforward, full of wisdom, knowledge, and
clemency;
Not frivolous nor light minded.
We obey our prophet and we obey a Lord
Who is the Compassionate, most kind to us.
If you offer peace we will accept it
And make you partners in peace and war.
If you refuse we will fight you doggedly,
'Twill be no weak faltering affair.
We shall fight as long as we live
Till you turn to Islam, humbly seeking refuge.
We will fight not caring whom we meet
Whether we destroy ancient holdings or newly gotten gains.
How many tribes assembled against us
Their finest stock and allies
They came at us thinking they had no equal
And we cut off their noses and ears
With our fine polished Indian swords,
Driving them violently before us
To the command of God and Islam,
Until religion is established, just and straight, and
Al-Lat and al-Uzza and Wudd are forgotten
And we plunder them of their necklaces and earrings.
For they had become established and confident,
And he who cannot protect himself must suffer
disgrace (1.1:587-8).

I: After the Conquest of Mecca to 632 CE

The Prophet's contacts with non-Muslims after the conquest of Mecca and Taif were mainly of three forms: 1) Jihad or raiding armies, occasionally under the Prophet's own leadership, continued to march to the north, south and southeast of Arabia. The northerly expeditions finally brought the Muslims to the Byzantine territories; 2) the Prophet is reported to have sent preaching parties and ambassadors after Hdaybiya and during this period to various groups and personalities, including the Byzantine and Iranian rulers. Deputations from Arabia and from the frontier regions are also reported to have gone to Medina. Those addressed by the Prophet were normally asked to acknowledge his Prophethood, perform Islamic prayers and pay the Islamic taxes -- **ZAKAT** and **SADAQAT**, to him. They were also asked to dissociate themselves from the nonbelievers and fight them for Islam. In most cases, the responses are reported to have been positive in one way or another. And 3) apparently some groups, after surrendering to Islam, hesitated to obey the Prophet's instructions, particularly in the matter of paying Islamic dues. In such cases the Prophet had to send punitive expeditions.

Certain problematic aspects of this treatment should be noted. Although the Arabs were frightened by the sword of the Messenger of Allah after they saw what he had done to the Meccans and Hawazin (W:974), some tribes continued to resist his raiding parties. Banu Tamim of central Arabia were among the resisters. [For the story see 1.1:628-31; W:973-80.] When the Muslim, raiders laid hands on the Banu Tamim livestock, apparently without their permission, they protested, exclaiming "What is this? - our property is being taken away from us unjustly." The Muslim tax collectors replied: "We are a people who believe in the religion of Islam and this is (what) our religion (has authorized us to do)" (W:973). When Banu Tamim refused to pay the tax, the Muslims, few in number, returned to Medina empty-handed. The Prophet decided to send an armed group to punish Banu Tamim, and asked for volunteers. The notorious Uyayna b. Hisn offered his services, assuring the Prophet he would make the rebels surrender to Islam, "God

willing" (W:974). The Prophet dispatched Uyayna and fifty horsemen, who accomplished the mission - returning to Medina with eleven women and thirty children captives. Al-Waqidi tells us none of the Emigrants or the Helpers was included in the raiding party under Uyayna. Thus, Muslims see that the Prophet picked the more notorious elements from converts to the rising star of Islam, to deal with nonbelievers more harshly. One of the reasons, perhaps, was the Helpers' growing disenchantment after the conquest of Mecca.

A delegation of Banu Tamim soon came to Medina requesting the release of their women and children. At first a kind of debate in prose and poetry took place between the two sides. Banu Tamim tried to pose as a powerful and respectable tribe while the Muslims, using intimidating language, warned them to behave as the Prophet desired. As the Prophet ordered, a Muslim speaker said after praising God:

By His power He made us Kings and chose the best of His creation as an apostle, and honoured him with lineage, made him truthful in speech, and favored him with it above (all) that He created. He was God's choice from the worlds. Then He summoned men to believe in him. ...We are God's helpers and assistants of His apostle, and will fight men until they believe in God; and he who believes in God and His apostle has protected his life and property from us; and he who disbelieves we will fight in God unceasingly and killing him will be a small matter to us..." (1.1:629; cf. W:976-7).

On this occasion, Hassan was ordered by the Prophet to tell the Banu Tamim:

Curse you, would you boast against us
When you are our servants, half wet-nurses and half-slaves?
If you have come to save your lives and property
Lest they be divided as booty,
Then give not God an equal and embrace Islam
And do not dress like foreigners (1.1(IH):786).

Added to this was a direct reproach by the Almighty to the Banu Tamim representatives who, in their Bedouin way, thinking themselves as equal to the Prophet talked loudly during their parleys. God told them to behave properly while in the company of the Prophet and not to raise their voices above his, nor speak aloud to him as they spoke to one another... (W:979; cf. Q49:1-4 AYA tr.). This was perhaps enough to convince the Banu Tamim they had confronted God's chosen people. When

they accepted Islam, the Prophet not only released their women and children but also "gave them valuable gifts" (1.1:631; W:979). During the Muslim raid on the al-Qurta in June-July, 630 CE, al-Usyad, a Muslim zealot, offered his non-Muslim father, Salama, protection on condition he become a Muslim. The old man refused to convert; instead he reviled his son and Islam. Our believer was outraged. He beat the horse his father was riding, which jumped violently. The old man fell down. A Muslim comrade of the son did the dirty job; he killed the fallen father who had used unflattering words against Islam (W:982; IS- B,2:162-3) while the son was watching approvingly, apparently. Islamic sources mention such stories to appreciate and reinforce the ruthlessness of believers against non-Muslims - including their fathers - rather than questioning such actions.

Also in 630 CE, the Prophet sent Ali and 150 horsemen and camel-riders to destroy a pagan worship-place, al-Fuls, which they did. During the raid, the Muslims successfully attacked various tribes. The Muslims killed many, enslaved many "pagans" including women and children, and captured many livestock as booty before they returned to Medina (W:984-9). On the expedition a "negro lad" suspected to be an informer for the enemy was arrested and brought to Ali. After the captive was assaulted by the Muslims, he confessed. Now he was pressured to provide information about the enemy to the Muslims. Ali, raising his sword above the lad's head, threatened to behead him if he tried to lie. The frightened boy agreed to collaborate (W:986). The information he provided proved to be quite useful in finding, killing and enslaving the enemy. After the raid, the lad pleaded for his release, but Ali asked him to become a Muslim to earn his freedom. The captive refused and was put with the others enslaved during the raid. Ironically, some of them cursed their fellow-prisoner, the "negro lad," who they thought betrayed them. Other captives, however, realized that "what had happened to him would have compelled anyone to act similarly" (W:987). The prisoners were gathered together. Ali asked them to

convert to Islam. "Those who became Muslims were released and those who refused were beheaded" (W:987). "The negro lad," Aslam, was among those who decided to convert to Islam.

J. The Tabuk Expedition (1.1:602-14; W:989-1076; IS-B,2:165- 8).

We end this segment with a survey of the Expedition of Tabuk, one of the most important events of the last phase of the Prophet's life. The Islamic story of the Tabuk (along with relevant events) is a microcosm of topics we have explored through our study of the Prophet's Medinan career. The story reasserts in the Muslim mind Islam's self-righteous aggressive expansionism; it culminates in Islam's final verdict on treaties and undertakings concerning all categories of non-Muslims; and it also reconfirms the appropriateness of various modes of Muslim treatment of nonbelievers in war and peace.

The Tabuk expedition undertaken by the Prophet under his direct leadership, was the first important raid against an entity beyond the Arabian peninsula: the Eastern Roman empire. Though for various internal reasons the Tabuk did not accomplish much, descriptions in Islamic sources about this expedition reinforce in the Muslim mind the necessity to engage in unprovoked perpetual wars until Islam dominates the whole world. It also reconfirms various modes of Muslim treatment of nonbelievers in war and peace. Ibn Ishaq, al-Waqidi, Ibn Sad and Tabari do not feel obliged to mention any defensive or preemptive reason for the Prophet's decision to attack the **RUM** i.e., the Byzantines. Al-Waqidi and Ibn Sad begin their discussions by mentioning some movements and mobilizations of Byzantine forces in their Syrian territories. These reports seem to be mere situation reports. They do not tell us that these movements had any connection to the Muslims or Muhammad, or that the Byzantines meant to clash with the Prophet's domain. Although it was the first time the Prophet declared openly what his target was when he ordered mobilization, he did not mention any aggressive intention or danger from the Byzantine side. Many

dissenters, the so-called hypocrites and some sincere Muslims were surprised that the Prophet decided to confront, for no reason, powerful Byzantium. Had there been any danger of Byzantine attack or of Byzantine interference in Muhammad's affairs the Prophet or the Quran would have mentioned it while condemning those who opposed the expedition or showed lack of enthusiasm for the Prophet's venture. Nor do our sources mention that, during the Prophet's ten-day stay at Tabuk, the main Byzantine forces took any notice of the Muslim presence in the region.

This impression is contradicted by some legendary Traditions in the context that, however, serve a different purpose. Believers are told that Heracleus sent a messenger to learn about Muhammad at Tabuk and that after being convinced that Muhammad was the true Messenger of God, he (Heracleus) invited in vain his people to recognize and follow Muhammad as a Prophet. Heracleus warned his people who had refused to believe in Muhammad the danger of the loss of their rule. Fearing the loss, Heracleus did not make any advance against Muhammad (W:1018-19). Along with reinforcing the Muslim belief in the authenticity of Muhammad's Prophethood on the basis that even his contemporary Roman Emperor was convinced of Muhammad's Messengership, this report tells believers that Heracleus was on the defensive and scared. This legend also erases from Muslim mind the unsuccessful aspect of the Tabuk expedition.

Readers of the Prophet's biography and the Quran know well that for the believers Tabuk does not need apology. It was a necessary extension of Islam's aggressive expansion as enjoined by the Almighty and prophesied by the Prophet. The Prophet had been promising and predicting Islam's domination over the Romans, Iranians and all known contemporary powers even during the difficult days of Mecca and the siege of Medina by the Confederates (e.g., 1.1:191, 452). During the Tabuk expedition the Prophet reminded the believers and the whole world of his and his followers' Divine right to expropriate Rome and Iran

along with their treasures as well as Yemen. He said:

God has indeed bestowed on me the treasures of Iran and Rome, and the kingdom of Himyarite Kings. (Muslims) fight for God and consume what God thus gives them [i.e., Muslims are justified to plunder non-Muslims they fight because the (Muslims) are fighting for God] -- **INN ALLAH ATANI AL-KANZAYN FARS WA'R-RUM WA AMADDANI BI'L-MULK, MULUK HIMYAR, YUJAHIDUN FI SABIL ALLAH WA YA'KULUN FI'LLAH (W:1011).**

A series of reports in descriptions about the Tabuk confirms in the Muslim mind the necessity of perpetual holy war against non-Muslims. For reasons mentioned elsewhere in this study, Tabuk was a failure. It was preceded and followed by growing dissent. Many apologetic stories of the Tabuk accounts indicate even some sincere Muslims' lukewarmness about the venture. Also, among expeditionists were many disgruntled hypocrites who further demoralized the Prophet's camp. It was also an extraordinarily hot season. The Prophet's army was exhausted, physically and psychologically, when it returned to Medina.

The Muslims began to sell their weapons and say 'there will be no more Jihad ' -- **JAALA'L-MUSLIMUN YABIUN ASLIHATAHUM WA YAQULUN: INQATAA'L-JIHAD (W:1057;IS-B,2:167).**

They were wrong; our sources tell believers of all time:

When this news reached the Messenger of God, he forbade them (from selling their weapons) and said: 'a group from my community will continue to fight for the Truth (Islam) until the appearance of ad-Dajjal' (ibid: parentheses added).

(According to Islamic eschatology, ad-Dajjal is the Islamic Antichrist. Just before the end of this world, non-Muslims of the world under the leadership of ad-Dajjal will be defeated by Muslims led by al-Mahdi, the Islamic Messiah, and/or Jesus Christ).

The Prophet's injunction was soon confirmed by the Almighty, who enjoined:

O believers, fight the unbelievers who are near you, and let them find in you a harshness: and know that God is with the God-fearing (9:123).

God told the believers and His Messenger to fight to the death the neighboring non-Muslims and continue fighting adjoining non-Muslims as they went ahead (T,11:71-2). The first neighbors against whom Muslims

were ordered to fight, according to Tabari, were the Byzantines (ibid). After their victory over the Byzantines, the Muslims had to fight the other neighboring non-Muslims and so on, Tabari maintains. "It is a duty of the (Muslim) people of every region to fight to the death their neighboring adversaries (i.e., non-Muslims)." According to this Divine verdict, Tabari asserts, the Muslims of one region have also to join when needed the Muslims of another region if they are at war (which they must be, according to 9:23 and Tabari's explanation) with their neighboring non-Muslims. This is incumbent because Muslims are in league against those who are not from them, (i.e. non-Muslims) (ibid). Tabari concludes, according to the first phrase of the verse, fighting by (the Muslims of) every region against adjoining adversaries (of Islam) is **AL-FARD**, an unavoidable Divine duty (T,11:71). Explaining further, one of Tabari's sources tells us that according to the verse the Prophet and the believers had to fight first the (remaining) adjoining Arabs. After they accomplished this, God ordered Muslims to wage Jihad against the People of the Book (the Christians and Jews), and fighting against them is the best kind of holy war (Jihad) in the eyes of God-- **FA-LAMMA FARAGH MIN QITAL MAN YALIH-I MIN AL-ARAB AMARAHU BI JIHAD AHL AL-KITAB, QAL: WA JAHADUHUM AFDAL AL-JIHAD IND ALLAH** (T,11:72).

Of the treatment of nonbelievers in the context of descriptions about Tabuk our sources record the following for the inspiration of Muslims. The Quran again bound Muslims in principle to "let (nonbelievers) find in them, i.e., Muslims) a harshness" (Q9:123). This "harshness" to non-Muslims was demonstrated in various ways.

It was not only the notorious new Muslim Uayyna b. Hisn who during the Hawazin-Taif expeditions thought participation in Muslim raids against non-Muslims gave the divine right to capture and use nonbelievers' women for sexual gratification. During preparations for the Tabuk, the Prophet himself awarded this 'divine right' to Muslims as an incentive in the holy struggle and war, Jihad and qital against

non-Muslims. It was on this occasion that the Prophet, trying to convince dissenters to accompany the expedition, told one of them, al-Jidd: "will not you join us this year? Maybe you will have the chance to sack and take some of the daughters of the Byzantines" -- **HAL LAK AL-AM? TAKHRUJ MAANA LAALLAK TAHTAQIB MIN BANAT AL-ASFAR** (W:992, 1063; also see TT,3:101). Al-Jadd bin Qays politely refused the offer. He was not a true believer, the sources tell us; he was a Munafiq, a "hypocrite." Had he accompanied the Prophet to sack and take -- **IHTIQAB** some of the Byzantine girls, he would have been remembered by Islamic sources as a true SAHABI, Companion, a model believer, to be loved, respected and followed by believers of all times. The Prophet had declared: "the best of my community are my (Muslim) contemporaries" -- **KHAYR UMMATI QARNI ()**. He also said: "How good are my Companions, O God. Never blame them (i.e., none should blame them) after my death," i.e., my Companions are above criticism -- **ALLAH ALLAH FI ASHABI! LA TAAKHIDHUHUM GHARAD-AN MIN BADI... ()**. Muslims know well that al-Jadd and his likes were not among these much praised Companions.

At Tabuk the Prophet found himself in an impossible situation. During consultations with his Companions, Umar told him the Romans consisted of a multitude and there were no Muslims among them [to collaborate with the Prophet's party as fifth columnists?]. Umar also said that the Prophet had reached close enough to the Byzantines to frighten them -- **WA QAD AFA'AHUM DUNUWWUK** (W:1018-9; brackets added). So, Umar said, it was better to return to Medina that year and plan for the next step later (ibid). The Prophet gave up the idea, temporarily, of attacking the Byzantine mainland.

Perhaps, however, to keep up the believers' morale and gain some material rewards for the exhausted and frustrated Companions, the Prophet sent Khalid with 420 horsemen on a side run against some frontier Christian Arab chiefs. Ukaydir b. Abd al-Malik of Dumat al-Jandal was one (W:1025; 1.1:607-8).

ENDNOTES

Part III : Belief in the Books and MessengersSection 9: THE ERA OF THE LAST BOOK, THE QURAN, AND OF
THE LAST MESSENGER OF GOD, MUHAMMADSegment 2: The Establishment of a Dar al-Islam and its
Policy about Coexistence and Treaty Relations

- a: A Study of Ideal Islam in Power
- b: Methods Used by the Ideal Islam in Relationship
With Non-Muslims

¹Muhammad Hamidullah, The First Written Constitution in the World, henceforth referred to as MH, Const., p. 16; brackets added. In this sub-segment of our study, especially in our analysis of the document we call the Ordinance of Medina, we refer to MH, Const. extensively. Hamidullah's above work is an edition and explanation of the same document generally known as the "Constitution of Medina." The selection here of Hamidullah and his above work has two bases. 1) Hamidullah, a contemporary believing Muslim scholar, has done extensive work on the Prophet's conduct of state, his wars and his treaty relations with non-Muslims and on the Muslim conduct of state. His works are translated in many Islamic and Western languages. 2) His scholarship reflects contemporary believers' modes of treatment of documents related to these subjects.

²Maududi, Movement:77. For the Islamic authenticity, importance, and necessity for true Muslims to gain a power-position in order to impose an Islamic regime see, e.g., Maududi, Movement..., especially chapter 2, pp. 77- 92 entitled "Power and Society."

³After reading the text of Clause 42 and relevant discussion here, we are reminded of Asadullah Ghalib, the greatest 19th Century Urdu poet and Hamidullah's countryman, grumbling, perhaps against such distortion,

PAKRE JATE HAIN FARISHTUN KE LIKHE PAR NAHAQ
ADAMI KOI HAMARA DAM-E-TAHRIR BHI THA?

"We are arrested unjustly, merely for what the
angels record
Who for us witnessed during the recording?"

⁴One may speculate to what extent contemporary "constitutions" of Muslim countries are inspired by this "authoritative" model, and why the believers have difficulty in digesting modern constitutionalism.

⁵If it can happen in the Iran of 1979-80, we cannot expect more from the Medina of 622. The similarities between Khomeini's strategies and those of the Prophet are interesting. The reception given Muhammad by the believers on his arrival at Medina was not different in quality than what Khomeini received at Tehran. The believers are reported to have anxiously waited for days for the arrival of the Prophet (IS-B,1:233). Similarly, non-Shiite communities and secular forces realized too late that Khomeini's definition of democracy, freedom, independence, prosperity, etc. were different from theirs. Also the rivalries of various secular groups (and super powers), and Khomeini's ability to play one against another, helped the Islamic regime to consolidate its power.

⁶Some contemporary Muslim activists, ignoring the very phrasing of the Quran 9:29, naively, if not disingenuously, argue that jizya charged to

the dhimmi, non-Muslim citizens of an Islamic country, is in lieu of their exemption from military service, and thus, in a favor. Now, this kind of forced and permanent exemption of a particular religious or racial groups is considered an insult and discrimination, rather than a favor. Perhaps about this kind of favor, an Urdu poet exclaimed: **MUJH PE IHSAN NA KARTE, TO YE IHSAN HOTA** "It would have been a favor, had you not done (any) favor to me."

⁷1.1:281, IH-Note 238; W:12; IS-B,2:8; ,2:403. For the non-aggression treaty with Juhaynah see 1.1:283 and with Banu Mudlij see Watt, Med.:3.

⁸See, e.g., W:9-13. The seven raids named by al-Waqidi are armed Expeditions (sing: **SARIYYAH or GHAZWAT**) of 1) Hamzah b. Abd al-Muttalib, 2) Ubaydah b. al-Harith, 3) Sad b. Abu Waqqas, 4) al-Abwa (Waddan), 5) Buwat, 6) al-Ushayrah, and 7) Nakhlah. Some of them take the names of the Prophet's hand-picked leaders of raiding parties; others are named after their destinations. Our sources differ slightly about their chronology. Three expeditions, al-Abwa/Waddan, Buwat and al-Ushayrah were led personally by the Prophet. According to al-Waqidi and Ibn Sad, the first expedition was led by Hamzah (dispatched by the Prophet) at the beginning of the seventh month after the hijrah. Tabari, drawing on Ibn Ishaq, maintains that all these raids took place during the second year after the hijrah, and that the first expedition was of al-Abwa (Waddan) led by the Prophet.

⁹For the full report see 1.1:286-9; W:13-9; IS-B,2:10-11; TT,2:410-15; Q2:217-8, 291; TS,4:299-320.

¹⁰Q2:217; I have replaced Guillaume's translation of the above verse in 1.1:288 with that of A.J. Arberry. For the occasion of revelation of Q2:217 and its relation to the Nakhlah expedition also see, along with 1.1:288, W:17-8; TT,2:412-3 passim; TS,4:304 passim).

¹¹For the full story see 1.1:289-360; W:19-172; IS-b,2:11-27; TT,2:420-79; and T commentaries on Badr-related Quranic verses, e.g., T,9:168-250; T,10:1-58 cf. Q8:1-75).

¹²An Urdu Poet has remarked, perhaps on a similar occasion:

**KHIRAD KA NAM JUNUN RAKH DIA JUNUN KA KHIRAD
JO CHAHE AP KA HUSN-E KARISHMA-SAZ KAREY**

"Wisdom you have named insanity and insanity wisdom. Your wonder-making charm does what it wants!"

¹³Q13:12-4 passim cf. TS,6:226-58; Q6:51-59 cf. TS,10:395-434; 1.1:363-4; W:176-81; TT.

¹⁴Q59:passim cf. T,28:27-56; 1.1:437-45; W:363-83; TT.

¹⁵For the full account see Q33 passim along with T; 1.1:461-81; W:496-530; IS-B,2:74-8; IS-MH,II/1:91-6; TT.

¹⁶1.1:458. For the full story of Nuaym, see W:480-93; 1.1:458-60.

^{16a}These rivalries among Medinans are discussed in some detail by W.M. Watt in Muhammad at Medina (1956):151-220.

¹⁷W:624-9; 1.1:507-8.

¹⁸W:626; 1.1:507. I have adopted in part Guillaume's alternative translation suggested in his footnote, which conveys the real sense of what the Prophet said.

¹⁹For the following see Q9:1-40 (quoted below in the footnote 20) passim; T,10:58-97 passim or TS,14:95-262 passim; 1.1:617-23; W:1076-9; IS-B,2:168-9.

²⁰A.J. Arberry's translation of the first 40 verses of the sura at-Tauba/Baraah is as follows. Abudllah Yusuf Ali's translation of the word BARAAH as "disavowal" is more appropriate than Arberry's "acquittal".

REPENTANCE OR DISAVOWAL

An acquittal, from God and his Messenger
unto the idolaters with whom you made covenant:
'Journey freely in the land for four months;
and know that you cannot frustrate the will of God, and
that God degrades the unbelievers.'

A proclamation, from God and His Messenger,
unto mankind on the day of the Greater Pilgrimage:
'God is quit, and His Messenger, of the idolaters.
So if you repent, that will be better for you; but if you turn
your backs, know that you cannot
frustrate the will of God.

And give thou good tidings to the unbelievers of a
painful chastisement;
excepting those of the idolaters with whom you made
covenant, then they failed you naught neither lent support to any
man against you.

With them fulfil your covenant till their term;
surely god loves the godfearing.

Then, when the sacred months are drawn away,
slay the idolaters wherever you find them,
and take them, and confine them, and lie in wait
for them at every place of ambush. But if they
repent, and perform the prayer, and pay the alms,
then let them go their way'

God is all-forgiving, all-compassionate.

And if any of the idolaters seeks of thee
protection, grant him protection till he hears
the words of God; then do thou convey him to his
place of security - , because they are a people
who do not know.

How should the idolaters have a covenant with god
and His Messenger? -

excepting those with whom you made covenant
at the Holy Mosque; so long as they go straight
with you, do you go straight with them; surely
God loves the godfearing.

How? If they get the better of you, they will not
observe towards you any bond or treaty,
giving you satisfaction with their mouths
but in their hearts refusing; and the most
of them are ungodly.

They have sold the signs of God for a small price,
and have barred from His way; truly evil is that
they have been doing,
observing neither bond nor treaty towards a believer;
they are the transgressors.

Yet if they repent, and perform the prayer,
and pay the alms, then they are your brothers
in religion; and We distinguish the signs for
a people who know.

But if they break their oaths after their covenant and thrust at

your religion, then fight the leaders
 of unbeliever; they have no sacred oaths; haply
 they will give over.
 Will you not fight a people who broke their oaths
 and purposed to expel the Messenger, beginning
 the first time against you? Are you afraid of them?
 You would do better to be afraid of God,
 if you are believers.
 Fight them, and God will chastise them at your hands and degrade
 them, and He will help you
 against them, and bring healing to the breast of
 a people who believe,
 and He will remove the rage within their hearts;
 and God turns towards whomsoever He will; God is
 All-knowing, All-wise
 Or did you suppose you would be left in peace,
 and God knows to as yet those of you who have struggled, and taken
 not -a part from god and His
 Messenger and the believers - and intimate? God is
 aware of what you do.
 It is not for the idolaters to inhabit God's place of
 worship, witnessing against themselves unbelief;
 those - their works have failed them, and in the Fire they shall
 dwell forever.
 Only he shall inhabit God's places of worship
 who believes in God and the Last Day, and
 performs the prayer, and pays the alms, and fears
 none but God alone; it may be that those will
 be among the guided.
 Do you reckon the giving of water to pilgrims
 and the inhabiting of the Holy Mosque as the same
 as one who believes in God and the Last Day
 and struggles in the way of God? Not equal are they
 in God's sight; and God guides not the people
 of the evildoers.
 Those who believe, and have emigrated, and have
 struggled
 in the way of God with their possessions and their
 selves
 are mightier in rank with god; and those -
 they are the triumphant;
 their Lord gives them good tidings of mercy from Him
 and good pleasure; for them awaits gardens wherein
 is lasting bliss,
 therein to dwell forever and ever; surely with God
 is a mighty wage.

O believes, take not your fathers and brothers
 to be your friends, if they prefer unbelief to
 belief;
 whosoever of you takes them for friends, those -
 they are the evildoers.
 Say: 'If your fathers, your sons, your brothers,
 your wives,
 your clan, your possessions that you have gained,
 commerce you fear may slacken, dwellings you love -
 if these are dearer to you than God and His
 Messenger,
 and to struggle in His way, then wait till God
 brings His command; God guides not the people
 of the ungodly.'

God has already helped you on many fields, and on
 the day of Hunain, when your multitude was pleasing

to you, but it availed you naught, and the land
 for all its breadth was straight for you, and you
 turned about, retreating.
 Then God sent down upon His Messenger His Schichina,
 and upon the believers, and He sent down
 legions you did not see, and He chastised
 the unbelievers; and that is the recompense
 of the unbelievers;
 than God thereafter turns towards whom He will;
 God is All-forgiving, All-compassionate.
 O believers, the idolaters are indeed unclean; so
 let them not come near the Holy Mosque after this
 year of theirs. If you fear poverty, God shall
 surely enrich you of His bounty, if He will; God is
 All-knowing, All-wise.
 Fight those who believe not in God and the Last Day
 and do not forbid what God and His Messenger
 have forbidden - such men as practice not the
 religion of truth, being of those who have been given
 the Book - until they pay the tribute out of hand
 and have been humbled.

The Jews say, "Ezra is the Son of God";
 the Christians say, 'The Messiah is the Son of God.'
 That is the utterance of their mouths, conforming
 with the unbelievers before them. God assail them!
 How they are perverted!
 They have taken their rabbis and their monks as lords
 apart from God, and the Messiah, Mary's son -
 and they were commanded to serve but One God;
 there is no god but He; glory be to Him, above
 that they associate -
 desiring to extinguish with their mouths God's light;
 and God refused but to perfect His light, though
 the unbelievers be averse.
 It is He who has sent His Messenger with
 the guidance and the religion of truth, that
 He may uplift it above every religion, though
 the unbelievers be averse.
 O believers, many of the rabbis and monks indeed
 consume the goods of the people in vanity
 and bar from God's way. Those who treasure up
 gold and silver, and do not expend them in
 the way of God - give them the good tidings of
 a painful chastisement.
 the day they shall be heated in the fire of Gehenna
 and therewith their foreheads and their sides and
 their backs shall be branded: 'This is the thing you
 have treasured up for yourselves; therefore taste you
 know what you were treasuring!'

The number of the months, with God, is twelve
 in the Book of God, the day that He created
 the heavens and the earth; four of them are scared.
 That is the right religion. So wrong not each other
 during them. And fight the unbelievers totally
 even as they fight you totally; and know that God
 is with the godfearing.
 The month postponed is an increase of unbelief
 whereby the unbelievers go astray; one year they make
 it profane, and hallow it another, to agree with
 the number that God has hallowed, and so profane
 what God has hallowed. Decked out fair to them
 are their evil deeds; and God guides not the people

of the unbelievers.

O believers, what is amiss with you, and when it is said to you, 'Go forth in the way of God,' you sink down heavily to the ground? Are you so content with this present life, rather than the world to come? Yet the enjoyment of this present life, compared with the world to come is a little thing.

If you go not forth, He will chastise you with a painful chastisement, and instead of you He will substitute another people; and you will not hurt Him anything, for God is powerful over everything.

If you do not help him, yet God has helped him already, when the unbelievers drove him forth the second of two, when the two were in the Cave, when he said to his companion, 'Sorrow not; surely God is with us.' Then God sent down on him His Shechina,

and confirmed him with the legions you did not see; and he made the word of the unbelievers the lowest; and God's word is the uppermost; God is All-mighty, All-wise (Q9:1-40).

²¹For introductory notes and relevant literature see "Ali b. Abi Talib," "Ibn Muljim" and "the Kharijites" in El.

²²Ibn al-Qutiyya (d. 977 CE) Tarikh Iftitah al-Andalus (History of the conquest of Spain), ed. Abd Allah Anis at-Tabba', Dar an-Nashr li'l-Jamiyyin, Beirut, 1957, p. 34, Ibn Abd al-Hakam (803-871 C) Futuh Misr wa'l-Maghrib (Conquest of Egypt and the West), ed. Ad al-Munim Amir, Lajna al-Bayan al-Arab; Cairo, 1961, p. 278.

²³For the full story see 1.1:665-6; :566-8; IS-B, 2:92-3; also see Watt, Med.:213. In al-Waqidi and Ibn Sad, Yusayr's father's name is mentioned as Zarim. Watt calls him Razim. I have adopted Ibn Ishaq's version as in Guillaume's translation, i.e. Rizam.

²⁴During the Indo-Pakistan war (1971), Radio Pakistan's popular war-song (in Punjabi language), **JANG KHED NAIN HONDI JANANIAN DI**, "War is not women's sport," was a male chauvinistic sexist slur addressed to Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India. We do not know to what extent the composers of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan were inspired by the Sunnah of the Prophet and His Companions in this regard. (All India Radio responded by broadcasting a rebuttal: **JANG KHED NAIN HONDI SHARABIAN DI**, "War is not alcoholics' sport." This was a reference to General Yahya Khan, then President of the Islamic Republic, who was thought to be a dipsomaniac.

²⁵This kind of confessions and repentance under duress continues to be common in Islamic (and other totalitarian) states. Among the most recent examples is that of Ihsan Tabari, a life-long ideologue and high ranking leader of the Tudeh (Communist) party of Iran. After Khomeyni put Tabari along with his comrades in the dungeons of the Islami Republic of Iran - and after most of these were tortured and many executed - Ihsan Tabari's confessions in favor of Islam and against the 'evils' of Marxism-Leninism appeared in Iranian media.

²⁶How the Prophet's and his Companions' exemplary treatment of non-Muslims during their jihad expeditions may become relevant to Muslim thoughts and actions in our time can be explained by reported actions and thoughts of some Muslim Mujhadin, "holy warriors," involved in the ongoing Afghanistan crisis. As documented by Islamic and world media,

many pious, i.e., fundamentalist, Muslims from various Arab-Muslim countries have joined, physically, the fight against the pro-Soviet Afghan government as a sacred Islamic duty. [For example, see various issues of the Islamic monthly, Al-Jihad: Saut Afghanistan al-Muslimah, ("The Holy War: Voice of Muslim Afghanistan"), published in Arabic language by Dar al-Jihad ("Jihad House/Center"), Peshawar, Pakistan. The following references to Al-Jihad are based on its Volume 57, June 1989 issues. Also see Anthony Hyman "Afghanistan: The Arabs at the War Front," The Middle East, London, July 1989, p. 19. I am indebted to Professor Alan Fisher at Michigan State University who loaned me some issues of the above-mentioned Al-Jihad.] Hyman, op. cit., reports that these Muslim volunteers consider "the Afghanistan struggle a successful example of a worthy Islamic cause." Hyman also reports that these "Arab volunteers have earned a reputation for bravery, and willingness to risk death ... but these Arabs have also acquired a name for brutality, for needless cruelty and ritual beheadings of captured prisoners. It is the treatment of captured Afghan women in Kunar and Nangrahar provinces since last winter which has provoked great resentment among Afghans. Detailed accusations of forced marriages, rapes and casual killings have been made" (op. cit.). These "accusations" and the Afghan Mujahidin's alleged involvement in drug related activities were already known.

The biographical sketches of these young Arab holy warriors and "martyrs" published with great admiration in Al-Jihad (op. cit.) indicate that before joining the "holy war" in Afghanistan they had received strong Islamic fundamentalist education and training. They went to Afghanistan to participate in what they thought was a "global Islamic holy war -- JIHAD-AN ALAMIY-AN ISLAMIY-AN (Al-Jihad, June 1989, p. 9). These warriors and their biographers repeatedly quote Traditions and Quranic passages related to the Prophet's jihad expeditions to say that the Arab volunteers are re-creating them in Afghanistan. What is questionable to Hyman and others is appreciated by Al-Jihad. Al-Jihad used almost all of its June 1989 edition to respond to "the accusations." As usual, the editor calls the "issue" about the "Wahhabis," i.e. Arab-Muslim fundamentalists, "a creation of the Western enemies of Islam and of their supporters in Afghanistan" (p. 3). Another essay (pp. 4-9) tells the readers that the British and their local supporters carried out similar propaganda against the 19th century jihad movement of Sayyid Ahmad "the Martyr" (of India). The section on current news from the "holy war front" indirectly responds to the charges of cruel treatment of prisoners of war. No regret is expressed. Instead, Al-Jihad has published a picture of a captured Afghan, Maulana Muhamamd Yaqub, with a sign of **AL-JASUS** "the spy" put before him and being humiliated by a group of Mujahidin around him, "just before his execution -- **QABL IDAMIHI**" (p. 154). Contrary to Hyman's calling such action "ritual beheadings of captured prisoners," Al-Jihad is proud to tell the readers about the summary execution of "the Spy" Muhammad Yaqub: **AQAM AL-MUJAHIDUN HUKM ALLAH FIH-I** "the holy warriors carried out God's verdict about him" (ibid).

The biographical sketches of the Arab-Muslim volunteers killed in Afghanistan are entitled **THULLAT-UN MIN AL AKHIRIN** "A throng of the Later Folk" (pp. 22-37). The phrase is taken from a Quranic passage (56:27-40). This passage mentions "the People of Right," those who will definitely be in Paradise. They will include, the Quran says, "a throng of the ancients" and "a throng of the later folk," i.e. some of them will be from the earlier Muslims, such as the Companions of the Prophet and some of them from the later. Al-Jihad means to say that these Arab volunteers are the kind of believers the Quran (56:39) mentions appreciatively and guarantees Paradise for them.

Of these Muslims Al-Jihad tells us unapologetically that during their expeditions in Afghanistan "they captured great amount of booty -- **GHANIMU GHANAIM KATHIRAH** (p. 24), exactly in words the Prophet's biographers use about his expeditions. Al-Jihad does not respond directly to the "accusations of rape and forced marriages." Had such things not occurred - knowing modern sensitivities - Al-Jihad would have

openly denied the charges. Had it been forced to say something, Al-Jihad would most probably have repeated what it said about the summary execution of "the Spy" Muhammad Yaqub: **WA QAD AQAM AL-MUJAHIDUN HUKM ALLAH FIHINNA**, "the holy warriors did with these (women) what the Divine law sanctions". Al-Jihad repeatedly mentions that the Afghans the Mujahidin are fighting are definitely **KUFFAR**, heathen non-Muslims. So, their women are to be treated accordingly. Al-Jihad's dangling of "beautiful women" before their eyes as definite reward for participation in the Afghan jihad does not encourage these young holy warriors to keep thoughts of fair sex off their minds. Eulogizing a certain Abu Tariq who was killed during expeditions against Afghanistan, Al-Jihad quotes a dream Abu Ahmad as-Sanani (another young Arab holy warrior) had about Abu Tariq:

I saw twenty-one beautiful women in a palace. An announcer announced: **'These women are for the Mujahidin.'** I said to myself: **'I choose the most beautiful of them,'** but they looked all similar so that it was not possible to differentiate one from others. Meanwhile the women (themselves) began to choose their partners. One (of the women) advanced and picked Abu Tariq (p. 25).

Another Arab holy warrior also had a dream about Abu Tariq:

And Abu Abd ar-Rahman al-Maaribi saw him (Abu Tariq) in a great palace. Abu Abd ar-Rahman and a group entered (the palace) Abu Tariq received them in his palace and entertained them with a variety of fruit and food. **Suddenly, a beautiful woman entered his palace.** Abu Tariq started behaving in such a way as if he wanted the guests to hurry up and leave so that he could sit with his partner (the woman) (ibid).

**FOUNDATIONS OF MUSLIM IMAGES AND TREATMENT
OF THE WORLD BEYOND ISLAM**

Volume IV

By

Malek Muhammad Towghi

A DISSERTATION

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History

1991

PART III: Belief in the Books and Messengers

**Section 9: THE ERA OF THE LAST BOOK, THE QURAN, AND OF
THE LAST MESSENGER OF GOD, MUHAMMAD**

**Segment 3: Foundations of Muslim Images and Treatment of
Modern Tendencies and Values**

Our discussion in this segment is based on the following assumptions (explained briefly in the introduction to this study). 1) Belief in the necessity to follow the Quran and the Sunnah of the Prophet in all times, places and circumstances obliges Muslims to compare contemporary phenomena to what the Quran and Muhammad confronted in his lifetime. After such a comparison, the believers are bound to follow the Prophet's and the Quran's pattern of response. Patterns of thought and behavior, if approximated in the Muslim minds with those attributed to the prophet's contemporary adversaries, lose their credibility and may even become loathsome. 2) Some contemporary phenomena (which we have called, broadly, modern-liberal-humanistic-rationalistic -pluralistic tendencies and values) have parallels in the pattern of thought and behavior of what we call the People of **JAHILIYYAH** perceived and confronted by the Quran and the Prophet during his lifetime. 3) Many aspects of modern thought and behavior recall to Muslim minds the **JAHILIYYAH** models of thought and action which were confronted,unappreciated and rejected by the Quran and Muhammad. Thus, modern tendencies emerge in Muslim minds as Neo-**JAHILIYYAH**, to be unappreciated, to say the least. (See the introduction and elsewhere in this study for some documentation in this regard.) We conclude that Muslim unenthusiasm towards the Renaissance-Enlightenment -based modern civilization - the Neo-**JAHILIYYAH** - is also the result of Muslim awareness through the Quran and Tradition that in many ways it resembles the **JAHILIYYAH** ridiculed and rejected by the Prophet. We also imply that those among Muslims and non-Muslims who cherish modern values and tendencies are likely to be treated by the believers the way Muhammad and the Quran treated the People of **JAHILIYYAH**.

In order to understand how modern tendencies recall to the Muslim mind the Jahiliyyah modes of thought and action, we need to know some basic characteristics of the People of Jahiliyyah as described, directly or indirectly, by Islam. Our sources tell Muslims that during his

Prophetic career Muhammad confronted or perceived two categories of nonbelievers: 1) **AHL AL-KITAB**, "the People of the Book," i.e., Jews and Christians, and 2) the rest we call **AHL AL-JAHILIYYAH**, "the People in a state of Ignorance," i.e., those neither Jews nor Christians. The nonbelievers not the People of the Book are lumped together in one category, usually, called **AL-MUSHRIK**, pagan, polytheist etc. Islamic sources, however, do not use the prefix **AHL**, "the people of", with **JAHILIYYAH** the way it is used in the term **AHL AL-KITAB**. While the Quran and Tradition directly ascribe jahiliyyah to the Arab pagans and to "the Hypocrites," the Islamic concept of jahiliyyah is much more generalized.

The term **JAHILIYYAH**, "a state of ignorance," occurs four times in the Quran. Its related forms such as the noun **JAHALAH** (ignorance), the verb **JAHILA/YAJHALU** (to be ignorant) also occur several times.¹ These "at testations" of the words **JAHILIYYAH** "in the Quran scarcely permit of their sense precisely determined." "They are applied to all which is anterior to Islam" (Ed. (sic), "Djahiliyya", El²,2:383). Though in all cases the sense of "ignorance," "unawareness," and "disregard" of what is correct from Islam's point of view is involved, we are primarily concerned with the term Jahiliyyah which is directly opposed by the Quran and Tradition to Islam. Though, usually, the term Jahiliyyah in medieval Muslim literature refers to the pagan Arabs, it connotes more than mere pagandom or idolatry. "The Hypocrites" charged with Jahiliyyah were definitely not pagans, meaning idol, worshippers or polytheists. Nor are they so charged by Islamic sources. Although certain features of Jahiliyyah are projected more than others, the Quran uses the term as a general concept, and as an indicator of certain condemnable modes of thought and action. The concept of Jahiliyya, among other things, "refers to the state of affairs in Arabia before the mission of the Prophet, to paganism (sometimes even that of non-Arab lands), the pre-Islamic period and the men of that time" (El²,2:383). It also means "not knowing God, the Prophet and the (Islamic) Law" (ibid,

parentheses added). It is "applicable to the period during which the Arabs did not know Islam and the Divine Law, as well as to the beliefs current at that time" (ibid). It is particularly applied to the periods when no Islamic Prophet guided and dominated society, such as the period between Adam and Noah - which, according to the Quran, was "the first jahiliyyah", or the [Prophetless] period between Jesus and Muhammad (ibid; Q33:33 cf. T,22:2-8). In brief, jahiliyyah refers to a time and state when people live and act without divine guidance. While Islam condemns Jews and Christians, the People of the Book, for their distortion and corruption of Revelations they received, the People of Jahiliyya are condemned for not receiving Divine Revelations at all. According to Islam, only the Jews and Christians are historically linked, though tenuously, to the true (Islamic) Messengers of God and to Divine revelation. Other creeds and world views are man-made, humanistic. As Maududi explains, it is the basic secular, non-Divine aspect of the People of Jahiliyyah that is central in the Muslim mind, contrasting them with the People of the Book who, at least, claim and once really had Divine connections. The People of Jahiliyyah "invented their own way of life" without ever receiving Divine guidance. Their "systems," like those of modern humanists, were "based on fancies and conjectures," not on the "Divine knowledge."

For these reasons, four groups mentioned and perceived by the Quran and Muhammad may be included in the general category of the people of Jahiliyyah: 1) the Sabeans, **AS-SABIUN**; 2) the Magians or Zoroastrians, **AL-MAJUS**; 3) the Pagan Arabs and 4) "the Hypocrites," **AL-MUNAFIQUN**. All these in Islam's eyes have an important feature in common: they are all secular, **AHL AL-JAHILIYYAH**, uninspired by revelation, ignorant, unmindful and deprived of, Divine guidance to be received only through the Messengers linked to the Islamic concept of Prophethood. The belief systems, world views and practices of these four groups, our sources tell us, are the creation of human minds, unverified by Divine Revelation.

The Sabeans.

Although some reports award the Sabeans and Zoroastrians, partially, the kind of treatment allowed to the People of the Book, their general images projected by Islamic sources put them on a par with the Arab pagans and apostates like "the Hypocrites." The Quran mentions the Sabeans twice, in Q2:62 and Q5:69. Tradition reports indicate the Prophet knew of the al-Majus, Magians or Zoroastrians (e.g., IS-B,1:263). After the Prophet's death, some Islamic jurists extended the term "the People of the Book" to Sabeans and Zoroastrians (G. Vajda, "Ahl al-kitab," EI²,1:264-6). However, this extension, never popular, remains controversial. Explaining Q2:62, Tabari defines the Sabeans literally as generic apostates: "anyone who quits his religion for another religion" -- **KULL KHARIJ MIN DIN-IN KAN ALAYH ILA AKHAR-IN GHAYRIHI** (TS,2:145 cf ibid:145-7). About the Sabeans, Tabari mentions various Traditions without preferring any. The Sabeans are "a people who do not have a (particular) religion -- **QAWM-UN LA DIN LAHUM**. "The Sabeans are neither Jews nor Christians; they do not have any religion" **AS-SABIUN LAYSU BI YAHUD WA LA NASARA, WA LADIN LAHUM**, asserts Tabari (ibid:146). They "are between the Zoroastrians and Jews; their butchered meat is not eaten by Muslims, nor are their women married (by Muslims)" (ibid). Note that, theoretically, Muslims are allowed to eat what meat the People of the Book slaughter, and marry their women. "The Sabeans... are neither Zoroastrians nor Christians" (ibid). According to another Tradition, the Sabeans "do say (or believe) that 'there is no god but God, but do not perform any (religious rituals) nor have any (divinely revealed) Book nor any Prophet (to follow) -- **YAQULUN LA ILAH ILL'ALLAH, WA LAYS LAHUM AMALWA LA KITAB WA LA NABIYY** (ibid:147; parentheses added). Are port defines the Sabeans as a sect of the People of the Book -- **TAIFAT MIN AHL AL-KITAB** -- who worship the angels, recite **AZ-ZABUR**, the Psalms) and perform the five daily prayers facing the qibla (Mecca? Jerusalem?) (ibid). This report projects, unapprovingly, the syncretic-heretic nature of Sabeanism. An Islam that

demands **UDKHULU FI'S-SILM KAFFAT-AN**, total adoption of pure Islam, obviously does not appreciate such eclecticism.

Ziyad b. Abih of Iraq, an Umayyad administrator wanted to charge them jizyah, i.e., treat them as the People of the Book, but was told that they worshiped the angels (ibid). Tabari does not tell us clearly what Ziyad eventually did. Apparently, after he was told of their angel-worship, Ziyad no longer considered the Sabeans the People of the Book. These reports taken together lead Muslims to believe that Sabeans were Deists, humanists or Unitarians of their times, closer to the People of Jahiliyyah than to the People of the Book. When Tabari tells Muslims that Sabeans "do not have a (particular)religion" and that they do not perform religious rituals, though they believe in a Supreme Being, they are, to a Muslim believer, like those modern persons who have an inactive and indifferent attitude toward organized religion and its rituals. The Sabeans are among the People of Jahiliyyah in the sense that they never received revelation from God considered authentic by Muslims.

The Zoroastrians/Magians

Muhammad is reported to have instructed his Muslim agents to give the Majus, Zoroastrians, of eastern Arabia the option of paying jizyah. Partially, it was a kind of treatment the People of the Book were awarded. However, it was, perhaps, a pragmatic exception; a jizya-paying Majus was obviously better than a dead or exiled one. The Prophet did not allow the Muslims to marry Zoroastrian women or eat what meat they slaughtered -- **LA TUNKAH NISAUHUM WA LA TUKAL DHABAIHUHUM** (IS-B,1:263). Thus, the Zoroastrians were not treated as full-fledged People of the Book. We also know that Tabari treats Zoroaster, the perceived founder of the Majusi religion, harshly. No Islamic sources award Zoroaster (or any other Zoroastrian figure) the kind of recognition and respect reserved for the founders of Judaism and Christianity, Moses, Jesus and other Biblical personalities. In popular Muslim thought, as well as by the orthodox Muslim clergy, the Zoroastrians are seen more as "fire

worshippers," i.e., polytheists than as monotheists. For Muslims, Zoroastrianism is a creed invented by human beings, not Divinely revealed and sanctified. It is a form of jahiliyyah.

The Pagans and "the Hypocrites".

The four Quranic references to Jahiliyyah directly relate to the pagan Arabs and "the Hypocrites." Compared to the descriptions about the Sabeans and Zoroastrians, our sources' portrayal of pagan Arabs and "the Hypocrites" is more factual, historical, and thus, for a Muslim, more palpable. Muslims are told extensively of their world view and patterns of thought and action. Obviously these portrayals of the two tangible groups of Jahiliyyah aim at condemnation of their world view and behavior. We shall study particularly those features and characteristics of the pagan Arabs and "the Hypocrites" (as described in Islamic sources) that generally approximate some modern phenomena Muslims confront.

ARAB PAGANDOM

As articulated by contemporary Muslim fundamentalist revivalists, Islamic images of Arab Jahiliyyah tell Muslims that Muhammad and the Quran confronted and rejected the total Arab world view and approaches to life and society. Islamic sources ascribe a whole range of religious, social, economic, political, intellectual and philosophical tendencies to pagan Arabs that in many cases approximate modern values. In most cases these pagan tendencies are directly or indirectly contrasted with the Islamic alternatives introduced by the Quran and Muhammad- thus rejected in the Muslim mind. Some polemical aspects aside, what Islamic sources project to believers about the pagan Arabs is not radically different, on some issues, from what several renowned modern Islamists and historians hold. In identifying how sixth and seventh-century Arabs confronted by Muhammad thought and acted, we consider the findings of Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918), Theodor Noldeke, Igaz Goldziher, W. Montgomery Watt and Maxime Rodinson, though their observations do not necessarily aim at conclusions derived here.² Before

we study general Islamic images of the pagan Arabs, let us comprehend the full sense of the two direct Quranic references to Jahiliyyah as they relate to this group.

In Q33:33 the Prophet's wives were told to stay in their houses and not display their finery. Such an open display of finery by women, seen by other men, -- **IZHAR AZ-ZINAT WA IBRAZ AL-MARAT MAHASINAH LI'R-RIJAL** -- is a norm of the Time of Ignorance -- **TABARRUJ AL-JAHILIYYAT**. It refers particularly, Tabari tells us, to the nonbelieving Qabilian women of the Prophetless age of intercession, **FATRAH**, between Adam and Noah, who had such an abominable style of life (T,22:2-8). So, what we call a liberated style of life is an act of jahiliyya committed by past nonbelievers in Divine revelations. The Prophet's wives (and Muslim women) are exhorted not to follow this jahiliyyah mode of behavior. Though the passage was revealed during the Medinan period, obviously, this liberal life-style the Prophet's wives and, implicitly, other Muslim women were asked to shun was a normal feature of Arab pagan society. It refers in general to the status and treatment of women in pre-Islamic Arabia. A study of Arab pagandom tells a believer that

The position of women among the pagan Arabs was in some respects freer than under Islam... The institution of veil was unknown... Divorce was not more easy than it is under the Muslim code and women had the right to it as well as men. Instead, the relations of the sexes before the time of Muhammad were in some respects quite good. In any case they were capable of being improved, whereas after the law of Islam had once come into force, alteration was not to be thought. The worst feature of the Islamic marriage code - that of the muhallil - was unknown (T.H. Weir, "Jahiliyyah," El,1:999). [According to the institution of **MUHALLIL**, a divorced woman, to be able to remarry her ex-husband, must first marry another man, have intercourse with him and then be divorced by this second husband.]

As modern values about the status and rights of women resemble those of the Jahiliyyah, they must look correspondingly undesirable to a Muslim believer. For a believer, subscribing to the modern ??? position about women would be tantamount to a ratification of a pagan Arab norm against the Quran and Muhammad.

During the parleys for the Truce of Hudaib, the Meccans refused to replace (in the truce document) "(We begin) with your name, O God" -- **BI'SMIK ALLAHUMM** with the new Islamic way introduced by Muhammad: "In the name of God, the Merciful, Compassionate." They also refused to accord the title of "Messenger of God" to Muhammad in the common document and insisted that only "Muhammad son of Abd Allah" as in the name of their signatory, Suhayl son of Amr, should be entered. The Meccans thus said that they believed in God but not in Muhammad's claim that he was His Messenger. Now, Muslims find this attitude, to express belief in the Supreme Being in one's own way or in a general way rather than following Islamic precepts strictly, and the desire to adopt a neutral lexicon in a document that concerns both believers and nonbelievers, rather than surrender to a strict Muslim formula is called by the Quran an indignation or bias of Jahiliyyah -- **HAMIYYAT AL-JAHILIYYAT** (Q48:25-6 cf. T,26:95-106). Keeping this in mind, our modern tendency to use neutral language in international documents, and neutral symbols for international and public institution - neither condemning nor condoning a particular dogma - would be an act of Jahiliyya. The ideal Quranic way, for example, would be to inscribe on coins: "In Allah, whose favorite religion is Islam, we trust" instead of "In God we trust." Our moderns who prefer to use value-free, neutral and objective symbols and language in all social transactions and institutions look like the People of Jahiliyyah condemned by the Quran 48:25-6.

The pagan Arabs, though practicing what Noldeke (p.659) calls a "low type" of polytheistic religion, believed in the existence of a Supreme Being and creator of the universe, whom they called Allah. Referring to Q6:109;10:22; 16:38, 29:65; 31:32; 35:42, for Noldeke

of special importance is the testimony of the Quran, which proves, beyond all doubt, that the heathen themselves regarded Allah as the Supreme Being. Thus men (turned) to Allah when (they) were in distress... solemn oaths (were) sworn in his (sic) name... and, He was recognized as the creator and the Giver of rain... Muhammad did not find it necessary to introduce an altogether novel deity... (664; also see Watt:25-8).

We also know of the presence of a few so-called **HUNAFAs** (sing: **HANIF**) among the Arabs who had completely abandoned pagan practices and believed in monotheism without converting to Judaism or Christianity (see 1.1:98-103; Watt, Mec.:28, 162-4; "HANIF", El², 3:164-66). Similarly, as Noldeke, Watt and Rodinson document, Judeo-Christian monotheistic beliefs increasingly penetrated the Arabian peninsula.

The Arabs Muhammad knew "did not see that their old polytheistic beliefs were incompatible with belief in God" (Watt, Mec.:27). Allah, the God, the Divinity for the Arabs was "the personification of the divine world in its highest form, creator of the universe and keeper of sworn oaths" (Rodinson:16). The smaller divinities and spirits they believed in, and to some extent revered and worshipped, "were thought of as having some connection with heavenly bodies" (Watt:23). So, the pagans, like most people today, believed in a Supreme Being. Like most of us, however, they doubted and challenged the concept of an exclusive personal relationship between the Almighty and a specific person such as Muhammad. The modern respect for others' rights to determine their own forms of belief in a Supreme Being is as unacceptable to a Muslim as the Jahiliyyah belief in Allah without belief in His special connection to Muhammad.

Besides, like moderns, these Arabs did not allow their beliefs in a Supreme Being or in other lesser deities to affect their social behavior. They separated religion from politics and social affairs. Like moderns, they believed in - and - practiced religious pluralism and toleration. Normally, they did not mind if some of them were converted to Hanifism, Judaism or Christianity - as long as such conversion did not frustrate and challenge the existing humanistic- pluralistic socio-political system. Nor did conversion of others to their "religious concepts" interest them. They were "lukewarm about religion" (Noldeke:659). Like our modernists, religion did not program their socio-political actions.

Muhammad's contemporaries and the generation immediately preceding them were, as a rule, little influenced by their religion. They followed the religious customs of their ancestors out of mere respect for tradition, the genuine Arab being essentially conservative; but no great significance was attached to such things. Nowhere do we find an instance of real devotion to a heathen deity (Noldeke, p. 659).

The Arabs Muhammad confronted "were not a religious group." Goldziher tells us "such central places of worship as existed merely assured a loose linking of the local cults, each cult going its own way" (Goldziher:12). There was no organized monolithic religion. "The archaic pagan religion was comparatively unimportant," and "the nomads appear to have (had) little serious belief in their objects of worship" (Watt:23). Though "the Bedouin...believed the land was peopled by spirits, the jinns, who were often invisible but appeared also in animal form," they "do not seem to have had much time for religion. They were realists, without a great deal of imagination" (Rodinson:10). One may or may not agree with Noldeke's judgments (p. 660), but at heart he supports the contention that the Arabs were not serious in the irreligious mythology when he says:

The luxuriant imagination which gave birth to the mythologies of (the) Indo-European race was denied to the Arabs, nor had they anything at all resembling the highly artificial and somewhat prosaic theology and cosmology of ancient Babylonia.

The Arabs did not have any organized religion. Instead, they had a combination of superstitions which did not influence their social behavior or how they thought and acted toward disbelievers in those superstitions. "(To) suppose that the Arabs fought against the Prophet on behalf of their religion would be a mistake. Among his opponents no trace of heathen fanaticism appears" (Noldeke:659). "None of (their) ideals, none of the forces which ordered the life of society or the individual had any supernatural basis" (Rodinson:17). Their superstitions were dominated by their realism (ibid:18).

Perspectives on the afterlife were another bone of contention

between Islam and the people of but but jahiliyyah. Noldeke and others may be right that the Quran might have exaggerated the pagan Arab disbelief in any form of afterlife. In any case, "Muhammad's opponents denied... the novel, and to their minds absurd, doctrine of the resurrection and the other world" projected so vehemently by Islam. "Their notions" Noldeke adds, "as to the state of departed souls were, of course vaguer, if anything, than the notions of Homer's fellow-countrymen as to the psyche (Noldeke:672). The Arabs showed great concern that their dead be buried properly and that their dead ancestors be respected. "That all this may be done without any notion of benefiting the departed is sufficiently obvious from the usage of modern Europe" (Noldeke:672-4). It was a civilized humanistic sense of decency expressed toward the dead. The Arab protest against Muhammad's assertions that their dead would be "roasted in Hell" did not reflect their belief in the existence of such Hell or Paradise afterlife. They simply, like modern civilized people, wanted to maintain a respectful tone while talking of the deceased. For Arab pagans, Muhammad's disrespectful and gruesome portrayal of their ancestors in Islamic Hell was as abhorrent as, for a modernist, Dante's treatment of Muhammad in Christian Hell. In principle, however, the Arabs rejected and ridiculed the idea that after death human bodies could be resurrected, rewarded or punished eternally after they had crumbled into dust. It is their disbelief in the afterlife that the Quran projects and vehemently condemns.³ Arab disbelief in a second life after death and in a Day of Judgement were "in line with the real beliefs of the Meccans" (Watt:124). Again, Muslims find much similarity between modern unenthusiasm - if not total disbelief - about the afterlife and the Jahiliyyah lack of concern about the same. The Arabs, like the moderns, were totally committed to this world. "Neither their cast of mind nor their way of life was likely to fix the eyes of the ancient Arabs on other-worldly values" (Goldziher:12). Like that of the moderns, Arab Jahiliyyah thought was, by and large, existentialistic.

The Arabs had a strong sense of social ethics and morality. They, for example, loved wine. But "at the same time the sot or habitual drunkard was not tolerated. Barad b. Qays was expelled from more than one tribe on account of his vicious habits in this respect" (T.H. Weir, "Djahiliyya," El,1:999). We have already seen the rebuttals of Abu Jahl and Hind (daughter of Utba the Great, wife of Abu Sufyan) to Muhammad, telling him that they believed in "good," decency, charity, generosity and other social virtues and practiced them. The Arabs assumed "that good consists in its own continued existence and in that of time-honored habits..." (Rodinson:84). As in modern times, the Arab sense of morality and social responsibility had a humanistic base. In their own ways Abu Jahl and Hind told Muhammad they did not need the Almighty's Messenger to tell them what was good; they knew it. Their good works, they implied, were inspired by human experience and normal moral sense. Like the modern moral rationale, Arab "maintenance of morality was due much more to respect for traditional usages [that had evolved out of human experience and thoughtfulness] and public opinion than to fear of Divine wrath" (Noldeke:673;brackets added). Like our Sartrean existentialists, pagan Arabs tried

to conform to the moral ideals of their own, in the formation of which religion played no role... The ideal man possessed in the highest degree the quality known as **MURUWA**, which can be literally translated as virility. This comprised courage, endurance, loyalty, generosity and hospitality. The feeling which drove a man to conform to this ideal was one of honour (IRD)... the sense of honour took over many of the ordinary functions of religion. None of these ideals, none of these forces which ordered the life of society or the individual had any supernatural basis. What they all came down to was man. Man was the ultimate measure of things... (Rodinson:17).

The Arabs thought themselves responsible more to human society than to an invisible God (or gods) through His Messengers. As Arab pre-Islamic poetry - compiled by Muslims and known to them - reflects,

tribal humanism was the effective religion of the Arabs of Muhammad's day... the realization of human excellence in action (was) an end in itself, and at the same time usually (contributed) to the survival of the tribe, which (was) the other great end of life. This is humanism in the sense that it is primarily in human

values, in virtuous or manly conduct, that it finds significance... belief in the honor and excellence of the tribe was the mainspring of nomadic life... (Watt:24).

Now, Muslim and Christian believers are not impressed by a Sartrean existentialistic concept of morality. As in Christianity, goodness without faith is also meaningless in Islam. Self-righteous virtuosness is monopolized by believers. As discussed in detail in Part IV in this study the Qurn repeatedly reminds Muslims of the uselessness of the good works of nonbelievers and nonconformists -- **HABITAT AMALUHUM** (e.g., Q2:217). For a Muslim, the modern existentialistic-stoic sense of morality and decency not based on faith and unguided by Revelation is as irrelevant and nonsensical as that of Arab pagandom.

The Arab sense of morality and urge to be good had, like modern ones, an "intellectual background." The pagans, like the moderns, believed humans could achieve goodness and happiness. For them there was no alternative to hoping for progress with the help of human-material resources. Their so-called fatalism was a way of taking into account physical and natural realities; it did not lead them to shun work and worldliness and seek a certificate from a savior for salvation. Pagan Arabs

do not seem to have held that all a man's acts were predetermined by fate, but only that certain aspects of his life were thus fixed... (e.g., a man's sustenance, the term of his life, the sex of a child, and happiness or misery). Fate was not worshiped. It was rather a form of science, for it was essentially the recognition of facts (Watt:25).

Beyond the recognition of these natural facts, which they called "blind fate," **DAHR**, they knew of no other limits to the materialization of man's potentials. They "(took) their own strength for granted" (Rodinson:84). Reflecting the Quran's disapproval (and his own as a Christian believer), Watt tells us the pagan Arabs had "too high an opinion of human powers" and had forgotten "man's creatureliness" (Watt:76). An "overestimate of human power and capacity (had) become the predominant intellectual assumption in Mecca"... "Financial power,

they thought, could do much to alleviate any adverse effect of the fickle rainfall of Arabia; famine could be averted by imports" (*ibid*:77).

These characteristics of pagan Arabs seem, to a Muslim, quite similar to (Renaissance-Enlightenment- inspired) modern rationalistic-existentialistic thought, generating belief in the idea of progress and in the possibility of achieving happiness here on this earth without Divine intervention. Muslims know that similar humanistic tendencies were attacked by the Quran, particularly during the Meccan period. The Quran ridiculed and condemned the Arab sense of "self-sufficiency" and humanistic self-confidence and high mindedness. The Quran calls this condemnable pagan Arab mode of thought **ISTIGHNA**, an orientation that they were independent of any higher power. Ridiculing Arab **ISTIGHNA**, the Quran projected the idea of the nothingness of humanity unguided by Islamic Revelation, and the transitory nature of this life.⁴

Arab humanistic tendencies were also reflected in their proto-democratic system, "based in principle upon equality" (Rodinson:14). Like moderns, they recognized no Divine right or authority which could elevate a particular person or group above others. "The veto of a single man was enough to upset a major decision" (*ibid*). Though "Arab democracy was less egalitarian than Athenian, (every) member of a Meccan clan counted for one and no one for more than one" (Watt:9). There was no discrimination on the basis of creed. Promotion to the Meccan senate, **MALA**, though not institutionalized, was based on human qualities and service to society. Kindness and generosity were prized, also "moderation in all circumstances to fall in with the unspoken will of those (one) meant to govern" (Rodinson:14). As in our modern age, there existed a sense of accountability to people, not to God or gods.

About Islam's prescribed and practiced treatment of this group of the People of Jahiliyyah, the outright pagans, we have said enough in earlier sections of this study.

AL-MUNAFIQUN, "The Hypocrites"

Other than the People of the Book (Jews and Christians) and the three groups of the People of Jahiliyyah (the Sabeans, the Magians or Zoroastrians and the pagans), the Quran and Tradition introduce Muslims to a particular group the Prophet confronted and condemned. These are **AL-MUNAFIQUN**, usually translated as "the Hypocrites and Doubters." W. Montgomery Watt correctly calls them the "Muslim Opposition." Occasionally we will refer to them as nonconformist Muslims of the Prophet's time.⁵ "The Hypocrites" were significant in number. Our sources mention more than fifty male individuals by name as al-Munafiqun. These were, obviously, the most active; **AKHABITH AL-MUNAFIQIN**, "the most spiteful Hypocrites," as our sources call them (e.g., W:1059). During the battle of Uhud, we are told, Abd Allah b. Ubayy, the most influential of the al-Munafiqun, had more than 300 followers (1.1:372). Apparently an equal number of female "Hypocrites" **AL-MUNAFIQAT**, were mentioned repeatedly by the Quran (see, e.g., Q9:67-8; Q33:73; Q57:13). During the preparations for the battle of Tabuk (630 CE), the "Hypocrites and doubters" who followed Abd Allah b. Ubayy were at least as many as those who followed Muhammad. "It is alleged," Ibn Ishaq tells us, on this occasion, that "it (i.e. that of "the Hypocrites") was not the smaller camp" (1.1:604). Descriptions of the executions of Banu Qurayza Jews and of Abd Allah b. Ubayy's death and burial indicate that a great number of Medinan males and females openly sympathized and identified with "the Hypocrite" cause (see, e.g., 1.1:463-482; W:510-29, 1058-60 passim). For this very reason the Quran had to warn the 'true' believers against sympathizing with "the Hypocrites" (see Q4:88 passim quoted below).

Most of "the Hypocrites" were Medinan Arab pagans who, along with their Aus and Khazraj kin, had converted to Islam. The Hypocrites included some Medinan former Jews. "There were people among the Jews who had converted to Islam and some of them became Hypocrites" -- **KAN NAS MIN AL-YAHUD QAD ASLAMU WA NAFAQ BADUHUM**. Zayd b. Rifaah b.

at-Tabut was one of them.⁶ NIFAQ, "Hypocrisy", is also ascribed to some Meccan Muslims who failed to leave their city for the Dar al-Islam Medina to fight for Muslims against their fellow Meccans, e.g., at Badr.⁷ Similarly, some Bedouins beyond Medina and Mecca are harshly criticized as Hypocrites -- "And among those around you of the wandering Arabs, are Hypocrites..."⁸

The Quran confirms that those later called al-Munafiqun had once or several times accepted Islam (Q4:137; 9:74; 63:3). Tabari explains these and other Quranic verses accordingly; these people had become Muslims -- QAD ASLAMU (TS,8:60). Even after they were charged with NIFAQ, "the Hypocrites" continued to identify with no other creed but Islam. The Quran, Muhammad and his contemporary non-Muslims verify that al-Munafiqun had not converted (or reconverted) to Arab paganism, Judaism or Christianity. Yet Muslims find the Quran and the Prophet condemning the Hypocrites, vehemently asking the believers to dissociate from them. Al-Munafiqun were apostates, Muslims are told, having reverted to AL-KUFR, disbelief. Although "the Hypocrites" would escape the ultimate Islamic punishment for apostasy, which is death, they were criticized by the Quran and the Prophet. The Quran declares unequivocally that, along with other non-Muslims, the Hypocrites will suffer after death eternal torture and torment in Hell. As a matter of fact, as apostates, the Hypocrites will be treated worse than other non-Muslims in the Last Day.⁹

What was wrong with the so-called Hypocrites? The Quran directly ascribes Jahiliyyah to them (Q3:154 cf. TT,5:50 passim). In general, the Quran charges al-Munafiqun with disbelief in God, the Messenger and in the Last Day.¹⁰ They are blamed for having "hurt" the Prophet (e.g. Q9:61-3). More specifically, "the Hypocrites" are condemned for their lack of enthusiasm for Islamic rituals, jihad and hijra, also for their hesitation to spend for the cause of Muhammad and, above all, for their sympathetic and friendly attitude toward non-Muslims.¹¹ Except for the Quran's usual rhetorical charge of disbelief in God, all other charges

are substantiated to a great extent by al-Munafiqun's behavior. These general charges were related to certain modes of thought and behavior of al-Munafiqun that parallel in the Muslim mind those modern phenomena we have called, broadly, liberal, rationalistic, secular, humanistic, pluralistic, etc. "The Hypocrites" are similar to the moderns on the following lines. 1) Like the moderns, al-Munafiqun's 'deviations' were based on their apparent belief in the separation of religion from mundane social affairs. They had adopted Muhammad's creed for limited spiritual-ritual purposes. 2) Al-Munafiqun adopted a conscientious, tolerant, pluralistic and rationalistic attitude toward non-Muslims. In the conduct of relations with non-Muslims, "the Hypocrites" expected the Prophet and the believers to abide by time-honored ethical and social standards. Social and legal undertakings and basic human rights, al-Munafiqun thought, were inviolable. 3) Al-Munafiqun insisted on maintaining pagan democratic traditions and an individual's right to express disagreement with the head of the community. In civic affairs, they expected Muhammad to follow consensus of opinion according to normal social traditions which, they thought, were also rational. They denied religion, i.e. Muhammad, overriding privileges. They did not expect the Almighty to intervene in mundane affairs. 4) Al-Munafiqun's attitude toward hijrah and jihad reflected their desire for peaceful coexistence and their dislike of aggression, expansionism and violence. 5) About the afterlife, al-Munafiqun demonstrated an agnostic tendency. They were definitely not convinced that rewards and punishments of the afterlife, if any, were related to what Muhammad said. Here again, al-Munafiqun had a Deistic approach. In the performance of good deeds and civic duties, "the Hypocrites" acted as existentialists and stoics. Their ethical concerns were humanistic, this-worldly, guided by time-honored traditions. 6) Al-Munafiqun did not believe in miracles.

Yet, al-Munafiqun - in their own ways - wanted to identify with Muhammad's creed. They resemble those modern Muslims who, openly (in

varying degrees) or implicitly, adopt liberal, humanistic, rationalistic and secular approaches in general social affairs while desiring to maintain identification with Islam for limited spiritual (or emotional)-ritual purposes. The Quran's and the Prophet's treatment of al-Munafiqun, however, deprives such modernist Muslims of any authenticity among the believers. While the Sabeans, the Majus and Arab pagans are condemned for having no link to Divine Guidance received through Islamic Messengers of God and, thus from Islam's point of view, for a total humanistic basis of their worldview and traditions, al-Munafiqun are condemned for their partial and selective adoption of Islam. This approximation becomes more firm in Muslim consciousness when they remember that it is particularly in the context of the condemnation of the Hypocrites in the Quran that the believers are told the condemnation - though directly related to al-Munafiqun of the Prophet's time - is applicable for all times to anyone with similar characteristics and attitudes (TS,1:389 cf. Q2:11 passim). The following elaborates the above points.

Whatever other social, political and chance factors, and regardless of the fact that some al-Munafiqun had accepted Muhammad's leadership under overt and covert pressure, most of them, particularly former Medinan and Meccan pagans, accepted Islam, seemingly, as a personal, non-political and spiritual phenomenon. They acknowledged Muhammad as their principal religious guide in a limited sense. They accepted Islam as a monotheistic creed with dogmas and rituals somewhat different from those of Judaism and Christianity, and closer to existing Arab traditions. For example, Muhammad recognized from the beginning the sacred nature of the **HARAM**, "Sanctuary," at Mecca and eventually adopted the Kaba as the **QIBLA**. Muhammad also accepted **HAJJ**, the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, as a religious institution. Above all, the Almighty talked in the Arabic language so dear to the Arabs. Like the Quraysh during Muhammad's early Meccan career, the Hypocrites before they were so dubbed must have been happy to know the Almighty had

established some connection to an Arab, one of them. Our sources document the existence in Muhammad's time of such a proto-nationalistic urge. Hanifism, a monotheistic orientation excluding specific dogmatic and ritualistic trappings and a non-Arab hierarchy of Judaism and Christianity, was already making headway in Arabia¹². A leading proponent of Hanifism was Abu Amir ar-Rahib, an Ausite Medinan who became an opponent and rival of Muhammad. He is also mentioned as a Munafiq. Abu Amir was called ar-Rahib, "the Monk," because of his monotheistic-spiritual proclivities. As H.A.R. Gibb has correctly noted, "Hanifiyya (Hanifism) was used to denote the doctrine preached by Muhammad and was only later replaced by Islam" (Gibb, Muhammadanism:38). Apparently, as far as religious incentives are concerned, all Medinans (including those later called al-Munafiqun) at first accepted Muhammad's creed as though it was just a more organized form of Hanifism; compared to Abu Amir ar-Rahib, Muhammad was a more successful and (for various local socio-political reasons) a more impressive and acceptable religious-political leader. However, they accepted Islam as a new creed and Muhammad as a religious guide to the extent the new religion remained personal, dealing with matters related to the worship of God such as prayer, fasting and gathering in a mosque. They did not expect the Almighty to interfere in the social, civic and political affairs so minutely. They also expected that God and His Messenger would honor normal time-honored moral standards, particularly their own words. In day-to-day worldly affairs, they expected Muhammad to act as a normal secular leader, abiding by their valued proto-democratic, social, moral, rationalistic norms. As a part of these expectations, for example, they thought Muhammad would abide in his own undertakings by the Treaty of Aqaba and the Ordinance of Medina, which included promises of nonviolence and freedom of religion for Medinan Jews. Similarly they did not expect the new religion would perpetuate and intensify tension between Medina and the rest of Arabia, going to the extent of violating international traditions such as respect for Truce Months -- **ASHHUR**

AL-HARAM, in which violence was forbidden. In brief, al-Munafiqun believed in the separation of religion and political-social-civic affairs. They saw the new creed they had adopted in their own images of religion influenced by their images of Arab paganism, Judaism and Christianity.

They had seen, and lived, Arab paganism as a nondeterminant factor in the conduct of relations between individuals and groups. They had also observed their fellow-Medinan Jews - and those beyond Medina - completely Arabized and secularized in culture and conduct of social relations, keeping religion a personal, private and spiritual affair. The Jews of Medina were divided in alliances on secular lines, the Qaynuqa being allied with pagan Khazrajites and the Nadir and Qurayza Jews with pagan Ausites. Thus, the Arabs saw Judaism per se as irrelevant to normal politics. Judaism or any other religion was only for table talk.

The Arabs knew Christians in Arabia mostly as a political "monks" -- (sing:) RAHIB. Christianity in Arabia during the Prophet's time was too meek and isolated to warn the Arabs against Roman-Byzantine official Christian bigotry. To the extent the Arabs were conscious of Christianity's interference in the peninsula's politics, their vague memories of the past and their consciousness of the situation in the southeastern regions of Eastern Roman Empire had prepared them to resent it. The Arabs were conscious of their ancestor's resistance to Christianity as a political factor in south Arabia and of the mistreatment of Semitic Christians in the north by the orthodox Rum. All this psychologically prepared them to think of religion as a matter of personal preference for limited spiritual-ritual purposes.¹³

The Hypocrites were called so because they resisted the transformation of their adopted simple apolitical Hanafiyyah into Islam. This literally meant "surrender," i.e., surrender of all traditions and human rights to God's will, who spoke only through Muhammad and always sided with Muhammad. Al-Munafiqun were also perplexed when the Prophet

told them that God, through abrogating verses, had nullified earlier guarantees. The more the Prophet talked of miracles and insisted all his political, military and social actions were inspired and sanctioned by God, the more "the Hypocrites" suspected his authenticity. They became more outspoken when they found Muhammad and his true followers did what "the Hypocrites" thought was completely immoral and irrational. Yet, al-Munafiqun, like some nonconformist Muslims of our time, desired to identify with Muhammad's monotheistic creed and its purely religious rites. This selective attitude, to believe in a part of Muhammad's teachings while occasionally disbelieving that some of his decrees were divine, this refusal to follow Muhammad blindly, as SUFAHA, idiots (as al-Munafiqun are reported to have said), - this secular tendency to separate religion from political social, this-worldly, affairs, Muslims find, is ascribed to the Hypocrites, and ridiculed and rejected by the Quran. The Quran calls al-Munafiqun's understanding that some of Muhammad's actions did not necessarily reflect God's will a condemnable thought, "to make division between God and his Messenger." Their whole attitude is called a "sickness."¹⁴

The Pact of Aqaba (followed by Muhammad's migration to Medina), as initially understood by Medinans, did not anticipate an aggressive Muslim policy against Mecca and the rest of the world. Also, Aqaba had guaranteed continuation of friendly alliances between Medinan Arabs (now Muslims) and their Jewish fellow citizens. After Muhammad established himself in Medina, he verified at least religious freedom for the Jews of Medina. Rapidly, however, the Prophet changed his policy. Aggression and discrimination against non-Muslims, including Medinan Jews and Meccan heathens, emerged prominently. Beginning with the battle of Badr (624 CE), the majority of Medinan Muslims, i.e., converted Khazraj and Aus, surrendered to Muhammad's change of mind. Those who protested and resisted earned the label of **AL-MUNAFIQUN**.

Al-Munafiqun's resistance, inspired by their basic belief in the separation of religion from social affairs, and in religion as a purely

personal-spiritual-ritual affair, was reflected in their attitude towards non-Muslims. Al-Munafiqun's progressively increasing differences in this regard with Muhammad indicated their religious, ideological and cultural tolerance, and a desire for peaceful coexistence regardless of differences in creed, ethnicity, etc. As tension between Muhammad and non-Muslims increased "the Hypocrites" tried to stay objective, impartial, conscientious and rationalistic, based on recognition of some basic human rights and on fundamental standards of honesty and decency. Such basic human decency and honesty, they thought, must be reflected by, e.g., honoring existing undertakings concerning non-Muslims. Though personally they preferred to identify with Muhammad's new monotheistic creed and its purely religious rites, the Hypocrites did not think other creeds intolerable, or that non-Muslims automatically lost their basic human rights. Al-Munafiqun did not allow their new creed to affect their relations with others negatively. Like the liberals and Deists of our time they believed in (and wanted to practice) religious pluralism.

Al-Munafiqun's troubles began with their desire for peaceful coexistence between the pagan world, e.g., Mecca, and the Dar al-Islam Medina, and with honest efforts to reconcile Medinan Jews with the Prophet on the basis of what the Prophet had already promised. They preferred peaceful coexistence even after the Prophet had changed his mind - particularly about the Jews of Medina. Al-Munafiqun's respect for the Jews' basic human rights was ridiculed as their **HUBB AL-YAHUD**, "love for the Jews." It was this **HUBB AL-YAHUD**, as the Prophet admonished Abd Allah b. Ubayy, that destroyed their credibility as true believers -- **AHLAKAK HUBB AL-YAHUD** (T,10:205 cf. Q9:84 passim). Now, human rights form a part of our much-lauded, emerging modern value system. But, Muslims find, the Hypocrites were branded as such, cursed, excommunicated and harshly treated by the Quran, Muhammad and the community of true believers for insisting on adherence to those values and tendencies.

Clear expressions of Muslim Medinan opposition to the Prophet's action were heard first during the debate about the Nakhla raid. This occurred in the first half of the second year after hijrah. During a Sacred Truce Month a band of Meccan Muslims dispatched by the Prophet had attacked a Meccan trade caravan escorted by four Meccan non-Muslims. Muslims captured the caravan after killing one and taking two as captives. The booty was brought to the Prophet, who eventually distributed it among the Muslims after the Quran justified the Muslim raid. However, in Mecca and Medina "there was much talk" against this Muslim action (1.1:288). Medina "boiled like a boiler" in disgust against the violation of peace during a "Sacred Month" agreed upon by all parties in the region - including the Prophet (W:16). Many "Muslim brethern reproached" the action (1.1:288). Note that, apparently, Quranic application of the term "al-Munafiqun" to nonconformist Muslims began with the Prophet's attack on the Banu Qaynuga Jews five months after Nakhla. Most likely, those later named al-Munafiqun were among the "Muslim brethern" critical of the raid. This first internal opposition sprang from the oppositionists' dissatisfaction with Islam's violation of peace during a "Sacred Truce Month" and their dislike of war with Meccans that this accident, as some Medinans mentioned, had made likely (W:16; 1.1:288).

With the rise of tension between Muhammad and the Jews, al-Munafiqun tried to remain neutral and reconcile the two parties so they could coexist peacefully. They said, as the Quran reports with ridicule,

We are peacemakers only (Q2:11). They said, "We intend to reconcile the two groups: the believers and the People of the Book." Undoubtedly, they indeed thought by doing so they were peacemakers between the Jews and the Muslims or between their religions... In all this they thought they were engaged in a noble task (TS,1;290 cf. Q2:11).

Referring to the Prophet's unquestioning followers who, al-Munafiqun thought, were mentally deficient simpletons, they said

Shall we believe as the foolish believe (Q2:13).

In Tabari's words, they said,

Shall we believe as (these) ignorant people have believed and authenticate Muhammad (in everything) as these people, deprived of rationality (or brains) and of perceptive faculty, authenticate him? -- **A NUMIN KAMA AMAN AHL AL-JAHL, WA NUSADDIQ BI-MUHAMMAD KAMA SADDAQ BIHI HAULA ALLADHIN LA UQUL LAHUM WA LA AFHAM?** (TS,1:293 cf. Q2:13).

The Quran quoted al-Munafiqun only to refute them. The Quran remarked that these "Hypocrites" were "sick in their hearts" and, indeed what they call peacemaking is, to God, "mischief making." Above all, these Hypocrites are themselves "foolish" in what they are doing (Q2:11-3).

In Tabari's words, explaining the Quranic passage, al-Munafiqun's efforts were

evil from God's point of view. Al-Munafiqun were doing the opposite of what God commands. Because God had indeed made them duty-bound to be hostile to the Jews and be on the side of Muslims and fight the Jews. God had obligated them to accept the Messenger of God and (believe) in whatever (revelation) came to him from God... So, their friendly meetings with the Jews and their uncertainties about the Prophethood of the Messenger of God and about what (revelation) came to him as certainly being from God is the worst wickedness and perversion even if they intended amelioration (of relations) and something righteous -- **QALU: NURID AL-ISLAH BAYN AL-FARIQAYN MIN AL-MUMININ WA AHL AL-KITAB. FA-HUM LA SHAKK ANNAHUM KANU YAHSABUN ANNAHUM FIMA ATAU MIN DHALIK MUSLIHUN... FA SAWA-UN BAYN AL-YAHUD WA'L-MUSLIMIN... AU FI ADYANIHIHIM... LI-ANNAHUM FI JAMI DHALIK MIN AMRIHIH IND ANFUSIHIH MUHSININ WA HUM IND ALLAH MUSIUN WA LI-AMR ALLAH MUKHALIFUN. LI-ANN ALLAH FARAD ALAYHIH ADAWAT AL-YAHUD WA HARBAHUM MAAL-MUSLIMIN, WA ALZAMAHUM AT-TASDIQ RASUL ALLAH WA BI-MA JAA BIHI MIN IND ALLAH... FA-KAN LIQAUHUM AL-YAHUD ALA WAJH AL-WILAYTAT MINHUM LAHUM WA SHAKKUHUM FI NUBUWWAT RASUL ALLAH WA FIMA JAA BIHI ANNAHU MIN IND ALLAH AZAM AL-FASAD, WA IN KAN DHALIK KAN INDAHUM ISLAH-AN WA HUD-AN** (TS,1:290-1 cf. Q2:11 passim).

Regardless of (the fact) that al-Munafiqun in their own minds intended to have tranquility and improved relations (between various groups) on earth, their (very) appearance with those who had rejected (Islamic belief system) against the friends of God (i.e., Muslims) was corruption on earth -- **WA BI-MUZAHARATHIHIH AHL AT-TAKDHIB BI'LLAH WA KUTUBIHI WA RUSULIHI ALA AULIA ALLAH... FA DHALIK IFSAD AL-MUNAFIQIN FI ARD ALLAH, WA HUM YAHSABUN ANNAHUM BI-FILIHIM DHALIK MUSLIHIN FIHA** (TS,1:289 cf. Q2:11 passim; parentheses added).

Al-Munafiqun's impartiality, their objectivity and 'shuttle diplomacy,' their going back and forth between the Prophet and the Jews,

were ridiculed by the Quran and called

swaying between this and that (belonging) neither to these nor to those (Q4:143).

In this verse

God means to say: "The Hypocrites' are confused about their creed. They do not believe in anything in a perfect manner. They do not share the believers' complete comprehension nor are they completely with the polytheists (i.e. non-Muslims) in their ignorance. They are perplexed in the middle." They are like what the Messenger of God said about them: "The Hypocrites are like the goat that takes turns between two herds: now goes to this (herd) and then goes to the other, knowing not which one she is following"... (According to another series of Traditions) God (in Q4:143) says: "Al-Munafiqun" are neither polytheists expressing their polytheism nor (true) believers... They are neither devout believers nor explicit pagans"... The Prophet explained [the characteristics or states of minds of] a believer, a Hypocrite and an (outright) non-Muslim (as follows): "they are like the three persons who reached a river. The believer jumped in the river and crossed it; then the Munafiq jumped (in the river) and began to swim til he was about to reach the believer that the heathen called" 'Come (back) to me; I am worried about you!' And the believer called him: 'Come to me; I have this and that,' enumerating for him (the benefits of) what he had. Yet the Munafiq persisted in wavering/going back and forth between the two until a damaging wave overwhelmed and drowned him." Indeed a Munafiq persists in skepticism and uncertainty until death and dies a skeptic..." Also reported to us, the Prophet of God used to say: "A Munafiq is like a goat (confused) between two herds: sees a herd in one field; approaches it; but does not feel like she belongs to that herd. Then, she goes to the other herd in another field; smells it; but, is not satisfied that she belongs to that herd either..." (In brief, another Tradition tells us) they are neither with the Companions of Muhammad [in every controversy] nor with these Jews [in all respects]... their faith did not become so pure that they remain with the believers [in every situation], nor are they with the pagans [in their belief system and on all situations]... They waver between Islam and un-Islam -- KUFRA... (that is what God says in Q4:143) (TS,9:332-5; parentheses and brackets, implied in Tabari, are added).

This **TADHABDHUB**, "wavering," of the al-Munafiqun was also noticed ironically by the Jews and, perhaps, by the pagans. A Jewish leader remarked bitterly about Abd Allah b. Ubayy, the leader of "the Hypocrites": "Ibn Ubayy is committed neither to Judaism nor to the creed of Muhammad nor to (polytheism,) the religion of his people" -- **WA IBN UBAYY LA YAHUDIY-UN ALA DIN YAHUD, WA LA ALA DIN MUHAMMAD WA LA HUA ALA DIN QAUMIHI** (W:369; also see Watt, Med.: 162; parentheses added).

In our Islamic portrait of al-Munafiqun, a modernist may see

appreciatively glimpses of an ideal conscientiousness, objectivity, and moderation and find a rationalistic urge of a people honestly in search of the Golden Mean, the Truth. It is not so, however, for a believer. In the context of Q4:143 and elsewhere the Quran and Tradition tell Muslims that the same objective neutrality symbolized al-Munafiqun's wretchedness. The very verse 4:143 ends with the remark "and whom God leads astray, thou wilt not find for him a way." Tabari explains this, in essence, by saying that it is nonsense to take a neutral or conscientious position between Muslims and others on any occasion. "What way other than Islam can lead one to the truth?" It is likewise nonsense to seek the truth somewhere else. "The Almighty has (clearly) told us that He would accept none but Islam as religion" (TS,9:335). This simply means al-Munafiqun should have followed the Prophet blindly in his actions against the Jews. The Quran warned:

O believers, take not the unbelievers as friends instead of the believers; or do you desire to give God over you a clear authority? Surely the hypocrites will be in the lowest reach of the Fire; thou wilt not find them any helper (Q4:144-5).

By this passage, according to Tabari, God tells Muslims not to be like al-Munafiqun who maintain friendly relationships with His enemies, i.e., non-Muslims. God warns of harsh punishment for those who continue friendly relations with non-Muslims and, thus, act as "Hypocrites". Their amicable relations with non-Muslims will be evidence of a crime, and God will treat such untrue Muslims as "hypocrites." So, Tabari concludes, Muslims should not invite God's wrath against them by befriending others than Muslims (TS,9:336).¹⁵

"The Hypocrites" supported the Jews because they understood that Muhammad was violating his own undertakings concerning the Jews (incorporated in the Aqaba pact as well as the Ordinance of Medina). They had also not anticipated aggression against Mecca and the rest of Arabia as a part of their Islamic duties. First, native Medinan Muslims, including al-Munafiqun, made the point that no clear revelation enjoining war against the Jews and others was received (see Watt,

Med.:183). Al-Munafiqun must have expected the Almighty would remain consistent with the earlier non-aggressive mode and with His Messenger's earlier reassurances. "The Hypocrites" were soon surprised and disappointed.

Those who believe say 'Why has a sura not been sent down?' Then, when a clear sura is sent down, and therein fighting is mentioned, thou seest those in whose hearts is sickness looking at thee as one who swoons of death, (47:20 passim).

This is a reference to the Abrogating Verses -- AL-AYAT AN-NASIKHAH, such as Q9:5, 29 etc. which continued to be revealed in Medina. These new revelations, and the Prophet's emerging Sunnah (conduct), which was also inspired by God, authorized nullification of earlier guarantees. While many Medinan Muslims surrendered to God's and His Messenger's new will, and arbitrarily disowned their legal and moral responsibilities to the Jews, the idea of Naskh ("abrogation"), that God could change His earlier and softer decrees, did not satisfy al-Munafiqun's traditional-legalistic sense of morality. Al-Munafiqun defied these new revelations.

...They said to those who were averse to what God sent down, 'We will obey you in some of the affairs': and God knows their secrets (Q47:26).

They told the Jews: "though we have become Muslims, we will not fight you" -- HAM MUSALMAN HUEY HAYN, LEKIN TUM SE NA LARENGAY (Ahmad Said, KASHF-UR-RAHMAN [URDU], 2:813 passim cf. Q47:26 passim). Al-Munafiqun also thought, given the state of war between Mecca and Medina created by the Prophet's strategies, it would be unwise to lose Medinan Jews' support (see Watt, Med. 182). With reference to these two concerns, the Quran (5:51-8 cf. TS,10:395-432) warns that those Muslims who take Jews and Christians as friends will be treated by God as Jews and Christians. They are those "in whose hearts is sickness," the Quran repeats. The Quran ridicules al-Munafiqun's concern that Medinan Muslims might need the help of Medinan Jews to defend their city. The Quran tells al-Munafiqun that "their works have failed," i.e., their

partial obedience to Muhammad, and their partial faith in Islam is useless unless they follow Muhammad unconditionally. True Muslims are those, the Quran says, who, in their unconditional obedience to Muhammad, disregard "the reproach of any reproacher," i.e., do not care about social and moral criticism of their conduct by others. Muslims, HIZB ALLAH, the "party of God," should not be concerned about good relations with non-Muslims; their victory is guaranteed by the Almighty. Their "friend is only God, and His Messenger and the believers."¹⁶

Having lost hope in the morality and neutrality of the God who spoke only through Muhammad - or having lost faith in Muhammad's authenticity as a genuine Messenger of God - al-Munafiqun took some belated and unorganized direct actions. Abd Allah b. Ubayy's verbal intervention and al-Munafiqun's moral pressure saved the lives of the Qaynuqa and Nadir Jews. Muhammad, cursing Ibn Ubayy, agreed, unwillingly, to exile the Qaynuqa whom he wanted to slaughter -- **WA HUA YURID QATLAHUM** (TT-1,2:480) and Banu Nadir, contenting himself with the expropriation of their enormous property. Banu Qurayza were not so fortunate. During the Banu Nadir affair, and before and after the execution of Banu Qurayza men and enslavement of their women and children, al-Munafiqun expressed their disgust about the whole affair. They openly praised the condemned Jews and cursed Muslim action against these Jews (see W:375-6 cf. Q59:11 passim; W:528 passim). Condemning Medinan Muslims' betrayal of their Jewish allies, particularly the Nadir and Qurayza Jews, Jabal b. Jawwal, a poet, praised Abd Allah b. Ubayy for his defense of the Qaynuqa Jews. Jabal eulogized the fallen Nadir and Qurayzah as "weighty men like the ponderous rocks... kindly and generous... (whose) glory (is) established on glory which time cannot obscure." Addressing Muslim Ausite betrayers, Jabal said

Dwell there, ye chiefs of Aus,
As though you were blind to Shame
You left your pot with nothing in it,
the pot of a people worth
mentioning is ever on the boil (1.1:481-2).

Remembering Banu Nadir, Abbas b. Mirdas, another problematic Arab poet

of the time, a Munafiq, said

Had the people of the settlement not been dispersed You would have seen laughter and gaiety within it. By my life, shall I show you women in howdahs Which have gone to Shatat and Tay'ab? Large-eyed like the gazelles of Tabala; Maidens that would bewitch one calmed by much truck with women? When one seeking hospitality came they would say at once With faces like gold, 'Doubly welcome! The good that you seek will not be withheld. You need fear no wrong while with us.' Don't think me a client of Salam b. Makhzum Nor of Huyayy b. Akhtab (1.1:443).

In the last two lines Abbas b. Mirdas was telling the believers he defended and praised the Jews though he was not one of them. "The Hypocrite" was following his conscience. In response, Khawwaf b. Jubayr, a believer, taunted Abbas for "weeping bitterly over the Jewish dead," calling his praise for the Jews "an obstruction in religion," a "falsehood and shame" (*ibid*). Our Hypocrite, Ibn Mirdas was too stubborn to keep quiet. He came with another poem, praising "the purest stock of the two priests," the Jews, more vehemently. Abbas said

You satirized the purest stock of the two priests¹⁷. Yet you always enjoyed favours at their hands. 'Twere more fitting that you should weep for them, Your people too if they paid their debt of gratitude. Gratitude is the best fruit of kindness, And the most fitting act of one who would do right. You are as one who cuts off his head To gain the power that it contains.¹⁸ Weep for B. Harun and remember their deeds, How they killed beasts for the hungry when you were famished.¹⁹ O Khawwat, shed tear after tear for them, Abandon your injurious attack upon them. Had you met them in their homes You would not have said what you say. They were the first to perform noble deeds in war, Welcoming the needy guest with kind words.

Both Jabal (or Jabalah) and Abbas were among those critics whom the Prophet silenced by bribe. The Prophet gave Jabal a great number of domesticated animals from the booty of Khaybar (W:700). After the conquest of Mecca, when Abbas b. Mirdas reverted to his criticism, the Prophet asked his Companions to "cut his tongue from me" -- IQTAU LISANAHU ANNI, i.e. to give him something to keep his mouth shut. "So they gave him 100 camels" -- FA-AUTUH-U MIAT-AN MIN AL-IBIL (W:947).

Al-Munafiqun did what conscientious dissenters in our time do against policies and actions of their own governments they think unjust. However, Muslims find that such actions were not appreciated by Islam.

They were called sabotage against God's will -- SADD AN SABIL ALLAH (e.g., Q58:14-20). By acting so, God said, al-Munafiqun "barred [others] from God's way; so there awaits them a humbling chastisement" (Q58:16). For their sympathies with non-Muslims (the Jews), Muslims find, al-Munafiqun were harshly reprovved again by God. Their "oaths" that they still believed in Islam (in their own ways) were ridiculed. "Satan has gained the mastery over them," the Quran remarked. They were called "Satan's party." It is unimaginable, the passage concluded, for a Muslim believer to be "loving to anyone who opposes God and His Messenger," i.e., non-Muslims, even if such non-Muslims are "fathers" or "sons" or "clan members."²⁰ Explaining Q58:14-20, Tabari tells us:

This is a reference to the Hypocrites who established friendship with the Jews and advised them... and said (to the Prophet) 'We shall not betray our allies and charges; they will be with us to help, reinforce and defend us. We are afraid of difficult times (when we might need them'... (By doing and saying so) al-Munafiqun "barred from God's way." (Because) God's verdict and way about disbelieving People of the Book are (as follows): 'slaughter them or charge them jizya. (As for the pagans, i.e., others than Jews and Christians), they are to be slaughtered'. So, al-Munafiqun, by being a hurdle between Muslims and these non-Muslims (i.e., by not allowing Muslims to slaughter these non-Muslims) -- **FA YUHAWWILUN BI-DHALIK BAYNAHUM WA BAYN QATLIHIM**, bar from God's way (TS,28:23-4 cf. Q58:14-20).

Al-Munafiqun had earned God's wrath (Q58:14). Why? Because, Tabari tells us again, though they took an oath that they were believers and among Muslims, they became friendly advisers to the Jews, the disbelievers, barring the application of God's decree that requires either to massacre or charge them jizya, and to slaughter the pagans -- **WA NUSHIHIM LI-ADAIHIM MIN AL-YAHUD... WA DHALIK ANNAHUM KAFARAH, WA HUKM ALLAH WA SABILUHU FI AHL AL-KUFR BIHI MIN AHL AL-KITAB AL-QATL AU AKHDH AL-JIZYAH WA FI ABADAT AL- AUTHAN AL-QATL. FA'L-MUNAFIQUN YASUDDUN AL-MUMININ AN SABIL ALLAH FIHIM BI-AYMANIHIM ANNAHUM MUMINUN WA ANNAHUM MINHUM, FA-YUAWWILUN BI-DHALIK BAYNAHUM WA BAYN QATLIHIM...** (T,28:24 cf. Q58:14-5).

Al-Munafiqun had inherited proto-democratic inclinations and belief in equal rights of members of a community from their pagan past.

Based on their understanding of limited jurisdictions of Islam, al-Munafiqun continued to think that as equals in the Medinan community they would have an equal role in the decision-making process concerning the whole community. For secular affairs they saw their new chief, Muhammad, as an Arab leader whose acts would follow a consensus of opinion. Al-Munafiqun rejected Muhammad's divine right to rule as the absolute and final authority - with veto power - in all human affairs. Absolute Divine right to leadership was alien to the Arabs. Al-Munafiqun's belief in the consultative process was further reinforced by the Prophet's adherence (as his Medinan career began) to the Arab democratic principle of SHURA, consultation to assure consensus and support of the people concerned before reaching an important socio-political decision. Very soon, however, the insistence of these problematic Muslims on protecting the integrity of the SHURA institution became another reason for labeling them "the Hypocrites." Their call for having a right to participate in decisions, as guaranteed by the unwritten Medinan-Arab constitution, was deemed hypocrisy.

The battle of Uhud (625 CE) was a flashpoint on this issue. To avenge their defeat at Badr (624 CE), the Meccans had marched against Medina. The Prophet called a general assembly of Medinans, apparently, excluding the Jews. Abd Allah b. Ubayy and other would-be dissenters, however, were present in this SHURA, consultative assembly. The Prophet opened the talk by saying: 'ASHIRU ALAYYA," Advise me (on how to face the situation)." [The verb ASHIRU "advise" comes from the root word SHURA "consultation, seeking advice etc."] The Prophet himself suggested a defensive strategy, namely, to remain within the strongly fortified city and defend it from within the settlements. An overwhelming majority, including Abd Allah b. Ubayy and other "Hypocrites," supported the idea enthusiastically (W:208-10; 1.1:371-2; also see Watt, Med:103-4). The majority considered it right and fit. During the meeting, however,

Some men whom God honored with martyrdom at Uhud and others who

were not present at Badr said, 'O apostle of God, lead us forth to our enemies, lest they think that we are too cowardly, and too weak to fight them.' Abd Allah (b. Ubayy) said, 'O apostle of God, stay in Medina, do not go out to them. We have never gone out to fight an enemy but we have met disaster, and none has come against us without being defeated, so leave them where they are. If they stay, they stay in an evil predicament, and if they come in, the men will fight them and the women and children will throw stones on them from the walls, and if they retreat, they will retreat low-spirited as they came.' Those who wanted to fight Quraysh kept urging the apostle until he went into his house and put on his armour... Meanwhile the people had repented of their design, saying they thought they had persuaded the apostle against his will, which they had no right to do, so that when he went out to them they admitted that and said that if he wished to remain inside the city they would not oppose him. The apostle said, 'It is not fitting that a prophet who has put on his armour should lay it aside until he has fought,' so he marched out with a thousand of his companions until when they reached as-Shaut between Medina and Uhud, Abd Allah b. Ubayy withdrew with a third of the men, saying, 'He has obeyed them and disobeyed me. We do not know why we should lose our lives here, O men.' So he returned with the waverers and doubters who followed him (1.1:372).

Also note that before the Prophet had left Medina

the Ansar (i.e., Medinan Muslims) said 'O apostle of God, should we not ask help from our allies, the Jews?' He said, 'We have no need of them' (ibid).

The battle of Uhud ended in a defeat for the Prophet. In al-Munafiqun's eyes Muhammad had acted arbitrarily and was responsible for the losses. They protested, "saying: Have we any part in the affairs?" -- **YAQULUN HAL LANA MIN AL- AMR SHAY?** (Q3:154 cf. TS,7:315-26). The Quran responded to this demand by terming it a Jahiliyyah mode of thought -- **ZANN AL-JAHILIYYAH** (ibid), which it was. The Almighty reminded them of Islam's limits put on the old Jahiliyya consultative system. The Prophet was no longer a mere first among equals with no veto power. He was asked by God to consult his followers on such occasions -- **WA SHAWIRHUM FI'L-AMR** (4:159). However, the purpose of such consultation, as Tabari tells us, is just to please them -- **TATYIB-AN MINHU BI-DHALIK ANFUSAHUM**, to harmonize them with their religion -- **WA TAALLUF-AN LAHUM ALADINIHM**, and to show (pretend to?) them that he (Muhammad) listens to them and seeks help from them -- **LI-YARAU ANNAHU YASMA MINHUM WA YASTAIN BIHM** (TS,7:343 cf. Q3:159). However, as Q4:150 concludes, "...When thou art resolved, put thy trust in God." That is, God tells Muhammad

that in all worldly and religious affairs, once he makes a determination approved by the Almighty, he must proceed with it as God commanded, regardless of his Companions' agreement or disagreement -- **FA IDHA SAHH AZMUK BI- TATHBITINA IYYAK... MIN AMR DINIK WA DUNYAK, F'AMD-I LI-MA AMARNAK BIHI ALA MA AMARNAK BIHI, WAFaq DHALIK ARA ASHABIK WA MA ASHARU BIHI ALAYK, AU KHALAFAHA** (TS,7:346 cf. Q3:159). The Quran and Sunnah override the decisions of even a **SHURA**. According to Tabari's frank explanations, God's command in Q3:159 to the Prophet to "take counsel with them in the affair" is advice to His Messenger just to adopt a tactical (if not disingenuous) attitude for show (TS,7:343-6). For us it simply means, given the circumstances in 625 CE and persisting Arab democratic traditions, the Prophet and the Almighty had to double- speak about the Arab principle of **SHURA**. The purpose was to make a mere show of **SHURA**, not necessarily to obey sincerely its logical consequences. God told the Prophet to make it clear that all decisions are made by Him through His Messenger --**QUL INN AL-AMR KULLUHU LI'LLAH** (Q3:154), not necessarily by the community at large. "The Hypocrites" who had expected to "have a say" in the affairs of the community, who criticized the Prophet's arbitrary decision and its tragic outcome, are rebuked and harshly criticized in the whole Quranic passage of 3:154- 180.

Al-Munafiqun's attitude toward hijra, and eventually toward jihad reflected their desire for peaceful coexistence between Muslims and non-Muslims; "the Hypocrites" loathed expansionism. Muslims find al-Munafiqun were condemned for these reasons. The duty of hijra enjoins that Muslims unable to transform a Dar al-Harb into a Dar al-Islam must segregate themselves from the heathen in such a land and then migrate to a Dar al-Islam and along with the Muslims of the Dar al-Islam fight the Dar al-Harb, even if it is their own homeland. If such a Dar al-Islam does not exist, Muslims are duty-bound to create one. Muslims must continue jihad until the whole world is transformed into a Dar al-Islam. After the Prophet established himself in Medina,

he and the Almighty rapidly articulated these two cardinal concepts, hijra and jihad, was a part of the faith. The spirit of hijra is the opposite of the idea of peaceful coexistence. And Islam's classical concept of jihad as it developed during the Prophet's Medinan career calls for perpetual, unprovoked aggression against followers of creeds other than Islam.

During the Prophet's lifetime some Muslims did not leave their homelands for Medina. Some of these were Meccans; others belonged to Bedouin tribes.²¹ These Muslims thought it was possible to maintain friendly and peaceful relations with their fellow-believers of Medina, as well as with their heathen fellow-citizens. They did not migrate to Medina; nor did they, in clashes between their homeland (a Dar al-Harb) and Medina (the Dar al-Islam), play fifth-columnists. Now, whatever our modernist appreciation for these pacifists par excellence and secular patriots of their time, Muhammad and the Quran condemned them and called their behavior NIFAQ. These nonconformists were condemnable "Hypocrites," Muslims are informed.

Islam exploded particularly against these "Hypocrites" during the battle of Badr. A few Muslims who had remained in Mecca after the Prophet's hijra to Medina accompanied their fellow-Meccans to defend a common interest - the Meccan caravan under attack by Muhammad's armed band. At Badr, when these Meccan Muslims saw their fellow-believers' attitude - which they thought was intransigent and irrational - they (the Meccan Muslims) remarked that their fellow-Muslims led by Muhammad were "deluded" by their new faith. It was their way to say that the Prophet and his Companions were fanatics. The failure of these Meccan Muslims to migrate to Medina, their refusal to act as saboteurs in their own society, and, above all, their civic solidarity with their fellow-citizens defending a common trade caravan against the invading Dar al-Islam were harshly criticized by the Quran. The Quran tells Muslims that these nonconformist Muslims who refused to act as fifth columnists for Islam will be punished harshly after death.²²

This Quranic passage refers to Muslims in Mecca whose faith in Islam, Tabari tells us, was not strong enough to leave the heathen land for Medina (T,10:21). It is implied that these Meccan Muslims should have collaborated with Medinan Muslims against their own state: Mecca. Q29:10-13, cf. TB,20:82-6 also condemn these Meccan Muslims for not migrating to Medina, and for being on the side of their fellow Meccans at Badr against Muslims.

Like these Meccan Muslims, some Bedouins also did not follow the Prophet in his hijra to Medina -- **TAKHALLAFU AN RASUL ALLAH WA LAM YUHAJIRU** (TS,9:12). The Quran indicates they wanted to make war neither on Medina nor on their own people (Q4:90; TS,9:23-6). The Quran ridiculed their desire to keep peace with both sides, protecting their fellow-believers of Medina as well as their heathen fellow-citizens -- **YURIDUN AN YAMNAUKUM WA YAMNAU QAUMAHUM** (Q4:91 cf. TS,9:26-8). Though they had adopted Islam, they preferred peaceful coexistence with their non-Muslim people. This was wrong, the Quran and Tradition tell the believers, because during the Prophet's time it was a duty to leave all non-Muslim lands for his domain and city -- **LI-ANN AL-HIJRAT KANAT ALA AHD RASUL ALLAH ILA DARIHI WA MADINATIHI MIN SAIR DAR AL-KUFR** (TS,9:14 cf. Q4:88-90). Muslim citizens of Medina, some of whom apparently sympathized with these fellow-believers, were warned against such tender-heartedness regarding those who had failed to shun their heathen people. Eventually, the Quran warned against these waverers.²³ In Tabari's words, Muslims must treat "these Hypocrites" as the Quran enjoins

unless they leave non-Muslim lands, separate from their people and join Muslims in the Dar al-Islam -- **HATTA YAKHRUJU MIN DAR ASH-SHIRK WA YUFARIQU AHLAHA... ILA DAR AL-ISLAM WA AHLIHA** (TS,9:17)... If these Hypocrites refuse to acknowledge God and His Messenger and turn away from hijrah from the domain of polytheism to the domain of Islam and (thus) from disbelief to Islam, Muslims, as the Quran says, must kill them wherever they find them (TS,9:18).

Tabari also reminds us that by Q9:1-6 God abrogated the four verses (Q4:89-90 and Q60:89), to the extent these verses suggest a softer

treatment of those who did not migrate to Medina and maintain a neutral policy between Muslims and non-Muslims -- **FA-NASAKH HAULAI'L-AYAT AL-ARBAAH BARAAT-UN...** (TS,12:25). According to God's final verdict, these nonconformists had only two choices: 1) migrate to the domain of Islam, join Muslims and fight non-Muslims, or 2) be killed by true Muslims.

Al-Munafiqun's pacifism, their tepidness toward Jihad , their lack of enthusiasm to contribute financially to Jihad campaigns, and their occasional interventions in favor of Jihad 's victims are, in the Muslim mind, the worst crimes of these "Hypocrites." As evidence of al-Munafiqun's wretchedness, Muslims are told that from the time of Muhammad's early raids against Meccan caravans to the declaration of war against Byzantium, all of the Prophet's confrontations against non-Muslims were questioned by al-Munafiqun. In modern times, such acts might earn peace prizes. For a Muslim these very 'peace-mongering,' "crying for peace" (Q47:35), qualified al-Munafiqun for Hell. Those who cried, "Our Lord, why hast thou prescribed fighting for us?" stand condemned by the Quran (4:77). For their pacifism al-Munafiqun were called, in a sexist slur, **KHAWALIF**, "spineless, like women" (Q9:83,87,93). What we call jingoism becomes an ideal mode of behavior for a believer. Al-Munafiqun's love for life was taunted as their **HADHAR AL-MAUT**, fear of death (Q2:19).

When the Prophet insisted on fighting the battle of Uhud as he wanted, Abd Allah b. Ubayy exclaimed, "O people, by God, we do not understand why should we get ourselves killed here -- **W'ALLAH MA NADRI ALA-MA NAQTUL ANFUSANA HA-HUNA, AYYUHANNAS** (TS,7:379 cf. Q3:167-8). Abd Allah, perhaps, realized there was a difference between his concept of civil defense and Muhammad's emerging ideology of holy war, Jihad . It was also on this occasion Abd Allah wished Muslims to renounce Jihad -- **LAU ATAUNA FI TARK AL-JIHAD** (ibid:382 cf. Q3:168). With respect to al-Munafiqun's conduct during Uhud and its immediate aftermath, Muslims find God responded in detail, 'promising' them "mighty chastisement."

Participation in jihad is God's way, Muslims are told, to "distinguish the corrupt from the good" and the "niggardly" from those who will be "living with their Lord" if martyred while fighting "in the way of God" (and who will have "blessing and bounty from God" here and hereafter). Muslims are told not to 'grieve' about the "wretched" conduct of al-Munafiqun concerning jihad, i.e., disregard them disdainfully.²⁴

What Ibn Ishaq and al-Waqidi tell us of Hatib b. Umayya, a "hypocrite" -- **WA KAN MUNAFIQ-AN** -- indicates, among other things, al-Munafiqun's disbelief in Muhammad's much-emphasized concept of reward and punishment after death. Hatib's son Yazid, a true believer, participated in the battle of Uhud. Yazid,

grievously wounded at Uhud, was brought to his people's settlement at the point of death. His Kinsmen gathered round, and the men and women began to say to him, 'Good news of the garden (of Paradise), O son of Hatib.' Now Hatib was an old man who had lived long in the heathen period and his hypocrisy appeared then, for he said 'What good news you give him? Of a garden of rue?25 By God, you have robbed this man of his life by your deception and brought great sorrow on me (1.1:383; W:263).

Ar-Raji was another tragic occasion when some Muslims died in a confrontation with non-Muslims. Instead of appreciating them as martyrs to be rewarded by God, al-Munafiqun remarked

YA WAYH-A HAULA AL-MAFTUNIN ALLADHIN HALAKU HAKADHA -- "Woe to these lunatics who died like this" (TS,4:230).

Al-Munafiqun had accompanied the Prophet during his Hodaybiyah adventure. The Meccans, uncertain of the Prophet's intentions, blocked the Muslims' way to Mecca. Exceptionally, they permitted Abd Allah b. Ubayy to enter Mecca for pilgrimage. Thus Mecca rewarded Abd Allah for seeking peace between the two cities. Abd Allah, however, refused, and thus proved his civic solidarity with fellow Medinans. Within the Prophet's camp, al-Munafiqun (as usual) expressed their misgivings about such adventures, and taunted the believers who thought Muhammad could perform miracles. To the believers, al-Munafiqun's behavior was enigmatic. A perplexed Muslim asked al-Jadd

b. Qays, a Munafiq, "Then, why did you come?" Al-Jadd said, "I came with my people." The Muslim asked, "Did you not even intend to perform pilgrimage (according to Islamic rituals)?" . Al-Jadd said, "No, by God" (W:590 passim). For al-Munafiqun their solidarity with fellow Medinan Muslims was a simple civic, patriotic act. They did not think religion had to do anything with it.

Al-Munafiqun had maintained their former pagan rationalism. They did not believe in the intervention of supernatural powers in human affairs. As evidence of al-Munafiqun's wretchedness, Muslims are told, they expressed their disbelief, on various occasions in the Prophet's miraculous performances and in his foretellings of Islam's victory over the world. During the Battle of the Trench (627 CE), the Prophet had decided to defend Medina by digging a moat around the city. During this operation the Prophet's spade struck a rock, striking sparks. The Prophet claimed he could literally see clearly in these sparks palaces and cities of Yaman, Iran and Byzantium, and Gabriel was telling him Muslims were destined to capture them. The believers who heard the Prophet talking of his miraculous sight believed and rejoiced in the good news (TB,21:86 passim cf. Q33:12). For al-Munafiqun, however, it was nonsense.

...the Hypocrites, and those in whose hearts is sickness, said, 'God and His Messenger promised us only delusion' (Q33:12).

During the siege, life became difficult in Medina. Muattib b. Qushayr, a Munafiq jibed:

Muhammad was promising us possession of treasures of the emperors of Iran and Rome - while none of us could even leave (the town) to answer a call of nature (TB,21:83).

They further said to others:

Are not you astonished (by this man) who talks to you temptingly and promises you nonsense, telling you that he can see from Medina palaces of Hira and cities of the Iranian emperor, and that these will be conquered for you? (ibid:86).

Similarly, on the occasion of Tabuk, when the Prophet talked as though he could perform miracles and know hidden things, al-Julas b. Suwayd, another outspoken "Hypocrite," remarked, "If what (Revelation) Muhammad has received (confirming his claims) or if what Muhammad says is true, we are worse than asses" -- **IN KAN MA JAA BIHI MUHAMMAD HAQQ-AN, LA-NAHN ASHARR MIN AL-HAMIR** (T,10:185-6). Explaining away al-Munafiqun's rationalistic bases for such an attitude, the Quran tells believers that they were uttering "words of disbelief," **KALIMAT AL-KUFR**, blasphemy (Q9:74)..pa

The Treatment

We have argued that on separation of religion from Tstate and day-to-day social affairs, on religious tolerance and pluralism, on respect for basic human rights and inter-group/international undertakings, on participatory management and government of a given socio- political unit, on peaceful coexistence and non-aggression etc., and on some metaphysical issues, al-Munafiquns' approaches were quite similar, in general, to modern liberal secular rationalistic humanistic tendencies and, in particular, to the aspirations of those 'Muslims' who want to practice modernism without dissociating from Islam. We may expect the believers likening such modern tendencies with those of al-Munafiqun to treat such nonconformist 'Muslims' as the Quran and the Prophet treated "the Hypocrites."

In principle, the Quran decreed that al-Munafiqun must be killed wherever they are found (Q4:89-91 as adjusted by Q9:1-28). Muslims must not befriend "the Hypocrites' (ibid). Al-Munafiqun are to be considered wretched. The Quran and the Prophet's Sunnah tell the believers to treat al-Munafiqun with harsh language and physical punishment. They were to be terrorized, starved, disgraced and economically harmed. The Prophet's Sunnah authorizes the believers to use all means to humiliate and character-assassinate "the Hypocrites" - to make life a hell for them. A "Hypocrite" is not to be forgiven even after death.

Commenting on Q4:89-91 passage, Tabari maintains these Hypocrites

had apostatized -- **IRTADDU**. God treated them as pagans, enjoining Muslims to kill them and enslave their women and children -- **ALLAH RADDAHUM ILA AHKAM AHL ASH-SHIRK FI IBAHAT DIMAIHIM WA SABY DHARARIHIM** (TS,9:7 cf. Q4:88-9). God told the Prophet to "do Jihad against the disbelievers and the Hypocrites and be harsh with them" (Q9:73; Q66:9). On Q9:73, Tabari starts his commentary by asserting that here God commanded the Prophet to fight the heathen as well as the Hypocrites "with sword and weapons" -- **YA AYYUHA'N-NABIY, JAHID AL- KUFFAR BI'S-SAYF WA'S-SILAH WA'L-MUNAFIQIN** (T, 10:183).

Tabari mentions the controversy about the kind of Jihad against "the Hypocrites". According to some Traditions, Tabari says, God ordered the Prophet to fight the Hypocrites physically, verbally, and by all means possible. In this context he quotes the famous Companion, Ibn Masud's report, according to which the verse meant:

A believer is enjoined to fight the heathens as well as "the hypocrites", first, with his hand; if he could not do so then with his tongue; if he could not do so, then with his heart; if he could not do so then he must become sad (for his inability to act against al-Munafiqun) -- **BI- YADIHI, FA-IN LAM YASTATI FA-BI-LISANIHI, FA-IN LAM YASTATI FA-BI-QALBIHI, FA-IN LAM YASTATI FA'L-YAKFAHARR FI WAJHIHI** (T,10:183-4).

According to this interpretation, Jihad "with the hand," i.e., physical attack on the Hypocrites, is the most ideal form of recommended Jihad . According to a series of other tradition reports, the verse has asked for " Jihad with sword" against the heathens and " Jihad with tongue", and "unfriendliness" against "the hypocrites" (ibid). "God commanded his Prophet to fight the heathens with the sword and be harsh against the hypocrites in applying corporal punishments - **WA YAGHLUZ ALA'L-MUNAFIQIN FI'L-HUDUD** (T,10:184). Surprisingly, just before and after his legalistic explanation, Tabari gives his own verdict about these controversial Traditions:

In my opinion the first of the reports, that of Ibn Masud is correct: that is, God commanded his Prophet to do Jihad against the Hypocrites the way He has commanded Jihad against the pagans... And God's saying, "and be thou harsh with them" means 'exert pressure on them through Jihad and qital (fighting to kill)

and by terrorization -- **WA'SHDUD ALAYHIM BI'L-JIHAD WA'L-QITAL WA'L-IRAB** (T,10:184).

Q9:74 tells Muslims that "God will afflict (al-Munafiqun) with a painful doom in this world and the Hereafter...". The painful doom or chastisement in this world, Tabari adds, is either by slaying them or by disgracing (character- assassinating?) them, -- **IMMA BI'L-QATL WA IMMA BI-AJIL KHIZY-IN LAHUM FIHA** (T,10:187). Obviously, this comes about through the believers. God said He will chastise al-Munafiqun "twice" before "returning" them to the mighty chastisement of the Last Day" (Q9:101). The double chastisement of the Hypocrites refers to their punishment in this world and in the grave - (before the Resurrection -- **AL BATH**, for the Last Day) (T,11:9). As one example of punishment on earth, Tabari mentions the Prophet's expulsion of the Hypocrites from his mosque, once, openly rebuking and humiliating them (T,11:10). Other Tradition reports explain the "twice this-worldly punishment," maintaining it happens by "starving and assassinating, or by terrorizing and assassinating" the hypocrites -- **BI'L-JU WA'L-QATL,... BI'L-KHAUF WA'L-QATL** (T,11:10). Another series of Tradition explains the worldly punishment of the Munafiqun as they lose property and children, or suffer from their tragedies. Their material loss may happen by charging Islamic tax, **ZAKAT**, on their property (T,11:11). Notice that though **ZAKAT** is to be paid only by true Muslims, believers should charge **ZAKAT** to al-Munafiqun not as recognition of their Islam but as extortion, aimed at hurting these "enemies of God" financially.²⁶ Tabari tells readers that all these explanations of Q9:101 are acceptable (T,11:11-2). Explaining "O Prophet, do Jihad against the disbelievers and the hypocrites, and be stern with them" (Q66:9), Tabari says God commanded his Prophet to do Jihad "with sword" against the heathen, and be stern with al- Munafiqun by applying corporal punishment to them -- **...AN YUJAHID AL-KUFFAR BI'S-SAYF WA YAGHLUZ ALA'L-MUNAFIQIN BI'L-HUDUD** (T,28:169).

The convolutions in Tabari's (and other Traditional exegetes')

explanations of clear Quranic verdicts in Q4:76,89-9; Q9:73-4, 101 and Q66:9 about the treatment of al-Munafiqun stem from his (and the Muslim) awareness of the inconvenient fact that almost all of the known "Hypocrites" escaped death, Islam's punishment for apostasy prescribed clearly for al-Munafiqun. **QATL**, "killing" and **QITAL**, "fighting to kill," the ultimate form of jihad as laid down by the Quran, did not materialize against al-Munafiqun during the Prophet's lifetime. Except on a few occasions when some al-Munafiqun were physically mishandled and slightly mauled, even the application of **HUDUD**, corporal punishment, with or without **GHILZAH**, harshness, on al-Munafiqun did not ensue. With this in mind, Tabari himself asks

In spite of their disbelief, then, why did the Prophet let "the Hypocrites" live among his Companions? (T,10:184).

Tabari answers as follows: Though God, Muhammad and the believers knew well that the Munafiqun were disbelievers and committed acts for which they would "pay" in the afterlife, because of their verbal claim to be Muslims and verbal denial of allegations they had immunity of life and property (ibid). Tabari legalistically explains in his commentaries on Q2:8-10 and Q4:142 passim:

Because (al-Munafiqun) told the Messenger of God and the believers verbally that they acknowledged him (as the Messenger of God) and believed in God and in the Last Day, they were treated in this mundane, temporal world - in matters of matrimony and inheritance - as Muslims, sparing their blood and property, and their children (and women) from enslavement -- **BI-MA AZHARU BI-ALSINATIHI**
LI-RASUL ALLAH MIN AL-IQRAR BIHI WA QAULIHIM LAHU WA LI'L-MUMININ:
AMANNA BI'LLAH... YAUMI'L-AKHIR, HATTA HUKIM LAHUM BI-DHALIK FI
AJIL AD-DUNYA BI-HUKM AL-MUSLIMIN: FI HAQN AD-DIMA WA'L-AMWAL,
WA'L-AMN ALA'DH-DHURRIYYAT MIN AS-SIBA, WA FI'L-MUNAKAHAT
WA'L-MUARITHAT (TS,1:325-6 cf. Q2:17).

Tabari, however, repeatedly tells the believers that the Hypocrites' confession of faith, their participation in Islamic prayers and their denial of reports about their un-Islamic deeds aimed to escape sure death and enslavement (of their women and children) at the hands of the Prophet and his companions -- **HADHAR AL-QATL ALA ANFUSIHIM WA'S-SIBA MIN**
RASUL ALLAH WA ASHABIHI (TS,1:271 cf. 2:8; also see TS,9:329-31 cf.

Q4:142). Tabari also tells the believers that al-Munafiqun kept their "reversion to jahiliyya," "their animosity to the Prophet," their "tilting towards the Jews" and their "evil perception of Islam" secret, never expressing them openly -- **FI KHIFA-IN GHAYR JIHAR** -- because of their fear that otherwise the Prophet would slay them and enslave their women and children.

So, fearing for their lives, when they met the Messenger of God and the believers among his Companions, they said to them: 'We believe in God and His Messenger and in Resurrection (Day).' So (in this way) they told them (Muhammad and his companions) the True Word in order to ward off the application of God's decree to them... (TS,1:270 cf. Q2:8).

This is half of the truth at most, though Tabari in principle does not reject the possibility of application of QATL (slaying), QITAL (fighting to kill), taking GHANIMAH (confiscation of non-Muslim property) and of SIBA (enslavement of non-Muslim women and children) to "the Hypocrites." Our sources, including Tabari, report that the Prophet spared al-Munafiqun because he could not do otherwise. In his confrontations with Medinan al-Munafiqun the Prophet faced circumstances similar to those he met in Mecca before the hijrah. In his treatment of al-Munafiqun, Muhammad had similar considerations in mind that convinced him to treat the Meccans, after the conquest, and most of the Arabs, differently - compared to his treatment of the Jews and Christians.

Most of the Medinan al-Munafiqun belonged to the great tribes of Khazraj and Aus, Muhammad's power base. As an Arab, Muhammad knew that strong tribal links and concerns governed relations between individuals of a certain tribe or confederation, regardless of differing creeds. Although most of the Aus and Khazraj eventually became true believers obeying Muhammad unconditionally, as Arabs it would have been extremely difficult for them not to avenge the death of a clan, or family-member caused by an outsider. Such an inaction would have damaged their image throughout Arabia. As we shall see, Medinan Muslims expressed these concerns openly. Medinan and other al-Munafiqun were not as rich as

Medinan and Khaybarian Jews, nor were their women as conspicuously elegant and beautiful as Jewesses - reasons which would have provided strong incentives for open Jihad against them. But actual restraint was caused by what the Quran calls (in a similar context) **HAMIYYAT AL-JAHILIYYAH**, pagan Arab bias. On the basis of civilized Arab traditions, for a member of the **QAYLAH** (Aus plus Khazraj) confederation it would be almost impossible to take as spoils the property of another, to enslave his children, or to enslave and use his women as concubines -- **MA MALAKAT AYMANUKUM**. Although the Quran continuously indoctrinated and brainwashed believers to shun such **HAMIYYAT AL-JAHILIYYAH**, the Prophet knew his Medinan followers had not lost their tribal loyalties to the extent some of them had in confrontations with the Jews, and their treatment of figures like Abu Afak, and Asma, daughter of Marwan, who belonged to lesser, powerless clans. Qayla tribal solidarity in particular, and Arab tribal traditions in general, were too strong for Muhammad to challenge frontally.

Besides, as the overall difference between Muhammad's treatment of Arab foes and that of non-Arab adversaries indicates, he himself thought and felt as a typical Arab. Once Muhammad gained supremacy in Mecca, he treated fallen adversaries as a Quraysh gentleman was expected to treat other Quraysh - generously. His treatment of the Hawazin confederation was harsher than the one awarded to the Meccans. (After all, the Hawazin were not Quraysh.) But Muhammad never showed the mercy, forgiveness, and politeness to the Jews he eventually showed to the Hawazin and other Arab tribes. Unlike other Arabs, the Jews were less likely to jump on the bandwagon of Islam.

There was something more. On moral, political and legalistic grounds al-Munafiqun's arguments and protests impressed even the true believers among the Helpers. For this reason, sometimes, al-Munafiqun gained support from the Muslim community, including some heretofore known as strong supporters of Muhammad. Even after the events of Banu Mustaliq/al-Muraysi (discussed below) that resulted in the loss of Abd

Allah's influence, Medinan Muslims defended al-Munafiqun against fellow-believers. On the occasion of AL-IFK, the scandal about the Prophet's wife (Aisha), when Sad b. Muadh, an Ausite chief, referring to Abd Allah b. Ubayy and other al-Munafiqun, suggested to the Prophet he order them killed, Sad b. Ubadah, a famous Khazraj Muslim, stood up and said:

'By Allah, you lie. They shall not be beheaded. You would not have said this had you not known that they were of Khazraj. Had they been your own people you would not have said it'... Feeling ran so high that there was a lot of fighting between these two clans of Aus and Khazraj (1.1:496; also see W:431-2).

Both Aus and Khazraj believers protected their al-Munafiqun.

Regarding the Prophet's Nakhla expedition, al-Munafiqun led the protest against his violation of the Sacred Truce Months. Their forceful argument brought Medina to a boil -- **AL-MADINAT TAFUR FAUR AL-MIRJAL** (W:16). Many sincere Muslims became disillusioned with the Prophet. Similarly, al-Munafiqun's charge that the Prophet was violating solemn pacts and undertakings in his treatment of the Jews, particularly Banu Qurayza, earned them growing support from Ausite and Khazrajite Muslims. Our sources make clear that by the time of Tabuk the increasing al-Munafiqun and their sympathizers were a major problem for to the Prophet. The clash between the Emigrant and Helper Muslims at al-Muraysi indicated that many sincere Medinan Muslims, Helpers, were impressed by Abd Allah b. Ubayy's protests against what he saw as an unfair domination of Medinan affairs by Muhammad and his Meccan Emigrant companions. Those Prominent Helpers who after the conquest of Mecca and Hawazin openly grumbled against (what they thought was) Muhammad's unfair bent towards his fellow-Meccans (1.1:596-7), must have remembered appreciatively the Medinan "Hypocrites'" concerns for native Medinan rights against the colonialistic intrusion of the Muhajirs, Meccan refugees in Medina.

Medinan images of al-Munafiqun as moral and popular also embarrassed the Prophet. Al-Jadd b. Qays's refusal to join the Tabuk

expedition despite the Prophet's dangling before his eyes the "beautiful Roman girls" (that al-Jadd might capture as part of the spoils), shows two things: 1) al-Jadd was disinterested in jihad; 2) this "enemy of God," "the Hypocrite," must have thought about the impropriety of capturing others' women for sexual gratification, though Muhammad's creed authorized this. On the basis of this jahiliyya morality, al-Munafiqun censured (T,22:45 cf. Q33:57) adoption of the captive Jewish Safiyah as concubine -- MA MALAKAT AYMAN -- just after torturing to death her husband and loved ones at Khaybar (W:708 passim). Of course, al-Munafiqun exploited such occasions for political purposes, but in any case it showed their dislike of such practices. The Quran, as in the case of the Prophet's marriage with Zaynab, intervened particularly when some of the Prophet's actions were unpopular. Significantly, Islamic sources seldom blame al-Munafiqun for any moral weakness in their social and business transactions. Had al-Munafiqun had such flaws our sources would have mentioned them prominently. The one report about Meccan Abu Jahl's alleged delinquency in repaying a certain debt to a Bedouin is mentioned with glee.

Our sources frankly record Abd Allah b. Ubayy's popularity among Medinans. Though a Khazrajite, he was equally respected and trusted by the Aus and Medinan Jews. Before their conversion to Islam, the Aus and Khazraj decided to appoint him as the "king" of Medina (T,28:116). Ibn Ubayy was also respected by Meccans. Given the background of rivalries and wars between the two tribes, it was a signal appreciation of Abd Allah's trustworthiness as a fair leader interested in maintaining peace between various Medinan groups and between Medina and Mecca. And even after his death, Abd Allah's popularity among Medinans was so great that the Prophet had to pretend kindness to him in order to win over his supporters.

Among his people, Abd Allah (was considered to be) a great exalted nobleman -- KAN ABD ALLAH FI QAUMIHI SHARIF-AN AZIM-AN (T,28:116).

Even after the tensions between Abd Allah and Muhammad became obvious, influential and sincere Medinan Muslims defended him in meetings with the Prophet. On one such occasion, responsible Medinan Muslims, in front of the Prophet, lambasted a Medinan lad, Zayd b. Arqam, who informed Muhammad of Abd Allah's opposition. When Zayd told the Prophet of Abd Allah's anti-Muhammad utterings, these Medinan Muslims said to Zayd:

Shame on you, by talking like this about the noble of your people. You ascribe to him things which he did not say; you commit transgressions and violate (clan-family) solidarity -- **AMADTA ILA SAYYID QAUMIK; TAQUL ALAYH MA LAM YAQUL WA QAD ZALAMTA WA QATATA'R-RAHIM** (W:417).

When Abd Allah died - though politically defeated -- the gathering at his burial was emotional and tumultuous. Many Medinans openly cried for him and remembered him openly as "a man who was kind and benevolent to the needy and poor" -- **QAUM-UN AHL FAQR, WA KAN YUHSIN ILAYHIM** (W:1060 passim). The Prophet knew all these things. From the beginning of his Medinan career, Medinan Muslims constantly reminded Muhammad of the difficult situation that might follow from attacking al-Munafiqun frontally. Of Abd Allah b. Ubayy, the Khazraj and Aus Muslim told the Prophet:

O Messenger of God, deal gently with him. By God, God brought you at a time when his people were putting together pearls to crown him. Now he feels that you have deprived him of his kingdom -- **YA RASUL ALLAH URFUQ BIHI, FA-WA'LLAH LAQAD JAA BIK WA INN QAUMUHU LA-YUNZZIMUN AL- KHARAZ LI-YUTAWWIJUH, FA-INNAHU LA-YARA ANNAK QAD ISTALABTAHU MULK-AN** (T,28:116).

When Umar asked Muhammad to give him permission to kill Abd Allah - or ask some Medinan Muslims to do it, the Prophet remarked frankly

(No); this will cause many noses in Medina to tremble for him (i.e., many people of Medina will be appalled by such an action, causing an upheaval) - **IDHA-AN TARAD LAHU ANUF-UN KATHIRAT BI-YATHRIB** -- (T,28:114; parentheses added).

Recognizing the fact that others considered Abd Allah a Muslim Companion, the Prophet also said that he did not want to be seen as one

who kills his own companions -- **WA'LLAH LA YATAHADDATH AN-NAS ANN MUHAMMAD YAQTUAL ASHABAHU (ibid)**. Obviously the Prophet refrained more in fear of the dangerous consequences of such an action than of any ethical and moral concerns. As Muhammad confided later, he preferred character assassination to an abortive assassination attempt.

In its defamation of al-Munafiqun, Islam adopted its model of the Meccan period against the pagans. The Quran and the Prophet used strong language to demoralize these opponents. The Prophet also used sabotage tactics, threats and underhanded methods to render them ineffective. Although most of the al-Munafiqun had lost faith in the authenticity of the Medinan Quran, the Muslim community at large believed in the Quran as the Word of God. When embarrassed or cornered by al-Munafiqun's opposition the Prophet as usual waited for Divine intervention, i.e., revelation of new Quranic passages. Gratifyingly, the Almighty always responded in favor of His Messenger. Given the strong pressure of the organized community of believers, al-Munafiqun could not openly challenge the Divine authenticity of these Revelations. (Here, we are not concerned with soci-political-psychological factors that enhanced conformity to Islam.) Many of al-Munafiqun's close relatives were among the true believers, who were embarrassed to see their relatives being directly defamed by the Almighty. As in any pre-modern society, it was a point of prestige for Muslim Aus and Khazraj. They wanted to see their al-Munafiqun escape Divine criticism by conforming to Muhammad. Al-Munafiqun themselves felt the growing pressure of the Quran's direct intervention. Strong believers, friends and foes alike, used to warn al-Munafiqun that the Almighty constantly watched their nonconformism. That the Quran would intervene was a nightmare for al-Munafiqun. The Almighty and His Messenger pressed this weak point of the Hypocrites truthlessly. God Himself rejoiced in the effectiveness of this Divine terrorization.²⁷

So, as in Mecca against pagans, the 'biting tongue' of the Medinan Quran - augmented by those of the Prophet and the believers - was the

main tool against al- Munafiqun. In its "cold war" propaganda the Quran was relentless. The Quran said al-Munafiqun were not believers, regardless of their claim to believe in God, the Messenger and the Last Day (Q2:8). They deceived God (Q2:9). In their heart was sickness (Q2:10). Regardless of their intentions, their effort to maintain peaceful relations with non-Muslims was "corruption on the earth"; they were "idiots" (Q2:11-3). "God mocks them, leaving them [to] wander blindly in their contumacy" (Q2:15). They were deaf, dumb and blind (Q2:18). Muslims were told these nonconformists were the worst enemy (Q2:204); "Hell, an evil resting place, will settle their account" (Q2:206). Satan had seduced them (Q9:25) and caused them to backslide (from jihad) (Q3:155). They were Satan's friends (Q3:175), wicked and unclean (Q3:179). "God will gather Hypocrites and (other) non-Muslims, all together into Hell" (Q4:140). "Their works have failed, and they have become losers" (Q5:53), i.e. they will not receive any reward for their partial Islam and for whatever good intentions they harbor and good works they do. They vexed and opposed the Prophet (Q9:61-3). They were guilty; God had "shunned" these "transgressors" (Q9:66-7). They were unwholesome, RIJS - they stank. God will never be pleased with them (Q9:96). They have declared war against God and His Messenger (Q9:108). "God has cursed them and has made ready for them Hell" (Q48:6). They are evil-livers (Q57:16). Talking aloud about al-Munafiqun, the Almighty told His Messenger (and the world)

When thou seest them, their bodies please thee; but when they speak, thou listenest to their speech, and it is as if they were propped-up timbers. They think every cry is against them. They are the enemy; so beware of them. God assail them! How they are perverted! And when it is said to them, 'Come now, and God's Messenger will ask forgiveness for you,' they twist their heads, and thou seest them turning their faces away, waxing proud. Equal it is for them, whether thou askest forgiveness for them or thou askest not forgiveness for them; God will never forgive them. God guides not the people of the ungodly. Those are they that say, 'Do not expend on them that are with God's Messenger until they scatter off'; yet unto God belong the treasures of the heavens and of the earth, but the hypocrites do not understand. They say, 'If we return to the City, the mightier ones of it will expel the more abased'; yet glory belongs unto God, and unto His Messenger and the believers, but the hypocrites do not know it (Q63:407).

These are only a few examples; in most cases these themes were repeated in various Quranic passages.

Two other Meccan Quranic/Islamic methods were used against al-Munafiqun. Believers were told 1) al-Munafiqun were predestined to be wretched. 2) Muslims were told to practice mini-hijra from al-Munafiqun's company. After al-Munafiqun's intransigence became obvious and persistent, the Prophet's many contemporary followers had the same question Tabari raised: Why did the Prophet and God not act tangibly to punish them? At a time when al-Munafiqun refused to reform and Muhammad was unable to eliminate them, the Almighty explained His inaction in this world by telling the believers He had "put seals on their hearts" making them unable to understand and follow Muhammad (Q9:87, 93). That these al-Munafiqun continue to prosper and are untouched by calamities is according to God's own plan. God, intentionally, "gives them rein so that they may grow in sinfulness," preparing them for "a shameful doom." God's purpose is to "separate the wicked from the good." This explanation was accompanied by God's reassurance that He would not leave the believers in their "present state" of helplessness concerning al-Munafiqun (see Q3:178-80).

Apparently, al-Munafiqun's criticism was convincing. The true believers were unable to rationalize normally and logically the Prophet's position in controversies between him and al-Munafiqun. To protect the true believers from jahiliyyah, intellectual pollution, the Quran repeated its Meccan mini-hijra segregationist policy of I'RAD, keeping away from the "polluted, untouchables" -- RIJS (Q9:95; also see Q4:63, 81, 140; Q33:1). Believers were told to disdain al-Munafiqun -- ARIDU, and "not to sit with them" -- LA TAQUDU MAAHUM (Q4:140; ibid). Lest we misunderstand, Tabari reminds us that these Quranic decrees suggesting an isolationist, scornful, segregationist attitude short of physical violence were temporary. As in the case of apparently 'soft verses' concerning the People of the Book and the pagans, restraint from violence against al-Munafiqun was eventually abrogated. About Q4:80,

which asked the Prophet to "turn away" from "the Hypocrites," Tabari tells believers it belonged to the period before jihad was enjoined; "after that He (God) sent commandment to do jihad against them (i.e. the Hypocrites) and adopt a harsh attitude towards them until they become Muslims" (TS,8:562).

Islamic forms of this divinely recommended harshness were demonstrated by the Prophet's handling of Abd Allah b. Ubayy and some other "hypocrites." Thus, the Prophet left a perfect model (Sunnah) for believers in dealing with nonconformists 'by other means' who cannot be eliminated immediately by force.

Particularly after Badr (624 CE), Abd Allah b. Ubayy emerged as the most prominent nonconformist Muslim oppositionist, a "Hypocrite." He was too influential and popular to be eliminated the way Kab b. al-Ashraf, Abu Afak, Asma, the daughter of Marwan, and others had been. By the time of the Expedition of al-Muraysi against Banu Mustaliq (627 CE), Abd Allah had apparently gained the sympathy of most of Medinan Muslims. The Prophet was alarmed. With the help of the Almighty, Muhammad confronted Abd Allah with special methods, rendering him ineffective as a leader. Though a broken man, Abd Allah had yet to be dealt with carefully. The Prophet showed the way to deal with such problematic but influential nonconformists. The Prophet's raid of **AL-MURAYSI**' against Banu Mustaliq (), rich nomadic pagan Arabs, provided Abd Allah b. Ubayy with a chance to demonstrate his utmost influence on the Helpers, endangering the position of the Prophet and his Meccan followers (the Emigrants) in Medina. The same expedition, however, ended with the beginning of Ibn Ubayy's disgrace and loss of prestige in his own city.²⁸

That Abd Allah b. Ubayy and other al-Munafiqun participated in the Prophet's raids was not unusual. This time, however, they accompanied the Prophet in greater numbers than usual (W:405). Al-Waqidi tells us they did this for material gain (ibid). Some al-Munafiqun frankly admitted they participated in these jihads for

mundane purposes -- **ARAD AD-DUNYA** (W:424). Note that it was a common interest for all, including the believers. The Prophet himself mentioned material gain to persuade al-Munafiqun to participation in his expeditions. Islam had legitimized booty. Besides, according to the peninsular tribal divisions, Banu al-Mustaliq were not closely linked to Medina. It is also possible that al-Munafiqun's greater participation in the al-Muraysi raid was caused by the Quran's pressure; the Quran had constantly attacked al-Munafiqun for their lack of enthusiasm for jihad.

Although some other tribes had united with the Banu Mustaliq to fight the Muslims, the Prophet's terror techniques won the day. This expedition also exposed existing tensions between the Helpers (Medinan Muslims) and the Emigrants (mostly Meccan Muslims in Medina). During the operations against Banu Mustaliq, Hisham b. Subaba, an Emigrant Muslim, was killed in error by a Helper closely related to Ubadah b. as-Samit, a prominent native Medinan Muslim. The Helper mistook Hisham, our sources maintain, for a Banu Mustaliq enemy. The Prophet told the Helpers to pay the bloodwit, which they did (1.1:492, 550). The killing of a Meccan Muslim by a Medinan at al-Muraysi, though our sources tell us it was an accident, must have created more tension between the Emigrants and the Helpers.

The raid was over and the booty distributed but the march back to Medina had not yet started. Apparently a trivial quarrel between Jahjah of the Emigrant camp and a certain Sinan, (an ally of the Khazraj Helpers), took place. Drawing water from the well, Jahjah and Sinan confused their buckets and fell to fighting. The ropes had entangled. The first bucket which came out of the well was claimed by Jahjah though it belonged to Sinan -- **WA HIA DALV SINAN** (W:415). Jahjah was wrong. Al-Waqidi's description also indicates it was Jahjah the Emigrant who first attacked Sinan, bloodying him (ibid). Jahjah also took a third aggressive step: he called on the Quraysh and other Meccan Emigrant Muslims for support in a traditional way. He cried **YA AL QURAYSH, YA AL**

KINANANAH! "O people of Quraysh, O people of Kinanah (come to my help)" (ibid). Hearing this (a group of) the Quraysh rushed towards (the scene) -- **FA-AQBALAT ILAYH QURAYSH SIRA-AN** (ibid). Seeing this, Sinan reports, he called the Helpers (in a traditional call for help -- **FA-LAMMA RAAYT-U MA RAAYT-U, NADAYT-U BI'L-ANSAR** (ibid). So, the Aus and Khazraj also moved towards the scene. The two Muslim groups, the Emigrants and the Helpers, with weapons drawn, were ready to fight. "A great tragic civil war was approaching", the reporter concludes -- **SHAHARU'S- SILAH HATTA KHASHAYT AN TAKUN FITNAT-UN AZIMAT-UN** (ibid). Some other Emigrants (sic), however, intervened, asking Sinan to forego his right -- **UTRUK HAQQAK** (ibid), i.e. to disregard Jahjah's injury and forgive him. This indicates that Sinan was the victim, Jahjah the Emigrant offender. But the Helpers told Sinan not to do so, and to let the Prophet decide. The Emigrants, apparently, did not want the matter to reach the Prophet. They finally persuaded Ubadah b. as-Samit and Sinan's other close allies to ask Sinan to forget the matter. Sinan did so (W:416). From a tribal point of view it was a humiliating situation for the Helpers. The crowd had dispersed. The Helpers and the Emigrants moved towards their (apparently) separate camps to rest. Abd Allah b. Ubayy was, still, stung - **FA-GHADIB IBN UBAYY GHADAB-AN SHADID-AN** (ibid). Addressing the Helpers, he said:

Have they actually done this? They dispute our priority, they outnumber us in our own country, and nothing so fits us and the vagabonds of Quraysh as the ancient saying "Feed a dog and it will devour you." By Allah, when we return to Medina the noble [native Medinans] would drive out the mean [Mecca refugees]... This is what you have done to yourselves. You have let them occupy your country, and you have divided your property among them. Had you but kept your property from them they would have gone elsewhere (1.1:491,; also see T,28:114 passim cf. Q63:8; W:416; TT-1,2:605-6).

Al-Waqidi adds to Ibn Ubayy's speech:

By God, I have never seen this kind of humiliation... They made us hate each other... You made yourselves targets for death... You got yourself killed for him leaving your children as orphans; thus you decreased in number and they increased... (W:416-7).

Zayd b. Arqam, a Khazrajite child, told the Prophet what Abd Allah was uttering. Muhammad was alarmed. He must have been disturbed more by the fact, as our sources indicate, that no Medinans Abd Allah addressed had protested or challenged the Munafiq's provocations. Even the few prominent Helpers who were sitting with the Prophet when Zayd brought the bad news did not dissociate themselves from what Abd Allah had reportedly said. The news of his speech spread in the camp, the topic of discussion everywhere -- **WA SHAA FI'L-ASKAR MA QAL IBN UBAYY, WA LAYS LI'N-NAS HADITH-UN ILLA MA QAL IBN UBAYY (W:417)**. Yet, then, our sources nowhere say Abd Allah was condemned by any Helper. Instead, they tell us some Helpers admonished the "lad" for ascribing wrong things to "the chief of his people," and for being unfair and unfaithful to a close relative, Abd Allah -- **WA JAAL RAHT-UN MIN AL-ANSAR YUNABBIUN AL-GHULAM WA YAQULUN: AMADT ILA SAYYID QAUMIK, TAQUL ALAYH MA LAM YAQUL WA QAD ZALAMT WA QATATA'R-RAHIM (W:417)**. Ibn Ishaq remarks: (After all,) Abd Allah b. Ubayy

was a great man among his own people and the Ansar (Medinan Muslims) who were present with the apostle said: 'It may well be that the boy was mistaken in what he said, and did not remember the man's words,' sympathising with Ibn Ubayy and protecting him (1.1:491; also see TT-1,2:606 passim; W:418).

Our sources insist that Abd Allah later disowned what he had said, though it is unclear whether he disowned the whole statement or only certain parts of it. Less likely, he might have disowned the whole statement. Most probably he disputed the sentence **"WA'LLAH LAIN RAJANA ILA'L-MADINAT LA-YUKHRIJANN AL-AAZZ MINHA'L-ADHALL**, "By God, after we return to Medina the mighty noble[ones] (i.e., the native Medinans, the Helpers) would expel the mean (i.e. the Meccan Emigrant Muslims)" (W:416; TT-1,2:605). The Quranic condemnation that soon came particularly quotes and emphasizes this sentence, and the fact that Abd Allah "disdainfully" refused to apologize (Q63:5,8). We also see that the Prophet, complaining to some close Medinan comrades, repeatedly referred to this sentence. Muhammad was so alarmed that just after the

news spread and Abd Allah refused to apologize, he unexpectedly ordered the journey back to Medina. Usayd b. Hudayr, a Medinan Companion, approached the Prophet to say politely:

'You are travelling at a disagreeable time, a thing you have never done before.' The apostle said, 'Have you not heard of what your friend said? He asserted that if he returns to Medina the stronger will drive out the weaker.' He (Usayd, trying to relieve the Prophet) answered, 'But you will drive him out if you want to; he is the weak and you are the strong (1.1:491; parentheses added; also see TT-1,2:606; W:419).

Usayd, however, quickly added - defending Abd Allah indirectly, and warning the Prophet against taking any harsh action -

'Treat him kindly, for Allah brought you to us when his people were stringing beads to make him a crown, and he thinks that you have deprived him of a kingdom (ibid; ibid; ibid).

Muhammad was too intelligent not to understand where almost all of his Medinan Helpers stood in this affair. He could see that no Helper was flatly condemning their "great noble" -- **SHARIF AZIM**, fellow-citizen, and that the only Medinan who brought him the news about Abd Allah's activities was a **GHULAM** "lad" who was being admonished by all other Helpers. For the time being he could rely no more on native Medinans. Muhammad's first strategy was to continue his headlong journey to divert people simply by exhausting them. His Companions were also concerned about the safety of their families in Medina (W:422).

Then the apostle walked with the men all that day till nightfall, and through the night until morning and during the following day until the sun distressed them. Then he halted them, and as soon as they touched the ground they fell asleep. He did this to distract their minds from what Abd Allah b. Ubayy had said the day before (1.1:491).

After Zayd had brought the bad news, Umar (the Prophet's Meccan Companion) suggested (perhaps confidentially or in a limited company) to kill Abd Allah. Umar volunteered to do so. Umar also told the Prophet to ask a faithful Helper to kill Abd Allah. The Prophet was not so reckless. He said, "But what if men should say Muhammad kills his own

companions?" (1.1:491). The Prophet also reminded Umar that "several noses in Medina will shudder if he acted the way Umar was suggesting" (W:418). "No," Muhammad said to Umar, "but give orders to set off" (1.1:491). The Prophet rushed the army back to Medina. Meanwhile, he was planning how to deal with Abd Allah b. Ubayy.

Muhammad demonstrated, once again, that he was a genius in handling crises. The Quran was his trump card. He knew most Medinan Muslims still believed in the Quran as the Word of God. He also knew that the Almighty was always there to help him. What Muhammad needed was some quiet time to think and then to declare new passages of the Quran. For two or three days during the furious journey the Prophet remained mostly quiet. He was thinking.²⁹ Finally Revelation came. The Prophet was riding. Zayd, who was aware of the gestures and conditions Muhammad showed during the final moments of delivery of Revelation rode beside and watched closely. As a believer he knew Revelation was "coming down" -- **NUZUL**. Zayd had prayed for such divine intervention to prove that he was right and the rest of the Medinans wrong (W:417). The Prophet was in the final stages of a deep meditation; sweat was flowing from his face (W:419). The Prophet opened his eyes. Pampering "the lad" in order to encourage him to continue eavesdropping for the Messenger of God, Muhammad "took hold of Zayd b. Arqam's ear, saying, 'This is he who devoted his ear to Allah'" (1.1:492). The Prophet recited the masterpiece with certain intended effects. It was sura 63 of the Quran entitled **AL-MUNAFIQUN**, confirming Zayd's report and condemning "the Hypocrites".³⁰ Some Medinan Muslims familiar with the Prophet's semi-ecstatic conditions before Revelations anticipated Quranic condemnation. Before the Revelation came (the same day), Ubadah b. as-Samit advised Abd Allah to go to the Prophet and apologize. Abd Allah refused, averting his face arrogantly and moved away. Ubadah said "By God, there will indeed come down a passage of the Quran at the 'bending' of your head which will be recited (loudly) during prayers" -- **AMA WA'LLAH LA-YANZILANN FI LAYY-I RASIK QURAN-UN**

YUSALLA BIHI (W:420). It seems that until that time no Quranic Revelations had directly referred to Abd Allah b. Ubayy. The "occasion of revelation," particularly Verses 5 and 8, make it known that the Almighty had directly confronted Abd Allah. For the believers it was a hint that God had declared Ibn Ubayy MAHDUR AD-DAM, a renegade who could be killed by any person. The Quran had its way.

The true believers, including the Helpers, had to believe that Abd Allah was indeed condemned by God. After this revelation, Ubadah b. as-Samit and Aus b. Khauliyy (Helpers) abstained from greeting Abd Allah when they passed him. Now it was dangerous and impious to have intimacy with one disliked by God and Muhammad. When Abd Allah asked what was the matter they told him, blaming and reproaching him for what he had caused: the Revelation of the Quran against their earlier defense of him (W:420). The two Helpers again advised Abd Allah to "repent to God," i.e., surrender to Muhammad's leadership unconditionally. Abd Allah persisted in what he was. LA AUD ABAD-AN -- "I will never revise (my attitude)", Abd Allah answered (W:420). As Medinans, the two Helpers had the anxieties of Abd Allah's son. Ibn Ubayy had created a difficult situation for all native Medinan believers, particularly the Khazrajites.

Al-Hubab, Abd Allah's son, a sincere believer, was conscious of his tribal responsibilities as a son and as a member of the Khazraj clan.³¹ The news of God's direct condemnation of Abd Allah reached the son. Al-Hubab had also come to know about Umar's earlier suggestion to kill Abd Allah (W:420). The Prophet's purpose was served. As a person and as an Arab, Al-Hubab was faithful to his father - though the son did not share his father's cynicism about Muhammad. The son was a true believer and equally faithful to Muhammad as the Messenger of God. Al-Hubab realized he could soon be faced with a difficult situation. He rushed to the Prophet and mentioned frankly his anxiety. He said

I have heard that you want to kill Abd Allah b. Ubayy for what you have heard about him. If you must do it, then order me to do it and I will bring you his head, for al-Khazraj know that they

have no man more dutiful to his father than I, and I am afraid that if you order someone else to kill him my soul will not permit me to see his slayer walking among men and I shall kill him, thus killing a believer for an unbeliever, and so I should go to hell (1.1:492; also see-1,2:608; T,28:116 cf. Q63:1-9; W:421).

For Al-Hubab the believer, his father's life and death were in Muhammad's hands. The son thought he had only three equally painful choices: to live with the pain and shame of a father-killer or with the grief and infamy (in a tribal society) of inaction in case his father was killed by others, or violate his first loyalty to Muhammad by acting against his father's killers and, thus, (as he believed) invite God's curse here, and the entitlement for Gehenna hereafter. Al-Hubab was wrong. He had not thought of a fourth option: the Prophet's calculated **HILM**, magnanimity. Referring to the father, the Prophet told the perplexed son:

We would rather be gentle with him and enjoy his company as long as he lives -- **BAL NARFUQ BIHI WA NUHSIN SUHBATAHU MA BAQA MAANA** (TT-1,2:608; ibid).

Muhammad was not telling the truth. Based on the Prophet's expressions and actions, Muslim believers know that the Prophet did not mean what he said. The Prophet never enjoyed the company of this "enemy of God" whom he had cursed many times. Recalling reports related to the same expedition (al-Mustaliq/al-Muraysi) Muslims read that nothing pleased Muhammad and the believers, so much as the news of the Munafiq's death and the agony of Abd Allah.³²

The extent of tension between Medinan Muslims and the Emigrants can be judged from Al-Hubab's response to Umar's earlier suggestion to the Prophet. Umar had proposed to the Prophet that Muhammad b. Maslama (a Medinan believer) kill Ibn Ubayy. (Both Al-Hubab and Umar are recognized in Muslim sacred annals as great and respectable **ASHAB**, "Companions" of the Prophet.) After the Prophet assured al-Hubab that his father would not be killed, al-Hubab gave vent to his anger against Umar. Cursing and ridiculing him in a poem, al-Hubab said, among other

things,

Yesterday, he asked (the Prophet) to send Muhammad (b. Maslamah) to kill him (Ibn Ubayy) Shame on him for what he asked.

But al-Hubab and some other Helpers were equally angry with Ibn Ubayy. Not only because as believers they were impressed by the Quran but also because Abd Allah Ibn Ubayy had created a difficult situation. They were grateful to the Prophet, who had rescued them from the impasse. By acting magnanimously and knowing well, as he later confided to Umar, that such magnanimity is paid back in a traditional tribal Arab society, Muhammad turned the tables on his most prominent and troublesome adversary, Ibn Ubayy. The son and other Khazrajs had to deal with the "enemy of God" to show their first loyalty to Islam and their gratitude to Muhammad.

Socially and politically, Ibn Ubayy's slow death had begun. The expedition of al-Mustaliq saw him reach the peak of his influence among Medinans. Ibn Ubayy must have felt confident enough of Medinan support when he openly called the Prophet and his Meccan Emigrant Companions JALABIB, vagabonds, and then adamantly refused to apologize. When the army returned to Medina, Ibn Ubayy's own son treated the Munafiq father as a 'vagabond.' In order to demonstrate his loyalty to Islam and gratitude to Muhammad, the believing son decided to humiliate his troublesome Munafiq father. With a drawn sword in hand al-Hubab blocked the way of his father to his own home. "By God," the son said to his father, he could not enter the house. The blockaded father exclaimed repeatedly in vain, "O people of Khazraj, look at my son not allowing me to enter my own house" (T,28:115). People gathered and tried to convince the son to let his father enter his house. The adamant believer did not yield. "By God," he said, "he cannot enter the house but with the permission of God and His Messenger" (*ibid*). Muhammad was informed. Demonstrating further calculated magnanimity to win the hearts of the son and the Khazraj, he sent word to the son to allow the father

enter the house. The believer obeyed and said: Now that the Prophet's command has reached me, I agree (T,28:115). Ibn Ubayy was crushed. He could enter his own house only with Muhammad's permission. As a matter of fact, our sources tell us, beginning on the day when the Prophet told Abd Allah that his father would not be killed,

Whenever he (Ibn Ubayy) made any mischief, his own people used to rebuke him, censure him, treat him harshly and threaten him -- **WA JAAL BAD DHALIKA'L-YAUM IDHA HADATH AL-HADATH KAN QAUMUH-U HUM ALLADHIN YUATIBUNAHU WA YUKADH-DHIBUNAHU WA YUANNIFUNAHU WA YATAADUNAHU** (T,28:113). After that it happened that if any misfortune befell it was his own people who reproached and upbraided him roughly (1.1:492).

Al-Waqidi gives an example. After the squabble at Al-Muraysi, Usayd b. Hudayr, a Medinan Muslim loyal to the Prophet, addressed Ibn Ubayy in this language: "Had I known that the Messenger of God would agree, I would have pierced your testicle with the arrow, O enemy of God" (W:424). Muhammad enjoyed the outcome. Our sources have preserved the Prophet's response (to tell the believers of all times that Muhammad did not really mean it when he said to the son that he, the Prophet, enjoyed his father's company). Muhammad

said to Umar when he heard this state of things: 'Now what do you think, Umar? Had I killed him on the day you wanted me to kill him the leading men would have trembled with rage. If I ordered them to kill him today they would kill him'. Umar replied, 'I know that the apostle's order is more blessed than mine' (1.1:492; also see T,28:116-7).

The Prophet no longer needed to kill Abd Allah b. Ubayy. He was dying. Islam was in fashion, backed by the power of the Islamic state. Al-Hubab, the true believer, was concerned about the image of his family. He did not like being known as the son of an "enemy of God," a Munafiq who was seriously ill. Al-Hubab thought of a miraculous performance to soften his father's heart in favor of Islam - to yield to Muhammad. The son asked the Prophet to save and give him the defiled water after making ablution (the Islamic ritual of washing hands, mouth, face and feet before prayers). The believing son told the Prophet

of his holy scheme: he would make his father drink this tainted water, hoping the sacredness of the unclean water tainted with the divine saliva and dirt of the Prophet's hands, face and feet would miraculously cause the softening of his father's heart -- **FA-TAWADDA HATTA USQIHI-I MIN WUDUIK LAALL QALBUHU YALIN** (T,28:113). The Prophet agreed, again graciously. Al-Hubab took the filthy water home secretly. Abd Allah was on his deathbed. The son waited for the time when the "enemy of God" would ask for water. He eventually did. The believer-in-waiting offered the cup, dutifully. Ibn Ubayy was too sick and perhaps too thirsty to notice the filth before drinking what was holy water for his believing son. He did not know about the sacred conspiracy. He drank it. The son, curious about the miraculous effects of the defiled sacred aqua anxiously asked his father if he knew what he had drunk. Most probably our believer expected this water having touched the Prophet's body and mixed with his spittle would taste like rose-water. The outraged dying 'enemy of God' answered yes, he knew what the ideal believer son had given him to drink. Ibn Ubayy said: **NAAM; SAQAYTANI BAUL UMMIK**, "yes; you made me drink the urine of your mother" (T,28:113).

Muhammad visited Abd Allah on his deathbed. The Prophet did this, al-Waqidi tells us, to demonstrate his generosity -- **WA HUA YAJUD BI-NAFSIHI** (W:1057). The "(symbol of) Mercy and Compassion for the Universe -- **RAHMAT-AN LI'L-ALAMIN** (as the Quran (Q21:107) calls the Prophet) said to the dying man: "I had warned you against loving the Jews" -- **QAD NAHAYTUK AN HUBB AL-YAHUD** (ibid). "The Hypocrite" was none the less one-track-minded; he did not regret what he thought was his principled stand for the human rights of the Jews. Instead, he taunted those Medinan Muslims, such as Sad b. Zurarah, who had betrayed the Jews (ibid). Too tired to continue such a serious discussion, Abd Allah changed the topic, reminding his kind visitor: **YA RASUL ALLAH LAYS BI-HIN ITAB! HUA'L- MAUT**, "O Messenger of God, this is not the time for rebuke; it is death (i.e., I am dying)" (ibid).

Abd Allah b. Ubayy died the same day. His son, al- Hubab, was still concerned about the salvation of his father and, perhaps, even more about the image of his family in a society where Islam had become the only criterion of honor and un-Islam was deemed a disgrace. Only a gesture by the Prophet could rehabilitate the family's image. Al-Hubab was a believer par excellence. The ineffectiveness of his earlier operation had not caused him to doubt the miraculous nature of the Prophet's touch. Al-Hubab asked the Prophet for his shirt wet with his sweat -- QAMISAHU WA HUA ARIQ (T,10:199). The son wanted to use it as the shroud for the deceased. The son also requested the Prophet to pray for the forgiveness of the dead soul and participate in the burial rites. This would mean Abd Allah had died as a Muslim. The Prophet granted all these. During the burial rites the Prophet uncovered the dead man's head and expectorated on the dead man's face -- FA-KASHAF MIN WAJHIHI WA NAFATH ALAYH-I MIN RIQIHI (W:1057), as an additional act of blessing. The sacred sweat and saliva were to accompany Abd Allah in his grave, in order to guarantee his salvation, as "The Bubble," i.e. al-Hubab, expected.

The Prophet had to explain confidentially for the guidance of all believers to come that he had not forgiven this "enemy of God." Muhammad also implied that in all this drama he had duped the true believer, "The Bubble." Apparently, before the Prophet participated in Abd Allah's burial God had revealed

Ask pardon for them or ask not pardon for them; if thou askest pardon for them seventy times, God will not pardon them... And pray thou never over any one of them when he is dead, nor stand over his grave; they disbelieved in God and His Messenger, and died while they were ungodly (Q9:80-84)

Tabari faced with contradictory reports, explains the verses as usual in a somewhat confusing way. On the one hand he implies Muslims knew of the contents of the verses; that is why Umar reminded the Prophet of the Divine decrees against the Prophet's readiness to pray for Ibn Ubayy. On the other hand, Tabari tells us that particularly V.

84 was revealed after Muhammad had performed the burial rites. In other words, Muhammad told the believers that though he had participated in the burial ceremony, God did not like it. Consequently, after that, the Prophet never prayed for a Munafiq nor participated in their burial rituals -- **FA MA SALLA BADAHU ALA MUNAFIQ-IN WA LA QAM ALA QABRIHI. 33** Muhammad's confidential response to his close comrades, who wanted the Prophet to discard the deceased "enemy of God" openly, was a lesson in double-speak, if not disingenuousness, to believers of all time in similar situations. To Umar, who raised a big hue and cry when Muhammad prayed for Ibn Ubayy, the Prophet said, playing with words, (or invoking the Quran as the final authority to do so)

I have been told (by God), ask not pardon for them; if thou askest pardon for them seventy times God will not pardon them'. So, I ask pardon for them seventy plus seventy plus seventy times - **FA ASTAGHFIR LAHUM SABIN WA SABIN WA SABIN** (T,10:199).

Also, explaining "Ask pardon... or ask not..." the Prophet said God had thus authorized him to choose, so he chose to "ask pardon" rather than not (ibid:200 passim). In order to inform the believing readers aware of the deep structure of the language what the Prophet really meant, Tabari adds that when he said this to Umar, "the Messenger of God was smiling -- **WA RASUL ALLAH YATABASSAM!**" (ibid:205). Being the last Messenger of God for humankind the Prophet could not depend on his sarcastic **TABASSUM**, smile, to convey the message. He wanted to be sure no nonconformist 'Muslim' would be forgiven, even after death, on the basis of his performance during Abd Allah's burial rites. By the end of his (apparently confidential) reassurance to Umar and other close comrades, the Prophet remarked frankly that neither his shirt nor his prayer for Ibn Ubayy would help him escape God's chastisement, and that he did all that hoping to win "a thousand" of Ibn Ubayy's people for Islam -- **WA MA YUGHNI ANHU QAMISI MIN ALLAH AU RABBI WA SALATI ALAYH, WA INNI LA-ARJU AN YUSLIM BIHI ALF-UN MIN QAWMIH** (T,10:206). This particular form of **MAKR** or **HILA**, **TABASSUM** to the inner circle of believers while pretending friendship with resourceful "enemies of God,"

is a Prophetic Sunnah to be emulated by true believers in similar situations.

Ibn Ubayy's growing ineffectiveness, beginning from al-Muraysi, rendered al-Munafiqun leaderless, though apparently they increased in number. Quietly, most of them began to boycott Muhammad's jiḥād expeditions. Al-Munafiqun's large-scale boycott of the Tabuk expedition (630 CE) grieved the Prophet (see Q9:38-106 cf. TS,14:251 passim). During this period some al-Munafiqun tried to isolate themselves by building a separate mosque in a Medinan suburb where they lived. They told the Prophet, politely, they had built the mosque for the weak, elderly and handicapped of the locality who found it difficult to attend the Prophet's central mosque for prayers, particularly during the rainy seasons and flash floods (T,11:23 passim cf. Q:107-110). They asked the Prophet to visit and bless the mosque to pray in it for them -- WA INNA NUHIBB AN TATINA FA-TUSALLI LANA FIHI (ibid). The Prophet did not respond immediately, promising to do so in the near future, "God willing" -- IN SHA ALLAH, he added (ibid). As usual, he needed to think and plan.

The Quran and Tradition hint at a conspiracy by "the Hypocrites" involved in the building of this "opposition Mosque." Explaining Q9:107, Tabari reports that Abu Amir, "the Monk," had advised these al-Munafiqun to build the mosque as a center of conspiracy against Muhammad. According to these reports, Abu Amir had left for Byzantium to seek support against the Prophet (T,11:23-26 cf. Q9:107). Our sources nowhere substantiate this charge. Al-Munafiqun involved in building this mosque - Tas named by Tabari (ibid) and Ibn Ishaq:609 - belonged to peripheral, insignificant sub-clans. They were in no position to launch a serious conspiracy against Muhammad supported by the majority of Aus and Khazraj, along with the Emigrants.

There were two main reasons for these al-Munafiqun's desire to build a place of worship away from the Prophet's mosque. 1). Islam's verbal attacks and believers' abuse against nonconformists had reached

unbearable dimensions. Strong believers in Islam repeatedly insulted and mauled the Munafiqun, including Abu Amir, during congregations in the Prophet's mosque (see e.g. W:1046-9 passim). Especially, those not belonging to the powerful Aus-Khazraj sub-clans were more vulnerable and less secure. They built the mosque simply to avoid nuisance in the Prophet's mosque which Abu Amir thought had become a **MIRBAD**, a barn, a zoo (W:1049). 2) Although these al- Munafiqun, like others, had lost respect for the Prophet's political policies and interests in jihād, they apparently still believed in the possibility of maintaining a non-political, Hanifist, Islam, for purely spiritual-ritual purposes. They chose a young man as imam (prayer leader, W:1048) who they knew had memorized enough of the Quran (necessary for recitation during prayers). Their reported link to Abu Amir, the known Hanif, indicates that they wanted to revive their less Islamized, apolitical Hanafiyyah religion within Islam's ritualistic parameters.

Al-Munafiqun of the "opposition Mosque" were waiting for the Prophet's promised visit (W:1048). Like many others, these "Hypocrites" had not accompanied the Prophet in his Tabuk expedition. Just after the Prophet's return from Tabuk, he summoned two believers

and told them to go to the mosque of those evil men and destroy and burn it... (One of the two commissioned believers) took a palm-branch and lighted it, and then the two of them ran into the mosque where its people were and burned and destroyed it and the people ran away from it (W:609: also see T ibid).

The adjacent houses of al-Munafiqun, including that of their spiritual leader, Abu Amir, were also put afire (W:1047). The Prophet confiscated and distributed the estate among the believers to build their own houses (ibid). As usual, the Almighty immediately confirmed His last Messenger's action against those who wanted to worship Him quietly instead of participating in the QITAL, "fighting to kill," in His name. This mosque was built, the Quran said,

In opposition and unbelief, and to divide the believers and as a place of ambush for those who fought God and His Messenger aforetime - they will swear, 'We desired nothing but good'; and

God testifies they are truly liars. Stand there never... The buildings they have built will never cease to be a point of doubt within their hearts, unless it be that their hearts are cut into pieces; (Q9:107-10).

There was to be no division among Muslims on the Jihad- oriented political nature of Islam. All Muslims had to talk with one voice, act as one hand. They had to behave as one JAMAAH, "united community" - like a herd. Any hope for the emergence of a 'loyal opposition' in Islam, any ideas of toleration and separation of religion from politics, were buried forever in the ashes of MASJID DIRAR, the "Opposition Mosque."

Muslim believers determined to follow the Quran and emulate the Sunnah find there is no place in Islam for the New- Jahiliyya, Modernism, so similar in its various dimensions to the Jahiliyya Muhammad and the Almighty confronted during the Golden Age of Islam.

ENDNOTES**Part III: Belief in the Books and Messengers****Section 9: The Era of Muhammad****Segment 3: Foundations of Muslim Images and Treatment of Modern Tendencies and Values.**

¹For **JAHLIYYAH** see 3:154, 5:50, 33:33; 48:26. For **JAHALAH** see 4:17; 6:54; 16:119; 49:6. For **JAHILA/YAJHALU** see 6:111; 7:138; 11:29; 27:55; 46:23. For **JAHLIL** see 2:67; 2:273; 6:35; 7:199; 11:46; 12:33; 12:89; 25:63; 28:55; 29:64. For **JAHLUL** see 33:72.

²Unless noted otherwise, page numbers refer to T. Noldeke, "Arabs (Ancient)", Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. 1.659-73; Ignaz Goldziher (translated by Andras and Ruth Hamori), Introduction to Islamic Theology and Law, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey (1981); W.M. Watt, Muhammad at Mecca, Oxford-At the Clarendon Press, (1953); Maxime Rodinson, Muhammad (translated by Anne Carter) New York (1971). Noldeke, Watt and Rodinson refer, among others, to Wellhausen.

³See for example Q17:51, 99; 19:37-8; 23:37, 82-3; 25:10-14; 27:67-8; 30:10; 37:16-21, 53; 4:35-6; 50:3; 52:11-14; 56:47-8; 74:46; 75:3; 79:10-12; 83:10-11; 107:1.

⁴See, e.g., Q10:24-5; 74:24-5; 80:5-27; 86:6-10; 87:16-7; 90:4-5; 92:8; 96:1-17; 106:4.

⁵On al-Munafiqun in the Quran, and in Tabari's Tafsir, for detailed commentaries on relevant Quranic passages see Q2:8-20 cf. TS,1:268-362; Q2:204-6 cf. TS,4:229-45; Q3:154-159, 160-80 cf. TS,7:377-83; Q4:60-91 cf. TS,8:507-93; TS,9:7-14; Q4:137-51 cf. TS,9:314-45; Q5:51-8, 61-62 cf. TS,10:395-432, 447-7; Q8:49-51 cf. T,10:20-3; Q9:61-110 cf. T,10:167-200; T,11:2-35; Q24:11-12 cf. T ; Q29:10-13 cf. TB,20:82-6; Q33:1 12-24 cf. relevant parts, Q47:20-34; Q48:6 cf. T,26:73; Q57:10-15 cf. T,27:223-4 passim; Q58:13-20 cf. T,28:22-7; Q59:11-4 cf. T,28:45-7; Q63:1-9 cf. T,28:106-17; Q66:9 cf. T,28:169. For two specific lists of Medinan Arab and Jewish Munafiqun, and related discussions, see 1.1:242-70. In Tabari's Tarikh and Tafsir and in Ibn Ishaq-Ibn Hisham, al-Waqidi and Ibn Sad references to "the Hypocrites" are spread throughout relevant volumes and exegeses of relevant Quranic passages. More detailed discussions, however, are located where the Quranic passages and other sources mentioned deal with the events concerning Banu Qaynuqa, Uhud, Banu Nadir, the Ditch (Khandaq), Banu Qurayza, Al-Mustaliq/Al-Muraysi, al-Ifk (Scandal about Aisha), al-Hudaybiyah, Khaybar, Hawazin, Tabuk and the "Opposition Mosque" -- MASJID DARAR. We will refer to specific volumes and pages in the body of our discussion. For al-Munafiqun also see Watt, Med.:180-91; FR. Buhl, "Al-Munafikun," EI,3:722-3.

⁶TS,1:296 cf. Q2:14; TS,8:60 cf. Q4:60; also see 1.1:246-7.

⁷See Q:4:88-9 cf. TS,9:7-24; Q8:49-51 cf. T,10:21; Q29:10-13 cf. TB,20:82-6.

⁸Q9:89, 101 passim, cf. T,10:209-11; T,11:3-5, 9 passim.

¹¹"Surely, the Hypocrites will be in the lowest reach of the Fire (Q4:145). (They will be in) "Gehenna... how evil a cradling" (Q2:206). "...for them awaits a painful chastisement" (4:138). "... the angels take (them) beating their faces and their backs (telling them 'Take the

chastisement of the burning..." (Q8:50-1). "For (them) awaits the fire of Gehenna, therein to dwell forever" (Q9:61-63). "The Hypocrites... are ungodly. God has promised the Hypocrites, men and women, and the unbelievers, the fire of Gehenna, therein to dwell forever. That is enough for them; God has cursed them; and there awaits them a lasting chastisement... Those their works have failed in this world and in the world to come; those - they are the losers" (9:66-9). "O Prophet, struggle with the unbelievers and hypocrites, and be thou harsh with them; their refuge is Gehenna - an evil home coming! ...they failed God in that they promised Him and they are liars... God derides them; for them awaits a painful chastisement... God will not pardon them; that because they disbelieved in God and His Messengers; God guides not, the people of ungodly" (9:73-9). "So turn aside from them, for they are an abomination, and their refuge is Gehenna - a recompense for what they have been earning" (9:95). "...They disbelieved in God and His Messenger and died while they were ungodly. (... God only desires to chastise them in this present world, and their souls should depart while they are unbelievers" (9:84-5). "And some of the Bedouins who dwell around you are hypocrites; and some of the people of the City [Medina] are grown bold in hypocrisy. Though knowest them not; but We know them and We shall chastise them and We shall chastise them twice, then they will be returned to a mighty chastisement" (9:101). "... and that He may chastise the hypocrites, men and women alike, and the idolaters, men and women alike and those who think evil thought of God; against them shall be the evil turn of fortune. God is owrth with them, and has cursed them, and has prepared for them Gehenna - an evil homecoming" (48:6). "God has made ready for them a chastisement terrible; surely they - evil are the things thy have been doing... so there awaits them a humbling chastisement... they are the inhabitants of the Fire, therein dwelling forever... they are the liars! Satan has gained the mastery over them, and caused them to forget God's Remembrance. Those are Satan's party; why, Satan's party, surely, they are the losers. Surely those who oppose God and His Messenger, those are among the most abject" (68:14-20). "When the hypocrites come to thee they say, 'We bear witness that though art indeed the Messenger of God.' And God knows that thou art indeed His Messenger, and God bears witness that the hypocrites are truly liars. ...That is because they have believed, then they have disbelieved; therefore a seal has been set on their hearts and they do not understand... They are the enemy; so beware of them. God assail them! How they are perverted! ... God will never forgive them. God guides not the people of the ungodly (63:1-6). O Prophet, struggle with the unbelievers and the hypocrites, and be thou harsh on them, their refuge shall be Gehenna - an evil homecoming" (66:9).

¹⁰e.g., Q2:8 cf. TS,1:268; Q3:167-8; Q4:150 passim; Q9:66-9, 84-5; Q63:1-6.

¹¹See Q2:11, 14; 3:167-8; 4:40, 88-91, 137-45; 8:49-51; 9:61, 67, 81, 86-8, 90-101; 33:12; 47:20-31; 57:10; 58:13-20; 63:7.

¹²See 1.1:98-103; Watt, Mec.:162-4; Tor Andrae, Muhammad: 108-111.

¹³On the basis of Jahiliyyah poetry and Arab oral history, Ibn Ishaq and Tabari have recorded the pre-Islam confrontations in Yaman and the rest of the peninsula between the Arabs and Byzantium and Abyssinia (see 1.1:7-33; TT-1,2:105-54). These traditions were known to the Arabs during the Prophet's time. Disregarding some obvious superimpositions in Ibn Ishaq and Tabari required by sacred Islamic historiography, these reports indicate that, though converted to Judaism, Tubbah and Dhu Nuwas, the Yamenite kings (as they were portrayed) remained popular as heroes in Arab consciousness. In its descriptions of Dhu Nuwas's actions against Najranite Christians, and of events to be shown, Arab lore's resentment is directed against Byzantine- Abyssinian sponsored Christianity in south Arabia. A certain Famiyun of Syria, these reports

say, had converted a group in Najran, southwest Arabia, to Christianity (1.1:14-16). On the basis of a vague Meccan Quranic passage (85:4-8), Ibn Ishaq and Tabari tell us that the Yamanite army led by Dhu Nuwas massacred these Christians. Daus Dhu Thalaban, one of these Christians escaped and reached

the Byzantine court... and asked the emperor to aid him against Dhu Nuwas and his troops, telling him what had happened... (The emperor said) he would write to the Abyssinian king who was Christian and whose territory was near the Yaman... Daus went to the Negus with the emperor's letter, and he sent with him seventy thousand Abyssinians, putting over them a man called Aryat... Dhu Nuwas with the Himyarites and such of the Yamani tribes as were under his command came out against him... (After he was defeated) Dhu Nuwas turned his horse, beating it until it entered the waves... This was the last that was seen of it... Aryat carried out the Negus's orders, and sent a third of the (Yamani) women and children to him. He stayed on in the country and reduced it to subjection. One of the Yamanis, remembering how Daus [as a traitor] had brought the Abyssinians upon them, said "Not like Daus and not like the things he carried in his saddle bag." And this saying has become proverbial in the Yaman until this day [i.e., Arabs' think seeking help from the Byzantines and Abyssinia against Dhu Nuwas was treacherous] (1.1:18-9, brackets added).

The vagueness in Q85:4-8, usually explained as an expression of the Quran's sympathy with Najranite Christians and a condemnation of Dhu Nuwas's action, also indicates a lack of such enthusiasm for them within the general climate of opinion in Arabia of the Prophet's time. After a mere reference to Q85:4-8 and its link to Dhu Nuwas and his army - with no negative comment on Dhu Nuwas - Ibn Ishaq and Tabari quote, approvingly, pre-Islamic Arab poetry and reports that completely disregard Q85:4-8. In these reports Dhu Nuwas is repeatedly remembered as a hero, and the Abyssinian domination of Yaman and their following invasion of Hijaz are cursed. So it is that the Byzantine-linked Abyssinian venture to build a cathedral in Yaman, intended to rival the Kaba and distract pagan pilgrims from it, is ridiculed. In the rest of the story the Abyssinian presence in the Yaman, and their moves against the pre-Islamic Mecca, are openly condemned. If the Traditionists are correct that Q85:4-8 indicates support and sympathy for **ASHAB AL-UKHDUD**, "Men of the Pit," i.e. Najranite Christians, apparently, the Quran forgets "the Men of the Elephant," whose "guile" the Almighty made

to go astray. And He loosed upon them birds in flights, hurling against them stones of backed clay and He made them like green blades devoured (Q:105:1-5)

were there to avenge **ASHAB AL-UKHDUD** against Dhu Nuwas and his troops. Q105, perhaps, provided moral support to Ibn Ishaq and Tabari, who on the basis of pagan Arab traditions portray enthusiastically, as an epic, the continued southeastern Arab resistance to the Byzantine-sponsored Christian Abyssinian domination.

When the people of the Yaman had long endured oppression, Sayf b. Dhu Yazan the Himyarite (with the help of an Iranian-appointed Arab) governor at al-Hira and the surrounding country of Iraq... (went to the Iranian emperor saying to him) 'O King, ravens (i.e., Abyssinians) have taken possession of our country... I have come to you for help and that you may assume the kingship of my

country' (1.1:30; parentheses added).

According to Arab traditions quoted by Ibn Ishaq and Tabari, the Iranian emperor sent 800 mercenaries under a certain Wahriz as commanding officer. With their help, Sayf and his Yamani resisters defeated Masruq, the Abyssinian governor and his troops, thus ending Christian domination in south Arabia. In their descriptions of the story our sources, quoting Arab pagan traditions, portray Sayf Dhu Yazan - unlike Daus who is cursed as a traitor - and others who ended Byzantine-Abyssinian domination as heroes. Glimpses of Arab sentiments are preserved in Jahiliyya poetry about these pre-Islam events.

Sayf b. Dhu Yazan al-Himyari said:

Men thought the two kings had made peace
 And those who heard of their reconciliation found the
 matter was very grave.
 We slew the prince Masruq and reddened the sands
 with blood.
 The new prince, the people's prince,
 Wahriz swore an oath that
 Hew would drink no wine until he had captured 4
 prisoners and spoil.

Abu al-Salt b. Abu Rabi'a al-Thaqafi said:

Let those seek vengeance who are like Ibn Dhu Yazan
 Who spent long years at sea because of his enemies,
 When the time for his journey came he went to Caesar
 But did not attain what he sought.
 Then he turned to Chosroes after ten years,
 Counting his life and money cheap,
 Until he came bringing the Persians with him.
 By my life you were swift in action,
 What a noble band came out:
 Never were their like seen among men!
 Nobles, princes, mighty men, archers,
 Lions who train their cubs in the jungle!
 From curved bows they shot arrows
 Stout as the poles of the howdah
 Bringing the victim a speedy death.
 You sent lions against black dogs,
 Their fugitives are scattered all over the earth.
 So drink your fill, wearing your corwin,
 On Ghumdan's top reclining in a house you have 4
 chosen.
 Drink your fill, for they are dead,
 And walk proudly today in your flowing robes.
 Such are noble deeds! not two pails of milk mingled with
 water
 Which afterwards become urine

'Adiy b. Zayd al-Hiri, one of B. Tamim, said:

What is there after San'a' in which once lived
 Rulers of a kingdom whose gifts were lavish?
 Its builder raised it to the flying clouds,
 Its lofty chambers gave forth musk.
 Protected by mountains against the attacks of

enemies,
 Its lofty heights unscalable.
 Pleasant was the voice of the night owl there,
 Answered at even by a flute player.
 Fate brought to it the Persian army
 With their knights in their train;
 They traveled on mules laden with death,
 While the asses' foals ran beside them
 Until the princes saw from the top of the fortress
 Their squadrons shining with steel,
 The day that they called to the barbarians and
 al-Yaksum
 'Cursed be he who runs away!'
 'Twas a day of which the story remains,
 But a people of long established dignity came to an
 end.
 Persians replaced the native born,
 The days were dark and mysterious.
 After noble sons of Tubba',
 Persian generals were firmly settled there
 (1.1:32-3).

Similarly, the reported debate around Q30:1-6 between Muhammad and the Meccans clearly indicates pagan Arabs' dislike for the Byzantine "People of the Book," i.e., Christians. With reference to the early seventh-century confrontations between the Byzantines and Iranians, the Meccans wished to see their "fellow-pagan" Iranians overwhelm Christian Byzantines (T,21:16-22). As for northern Arabia and the larger Arab-Semitic world of greater Syria, all historians tell us of their resentment against Orthodox Greek Byzantium as a factor in Arab Islam's earliest stunning victories. The pre-Islamic Arab lore depicting the Ghassanids and other historical or legendary figures (confronting the Romans) as heroes also reflected the Arab refusal to appreciate that Christianity *per se* was more important than their nationalistic secular preferences. In a way, they rejected Christianity's role or right to indulge in politics. Again, one may surmise, it was Christianity's association with a state, Byzantium, that discouraged the Arab Hanifs from adopting it.

¹⁴"And some men there are who say, 'We believe in God and the Last Day'; but they are not believers. They would trick God and the believers... In their hearts is a sickness, and God has increased their sickness, and there awaits them a painful chastisement for that they have cried lies... When it is said to them, 'Believe as the people believe,' they say Shall we believe, as fools believe?' Truly, they are the foolish ones, but they do not know" (Q2:8-13; see TS,1:268 about Q2:8's connection to the Hypocrites).

"Those who believe, and then disbelieve, and then believe, and then disbelieve, and then increase in unbelief - God is not likely to forgive them, neither to guide them on any way" (Q4:137).

"Those who disbelieve in God and His Messengers and desire to make division between God and His Messengers, and say, 'We believe in part,' desiring to take between this and that a way - those in truth are the unbelievers; and We have prepared for the unbelievers a humbling chastisement (Q4:150-1).

¹⁵YAQUL LAHUM JALL THANAUHU: YA AYYUHALLADHIN AMANU BILLAH WA RASULIHI, LA TAWALU'L-KUFFAR FA-TUAZIRUHUM MIN DUN AHL DINIKUM WA MILLATIKUM MIN AL-MUMININ, FA-TAKUNU KA-MAN AUJABAT LAHU'NNAR MIN AL-MUNAFIQIN. THUMM QAL JALL HANAUH MUTAWAAID-AN MAN IAKHADH MINHUM AL-KAFIRIN AULIYA MIN DUN AL-MUMININ, IN HUM LAM YARTADI AN MUALATIHI, WA YANZAJIR AN

MUKHALLATIHI = AN YALHAQAHU BI-AHL WILAYATIHI MIN AL-MUNAFIQIN ALLADHIN AMAR NABIYUHU... BI-TABSHIRIHIM BI-ANN LAHUM ADHAB-AN ALIM- AN=: A-TURIDUN AYYUHA'L-MUTTAKHIDHUN AL-KAFIRIN AULIYA MIN DUN AL-MUMININ MIMMAN QAD AMAN BI WA BI-RASULI AN AJALU ALAYKUM SULTAN-AN MUBIN-AN, YAQUL HUJJAT-AN BI- ITTIKHADHIKUM AL-KAFIRIN AULIYA MIN DUN AL-MUMININ, FA- TASTAWJIBU MINHU MA ISTAWJABAHU AHL AN-NIFAQ ALLADHIN WUSIF LAKUM SIFATUHUM WA AKHBARAUM BI-MAHALLIHIM INDAHU... YAQUL LA TUARRIDU LI-GHADAB ALLAH, BI-IJABIKUM AL-HUJJAT ALA ANFUSIKUM FI TAQADDUMIKUM ALA MA NAHAKUM RABBUKUM MIN MUALAT ADAIHI WA AHL AL-KUFR BIHI (TS,9:336 cf. Q4:144).

¹⁶O believers, take not Jews and Christians as friends; they are friends of each other. Whoso of you makes them his friends is one of them. God guides not the people of the evildoers. Yet thou seest those in whose hearts is sickness vying with one another to come to them, saying, 'We fear lest a turn of fortune should smite us.' But it may be that God will bring the victory, or some commandment from Him, and then they will find themselves, for that they kept secret within them, remorseful. And the believers will say, 'What, are these the ones who swore by God most earnest oaths that they were with you? Their works have failed; now thy are losers.'

O believers, whosoever of you turns from his religion, God will assuredly bring a people He loves, and who love Him, humble towards the believers, disdainful towards the unbelievers, men who struggle in the path of God, not fearing the reproach of any reproacher. That is God's bounty; He gives it unto whom He will; and God is All-embracing, All-knowing. Your friend is only God, and His Messenger, and the believers who perform the prayer and pay the alms, and bow them down. Whoso makes God his friend, and His Messenger, and the believers - the party of God, they are the victors. O believers, take not as your friends those of them, who were given the Book before you, and the unbelievers, who take your religion in mockery and as a sport - and fear God, if you are believers - and when you call to prayer, take it in mockery and as a sport; that is because they are a people who have no understanding (Q5:51-8 cf. TS,10:395-432).

¹⁷This and the following two footnotes are borrowed from A. Guillaume in his 1.1:444. "Commentators say that there were two tribes known as the Kahinayn in the neighbourhood of Medina."

¹⁸"i.e. kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. In destroying the Jewish settlements they had destroyed the prosperity of the Hijaz."

¹⁹"Lit. 'killed hunger'".

²⁰Has thou not regarded those who have taken for friends a people against whom God is

wrathful? They belong neither to you nor to them; and they swear upon falsehood, and that wittingly. God has made ready for them a chastisement terrible; surely they - evil are the things they have been doing. They have taken their oaths as a covering, and barred from God's way; so there awaits them a humbling chastisement. Neither their riches nor their children shall avail them anything against God; those - they are the inhabitants of the Fire, therein dwelling forever. Upon the day when God shall raise them up all together, and they will swear to Him, as they swear to you, and think they are on something. Surely, they are the liars! Satan has gained the mastery over them, and caused them to forget God's Remembrance. Those are Satan's party; why, Satan's party, surely, they are the losers!

Surely those who oppose God and His Messenger, those are among the most abject. God has written, 'I shall assuredly be the victor, I and My Messengers.' Surely God is All-strong, All-mighty.

Thou shalt not find any people who believe in God and the Last Day who are loving to anyone who opposes God and His Messenger, not though they were their fathers, or their sons, or their brothers, or their clan. Those - He has written faith upon their hearts, and He has confirmed them with a Spirit from Himself; and He shall admit them into gardens underneath which rivers flow, therein to dwell forever, God being well-pleased with them, and they well-pleased with Him. Those are God's party; why, surely God's party - they are the prosperers. (Q58:14-22).

²¹See Q4:88-91 cf. TS,9:7-14; Q8:49-51 cf. T,10:20-3; Q29:10-13 cf. TB,20:82-6.

²⁴"When the hypocrites, and those in whose hearts was sickness, said, 'Their religion has deluded them'; but whosoever puts his trust in God, surely God is All-mighty, All-wise. If thou couldst only see when the angels take the unbelievers, beating their faces and their backs: 'Taste the chastisement of burning - that, for what your hands have forwarded, and for that God is never unjust unto his servants" (Q8:49-51).

²³How is it with you, that you are two parties touching the hypocrites, and God has overthrown them for what they earned? What, do you desire to guide him whom God has led astray? Whom God leads astray, thou wilt not find for him a way. They wish that you should disbelieve as they disbelieve, and then you would be equal; therefore take not to yourselves friends of them, until they emigrate in the way of God; then, if they turn their backs, take them, and slay them

wherever you find them;
 take not to yourselves any one of them
 as friend or helper
 except those that betake themselves to a people
 who are joined with you by a compact,
 or come to you with breasts constricted
 from fighting with you or fighting their people.
 Had God willed, He would have given them
 authority over you, and then certainly
 they would have fought you. If they withdraw
 from you, and do not fight you, and offer you
 peace, then God assigns not any way
 to you against them.
 You will find others desiring to be secure
 from you, and secure from their people, yet
 whenever they are returned to temptation, they
 are overthrown in it. If they withdraw not
 from you, and offer you peace, and restrain
 their hands, take them, and slay them wherever
 you come on them; against them We have given you
 a clear authority (Q4:88-91).

²⁴And what visited you, the day the two hosts
 encountered, was by God's leave, and that He might
 know the believers;
 and that He might also know the hypocrites
 when it was said of them, 'Come now, fight
 in the way of God, or repell!' They said, 'If only
 we knew how to fight, we would follow you.'
 They that day were nearer to unbelief than to belief,
 saying with their mouths that which never
 was in their hearts; and God knows very well the things
 they hide;
 who said of their brothers (and they themselves held
 back), 'Had they obeyed us, they would not have been
 slain.' Say: 'Then avert death from yourselves, if
 you speak truly.'
 Count not those who were slain in God's way
 as dead, but rather living with their Lord,
 by Him provided,
 rejoicing in the bounty that God has given
 them, and joyful in those who remain
 behind and have not joined them, because
 no fear shall be on them, neither shall they sorrow,
 joyful in blessing and bounty from God,
 and that God leaves not to waste the wage
 of the believers.
 And those who answered God and the Messenger
 after the wound had smitten them - to all those
 of them who did good and feared God, shall be
 a mighty wage;
 those to whom the people said, 'The people have gathered against you,
 therefore fear them';
 but it increased them in faith, and they said,
 'God is sufficient for us; and excellent Guardian is He.'
 So they returned with blessing and bounty
 from God, untouched by evil; they followed
 the good pleasure of God; and God is
 of bounty abounding.
 That is Satan frightening his friends,
 therefore do not fear them; but fear you Me,
 if you are believers.

Let them not grieve thee that vie with one another

in unbelief; they will nothing hurt God;
 God desires not to appoint for them a portion
 in the world to come, and there awaits them
 a mighty chastisement.

Those who buy unbelief at the price of faith,
 they will nothing hurt God; and there awaits them
 a painful chastisement.

And let not the unbelievers suppose that
 the indulgence We grant them is better for them;
 We grant them indulgence only that they may
 increase in sin; and there awaits them
 a humbling chastisement.

God will not leave the believers in the state
 in which you are, till He shall distinguish the
 corrupt from the good,

and God will not inform you of the Unseen;
 but God chooses out of His Messengers
 whom He will. Believe you then in God
 and His Messengers; and if you believe
 and are godfearing, there shall be for you
 a mighty wage.

But for those who are niggardly with
 the bounty God has given them, let them not
 suppose it is better for them; nay, it
 is worse for them;

that they were niggardly with they shall have
 hung about their necks on the Resurrection
 Day; and to God belongs the inheritance
 of the heavens and earth; and God is aware of
 the things you do. (Q3:166-80 cf. TS,7:377-440).

Almost all Quranic references to al-Munafiqun condemn their failure to contribute, personally and financially, to jihād campaigns. Al-Munafiqun are condemned for their anti-jihād attitudes and expressions. In the Prophet's biographies and the Tafsir literature, al-Munafiqun's anti-jihād picture is disdainfully portrayed amid reports about the Prophet's jihād expeditions, e.g., Uhud, Qaynuqa, Nadir, Qurayza and Tabuk. For more specific references in the Quran see Q2:19; 3:154-9, 166-80; 4:66,72-8; 5:54; 8:49; 9:61-110; 29:10-11; 33:12-24; 47:20-35; 57:10-15; 58:16-19.

²⁵"The dead were buried with rue at their feet at this time": Guillaume's note in 1.1:383. Also see al-Waqidi:263, who gives the same explanation -- **AL-HARMAL HABB NABAT-IN WA KANAT AL-ARAB TAJAL AL-HARMAL FI'L-QUBUR.** Al-Waqidi adds: "(Hatib) meant to say "there is no Paradise for him except this (rue in his grave) -- **WA ARAD HUNA: LAYS LAHU JANNAT ILLA DHAK (ibid).**"

²⁶Such an argument did Colonel North, a believer of our time, bring forward during the Iran-Contra hearings to justify overcharging for the arms sold underground to the Khomeini regime. Apparently, all kinds of believers think alike: to hurt perceived heathens by hook or crook!

²⁷The hypocrites are afraid, lest a sura should be sent down against them, telling thee what is in their hearts. Say: 'Mock on; God will bring forth what you fear.'

And if thou questionest them, then assuredly they will say, 'We were only plunging and playing.'
 Say: 'What, then were you mocking God, and His signs, and His Messenger?'

Make no excuses. You have disbelieved after your believing. If We forgive one party

of you, We will chastise another party for that
they were sinners.'

The hypocrites, the men and the women, are as
one another; they bid to dishonour, and forbid
honour; they keep their hands shut; they have forgotten
God, and He has forgotten them. The hypocrites -
they are the ungodly.

God has promised the hypocrites, men and women,
and the unbelievers, the fire of Gehenna,
therein to dwell forever. That is enough for them;
God has cursed them; and there awaits them
a lasting chastisement.

Like those before you, who were stronger than you
in might, and more abundant in wealth and children;
they took enjoyment in their share; so do you
take enjoyment in your share, as those before you
took enjoyment in their share. You have plunged
as they plunged. Those - their works have failed
in this world and in the world to come; those -
they are the losers" (Q9:64-9).

²⁸For the full story see 1.1:490-499, 768-9 (I.H. Notes); W:404-40;
Tabari's commentaries on Q24:11-12 passim; Q63:1-9; TT-1,2:604-19.

²⁹A nonbeliever may speculate that Muhammad was formulating the relevant
Quranic passage as poets and other artists do on such occasions before
producing the piece. This is what some of the Prophet's contemporary
heathens thought about his "invention" and "production" of the Quran
when they said he had "written it down"/"had others write it for
him/concocted it" -- **IKTATABAH** (Q25:4-5)

³⁰ The Surah **AL-MUNAFIQUN**, "THE HYPOCRITES", in the Quran:

In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate
When the hypocrites come to thee they say,
'We bear witness that thou art indeed
the Messenger of God.' And God knows
that thou art indeed His Messenger, and
God bears witness that the hypocrites
are truly liars.

They have taken their oaths as a covering,
then they have barred from the way of God.
Surely they - evil are the things they
have been doing.

That is because they have believed, then
they have disbelieved; therefore a seal
has been set on their hearts, and they
do not understand.

When thou seest them, their bodies please
thee but when they speak, thou listenest
to their speech, and it is as they were
propped-up timbers. They think every cry
is against them. They are the enemy;
so beware of them. God assail them! How
they are perverted!

And when it is said to them, 'Come now,
and God's Messenger will ask forgiveness
for you,' they twist their heads, and thou
seest them turning their faces away,
waxing proud.

Equal it is for them, whether thou askest
forgiveness for them or thou askest not
forgiveness for them; God will never
forgive them. God guides not the people

of the ungodly.

Those are they that say, 'Do not expend on them that are with God's Messenger until they scatter off'; yet unto God belong the treasures of the heavens and of the earth, but the hypocrites do not understand.

They say, 'If we return to the City, the mightier ones of it will expel the more abased'; yet glory belongs unto God, and unto His Messenger and the believers, but the hypocrites do not know it.

O believers, let not your possessions neither your children divert you from God's remembrance; whoso does that, they are the losers.

Expend of what We have provided you before that death comes upon one of you and he says, 'O my Lord, if only Thou wouldst defer me unto a near term, so that I may make freewill offering, and so I may become one of the righteous.'

But God will never defer any soul when its term comes. And God is aware of the things you do (Q63).

³¹In Islamic sources al-Hubab is mostly mentioned as Abd Allah, son of Abd Allah. When al-Hubab converted to Islam Muhammad did not like his name, al-Hubab, which literally means "the Bubble." The Prophet said 'al-Hubab' was the name of Satan. The Prophet named him Abd Allah (see IS-B,3:540-2). I mostly use here the original name al-Hubab to avoid confusion between Abd Allah the son and Abd Allah the father.

³²On his way back to Medina from al-Muraysi the Prophet received the news of the death of a great heathen -- MAUT AZIM MIN UZAMAI 'L-KUFFAR, Zayd b. Rifaah, a known Munafiq whose house used to be "a sanctuary for the Hypocrites" -- KAHF-AN LI'L-MUNAFIQIN. As soon as the Prophet heard the news he openly rejoiced in Ibn Rifaah's death, and congratulated the believers (T,28:116). Zayd b. Rifaah b. at-Tabut was a Qaynuga Jew converted to Islam and now was considered a Munafiq leader. Abd Allah b. Ubayy liked and respected him. Knowing this, Ubadah b. as-Samit, a believer, went to Abd Allah to tell him about the death of Zayd b. Rifaah - to cause him agony. Ubadah said, "your friend is dead." "Which friend?" Abd Allah asked. "The one whose death is a great victory for Islam and its people..., Zayd b. Rifaah," Ubadah said. Abd Allah could only say, "this is a great tragedy; by God, he was what he was" (i.e. a great honorable man). Our believer, disregarding Abd Allah's grief, continued to abuse the dead. Reporting gleefully Abd Allah's grief and helplessness, Ubadah concludes, "He was confounded and vexed and left (the unsolicited company) a broken mourning sad man" (W:423, parentheses added; also see TT-1,2:607 passim).

³³T,10:206; for the whole story here see T,10:199-200, 204-7 cf. Q9:80, 84; W:1057-60.

Part III: BELIEF IN RESURRECTION AFTER DEATH: THE HEREAFTER

Belief in an afterlife is the fourth requirement of the Iman Mujmal, the Islamic Synoptic Credo. Soon after the transformation of the whole world into a Dar al-Islam, life in this universe will be terminated. None will survive but the Almighty.

All that dwell upon the earth (will) perish; there will remain (only) the Face of thy Lord (Q55:26-7).

A great "terror" will bring this world to a sudden catastrophic end.¹

AL-AKHIRAH, the Hereafter, will begin with a tumultuous **YAUM AL-QIYAMAH/YAUM AL-BATH**, Day of Resurrection. All human beings will be resurrected from the dead and gathered in one place to be judged by the Almighty. This will be **YAUM AL-HISAB**, the Day of Reckoning, Judgment Day. Believers in Islamic Messengers of God - from Adam to Muhammad - the Muslims, will go to **AL-JANNAH**, Paradise, and the rest to Hell, **JAHANNAM**.²

A vast amount of material in the Quran and the Tradition deals with various dimensions of the Islamic concept of the Hereafter. Like material in other parts of the Iman Mujmal, various Al-Akhirah-related descriptions also affect Muslims' pattern of thought and behavior, particularly their images and treatment of the world beyond Islam. The sheer force of repeated and vivid descriptions of the Hereafter-related material, the wonderful accounts of Paradise, and the gruesome portrayal of Hell reinforce the belief in these phenomena, fixing the concept as a reality in Muslim minds. The style, intensity and extent of these descriptions help believers to touch and feel the reality of Paradise and Hell in imagination and act accordingly: to win Paradise and escape Hell.

The foremost effect of the Islamic concept of the Hereafter is the devaluation of this-worldly life and degradation of non-Muslims' works in Muslim eyes. For a Muslim, Paradise or Hell are the ultimate destinations of humankind. That life will terminate in this world just after the establishment of a world-wide Dar al-Islam deemphasizes this-worldliness. Al-Mahdi, the prince from the Prophet's house who will "fill the world with justice" will reign for less than a decade

(AD,35; T,7-9; IM,36:34 cf. AD,35:4-8; Tir,31:52; IM,36:34). The establishment of the world-wide Dar al-Islam in this world is to demonstrate the Almighty's omnipotence and the 'fact' that Islam is His preferred creed - not to bless human beings here and now. The real eternal kingdom of God is to be realized in **AL-AKHIRAH**, the Hereafter. So, life here and now is a mere transitory stage. The great extent of Islamic material about the Day Hereafter indicates the utmost importance of the concept for Muslims. The Quran and Tradition repeatedly contrast the Hereafter to this "lowly, mean world," **DUNYA**, encouraging believers to prefer the former to the latter. "Purchasing the present life at the price of the world to come" is condemned (Q2:86, also see 14:3; 16:107). "Fighting in the way of God" and, thus, "selling the present life for the world to come" is appreciated (Q4:74; cf. 17:19). "The world to come is better" (Q4:77; 17:21). God prefers (for the believers) "the world to come" to "the lures of this world" (Q8:67). God warns the believers not to be "content with this present life, rather than the world to come." Because "the enjoyment of this present life, compared with the world to come, is a little thing" (Q9:38). "The wage of the world to come is better" (Q12:57; 16:41). "The abode of the world to come is better" (Q12:109; 16:30). "This present life, beside the world to come, is naught but passing enjoyment" (Q13:26). Similarly, "the chastisement of the world to come is yet more grievous (Q13:34), and more degrading" (Q41:16).

This life of the world is but a pastime and a game. Lo! the home of the Hereafter - that is Life, if they but knew (29:64). This life of the world is but a passing comfort; the world to come is the abode of stability (Q40:39), better and more enduring (87:17).

Although Muslims may seek and receive **FI HADHIHI'D-DUNYA HASANAH** "good in this world," rewards and comforts in this life (Q2:201, 7:156; 16:41), the Quran's devaluation and condemnation of this world and this-worldly engagements are overwhelming.

The similitude of the life of the world is only as water which We send down from the sky, then the earth's growth of that which men and cattle eat mingleth with it till, when the earth hath taken on

her ornaments and is embellished, and her people deem them that they are masters of her, our commandment cometh by night or by day and We make it as reaped corn as if it had not flourished yesterday. Thus We expound the revelations for people who reflect (Q10:24)

i.e., on the transitory nature of this world.

And coin for them the similitude of the life of the world as water which We send down from the sky, and the vegetation of the earth mingleth with it and then becometh dry twigs that the winds scatter... Wealth and children are an ornament of the life of the world. But the good deeds which endure are better in thy Lord's sight for reward (in the Hereafter)... (18:45-6, parentheses added). The present world is the joy of delusion (3:185) the present world is naught but a sport (6:32)... Are you so content with this present life rather than the world to come? (9:38) This present life, beside the life to come, is naught but passing enjoyment (13:26).³

Nonbelievers' worldly engagements, successes and enjoyments are not to be envied; these things symbolize their wretchedness (Q2:212; 3:14) and delusion (Q3:185; 6:70, 130; 7:51; 10:7, 88; 31:33; 35:5; 45:35). Their worldly successes are to be ignored and ridiculed (Q18:28, 48).⁴

To conclude and speculate further about the effects of the concept of the Hereafter on Muslim images and treatment of nonbelievers, an understanding of certain dimensions of Islamic material about the afterlife will help.

Paradise and Hell in the Quran and Tradition.

Paradise is a place as wide as the whole earth and 'heaven' (Q3:133), an abode of peace with enduring delights and security (Q6:127; 9:72; 10:9; 13:9, 35). No bad feelings, nor sorrow nor fatigue reach those in Paradise; they will get whatever they wish. They will live there forever in God's presence enjoying His pleasure (2:25; 3:15, 25; 6:127; 13:35; 15:45-8; 16:30-1; 25:15-6; 35:34-5; 39:34). There will be excellent mansions, surrounded by rivers and gardens with abundant fruit (2:25; 3:15, 198, 122; 5:89; 9:72; 10:9; 13:9; 51:16; 54:54; 61:12). Paradise-dwellers will be adorned with bracelets of gold, pearls, green garments of fine silk and heavy brocades, reclining on "raised thrones" (18:31; 22:23; 35:33). Rivers of Paradise will be "of water unstaling... of milk unchanging in flavor... of wine - a delight to

drinkers"... along with "every fruit and forgiveness from their Lord" (47:15).

Those in Paradise "shall drink of a cup whose mixture is camphor." And there shall be "a fountain whereat drink the servants of God making it to gush forth plenteously." Their faces will be radiant and glad. They will be reclining "upon couches, therein they shall see neither sun nor bitter cold; near them shall be its shades and its clusters many meekly down, and there shall be passed around them vessels of silver, and goblets of crystals, crystal silver that they have measured very exactly. And therein they shall be given to drink a cup whose mixture is ginger. Therein a fountain whose name is called **SALSABIL** (76:5-22).

There will be "spouses purified" (2:25; 3:15), "busy o in their rejoicing... (along with) their spouses, reclining upon couches (having) all that they call for" (36:55-7). "Wide-eyed houris spoused (to the believers)" and "wide-eyed maidens restraining their glances as if they were hidden pearls" and (similar) youths will move around amid passing cups "from a spring..., a delight to drinkers, wherein no sickness is neither intoxication" (37:40-9; 52:17-24). "Immortal youths shall go about them... (as) scattered pearls" (76:5-22). For the believers, in Paradise "awaits a place of security, gardens and vineyards and maidens with swelling breasts, like of age, and a cup overflowing" (78:31-6). The last part of the surah **AR-RAHMAN** "The All Merciful" is one of the many masterpieces where the Quran describes Paradise.

But such as fears the Station of his Lord,
 for them shall be two gardens -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 abounding in branches -
 which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 therein two fountains of running water -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 therein of every fruit two kinds -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 reclining upon couches lined with brocade,
 the fruits of the gardens nigh to gather -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 therein maidens restraining their glances,
 untouched before them by any man or jinn -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 lovely as rubies, beautiful as coral -

O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 Shall the recompense of goodness be other than goodness?
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?

And besides these shall be two gardens -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 green, green pastures -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you de p
 goodness?
 therein two fountains of gushing water
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 therein fruits,
 and palm-trees, and pomegranates -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 therein maidens good and comely -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 houris, cloistered in cool pavilions -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 untouched before them by any man or jinn -
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?
 reclining upon green cushions and lovely druggets
 O which of your Lord's bounties will you and you deny?

Blessed be the Name of thy Lord, majestic, splendid
 p(55:46-78).⁵

Compared to the believers' wonderful Paradise, **JAHANNAM**, the permanent home of nonbelievers, will be a hell in its real sense. The horrifying sufferings in Hell are described throughout the Quran. Those in Gehenna "are given to drink boiling water, that tears their bowels asunder" (47:15). They will be "roasted well" (36:63; 38:56-8). Those in Hell will be forced to eat the fruit of a tree called az-Zakkum.

It is a tree that comes forth in the root of Hell; its spathes are as the heads of Satan and they eat of it, and of it fill their bellies, then on top of it they have a brew of boiling water (Q37:62-7; also see 44:43-50).

This drink of az-Zakkum is "like molten copper bubbling in the belly as boiling water bubbles." Meanwhile, these wretched nonbelievers will be "thrust in the midst of Hell," "the chastisement of boiling water" being poured over their heads. While so torturing, the Hell-keepers will continue to ridicule and humiliate them, reminding them of their disbelief in Islam (44:43-50). In Hell, "an evil cradling," its dwellers will have boiling water and puss to drink; "and other torments of the like kind coupled together (38:56-8). Against those in Hell "shall be loosed a flame of fire, and molten brass." They "shall be seized by their forelocks and their feet; they shall go round between it

and between hot boiling water" (55:41-5). Reminding one of his disbelief in the Islamic God, the Almighty Commands the angel:

Take him, and fetter him, and then roast him in Hell; then in a chain of seventy cubits' length insert him (69:30-3).

Referring to a disbeliever in Muhammad's Prophethood, God declares:

I shall surely roast him in SAKAR; and what will teach thee what is SAKAR? It spares not, neither leaves alone, scorching the flesh (74:25-9). Surely We have prepared for the unbelievers chains, letters, and a Blaze (76:4) that shoots sparks like dry faggots, sparks like to golden herds. Woe that day unto those who cry it lies! This is the day they shall not speak, neither be given leave... (77:30-6).

For disbelievers in Islam, Gehenna will

become an ambush... therein to tarry for ages, tasting therein neither coolness nor any drink save boiling water and pus... (78:21-5)... humbled, laboring, toilworn, roasting at a scorching fire, watered at a boiling fountain, no food for them but cactus thorn (untattering), unappeasing hunger (88:2-7).

Traditions ascribed to the Prophet Muhammad give similar pictures of Paradise and Hell. The Prophet during his nocturnal journey to Heaven and in visions saw Paradise and Hell.⁶ "The smallest spot of Paradise," the Prophet told the believers, "is better than the whole world." The Prophet talked of the pleasant odor of Paradise in detail. He talked of the houris waiting for the believers in sumptuous and elegant tents. He talked of 'the highest mansions' of the two silver gardens and two golden gardens, of "the different gates from which different people are called, of a particular gate called **AR-RAYYAN** (through which those who fast in the month of Ramadan will enter Paradise), of the weekly schedule of the opening of certain particular gates, of the distance in minute detail between various gates of the dimensions of Paradise and particular buildings therein, of streets, trees, rivers and a particular fountain called **SALSABIL**. The Prophet talked of the horses and also of the camels of **AL-JANNAH**. He did not forget to mention special Paradise dishes, the 'fish-liver dish' and 'heavenly bull dish.' He talked of the transparent goblets in Paradise, and the elegant clothes of those in it. He even told us "how children are born in" Paradise (See Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan

Tradition, pp. 96-7, 180-183).

The Prophet Muhammad told believers about the exact ratio of the heat in Hell to that of ordinary fire. The Prophet told believers about the great throngs of human beings in the Day of Resurrection and of their anxieties waiting for the Divine Judgment, of the scene when nonbelievers will have one-way 'tickets' inserted in their left hands for Hell and be branded on their faces as permanent dwellers of the Fire. The Prophet portrayed the picture more minutely: there will be a two-way drag. As the Quran affirms, nonbelievers will be caught by their forelocks and dragged on their knees towards Hell. This is not enough; Hell itself will be dragged towards the damned, the Prophet tells us, to shorten the distance and momentary relief of being out of the Fire. Hell is explained as a greedy monster; it cries out: **HAL MIN MAZID** "Are there any more?" (Q50:30); it wants more and more and more nonbelievers to roast. It is so ferociously greedy that God will interfere to check its greed, the Prophet tells us. The Prophet told the believers of the seven gates of Hell, one specially reserved for those who fight against Muslims. Bad news for women! They shall form the majority of Hell, Muhammad told us.⁷

To satisfy believers, the Prophet told them of the torturous scenes he was shown during his nocturnal journey. For example, he said, as a result of the torture and distortion of the body organs of the nonbelievers in Hell, there were some whose one tooth had grown like the mountain of Uhud, and whose skins had grown even more rugged than the rocks of the same mountain (Mu.51:44). The Prophet saw a distance of three days journey between the two shoulders of nonbelievers in Hell (Mu.51:45): as punishment, they were transformed into monsters. The Prophet told of the horrifying depth of, and the disgusting filth in, Hell, reassuring the Muslims, however, that they would escape this "evil cradle" (Bu:15; 81:51; 97:19, 36; Mu.1:148; IM. Intr.:b.9; 37:37).

The Quran adopts mostly a comparative description of believer-nonbeliever situations in the Hereafter. The surah, "the

"Terror" is among the best examples of the Quran's comparative style.⁸

THE TERROR

In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate

When the Terror descends
 (and none denies its descending)
 abasing, exalting,
 when the earth shall be rocked
 and the mountains crumbled
 ,,and become a dust scattered,
 and you shall be three bands --

Companions of the Right (O Companions of the Right!)
 Companions of the Left (O Companions of the Left!)
 and the Outstrippers: the Outstrippers
 ((those are they brought nigh the Throne,
 in the Gardens of Delight
 (a throng of the ancients
 and how few of the later folk)
 ::upon close-wrought couches
 reclining upon them, set face to face,
 immortal youths going round about them
 with goblets, and ewers, and a cup from a spring
 (no brows throbbing, no intoxication)
 no such fruits as they shall choose,
 and such flesh of fowl as they desire,
 and wide-eyed houris
 as the likeness of hidden pearls,
 a recompense for that they laboured.
 There in they shall hear no idle talk, no cause for sin,
 only the saying 'Peace, Peace!'

The Companions of the Right (O Companions of the Right!)
 mid thornless lote-trees and serried acacias,
 and spreading shade and outpoured waters,
 and fruits abounding
 unfailing, unforbidden,
 and upraised couches.
 Perfectly We formed them, perfect,
 and We made them spotless virgins,
 chastely amorous, like of age
 for the Companions of the Right.
 A throng of the ancients and a throng of the later folk.

The Companions of the Left (O Companions of the Left!)
 mid burning winds and boiling waters
 and the shadow of a smoking blaze
 neither cool, neither goodly;
 and before that they lived at ease,
 and persisted in the Great sin,
 ever saying,
 'What, when we are dead and become
 dust and bones, shall we indeed
 be raised up?
 What, and our fathers, the ancients?'.
 Say: 'The ancients, and the later folk
 shall be gathered to the appointed time
 of a known day.
 Then you erring ones, you that cried lies,
 you shall eat of a tree called Zakkoum,
 and you shall fill therewith your bellies
 and drink on top of that boiling water

lapping it down like thirsty camels.'
 This shall be their hospitality on the
 Day of Doom (56:1-56).

Reading the passage 7:42-53, believers find that as a result of their belief in Islam they will rejoice in the marvelous Paradise as promised, while disbelievers in Islam will be in Hell. The Hell-dwellers will "call to the inhabitants of Paradise: 'Pour on us water, or of that God has provided you!'" The believers, referring to the Almighty's verdict against the wretched, demonstrating an ideal behavior, would refuse, mercilessly.

Q36:55-63 shows the believers in Paradise "busy in their rejoicing, they and their spouses, reclining upon coaches (having)... all they call for," while nonbelievers will be 'roasting well' in Hell. Q37:40-74 is a long passage comparing and contrasting the states of believers and nonbelievers in AL-AKHIRAH. Those in Paradise amid comforts and luxuries (described in detail) will remember contemptuously their contemporaries who did not believe, and "looking down" will be so happy to see them "in the midst of Hell" being tortured variously. The believers will rejoice in their "great achievement." In Q38:49-69 (and in Q50:23-35 similarly) believers are depicted in "gardens of eternity... reclining at ease, calling at pleasure for fruit... (and) drinks (in the company of) beautiful maidens of equal age" while the Hell-dwellers under torture will be quarrelling and cursing each other, for having ridiculed the believers in this world. God will congratulate the believers while insulting the nonbelievers. Q39:11-20 compares, among other things, the "lofty mansions" of Paradise with "layers of fire above (those in Hell) and layers of fire below them."

On the Day of Judgment, the faces of disbelievers will be blackened; they will be herded together and rushed towards Hell. On the gates, the Hell-keepers will taunt them for their rejection of Islamic Prophets and Revelations and of their disbelief in the Hereafter. Then, the Hell-keepers would say: "Enter... Gehenna to dwell therein

forever. How evil is the lodging...!". Compared to this harsh treatment, the Paradise-keepers will receive the believers with greetings of peace: "Well you have feared; enter in, to dwell forever" (Q39:60-75). The passage 43:67-75 tells Muslims that there will be no grief and fear for them. Rather, "there shall be passed around them platters of gold, and cups... being whatever the souls desire, and the eyes delight..." But nonbelievers will be quarrelling with each other in frustration, suffering from the tortures of Hell, never "abated for them and therein they are sore confounded." Nonbelievers will be dragged through the Fire while the believers will be enjoying themselves in an "assembly... in the presence of (God)" (Q54:47-8, 54-5).9

The literalness of Islamic descriptions of Paradise and Hell makes them more real to the believers. Traditional explanations do not encourage speculation about any spiritual, figurative or symbolic interpretation. Reports ascribed to the Prophet and his Companions about the 'wide-eyed' houris with 'swelling breasts' and about the **GHILMAN**, Paradise Pages, refer to them as palpable, tangible beings. The debate of the Prophet and his comrades centers on the degree of whiteness and transparency of these voluptuous Quranic virgins and "pearl-like youths," rather than their spiritual and symbolic aspects. The question Islamic sources raise is not whether these beautiful creatures were physical facts or symbols of something else, but how the Almighty managed to keep the naughty jinn from having sexual intercourse with the houris before the believers could have them (see T,27:150-3).

The Prophet promised two houris to every male entrant of Paradise (T,27:153). In order to assure the believers that these creatures will not be nuns enwrapped in heavy garments, merely praising the Lord and encouraging the believers to engage in meditation, the Prophet added: **YURA MUKHKH SUQIHIMA MIN WARAI THIYABIHA** -- "the marrow of their legs could be seen from behind their clothes" (ibid). In the same context the Prophet tells the believers that the whiteness of these legs - indeed, the marrow within their leg bones - will be visible from behind

seventy (layers of) silken robes -- **INNAMA'L-MARAT MIN AHL AL-JANNAH, LA-YURA BAYAD SAQIHA MIN WARA SABIN HILLAT MIN HARIR WA MUKHKHIHA** (T,27:152). The **KAWAIB-A ATRABA**, "maidens with swelling breasts, like of age," of Q78:30-3 will be waiting in Paradise for the believers to enjoy them (T,30:17-20). The "wide-eyed maidens' restraining their glances - as if they were hidden pearls" (Q37:48-9) do not symbolize their absolute chastity and celibacy. It is simply to reassure believers that the houris will be so loyal that they will look at none but their assigned spouses among the believers (T,23:56-8). Referring to the root-word TAMTH in the Quranic verse **LAM YATMATH-HUNN QABLAHUM INS-UN WA LA JANN**, "No human being or jinn has touched the houris before them (i.e. the assigned spoused among the believers)", a Traditional report tells us categorically that **TAMTH**, "touching," in this context means sexual intercourse -- **AT-TAMTH AL-JIMA** (T,27:151). It rejects our modern apologist exegete, Abdullah Yusuf Ali's, assertion (in the context of his commentary on this passage) that no conjugal sense is involved in the concept of the houris in the Quran. The Quran and Prophetic Tradition assert, unapologetically, that the wide-eyed houris shall literally be espoused to the believers by the Lord as a show of His bounty for them (Q44:54-7 cf. T,25:136-8; Q52:20 cf. T27:23-4).

The Bases for the Divine Judgement.

Sacred Islamic sources tell Muslims that salvation in the Hereafter ultimately depends on 1) the acceptance of Islamic dogma, 2) performance of specific rituals as believers in this dogma, and 3) particular modes of relationship with non-Muslims. The dogma includes the five main components of the Iman Mujmal, i.e., belief in Islamic concepts of godhood, angels, Messengers and Books, the Hereafter and Predestination. Belief in (and obedience to) the Prophets, particularly Muhammad, take a central position in this belief system. All other components of the Synoptic Credo are to be understood and accepted as explained by the Prophets. For example, belief in God means belief in the God who

appointed Muhammad as His last Messenger. Those who do not acknowledge Muhammad as such and obey and follow him wholeheartedly are disbelievers in God. Belief in the concept of Revelation, Prophethood and Books means faith in the authenticity of the Islamic concept of history and eschatology as described in the Quran (received by Muhammad) and explained by Muhammadan Tradition. Obedience and love of Muhammad must be perfect and unconditional. One should love him more than one's loved ones. The ultimate evidence of this love for (and obedience to) Muhammad is to appreciate, condone and imitate his actions against non-Muslims.

Islamic rituals, other than being exclusive, in turn reinforce the same belief system and the negative images and treatment of nonbelievers. Similarly, Quranic exhortations for good works in most cases refer to adherence to the dogma in the abstract, to obedience to the Prophet as above and to the performance of Islamic rituals. To the extent Islam relates salvation to good works in general, the beneficiaries are to be Muslims and the Islamic cause. The most emphasized 'deeds' (sing:) **AMAL**, other than doing rituals, are **HIJRA** and **JIHAD** in their comprehensive sense. They earn one Paradise. Both **HIJRAH** and **JIHAD** express negative attitude toward non-Muslims. So, Muslims find that adhering to the Islamic belief and ritualistic system, and adopting an unfriendly and harsh attitude towards non-Muslims (e.g., being **ASHIDDA ALA'L-KUFFAR** (Q48:29), "harsh on nonbelievers" as defined by the Quran), that earn one Paradise, not necessarily good works per se. Similarly, Muslims find that those in Hell are the disbelievers in Islamic dogma, not necessarily evil-doers as commonly understood. This Muslim belief is further reinforced by the **HABT/HUBUT** and **AFW**-related material concerning the afterlife. The material around the concept of **HABT/HUBUT** "rendering vain" tells the believers that non-Muslims will go to Hell regardless of their good works. **AFW** "forgiveness"-related material guarantees believers a place in Paradise despite their evil deeds.

Two methods of studying the Quran - aided by Tradition - help to ascertain how the belief in Islamic dogma, performance of rituals, and unfriendly relations with non-Muslims are the highways to Paradise, while the contrary lead to Hell. 1) A study of the whole context preceding and/or following verses that refer some to Hell, others to Paradise; and 2) an understanding of the meanings and connotations of Islamic terms for laudable characteristics that earn one Paradise, and of the labels for condemnable deeds or thoughts which doom one to Hell. For example, when the Quran says 'a **MUTTAQI**, "godfearing," or a **SALIH**, "righteous," person goes to paradise,' what does it really mean? Are "uprightness" and "righteousness" signified in their common sense? Similarly, what does it mean when the Quran ascribes **FASAD**, "corruption, mischief," **JABR**, "tyranny," **ISRAF**, "prodigality," etc. to those who go to Hell? For illumination, we study two Quranic passages, the first Surah and the first passage of the second Surah; Tabari, as Traditionalist exegete, will guide us to further explanation and, specifically, to an understanding of laudatory and condemnatory terms. We will also meet the contents of the most important Islamic rite: **SALAT**, "prayer."

The Quranic passage 2:1-29 should be read as a single unit. Verses 2:7, 10, 24 condemn some to Hell. 2:25 sends others to Paradise. This passage divides people into 1) **AL-MUMINUN**, "the believers," who go to Paradise and 2) **AL-KAFIRUN**, "the disbelievers," condemned to Hell. The believers are those who believe in God and do "not set up compeers" to Him. The believers are **AL-MUTTAQIN**, "godfearing," who "believe in the Unseen, perform **SALAT**, the prayer, and expend." They "believe in what has been sent down to (Muhammad)... (and) have faith in the Hereafter"; they "do deeds of righteousness." Disbelievers are those who do the opposite. They "cry lies" to what Muhammad claimed. They "work corruption," are "insolent" and do not take Islam seriously. They are wretched: "God has set a seal on their hearts and on their hearing, and on their eyes is a covering."

Throughout his commentaries on the passage, Tabari repeatedly emphasizes the importance of **IMAN**, "belief," for salvation. First and foremost, this must be an **IMAN BI'L-GHAYB**, "belief in the Unseen" (Q2:3), i.e., complete blind faith. No rational proof is to be demanded. The Quranic passage and Tabari's commentaries condemn al-Munafiqun's incomplete, half-hearted and conditional belief in Islam (e.g. TS,1:285 cf. Q2:8-10). According to this passage and accompanying Traditions in Tabari, one must believe in the Islamic concept of godhood and invisible phenomena. Monotheism means belief in the God who appointed Muhammad His last Messenger. True belief in this God means faith in the Quran and Muhammad's other teachings as Divinely revealed guidance (e.g. TS,1:227-30, 36). Belief in the Unseen must include belief in the Islamic concept of angels, Paradise, Hell and other related phenomena (TS,1:236-8). **KUFR**, "disbelief," is defined as "repudiation of Muhammad's Prophethood and crying lies about him," i.e., disbelief in the authenticity of Muhammad's claim that he was the last Messenger of God and received Revelation from God to be obeyed by all -- **JUHUDUHUM NUBUWWAT MUHAMMAD... WA TAKDHIBUHUM BIHI** (TS,1:251). Tabari gives the example of Jews as such disbelievers. Commenting on Q2:8-10, Tabari maintains that without belief in Muhammad as the authentic Messenger of God, and without unwavering loyalty to his community, the People of the Book's claim of belief in God and the afterlife does not qualify them as "believers." These People of the Book are trying to deceive God, the believers and themselves. Regardless of their "lies" (and claims) they will be in Hell, as 2:10 tells us (ibid:285).

The Quranic passage asserts that believers who go to Paradise are **AL-MUTTAQUN** "godfearing, righteous, pious, those who ward off evil" (2:2, 21) and true **AL-MUSLIHUN** (which literally means "righteous, those who put things in order, work for peace and reconciliation between groups or individuals, reformers") (Q2:11). Disbelievers are condemned to Hell also for their **FASAD/IFSAD**, "corruption, mischief, wickedness" etc. According to Traditional explanations, these laudatory and

condemnatory terms emphasize the Islamic belief system and pattern of believe-nonbeliever relationships; contrary to their literal meanings, they do not signify works in general, as an uninformed reader might infer.

AL-MUTTAQUN, the godfearing, are those who avoid doing what God has forbidden and do what He has commanded to do (TS,1:232, 234). More specifically, **AL-MUTTAQUN** those fearful of the Divine Chastisement due those who shun Divine guidance (ibid:233). **AL-MUTTAQUN** are those hoping to receive God's mercy by acknowledging the authenticity of what (Muhammad) has received (ibid). Tabari also tells us that al-Muttaqun are those who believe in **AL-GHAYB**, "the unseen," such as "the Garden (Paradise) and the Fire (Hell)" along with related concepts of Resurrection as reward and punishment in the Hereafter. They are godfearing because they believe in (the existence of) God, His Books and Messengers (TS,1:238). Tabari also emphasizes that strict adherence to (the Islamic concept of) monotheism is essential to qualify as **MUTTAQI**. These are those who do not set up partners to God (TS,1:233-4). This is a reference to 'polytheists' and 'pagans,' as well as Christians who call Jesus son of God. To be more specific, Tabari tells us, the "godfearing" are those who believe "in Muhammad and in what he brought [i.e. the Quran and all from Islam as the authentic creed and sanctified religion of God] - not disbelievers; e.g., not those who claim to believe in the Prophets and Books that came before Muhammad, but belie Muhammad and what came with him" (TS,1:246-7). Here, Tabari mentions the Jews and Christians as not being godfearing because they do not believe in Muhammad and the Quran.

FASAD/IFSAD, "corruption, mischief", here refers to al-Munafiqun's friendly relations with non-Muslims, and to their efforts to make peace between the believers and the Jews. By doing so they committed **FASAD**, i.e., "unbelief and acts of disobedience... to God" (T-OXF,1:124).

'Corruption in the land' is any action therein which God has forbidden and the omission of anything which He has commanded to be observed. This is the general meaning of 'corruption'... in

Q2:30, i.e., disobedience to (the) Lord... omission of the duties He imposed,... doubt about God's religion whose truth a person must attest (T-OXF.,1:124-5).

Tabari further explains Quranic meanings of **FASAD**, "corruption," **ISLAH**, "reconciliation...", and **IHSAN**, "doing good." "(Al-Munafiqun) say, 'We intended to reconcile the believers with the People of the Book.' God opposed this and told them they were committing disobedience to God." Tabari admits that al-Munafiqun undoubtedly thought they did good -- **ISLAH** -- by trying to reconcile the Muslim with Jews or (foster peaceful coexistence) between the two religions. This was, however, a sin against God, Tabari remarks.

In their own thinking they were being righteous -- **MUHSINUN**, in all this (engagement in reconciliation), but as a matter of fact they were doing evil and were opposing God's command. Because they were under obligation by God the Almighty to have animosity and hostility against the Jews and take part with Muslim in fighting against them (the Jews) (as they were obliged) to confirm the Messenger of God and what be brought from God... Their friendly meetings with the Jews and their doubt about the Prophethood of the Messenger of Allah and about what he brought (Revelation, Quran) from God were (tantamount to be) the greatest "corruption." Contrary to this claim of being engaged in reconciliation, reforms and guidance between the believers and the Jews or between their religions, the Almighty said, 'Truly, they are the workers of corruption' (TS,1:291).

Thus here **ISLAH**, "reform, reconciliation etc." means just the opposite of its dictionary meaning where relations with non-Muslims are concerned. Later, Tabari tells us again:

When it is said in the Quran that 'they indulge in "mischief and corruption -- **FASAD**...', it relates to their disobedience of their Lord and disbelief in Him, to their rejection of His Prophet - (Muhammad), to their repudiation of his Prophethood and to their disavowal of what he (Muhammad) has brought in truth from God (TS,1:416).

FASAD FI'L-ARD, "corruption on earth," in Q5:32 primarily means being in a state of war with God and His Messenger (Muhammad) -- **INNAMA YAKUN BI'L-HARB LI'LLAH WA LI-RASULIH-I** (TS,10:240, i.e., not obeying and following God wholeheartedly and unconditionally as explained and demanded by Muhammad. Disbelieving in Muhammad's authenticity as the Messenger of God and final and binding authority on everything is to be

in a state of War with the Almighty. **FASAD** in Q38:28 that sends one to Hell means ascribing partner(s) to God, disobeying Him and acting against His commandments (received through the Quran and Muhammad) -- **YUKHALIFUN AMRAHU WA NAHYAHU** (T,23:152).

The believers go to Paradise because they perform **AS-SALAT**, "the prayer," and practice **INFAQ**, "expend" (2:3), and "do **AMAL SALIH**, good works" (2:25). Are these just simple pious works? NO. First: Quranic contexts and Traditional exegeses (as in Tabari) of most of about fifty **INFAQ**-related verses (as in Kasis:822-3) emphasize "expending" "in the way of God," mainly to encourage contributions for jihad expeditions and for poorer Muslims in order to strengthen their bond with Islam and enable them to participate in jihad campaigns. Second: their exclusive ritualistic forms are important. Third: the contents and procedures of these apparently pious actions again reinforce the Islamic belief system and the negative images and treatment of nonbelievers. **AS-SALAT**, "the Prayer" is to be performed in strictly Islamic ways.¹⁰ Note that no other kind of prayer, e.g., Hindu, Jewish, Christian, etc., qualifies for **SALAT**.

Along with its specific manner of performance, **SALAT** consists of recitations from the Quran and Tradition. Recitation of **AL-FATIHA** "The Opening," the first short Surah (Chapter) of the Quran, is the obligatory, most important part of every unit of Islamic prayer.¹¹ With obligatory prayers five times a day, a Muslim believer affirms at least 40 to 50 times daily the contents of al-Fatiha, and has possibly its vast Traditional connotations in mind. On numerous other formal and informal occasions - daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly - al-Fatiha is recited, read or heard by the believers.¹²

Al-Fatiha begins with an eloquent praise of God, confirming His "authority in the Day of Judgment" (1:1-3). Then, the believer pledges to worship only God and to seek support only from Him (1:5). The believer asks only for one thing, with an eye on its consequences in the Hereafter. This one thing, however, is comprehensive: "Guide us in the

Straight Path -- **AS-SIRAT AL-MUSTAQIM**, the Path of those blessed by you (God), not of those against whom you (God) are wrathful -- **AL-MAGHDUB ALAYHIM**, nor of those gone astray -- **AD-DALLIN**" (1:6-7). That is all. But Muslims, informed by Tradition, know the seven short verses of al-Fatiha convey a world of meanings. The Prophet called this short sura the **UMM AL-QURAN** "mother of the Quran."¹³ We concentrate on the last two short verses. What is the "straight Path" Muslims seek which they believe would lead to salvation in "the Day of Judgment"? Does the "Straight Path" relate directly to good deeds in general? Who are the "blessed," "the targets of God's wrath" -- **AL-MAGHDUB ALAYHIM**, and the "astray," and why? Do Muslims learn of any correlation between deeds and salvation? What kind of images of non-Muslims does the recitation of the Sura inculcate among believers?

Tabari adopts various methods to define "the Straight Path"; repeatedly, he comes to the same conclusion: it is Islam (see TS,1:170-7). It is the path that was followed by Muhammad and his contemporary followers, such as Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Ali, Tabari tells us. It is the only religion acceptable to God -- **LA YAQBIL MIN IBADIHI GHAYRAHU**. The "blessed" in the sura are the Muslims who obey God and Muhammad -- **TAIN LI'LLAH WA LIRASULIHI**. Tabari's detailed explanations leave no way for a non-Muslim to be counted as blessed (see T,1:177-80). When Muslims pray for Divine guidance to the Straight Path, they actually pray to remain what they are: Muslims.

On 17 pages (*ibid*:180-97), Tabari explains who **AL-MAGHDUB ALAYHIM**, "the target of God's wrath," and **AD-DALLIN**, "the astray," are, whose paths Muslims pray not to follow. They are those "who are against the Truth, deviating from the way of God, His Messenger (Muhammad) and the Muslims" (*ibid*:182). "The ones whose religions are not blessed and are not guided by God to the Truth" (*ibid*:183). Quoting condemnatory Quranic statements (Q5:60) against the Jews, Tabari (like all other Traditional exegetes) maintains that "the targets of God's wrath" in al-Fatiha are the Jews. Quoting the Prophet extensively, Tabari asserts

that "those against whom God is wrathful" are the Jews (ibid:185-8). One form of God's wrath against the Jews, Tabari says, is that He transformed (some of) them into apes and swine -- **AL-QIRADAT WA'L-KHANAZIR**; these reports say the Jews will be punished here and in the Hereafter (ibid:188-9). So, Muslims pray not to be like the "cursed" Jews, nor like any other non-Muslim. Again quoting other parts of the Quran (e.g. Q5:77) and Prophetic reports, Tabari informs us that the **DALLIN**, "misguided, astray" of al-Fatiha are particularly the Christians (see ibid:192-5). A Tradition sums up the discussion: when Muslims pray to God 'Do not guide us to the path of those against whom thou art wrathful nor of those gone astray,' they actually pray not to be Jews or Christians, who, Muslims know, are condemned to Divine chastisement (ibid:194).

In each unit of **SALAT**, after al-Fatiha, Muslims must recite passages from any other part of the Quran. This is followed in various postures by recitation of brief Traditional phrases praising God, the Prophet, his family and Companions, and Traditional prayers. Most of the Quran, we know, is a repetitive explication and assertion of its belief system (about God, angels Prophethood, Hereafter) and a diatribe against non-Muslims. Traditional prayers have similar contents. For example, in one of these Traditional prayers, referring to non-Muslims in general, Muslims pray: "O God, dissolve their gathering, tear to pieces their unity, destroy their land/country" -- **ALLAHUMMA, SHATTIT SHAMLAHUM, MAZZIQ JAMA'HUM, DAMMIR DIYARAHUM** etc.

Q2:1-29 reveals yet more. Q2:25 gives glad tidings of Paradise to "those who believe and do good works." As usual, Tabari again gives a very generalized definition of "good works" here: "Good works are those" God says, "which I have obligated through My Book and through your tongue (O Muhammad)" -- **AS-SALIH MIN AL-AMAL AL-LATI IPTARADTUHA ALAYHI WA AUJABTUHA FI KITABI ALA LISANIK ALAYH** (ibid:383). Tabari does not specify further.

INFAQ "to expend (charitably)" in Q2:3 is basically, for Tabari, a

reference to **ZAKAT**, the specific Islamic charity tax (TS,1:243). Undoubtedly, Islam encourages Muslims to be charitable towards other Muslims. The Quranic exhortations and the Prophet's practice in this regard do not necessarily help non-Muslims, unless **TALIF AL-QULUB**, "winning of the hearts (for Islam)," is the aim. We know that Q2:3 and numerous other passages encouraging "expenditure in the way of God" were revealed after the Prophet's hijrah to Medina. They meant to exhort Medinans (and later all others -- Muslims and non-Muslims) -- to help Meccan refugee (**MUHAJIR**) Muslims and, particularly, to contribute to the Prophet's jihad expeditions. According to other Quranic verses, the poor and the needy had to receive a share from **ZAKAT**. But the Prophet's Traditions hardly encourage giving **ZAKAT** or any other form of charity to non-Muslims, except for **TALIF AL-QULUB**. In almost all cases the non-Muslim recipients of generous gifts, to "win hearts" for Islam (such as the Meccans after the conquest), were not destitute. Such "expenditure" was more like **BAKSHISH**, if not outright bribes, than pious charity. In some cases the Prophet allowed some Muslims to give a part of their **ZAKAT** and other charities to their needy pagan, **MUSHRIK**, parents. But, after the conquest of Hawazin and Taif, when the Prophet bestowed upon the Quraysh a share of the booty, his Medinan Companions objected. They argued that these Quraysh recipients were not true Muslims. (Some of them had not yet accepted Islam formally.) The Prophet did not say non-Muslims could benefit unconditionally from Muslim charity and generosity. As the Messenger of God, he could say so if he pleased. Rather, the Prophet argued, he had done so "to win over a people that they may become Muslims" (1.1:596). Specific Quranic injunctions asking Muslims "to be harsh on nonbelievers and kind (only) to each other" -- **ASHIDDA ALAL-KUFFAR RUHAMA BAYNAHUM** (Q48:29) disallow a believer to be charitable towards non-Muslims. Muslims are categorically forbidden to "offer love" to non-Muslims.

O believers, take not My enemy and your enemy for friends, offering them love, though they have disbelieved in the truth that has come to you... (Q60:1).

Although this passage continues rhetorically with the charge against nonbelievers of expelling the Messenger and Muslims from Mecca as one reason for forbidding affectionate attitudes toward nonbelievers, the prohibition against amicable relations with nonbelievers recurrent elsewhere in the Quran is absolute (see Q3:28, 118; 4:89, 119, 139-44; 5:51,57; 9:23; 17:73; 29:41; 42:6...).

A similar detailed study of numerous Quranic passages with the help of cross-references and Traditional explanations of the context tells us it is the disbelief in Islamic images of God, His angels, the Books and Messengers and the Hereafter, and the "vain talk" about Islamic belief system that lead to Hell - not any evil deed in its common sense. The crux of consignment to Hell is the rejection of Muhammad as the last Messenger of God, who must be obeyed and followed, and of the Quran as the last, most comprehensive and sufficient Divine guidance, as explained by Muhammad. ISTIGHNA, "thinking oneself self-sufficient, unneedful of Divine guidance (through the Islamic Prophets, particularly Muhammad)," is a sure way to Hell. Numerous Quranic passages also tell that the People of the Book will go to Hell for corrupting earlier Revelations that foretold of Muhammad and Islam. Conversely, these Quranic passages promise Muslims Paradise for doing just the opposite, i.e., adhering to the Islamic belief system and specific rituals which again reinforce the same and make Muslims conscious of their superiority to non-Muslims.¹⁴ Likewise, Traditional explanations of condemnatory terms indicate those who go to Hell do not, primarily, do so for this-worldly misdeeds. Nonbelievers are called so and so, e.g., **ZALIM**, "transgressor, cruel," not for their cruelty or transgressions of others' rights but for their lack of faith in Islam. In order not to confuse Quranic condemnatory and laudatory terms with their common-sense meanings (even those in a general Arabic dictionary, and especially with their modern connotations), it is important to understand what the Quranic terms, such as those usually translated as "corruption," "tyranny," etc., really mean in Islam (See Appendix III

for an explanation of a sample of such terms and for a discussion of relevant problems).

Among particular actions that guarantee Muslims Paradise are performance of various forms of hijra and jihad, particularly its ultimate form, **QITAL** (fight to kill). The failure to do so dooms one to Hell. Both involve a negative and harsh attitude towards nonbelievers. (For some relevant Quranic passages, see footnote 21 below.) After portraying a horrible picture of Hell and wonderful scenes of Paradise, Hadith reports threaten nonbelievers with the former, and promise Muslims the latter for their adherence to Islam. Muslim warriors are particularly mentioned. The smallest share in holy war against nonbelievers gives a claim on Paradise.¹⁵ "Hurting" and "annoying" Muhammad in any form and for any reason leads one to Hell. Along with their refusal to accept him as God's last representative about everything, criticism of his family's and person's morality and personal life, or not loving him more than anyone else, including one's own loved ones, guarantee Gehenna.

Quranic passages that refer in context to Paradise and Hell occasionally mention good and evil deeds per se. Similar exhortations are found in the Hadith literature to do good and shun evil. But, ultimately, Muslims are led to believe that good deeds, as commonly understood, do not qualify nonbelievers for Paradise, nor do evil deeds condemn a Muslim forever to Hell. First, compared to the preponderance of Quranic narrations relating salvation or condemnation in the afterlife to the acceptance or rejection of the Islamic belief system and rituals - and to modes of relationship with nonbelievers - references to the correlation of the deeds and their outcomes in the Hereafter are very few. Second, references to evil deeds are a part of the Quran's rhetorical attacks on nonbelievers. Such things as 'respect for the orphans' and 'feeding the needy' were not the Quran's basic concerns, nor did the Prophet's contemporary nonbelievers notoriously deny the worth of charity. Third, to the extent Muslims are encouraged

to 'do good,' it is limited generally to other Muslims as beneficiaries or to the service of specific Islamic causes - such as **TALIF AL-QULUB**, "winning the hearts" of mostly influential non-Muslims for Islam. There is not one single kind word in the Quran and Hadith literature for non-Muslims. The so-called soft verses - some of them called Satanic and expunged from the Quran - and Traditions stand abrogated by the later Quranic verses and the Prophet's later definitive Sunnah. Sacred Islamic sources never encourage Muslims to be good, unconditionally, to a nonbeliever, always relating such kindness to the believers' salvation. Fourth, and most importantly, the Quranic principle of **HABT/HUBUT**, "rendering in vain," categorically devalues nonbelievers' good works, and the principle of AFW "forgiveness" assures Muslims Paradise regardless of their evil deeds.

HABITAT AMALUHUM "Their works are in vain."

On more than sixteen occasions the Quran asserts that non-Muslims' good deeds **HABITAT**, "are fruitless, futile, of no avail." Other verses, like Q3:117 and Q47:8, convey the same idea without the use of the term **HABT** or **HUBUT** "making void." Tabari's (and all other) Tradition-based exegeses, and the voluminous Hadith literature, reinforce this belief in Muslim minds. Most of these Quranic verses come in passages related to reward and punishment in the Hereafter¹⁷. As the immediate contexts of particular verses describe, those whose good works are disregarded are various groups of non-Muslims. Traditional explanations clarify this further. The Quranic passage containing 2:217 refers to the nonbelievers, including al-Munafiqun, who criticized the Prophet's Nakhla raid during one of the Sacred Truce Months -- **ASHHUR AL-HARAM**. The Quran sends these critics to Gehenna. "The works," i.e., the good deeds, of such "apostates" and of those who die in disbelief "have fallen both in this world and the Hereafter" (Q2:217).¹⁸ An apostate is one who quits Islamic religion -- **MAN YARJI AN DIN-AL-ISLAM** (TS,4:217). The good deeds of nonbelievers become void, which means the loss of the

reward for good works... in the Hereafter -- **HABITAT AMALUHUM WA DHAHABAT. WA BUTULUHA: DHAHAB-U THAWABIHA WA BUTUL AL-AJR ALAYHA WA'L-JAZA FI... AL-AKHIRAH** (ibid). There is no "praise" for the good works of nonbelievers in this world by people (clearly, Muslims) nor by God, here or in the Hereafter, because these good deeds were performed in a state of "error and falsehood," i.e., having no faith in Islam. Instead, God will curse and disgrace them, exposing their secrets... God declares to His people that the good works of these nonbelievers will be unprofitable for them because they were performed in a state of disbelief in God

FA-LAM YANALU BIHA MAHMADAT-AN WA-LA THANA MIN AN-NAS, LI-ANNAHUM KANU ALA DALAL WA BATIL, WA LAM YARFA ALLAH LAHUM BIHA DHIKRAN, BAL LAANHUM WA HATAK ASTARAHUM... WA A'LAM IBADAHU AN AMALUHUM TASIR BUR-AN LA THAWAB LAHA, LI-ANNAHA KANAT KUFR-AN BI'LLAH... (TS,6:287 cf. Q3:22).

For Q5:5 "... Whoso denies the Faith, his work is vain and he will be among the losers in the Hereafter," Tabari says that their expectations that God will reward them for their good works are futile -- **FA-QAD BATIL-A THAWAB AMILIHILLADHI KAN YAMALUHU F'ID-DUNYA, YARJU AN YUDRIK BIHI MANZILAT-AN IND ALLAH** (TS,9:592). By disbelieving in Muhammad, they have deprived themselves of the fortune of reward by God of their good works -- **GHABANU ANFUSAHUM HUZUZAHA MIN THAWAB ALLAH BI-KUFRIHIM BI-MUHAMMAD...** (*ibid*). God in Q5:5 emphasizes the point, another report relates, that "the Faith" (in Islam) is "the firmest handle" (on salvation in the Afterlife). "And, indeed, He accepts no good work but with it (the Faith" -- **AKHBAR ALLAH ANN AL-IMAN HUA'L-URWAT AL-WUTHQA, WA ANNAHU LA YAQBIL AMAL-AN ILLA BIHI** (*ibid*:593). For the purpose of any reward in the Hereafter, Q5:53 renders the good works of al-Munafiqun here null and void. "The good works they do in this world are futile; there is no reward for them nor any recompense" (TS,10:409). Why? "Because they did these (good works) without believing that they were obligated by God to do so, and without having correct faith in God and His Messenger --

**LI-ANNAHUM AMALU-HA ALA GHAYR YAQIN MINHUM BI-ANNAHA ALAYHIM
LI'LLAH FARD-UN WAJIB, WA LA ALA SIHHAT-I-IMAN-IN BILLAH WA
RASULIHI (ibid).**

Doing good as an existentialistic-stoic social concern does not make sense to a believer. "Those who deny Our Revelations and the meeting of the Hereafter, their works are fruitless" (Q7:174). They get only the "burden" of these good works and their "exhaustion" -- **WA HASALAT LAHUM AUZARUHA... WA AT'ABU ANFUSAHUM** (TS,13:116 cf. Q7:147). Indeed, the good works done by nonbelievers will be a curse for them -- **FA SARAT AMALUHUM ALAYHIM WABAL-AN (ibid)**. "Because they did (these) not for God" -- **LI-ANNAHUM AMALU LI-GHAYR ALLAH (ibid)**.

Soon after the conquest of Mecca, the pagan pilgrims were banned from approaching the Kaba and from continuing their social services, "the good works," such as providing drinking water for other pilgrims. Scorning these pagan pilgrims and social workers - and their likes - the Quran declared: "As for such, their works are vain and in the Fire they will abide" (Q9:17). The recompense for such religious and social good works is canceled because they are done for Satan, not for God (TS,14:166 cf. Q9:17). In Q9:69 al-Munafiqun (and their likes) are told again that their good deeds in this world will perish in the Hereafter; "they are the losers," for the same reasons: these good deeds are done in a state of mind loathed and hated by God -- **LI-ANNAHA KANAT FIMA YASKHAT ALLAH WA YAKRAHUHU** (TS,14:344 cf. Q9:69). There will be no reward for their good deeds but the Fire -- **FA LA THAWAB LAHA ILLA'N-NAR (ibid)**. Regarding Q11:15, Traditions in Tabari tell us that God may reward a nonbeliever in this world for his "good deeds" -- **AMAL SALIH** -- "such as being kind to kinsmen, giving charity to a begger, having mercy on one in plight, and similar charitable deed," but there is no reward for him in the Hereafter (T,12:12 cf. Q11:15). Note that most of the HABT-related verses directly or by implication deny rewards for the good deeds of nonbelievers in this world as well as the Afterlife -- **HABITAT AMALUHUM FI'D-DUNYA WA'L-AKHIRAH** (e.g., 3:22; 9:69; 18:104). Q11:15, a Meccan verse, and related Traditions were generated by historical

situations. After the Prophet's adversaries continued to prosper despite his warnings of Divine wrath in this world, the Quran and Muhammad 'rationalized' the situation by saying that those doing good for worldly purposes might be rewarded accordingly in this world (Q11:15). The Quran quickly added that for these nonbelievers there "is naught in the Hereafter save the Fire... (All) that they do here is vain and (all) that they are wont to do is fruitless (Q11:16). Because, they were doing these good deeds not for the sake of God; so God disregarded them and deprived the good-doer of his recompense (in the Hereafter) -- **LI-ANNAHUM KANU YAMALUN LI-GHAYR ALLAH, FA-ABTALAHU'LLAH, WA AHBAT AMILAHU AJRAHU** (T,12:14 cf. Q11:16). According to Tabari (T,16:31-5), Q18:102-6 in particular refer to the Jews' and Christians' self-styled good pious works. Though these Jews and Christians "reckon that they do good work" (18:104), God will reject them because of their disbelief in Islam and its belief system. With reference to 18:105 the Prophet said: "(In the Day of Judgment) a tall and most gluttonous eater and drinker will be brought forward; and weighted; but he will not weigh even like the wing of a gnat/mosquito -- **YUTA BI'L-AKUL ASH-SHARUB AT-TAWIL, FA-YUZAN, FA-LA YAZIN JANAH BAUDAT-IN** (TS,16:35); i.e., in the Hereafter, God will disregard the largest amount of good works if not done by a believing Muslim. (But Muslims with sins "like mountains" will be forgiven. Q33:19; 39:65; 47:8-9, 28, 32 and accompanying Traditions in Tabari repeat the same themes.)

AFW "Forgiveness."

On the other hand, there is an extensive, impressive amount of material which repeatedly reassures the Muslims that regardless of their sins they will go to Paradise and that no non-Muslims, regardless of their good deeds otherwise, will escape Hell. In his commentaries (based on the Prophet's explanations) on Q11:1-23, Tabari tells us that all non-Muslims, particularly those who come after Muhammad, are doomed to Gehenna (T,11:179-84; T,12:8-23). In this context, the Prophet said that in the Day of Judgment God will confidentially and affectionately

tell Muslims of their sins -- **DHUNUB**. After enumerating these at length, the Almighty, quietly, will say to each one of them: "I concealed your sins in the World and forgive you today" -- **FA INNI QAD SATARTUHA ALAYK FI'D-DUNY WA AFUHA LAK AL-YAUM** (T,12:21 cf. Q11:18-20). Having said this confidentially, God will put only the record of their good deeds in their right hands, qualifying them for Paradise (ibid). "As for the disbelievers and the Hypocrites, He will call them aloud." Cursing them for their disbelief in Him, God will send them to Hell (ibid). All that they do here and now is "nought" and "void" (Q11:16).

According to Q11:114, performance of **SALAT**, Islamic prayer, is a good deed that annuls ill-deeds. Explaining this Tabari quotes, on eleven full pages (T,12:127-38) numerous reports ascribed to the Prophet. These reports tell Muslims that as a result of their performance of Islamic rituals (such as ablution and five-times-daily prayers) their many sins will be forgiven. Tabari mentions cases of fornication committed by Muslims in Medina involving the wives of other Muslims absent on jihad expeditions. Apparently such incidents were common, and some Medinans were concerned about the situation. However, the Almighty revealed:

And perform the prayer at the two ends of the day and night of the night; surely the good deeds will drive away the evil deeds... (Q11:114).

Tabari's explanations indicate that this passage of the Quran solved the moral crisis in favor of fornicator-believers and other Muslim evil-doers. As explained by the Prophet, performance of Islamic rituals as "good deeds" entitles the believers to Divine forgiveness for their other "evil deeds" - such as sexual assaults on women. According to one of these reports, each one of the five daily prayers guarantees the forgiveness of all sins and misdeeds a believer commits before the prayer. The Prophet was performing **WUDU** "ablution," ritual washing of hands, face, feet etc., as preparation for a **SALAT**. He said:

Whoever performs ablution the way I am doing and then performs **SALAT AZ-ZUHR**, "afternoon prayer," the sins he/she has committed after the dawn-prayer -- **SALAT-AL-FAJR**, will be forgiven. Then, when he performs the "evening prayer: the sins committed between that and the afternoon-prayer are forgiven. [After counting the other three daily prayers and completing the 24-hour round of the day in the same way the Prophet said]... These (ablutions and prayers) are the good deeds which drive away the evil deeds (T,12:132-3).

Traditions quoted by Tabari give specific examples to guide believers through the Divine **AFW** system based on the performance of rituals.

A man came to the Prophet and said: 'I met a woman in a garden; I caught and embraced her -- **FA-DAMAMTUHA**, and had intimate company with her -- **BASHARTUHA** (Alternate translation: had sexual intercourse with her) and kissed her and did everything with her except that I did not compress her -- **FAALT-U BIHA KULL SHAY-IN, GHAYR ANNI LAM UJAMIHA.**' The Prophet remained silent. Then the verse "and perform the prayer at the two ends of the day and night of the night; surely the good deeds will drive away the evil deeds" (Q11:114) was revealed. The Prophet... recited the verse to the man. [i.e., told the man that by performing the prescribed prayers his sin of having intimate company etc. would be forgiven.] Umar said 'O Messenger of God, is this (forgiveness in this manner) for him exceptionally (for this one occasion) or for all the people?'. (The Prophet) said, "Of course, for all the people' (T,12:134; parentheses and brackets added)¹⁹.

Demonstrating the application of Q11:114 Tabari quotes many other reports. In one of them we are told of Abu'l-Yusr, a Muslim shopkeeper of Medina. A Muslim woman whose husband was on a jihad campaign went to the shop to buy some dried dates. Abul-Yusr told the woman that he had some better dates in his house. As soon as the woman entered the house our Muslim shop-keeper grabbed and kissed her. (Our believer does not tell us more.) Later, Abul-Yusr told the Prophet what he had done. Initially, the Prophet was not happy particularly because Abul-Yusr had assaulted a woman whose husband was fighting in the way of God. Abul-Yusr was in a difficult situation. But the angel Gabriel came and revealed [or reminded the Prophet of] Q11:114. The Prophet called Abul-Yusr and recited the verse which meant that by performing **SALAT** his sin would be forgiven. Some people again asked whether it was just for this one occasion. The Prophet reassured the believers that it was for all the believers (and for all such occasions). This account is reported by Abu'l-Yusr as follows --

AN ABI'L-YUSR: QAL ATATNI IMRAAT-UN TABTA MINNI BI-DIRHAM-IN TAMR-AN, FA-QULT-U: INN FI'L-BAYT TAMR-AN AJWAD MIN HADHA, FA-DAKHALT-U FA-AHWAYT ILAYHA, FA-QABBALTUHA... FA-ATAYT-U RASUL ALLAH, FA-QAL: AKHLAFT RAJUL-AN GHAZIYAN FI SABIL ALLAH FI AHLIHI BI-MITHL HADHA?... FA-NAZAL JIBRIL FA-QAL: AYN ABUL-YUSR? FA-JIT FA-QARA ALAYYA Q11:14. QAL INSAN-UN LAHU: YA RASUL ALLAH, KHAASSAT-AN, AM LI'NNAS AMMAT-AN? QAL LI'NNAS AMMAT-AN (T,12:137).

The Q15:2, "Perchance the disbelievers will wish that they had surrendered" (i.e., had become Muslims), foretells a scenario of the Hereafter. Believers read that non-Muslims will regret in the Afterlife their rejection of Islam in this world. However, it will be too late. This verse is another occasion for Tabari to quote extensive reports, mostly ascribed to the Prophet, reassuring Muslims that their worldly sins and misdeeds will be forgiven in the Hereafter. These reports portray scenes of the Hereafter showing Muslims having committed sins to be anxious and in some trouble. Non-Muslims, thinking that these Muslims will remain in Gehenna for their sins, taunt the believers that their Islam might not help them to escape punishment. But as soon as the Almighty realizes that the sinners were believing Muslims, He mobilizes all His forces to rescue them. All these wonderful stories come to the same conclusion: God will forgive Muslim sinners -- AHL AL-KHATAYA MIN AL-MUSLIMIN, and will issue an all-out decree that all those who were Muslims in this world must enter Paradise -- MAN KAN MIN AL-MUSLIMIN FA'L-YADKHUL AL-JANNAH.. Seeing this, non-Muslims "will wish that they were Muslims" in this world. (For Tabari's commentaries on Q15:2 see T,14:1-5).

In Q19:71-2 the Almighty says that though all will approach Hell, He will deliver the "godfearing" and leave the ZALIMUN "evil-doers" there "hobbling on their knees." Tabari's explanations clarify that "godfearing" means believer in Islamic faith, while others are called "evil-doers" in the sense that they did not believe in Islam. Quoting entertaining and reassuring reports from Muhammad and his comrades, Tabari engages again in a lengthy discussion to prove that only the nonbelievers in Islam will suffer forever in Gehenna. All those Muslims

who, as a consequence of their evil deeds and sins, might qualify for Hell will, on the basis of their belief in Islam, be definitely delivered from the Fire, treated well by God for the scorches they received in Hell in a kind of hurry before the final verdict, and then rehabilitated permanently in Paradise (T,16:108-15).

In treating Q35:32, Tabari quotes another series of reports by the Prophet's Companions assuring believers that wrong-doers, if they belong to the Community of Muhammad, will not be interrogated harshly in the Afterlife; God will forgive them and they will enter Paradise (T,22:134). This theme is repeated in T,24:13- 24, 34, explaining Q39:31-5 passim. "God will remit from them the worst of what they did, and will pay them to reward the best they used to do" (Q39:35). In his commentaries on Q40:1-20 Tabari again details how God will forgive the evil deeds of Muslim believers and help them in this world against the nonbelievers, and send them to Paradise in the Hereafter (see T,24:74-5 cf. 41-8). In the passage Q46:2-34 speaking of reward and punishment of the Afterlife, the Almighty, referring to the believers, says.

There shall no fear come upon them neither shall they grieve (Q46:13). Those are they from whom We accept the best of what they do, and overlook their evil deeds (they will be) among the owners of the Gardens. This is the true promise...(Q46:16).

The believers are reassured against grief and fear in the Afterlife. Their evil deeds will be passed by; they will know Paradise forever (T,26:1-13). Explaining Q46:16, Tabari tells us God will not take into account the evil- deeds of the believers. This is what Abu Bakr told Umar: God will conceal and disregard the evil-deeds of the believers -- INN ALLAH TAJAWAZ AN ASWA-I AMALIHIM FA-LAM YUBDIH (T,26:18). God will announce the evil deeds of nonbelievers, sending them to Hell, Abu Bakr further said (ibid). Answering his own hypothetical question (or perhaps one raised by Umar) about the nonbelievers' good deeds in general, Abu Bakr remarked: "Indeed God rejects the good-deeds of nonbelievers" (ibid). The themes that non-Muslims, regardless of their good deeds, will not go to Paradise, and all Muslims, regardless of

their evil deeds and sins, will escape Hell are discussed in the Hadith literature extensively. Faithfulness to the creed of the Prophet Muhammad (not good deeds per se) assures entrance to paradise (AD,8:26).

It is incumbent upon God to let Muslims who perform Islamic duties enter into Paradise (Bu.56:4). Those who confess Islam will go to Paradise even if they had committed sins; it is emphasized that none among Muslims will go to Hell.²⁰

One of the Almighty's methods of relieving believers will be to punish a Jew or a Christian for the sins committed by Muslims. The Prophet Muhammad said:

In the Day Hereafter, God will put a Jew or a Christian at the disposal of each Muslim, and then will say: 'This will be in Hell as a ransom for you'... For every dead Muslim God shall put a Jew or a Christian in the Fire -- **LA YAMUT RAJUL-UN MUSLIM ILLA ADKHAL ALLAH MAKANAHU AN-NAR YAHUDIYY-AN AW NASRANIYY-AN...** There will come Muslims in the Day of Resurrection having committed (capital) crimes as enormous as mountains. God will forgive them, putting (the responsibility and consequent punishment for) these (sins) on the Jews and the Christians -- **YAJI-U YAUM AL-QIYAMAT NAS-UN MIN AL-MUSLIMIN BI-DHUNUB-IN AMTHAL AL-JIBAL. FA- YAGHFIRUHA'LLAH LAHUM WA YADAUHA ALA'L-YAHUD WA'N-NASARA** (Mu.49:49-51).

Islam's devaluation of this-worldly life, ascribing a cardinal sin, disbelief in the Hereafter, to non-Muslims, leads believers to think of non-Muslims' achievements disdainfully and resentfully. All those beyond Islam who work stoically for the betterment of humanity are transformed in Muslim eyes into "rational animals," implying degradation for both rationality and rational people. The believers' "sacred rage" against modern civilization - against its "universities and libraries," "factories and laboratories," "highways and railways," "inventions and industries" and its "works of science and art" - is not a retaliatory response to 'imperialism'. As Abu'l-Ala Maududi's commentaries on Q18:103-6 indicate, it is the inevitable outcome of Islamic belief in the supremacy of the afterlife and in the worthlessness of the nonbelievers' deeds. Quranic passages such as Q18:103-6 must have been a common source of inspiration for the anti-civilization behavior of the Beduins who grieved Ibn Khaldun so much and for Maududi, the dean of the

modern Islamic fundamentalist movement. God told the Prophet (to tell the believers):

O Muhammad, say to them, "Should We tell you who are the most unsuccessful people and miserable failures in regard to their deeds? They are those, all whose endeavors, in the worldly life, had gone astray from the Right Way, but all along they were under the delusion that everything they were doing, was rightly directed: those are the people who rejected the Signs of their Lord and did not believe that they would ever go before Him. Therefore all their deeds were lost, for We will assign no weight to them on the Day of Resurrection. Their recompense is Hell for the disbelief they showed and for the mockery they adopted to My Signs and My Messengers... (Q18:103-6; Maududi's translation, originally in Urdu; English rendering by Ch. M. Akbar as in *The Meaning...*, v. 7, p. 45).

Assuming that all non-Muslims are disbelievers in God and the Hereafter and that "the Divine instructions" are received only through Islam, Maududi explains this passage as follows:

That is, whatever they did, they did for this world without paying any regard to God and the Hereafter. As they considered the worldly life to be the real life, they made the success and prosperity in this world their sole aim and object. Even if they professed the existence of Allah, they never paid any heed to the two implications of this profession: to lead their lives in a way to please Allah and to come out successful on the Day they shall have to render an account of what they did in this world. This was because they considered themselves to be mere rational animals who were absolutely independent and free from every kind of responsibility and had nothing else to do but to enjoy the good things of the world like animals in a meadow. "All their deeds were lost" in the sense that they will be of no avail to them in the life-after-death, even though they might have considered them as their great achievements but the fact is that they will lose all their value as soon as the world shall come to an end. When they will go before their Lord, and all their deeds shall be placed in the Scales, they will have no weight at all whether they had built great palaces, established great universities and libraries, set up great factories and laboratories, constructed highways and railways, in short, all their inventions, industries, sciences and arts and other things of which they were very proud in this world, will lose their weights in the Scales. The only thing which will have weight there will be that which had been done in accordance with the Divine instructions and with the intention to please Allah. It is, therefore, obvious that if all one's endeavours were confined to the worldly things and the achievement of worldly desires whose results one would see in this world, one should not reasonably expect to see their results in the Hereafter, for they would have gone waste with the end of this world. It is equally obvious, that only the deeds of the one, who performed them strictly in accordance with His instructions to win His approval with a view to avail of their results in the Hereafter, will find that his deeds had weight in the Scales. On the contrary, such a one will find that all his endeavours in the world had gone waste (*The Meaning...*, V. 7, p. 50 cf. Q18:103-6).

Various dimensions of the material about Islamic belief in AL-AKHIRA make cooperation, assimilation and friendly and peaceful coexistence between Muslims and non-Muslims impossible. These materials inculcate and reinforce a self-righteous, insolent, segregationist and aggressive attitude towards non-Muslims. The attraction of Paradise and fear of Hell are strong reasons for a believer to adjust relations with non-Muslims as required by Islam. For Muslim believers in a Meccan-like difficult situation, the idea of Paradise is intoxicating (and that of Hell terrifying) enough to sustain their faith in Islam. No wonder the bulk of picturesque portrayals of Paradise and gruesome descriptions of Hell are found in the Meccan surahs. The Quran tells the believers that non-Muslims' achievements and prosperity are signs of their wretchedness. Eventual great victory -- **FAUZ AL-AZIM** -- in the Hereafter, if not here and now, definitely belongs to the believers. There is no reason to be inspired by the nonbelievers. Their worldly successes and achievements are to be ignored and derided. They are good only when taken as booty. Muslims know that the line that separates Paradise from Hell is the same that divides those in this world into Muslims and non-Muslims. Quranic comparisons of the afterlife repeatedly remind the believers of the consequences of differences between belief and disbelief in Islam in this world. Muslims repeatedly read exhortations to dissociate from, and fight, the nonbelievers - or go to Hell.

Thou seest many of them making unbelievers their friends. Evil is that they have forwarded to their account, that God is enraged against them, and in the chastisement they shall dwell forever. Yet had they believed in God and the Prophet and what has been sent down to him, they would not have taken them as friends; but many of them are ungodly (Q5:80-1). Let not the believers take the unbelievers for friends, rather than the believers - for whoso does that belongs not to God in anything - unless you have a fear of them. God warns you... and unto God is the homecoming (Q3:28). O believers, take not for your intimates outside yourselves (Q3:118). O believers, take not Jews and Christians as friends... whoso of you makes them his friends is one of them (Q5:51; also see 5:57).

Muslims who do not shun nonbelievers' company, those who do not migrate

(hijra) from a society dominated by non- Muslims, are to be treated harshly. Mere peaceful coexistence with nonbelievers condemns them to boycott and death:

...therefore take not to yourselves friends of them, until they emigrate in the way of God; then, if they turn their backs, take them, and slay them whenever you find them; take not to yourselves any one of them as friend or helper... (4:89).

Muslims who violate Divine decrees against friendship with nonbelievers are declared apostates and sent to "the lowest reach of the Fire" (Q4:139-44 passim). After references to Paradise and Hell, the believers are warned that one's own non-Muslim relatives are not exceptions.

O believers, take not your fathers and brothers to be your friends, if they prefer unbelief to belief; whosoever of you takes them friends, those - they are the evildoers (Q9:23; also see Q60:1).

Almost all exhortations to adopt **GHILZAH** (harshness) and **SHIDDAH** (severeness) against nonbelievers, practice **HIJRAH** (disdainfully taking distance from the company and society of nonbelievers) in its various forms, and wage **JIHAD** and **QITAL** against them are directly or closely accompanied with a promise of Paradise for those who act accordingly, and a threat of Hell for those who fail to conform.²¹

The Hereafter-related material creates a dehumanized picture of non-Muslims in the Muslim mind: its most serious effect on Muslim images and treatment of non- Muslims. Armed with this belief in their being the chosen people of God -- **KHAYR UMMAH**, in the mechanism of **AFW** which assures salvation regardless of moral irresponsibility towards others (particularly nonbelievers), instructed that nonbelievers are wretched and damned despite their good works and qualities, believers justify, self-righteously and narcissistically, all mistreatments of nonbelievers, who lose all normal human rights. Quranic modes of addressing nonbelievers before sending them to Hell and their treatment by the Almighty in the Hereafter further encourage a believer to

disgrace nonbelievers and treat them sadistically. Note that a believer is exhorted to imitate God's ways -- **TAKHALLAQU BI-AKHLAQ ALLAH.**

Given the verses that send nonbelievers to Hell, the language used against non-Muslims effectively disgraces them, as the author of the Quran meant. Tradition (T,30:339) rejoices in telling us the maddening effect on Abu Lahab's wife when the Quran called her "the carrier of the firewood" with a rope of palm-fiber upon her neck" while "roasting" along with her husband "at a flaming fire" in Hell (Q111). To better appreciate and enjoy the effectiveness of the slur, Tabari records the heathen woman's following desperate responses. As mentioned before about Muhammad's Meccan career, it was partly because of Islam's degrading portrayal of their ancestors in Hell that some exasperated Meccans tried to negotiate with Muhammad, while others avoided encounters with him. Enormous scenarios of the Hereafter tell believers that God will inflict various kinds of humiliations and tortures on nonbelievers. There is no reason to believe that these portrayals do not encourage believers to treat nonbelievers in this world similarly. We know that the Quran authorized, and the Prophet indulged, in such acts. We may also speculate about the link between such Quranic-Traditional descriptions and the actions of Zayd b. Haritha, the Prophet's grandsons, and Tariq b. Ziyad concerning, respectively, Umm Qifrah, Abd ar-Rahman b. Muljim and the Spanish peasant. (See Part III, Section 9, Segment 2 of this study).

ENDNOTES

Part IV: Belief in Resurrection after Death: the Hereafter

¹See e.g. Q56:1-6 for detailed reports in Hadith literature about the events of the "Last Days" see "Dajjal," "Fitan," "Hour," "MAHDI," "Resurrection" etc. in Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition.

²For references in the Quran to the Hereafter as a matter of fact, and to the importance of belief in its happening, see, e.g., 2:4, 8, 24-5, 62, 126, 177, 228, 232, 264; Q3:45, 56, 77, 85, 114; Q4:38-9, 59, 136, 162; Q5:5, 41, 69; Q6:29, 164-5; Q7:45, 147; Q9:18-9, 29, 44, 45, 99; Q11:19, 22, 103; Q12:37; Q13:34; Q14:27; Q16:22, 60, 122; Q17:10; Q23:33, 74; Q24:2, 14, 19, 23; Q27:3, 4, 66; Q29:27; Q30:7, 16; Q31:4; Q33:63-6; Q34:8, 21; Q39:45; Q41:7; Q45:24; Q53:27, 29; Q59:3; Q74:53. For details of al-Akhira in Hadith literature, see "Resurrection," "Bridge," "Ibrahim," "Intercession," and "Muhammad" in Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition

³For more Quranic passages degrading this world and worldly engagements, see Q16:107; 18:28, 104; 20:131; 28:60-1, 79; 31:33; 33:28-9; 35:5; 42:36; 43:35; 45:35; 46:20; 47:36; 53:29; 57:20; 79:38; 87:16. Ibn Khaldun complains about the Arab-Beduin tendency to destroy rather than build civilization. See Maqaddima. To what extent this mentality was reinforced by Islam's basic tilt against worldliness is a matter for speculation. We know that the great Muslim builders, e.g., the Umayyads and Mughads, are villains rather than heroes for Muslim fundamentalists. The same is true about 'Muslim' philosophers and scientists compared to Muslim theologians and jurists.

⁴For further references to these themes in the Quran, see 2:94, 102, 114, 130, 200-1; 3:145, 148, 152, 176; 7:156, 169; 10:64; 11:15-6; 20:72, 127, 131; 23:37; 27:5; 28:60-61, 79; 29:36, 64; 30:7; 33:21, 28-9; 42:20, 40; 43:35; 46:26; 47:36; 57:20; 58:22; 60:6; 63:33; 65:2; 79:38; 87:16-7; 93:4.

⁵For more about Paradise in the Quran see 19:61-3; 22:24, 58-9; 30:15; 39:16, 20; 41:30-2; 44:51-7; 50:34-5; 38:49-56; 52:17-24; 69:21-4; 77:41-3; 83:22-36; 88:8-16.

⁶Bu, 23:93; 34:24; 91:35-6, 48; IM, 35:10; AbH3:352, e.g. For further references to the Prophet's nocturnal voyage in Hadith literature see A.J. Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition, Leiden, 1960, p. 25.

⁷For detailed references in Hadith literature to above and following descriptions of Hell see Wensinck, *ibid*: 96-7.

⁸The Quran calls those in Paradise the People "of the Right" and those in Hell "of the Left." As explained in Tradition and Tafsir literature (e.g., Tabari) they are so called because the Almighty in the Day of Judgement will deliver His verdict to the believers with His right hand as a sign of appreciation, and to the wretched nonbelievers with His left hand as an additional humiliation. According to Islamic traditions, right hand and right side signify honor and blessing, the left wretchedness and dishonor.

⁹For further comparisons of those in Paradise and Hell, see Quranic passages 41:26-32; 47:15; 76:4-22; 77:30-43; 78:21-36; 88:2-16.

¹⁰E.g. TS, 1:241-3. The second long chapters of all collections of the

SAHAH SITTA, the "Six Authentic (Collections of Hadith Literature)" and numerous other primary sources tell in detail how and when to perform SALAT. For specifics see "Prayers" in Wensinck.

¹¹Each of the five-times-daily prayers, and other Islamic prayers, consist of varying numbers of "bendings" (sing: RAKAH) we call here unit.

12

THE OPENING

In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate TPraise belongs to God, the Lord of all Being, the All-merciful, the All-compassionate, the Master of the Day of Doom. Thee only we serve; to Thee alone we praye for succour. Guide us in the straight path, the path of those whom Thou hast blessed, not of those against whom Thou art wrathful, nor of whose who are astray (Q1).

¹³See TS,1:107. Because of its basic importance Muslim commentators - from Tabari to our contemporaries - and Hadith literature record extensive exegeses of this less than one-quarter-page short Surah. Tabari's commenatareis spread over 94 pages (TS,1:107-201).

¹⁴See Q4:44-5 cf. TS,8:426-89; Q6:124-8; Q7:35-53 cf. TS,12:405-80, cf. 427, 436; Q11:1-3, 12-7 cf. T,11:179-84; T,12:8-25; Q11:109-22 cf. Q,12:3-6, 126-38; Q14:3 passim, 16-7, 27-9 cf. T,13:180-183, 213-23; Q15:2-9 passim, 28-45 cf. T,14:2-9 passim; Q19:66-98 cf. T,16:82-7, 108-19; Q20:41,74 passim cf. T,16:190; Q22:15-24 cf. T,17:125-35; 62 Q23:1-27, 102-17 cf. T,18:1-5, 22, 56-7; Q24:4, 11, 23 cf. T,18:75-95, 103-5; Q25:3-44: T,19:62, 87, 130-131; Q26:91-5; Q32:12-22, 28-9; Q33:9, 28-71 cf. T,21:98, 107, 122-34; T,22:2-53; Q35:19-42 cf. T,22:41, 116-7, 128-42; Q36:8-9 cf. T,22:149; Q37:63-73 cf. T,23:66 passim; Q38:1-64 cf. T,23:152, 175-82; Q39:1-22 cf. T,23:192-209; T,24:11-34; Q40:1-12 cf. T,24:41-8, 74-5; Q43:57-89 cf. T,25:98-9; Q44:17-36, 43-50 cf. T,25:107-16, 130-1; Q46:2-34 cf. T,26:1-13, 18, 30-6; Q47:1-13 cf. T,26:47, 60-2; Q50:20-30 cf. T,26:161-6; Q55:41-4 cf. T,27:142-5, 189-91; Q56:42-4, 51-6, 93-4 cf. T,27:189-94, 213-5; Q66:1-9 cf. T,28:155-72; Q67:6-11; Q69:25-41; Q74:50-51 cf. T,29:154-66; Q78:1-4, 17-30 cf. T,29:1-9; Q79:35-9 cf. T,30:48 passim; Q83:8-36 cf. T,30:97-110; Q87:9-16; Q88:24-6 cf. T,30:165...; Q89:23 cf. T,30:180; Q96:9-10 cf. T,30:253; Q98.

¹⁵See Tir.20:13, 17-8, 21, 23, 26; Bu.2:96; 97:28, 56; 56:14, 22, 112, 156; 58:1; Mu.32:20, 33, 117, 143-8.

¹⁶See, e.g., 2:108, 143; 3:32, 132, 172; 4:13-4, 42, 59, 80, 115, 136; 5:33, 56, 92 passim cf. T,18:75-105; Q33:6- 8, 21-71 cf. esp. T,21:122; T,22:41; Q66:1-10 cf. 28:155- 72.

¹⁷See Q2:217 passim cf. TS,4:217-8 passim; Q3:22 passim cf. TS,6:287 passim, Q3:117; Q5:5 passim cf. TS,9:591 passim; Q5:53 passim cf. TS,10:407 passim; Q7:147 passim cf. TS,13:116 passim; Q9:17 passim cf. TS,14:165 passim; Q9:69 passim cf. TS,14:340 passim; Q11:16 passim cf. T,12:14 passim; Q18:105 passim cf. T,16:35 passim; Q33:19 passim cf. T,21:139 passim; Q39:65 passim cf. T,24:24 passim; Q47:8-9, 28, 32 passim cf. T, 26: relevant verses, passim.

¹⁸The **AMAL**, "works, deeds" mentioned in these verses obviously means good deeds and works. Making evil deeds of the nonbelievers' void does not make sense. Authentic Muslim scholars in their (commentaries on and) translation of these verses from the Arabic into other languages usually qualify "deeds" or "works" in these passages with the adjective "good." For example, the translators and commentators of **TAFSIR IBN KATHIR** in Urdu use (in Urdu) **NEK AMAL**, **AMAL-E-SALIHAH** "good deeds" for the word **AMAL**, "works" in these Qur'anic passages. (See **IKU, PARAH,2,JUZ,3**, p. 70 cf. Q2:217; **PARAH 3**, p. 48; **PARAH, 26, JUZ,27**, p.

34. Tabari's commentaries occasionally clarify this point with specific examples.

¹⁹Both **MUBASHIRAH** and **MUJAMIAH** signify sexual intercourse, though in medieval Arabic usage they may have a confusing distinction. Our believer told the Prophet that he "did everything with the woman including **MUBASHIRAH** but did not do **MUJAMIAH**. According to Edward Lane **MUBASHIRAH** in this sense means "(the man) enjoyed contact with her skin; he became in contact with her, skin to skin, both being within one garment or piece of cloth... **WATIAHA** (treaded her under him) both (by penetrating) in the vulva and out of it" (AEL,1/1:207). To the extent we believe our believer told the truth, when he insisted that **MUJAMIAH** "compressing" did not take place, he meant penetration or discharge did not take place inside the vulva. It was only **COITUS CONJUGALIS** as Lane tells us about **MUBASHIRAH** (See AEL,1/2:455).

²⁰On these themes in Hadith literature see Bu3:49; 8:46; 19:36; 23:1; 43:3; 59:6; 60:47; 65:52, b.22:S4, b.8; 70:16; 77:24; 79:30; 81:13-4; 45; 97:33; Mu.1:43, 46, 47, 52-4, 153-4, 178-82, 240, 302, 377-8; 4:9; 5:263-4; 12:32-3; Tir. 7:44; 38:18; 44:590-7; AD,19:15; Nas.24:159; 47:7; IS,3/2:49.

²¹For **GHILZAH** see Q9:73, 123; 66:9; for **SHIDDAT** see Q48:29; for **HIJRAH** see Q2:218; Q3:195; 4:89, 100; 8:72-5; 9:20-1, 117; 16:41, 110; 22:58-9; 24:22; 29:26; 33:6, 50; 59:9; 73:10; 74:5; for **I'RAD** (to turn away) see Q4:63, 81; 5:42; 6:68, 106; 7:199; 9:95; 15:94; 28:55; 32:30; 53:29; for **JIHAD** see, e.g., Q2:218; 3:142; 4:95; 5:35, 54; 8:72-5; 9:16-24, 41-4, 81-8; 16:110; 22:78; 25:52; 29:6-89, 69; 47:31; 49:15; 60:1; 61:11; 66:9; for **QITAL** "to fight to kill" see Q2:190-1, 217, 244-6; 3:13, 111, 121, 146, 167, 195; 4:74-7, 84-90; 5:24; 8:16, 39, 65; 9:12-4, 29, 36, 111, 123; 47:20; 48:16; 49:9; 57:10; 59:11-2; 61:4; 73:20. For the link between participation in jihad and hijrah and Paradise in Hadith literature, see "War," "Expedition," "Martyr," "Paradise," "Hijrah," "Muhajir" in Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition.

PART V: BELIEF IN AL-QADA WA'L-QADAR, PREDESTINATION

Discussions about **AL-QADA** and **AL-QADAR**, in Islamic sources refer to discourses about Divine Predestination versus Free Will. Literally, **AL-QADA** means "decree," "judgment," "decision," etc. and **AL-QADAR** "to ordain, fix, determine" etc. The two terms, usually combined into one expression, discuss whether God has eternally established the fate of humans and directed their good and evil deeds. Although the combined phrase signifies only predestination, predetermination, preordination etc., it covers the whole subject of Divine predestination and direction of human will, choice and deeds versus the capacity and freedom of human beings to will, choose and act. Official and orthodox Islam, through the Iman Mujmal, Islamic Synoptic credo, asserts the necessity of professing explicitly belief in the preordination of 'good' as well as 'evil,' weal or woe, by the Almighty God -- **AL-QADAR, KAHAYRIH-I WA SHARRIH-I, MIN ALLAH TAALA**. For Muslim believers, this article of faith is based on the Quran and other teachings of the Prophet Muhammad. As about other articles of the Synoptic Credo -- God, the angels, the Messengers and the Books and the Hereafter -- the Quran and the sources of Tradition contain an enormous amount of material about predestination. Also, the material in the Quran and Tradition about predestination affects primarily Muslim images and treatment of non-Muslims. Belief in predestination is inculcated in Muslim minds through numerous Quranic passages and Traditional reports, and stories in various contexts. Examples from Tradition/Hadith reports follow. Quranic passages will be discussed at length later. Most of the Sahah Sitta and other collections of Hadith reports contain separate Chapters (sing: **KITAB**) or sections (sing: **BAB**) emphasizing the necessity of belief in predestination of "good and evil, weal or woe by the Almighty God" -- **AL-QADAR KHAYRIHI WA SHARRIHI MIN ALLAH TAALA**.¹ As usual, Tabari uses this material extensively in his Tafsir, commentaries on the Quran, and in his Tarikh.

The Prophet condemned disbelief in predestination and advised Muslims to shun the company of such disbelievers (AD,39:16; Tir., 30:13, 17; IM. Intr. b.9, 10; Ma.,46:6). Numerous Hadith reports emphasize

that belief in **AL-QADA** and **AL-QADAR** is a necessary article of faith in Islam (Mu., 1:1; AD,39:16; Tir.:30:10, 17; 38:4; IM., Intr., b.10, 11). Disbelief in predestination is disbelief in the Quran, as a Traditional report tells us -- **QULT-U L'IBN ABBAS INN NAS-AN YUKADHDHIBUN BI'LQADAR, FA-QAL: INNAHUM YUKAKADHDHIBUN BI-KITAB ALLAH** (TT- 1,1:34). The people do what they were destined to -- **WA INNAMA YAMAL AN-NAS AL-YAUM FIMA QAD FURIGH MINH-U** (ibid:35).

In his descriptions of the beginning of the creation by God, Tabari tells us that the first thing (or one of the first things) God created was "the Pen" -- **AL-QALAM**. As usual, Tabari augments his statements with evidences from the Quran and Tradition. The purpose, these sources imply - and mention explicitly - was to record all that was to happen and be; i.e., God, in an eternal blueprint, **UMM AL-KITAB**, "mother book," fore-ordained all events and the nature of the universe and everything therein (TT-1,1:28-60). The Prophet Muhammad said, "Indeed the first thing that God created was the Pen -- **AL-QALAM**. Then He said (to the Pen), 'Write.' So it documented in that moment all that was to happen" (TT-1:1:32). One of many other versions of the same report Tabari quotes is as follows:

Indeed the first thing that God created was the Pen. Then He told it to write. The Pen said: 'What shall I write, O my Lord?' (God) said, 'write the destinies.' (The Prophet) said, 'so, the Pen wrote in that moment all that was and all that was to be till eternity' (ibid:33).

The Prophet said when God fashioned Adam Satan thought he was "hollow" and remarked: "This creature will not straighten" (IS-B,1:27). This report is found among other reports about some of Adam's inherent weaknesses; it seems to be a concept similar to that of original sin in Christianity. The Prophet told other stories to emphasize the existence of some foreordained weaknesses of Adam and his children.

When the angels of death went to take Adam's life, he argued with them that he had thirty more years to live. The angels reminded Adam that he had voluntarily given these last thirty years to one of his beloved progeny, the Prophet David. After telling this story, Muhammad remarked

that Adam "denied it and like him his children also deny; and Adam forgot, so his children forget; and Adam committed a mistake and so his children commit mistakes" (IS-B,1:28). This referred to the Islamic belief that all human souls had professed Islam and promised to do so when born in bodies. Those who refuse to confess Islam forget that solemn eternal covenant.

Adam's story is usually accompanied with detailed reports about the predestination of his descendants to good or evil. The Prophet said when God created Adam, He brought forth all his progeny from his reins and added of one group, "These will go to Paradise, and I do not care." Referring to all others, God said, "and these will go to Hell, and I do not care" -- **INN ALLAH KHALAQ ADAM THUMM AKHADH AL-KHALQ MIN ZAHRIH-I, FA-QAL HAULA-I FI'L-JANNAT WA LA UBALI, WA HAULA-I F'INNAR WA LA UBALI** (IS-B,1:30 passim). Explaining Q7:172, the Prophet said

Verily god created Adam and then touched his back with His right hand and took out... his offspring **DHURRIYAT-AH-U** and said: 'I have created these for Paradise and they shall act the way the people of Paradise do.' Then He touched his back and took out (other of his) offspring... and said: 'I have created these for Hell and they (are doomed to) do as the people of Hell do. Someone asked, 'what about the deed,' O Messenger of God?' He said: 'Verily when God creates His servant for Paradise, He makes him do what the people of Paradise (must) do until he dies doing the deeds of the people of the Garden, and then, He will enter him in Paradise. And when He creates one for the Fire, He makes him do what the people of the Fire do until he dies and then He enters him in the Fire (T,9:113; parentheses added).

On eight full pages Tabari quotes various versions of Hadith reports in this regard. One of these tells us that after the creation of Adam's children, or their souls, God grasped them in His two hands and told those in His right hand: "You shall enter Paradise with peace," and said to the rest in His left hand: "Go to Hell, and I do not care." Then, God wrote (fixed) their lifespan -- **AJALAHUM**, their livelihood -- **RIZQ**, and their sufferings -- **MASAIBAHUM** (T,9:110-8 cf. Q7:172). Muslim Sahih (46:1) records the Prophet's numerous statements explaining the Quran 92:5-10. These indicate the Prophet believed in all forms of predestination and predetermination of human acts and events by the Almighty. The main emphasis is on the predestined divisions of mankind into two groups: one

destined to be SAID, blessed, going to Paradise and the other SHAQIYY, wretched, doomed to Hell.

According to a story from the Prophet Muhammad, the Prophet Moses, talking (obviously in Heaven after his death) with Adam, grumbled:

'O Adam, you are our father but you put us in loss and trouble; it is you who caused our expulsion from Paradise.' Adam said to him, 'Here you are Moses! God selected you with His Word and wrote for you with His (own) hands. [So, you should know the reality.] Do you blame me for something the Almighty (Himself) destined to happen with me forty years before He created me?' -- **A TALUMUNI ALA AMR-IN QADARAHU'LLAH ALAYYA QABL AN YAKHLUQANI BI ARBAIN SANAH?** Saying this, Adam convinced Moses [that Adam was not responsible for the expulsion from Paradise; it was all predestined by the Almighty to happen]. (Mu., 46:2; parentheses and brackets added).

According to another version of the same report, the wrangle between Adam and Moses took place before the Almighty, who apparently agreed with Adam that He was the real actor. Adam also reminded Moses of the Quranic passage 20:121, "And Adam disobeyed his Lord, and so he erred," saying that Moses must have known this was written forty years before Adam was created (Mu.46:2 [2652-15]). The assertion takes for granted the Islamic belief that the whole Quran was included in previous divine scriptures, like the Bible, in their original, 'uncorrupted' form, and that, moreover, all Divine scriptures were written - long before God created the world - in a Mother Book -- **UMM AL-KITAB**, and a Preserved Tablet -- **LAUH MAHFUZ**, kept with the Lord, perhaps for record. By referring Moses to the Quranic verses, Adam meant the Almighty had already destined him to 'disobey' God and commit error. Muhammad further said the human race is predestined to commit some form of adultery which they cannot avoid (because God so willed) -- **INN ALLAH KATAB ALA IBN ADAM HAZZAH-U MIN AZ-ZINA; ADRAK DHALIK LA MAHAL** (Mu,46:5 [26,57-20,21]).

The Prophet also said that God determines before birth an individual's livelihood, life-span, deeds, wretchedness or bliss. Those destined for Hell, according to the Prophet, may be most of their lives like those destined for Paradise, but their written fate shall overwhelm them. They shall start acting like the people of Hell, and eventually reach Hell. Those destined for Paradise, the Prophet continued, might be one yard from Hell because of their misdeeds but this destiny will

overwhelm them too and they will behave like the people of Paradise, which they will enter (Mu., 46:1, Hadith No. 2643). At conception the angel in charge asks "'O my Lord, is this to be a male or female?' God then deems it to be male or female. Then (the angel) says, 'My Lord, is this person to be perfectly healthy and well-shaped, or defective -- **A SAWIYY-UN AW GHAYR SAWIYY?**'. Then God destines (the individual to be born) to be hale and sightly or troubled. And (the angel) asks, 'My Lord, 'What is to be his livelihood? his hour of death? his character -- **KHULUQUHU?**' God sets (the individual) to be wretched or blessed" (ibid:2645-4). The Prophet said, "none is born, but with a place already 'written' by God in Paradise of Hell - already destined to be a wretched or blessed." Someone asked: "O Messenger of Allah, shall we not depend on what is written in our book (of destiny) and stop (weighing) the actions (or deeds)?" (The Prophet) said, "Those destined to be among the people of felicity (those destined to be blessed) are also (destined) to move towards the actions and deeds of the blessed ones (i.e., those destined to be blessed are also destined to act as blessed ones, automatically); and the wretched are destined to move towards the deeds of the wretched (i.e., those predestined to be wretched are also 'programmed' to act accordingly)." Then the Prophet said, "Act; every one is enabled (by God) to act accordingly. As for those blessed, they are enabled for the acts of the blessed people, and as for the wretched ones, they are enabled to act as the wretched do" --

MA MINKUM MIN AHAD, MA MIN NAFS-IN MANFUSAT-IN, ILLA WA QAD KATAB ALLAH MAKANAH MIN AL-JANNAT WA'N-NAR. WA ILLA WA QAD KUTIBAT SHAQIYYAT-AN AU SAIDAT..." FA QAL RAJUL-UN: "YA RASUL ALLAH, AFALA NAMKUTH ALA KITABINA WA NADAU'L- AMAL?" FA-QAL: "MAN KAN MIN AHL AS-SAADAT, FA SA-YASIR ILA AMAL AHL AS-SAADAT. WA MAN KAN MIN AHL ASH-SHAQAWAT, FA SA-YASIR ILA AMAL AHL ASH-SHAQAWAT." FA-QAL "IMALU FA KULL-UN MUYASSAR. AMMA AHL AS-SAADAT FA-YUYASSARUN LI-AMAL AHL AS-SAADAT. WA AMMA AHL ASH-SHAQAWAT FA YUYASSARUN LI-AMAL AHL ASH-SHAQAWAT." THUMM QARAA (AL-QURAN): FA AMMA MAN ATA... (Mu.46:1 [2647-6]).

After saying this, the Prophet recited the following Quranic passages as the basis of his above mentioned statement.

As for him who gives and is godfearing and confirms the reward most fair, We shall surely ease him to the Easing. But as for him who is a miser, and self-sufficient, and cries lies to the reward most fair, We shall surely ease him to the Hardship (Q92:5-10).

Children in their minority should not be considered necessarily innocent. During the burial rites of an infant, Aisha, the Prophet's wife, remarked the dead babe might have been lucky -- TUBA LI-HADHA, by dying so soon, thus escaping the likelihood of committing evil deeds and the consequent punishment in Hell. Aisha said the infant was just like an innocent bird and would definitely go to Paradise. The Prophet, however, corrected his wife immediately. He said:

O Aisha, it could be otherwise, (i.e., the infant could go to Hell); indeed, God created some for Paradise, having predestined them so when they were in the loins of their forefathers; and God created some for Hell, having destined them to be so when they were in the loins of their forefathers (Mu., 46:6 [2662-30,31]; parentheses added).

The Prophet invoked a parallel:

The child killed by al-Khidr (a Prophet or a pious ideal Muslim of the past) was predestined to be a non-Muslim -- **KAFIR**; had he lived, he would have grieved his (Muslim) parents by his transgression (against) and disbelief (in Islam) (Mu., 46:5 [2661-29]; parentheses added).

The Prophet was explaining two points: 1) all are predestined to be wretched or blessed. So, an infant is not necessarily blessed just because he has not committed evil. 2) Al-Khidr, a believer, who knew the infant was predestined to be wretched, i.e. non-Muslim, and act accordingly after coming of age, was authorized by God to kill the infant.

The Islamic story of Habil (Abel) and Qabil (Cain) tells us that the progeny of Qabil were doomed to be sinners (TT-1:18). A similar predestination appears in Islamic sources for the descendants of Noah's three or four sons: all the Prophets were predestined to emerge from the progeny of Sam. The children of Ham were predestined to be black; the children of Sam and the sons of Yafith were destined to rule. Belief in predestination is a cardinal element of the Muslim belief system but how it affects Muslim thought and behavior toward non-Muslims remains unexplained. This happened mainly because after some two decades following the Prophet's death in 632 CE, the philosophical discussion on

predestination diverted attention away from the real purpose of predestination -related material in Islamic sources to irrelevant directions. An explanation of the medieval debate on the subject will here precede the argument that extensive treatment of predestination in the Quran and Tradition aims to reinforce negative Muslim images and treatment of non-Muslims.

After the Umayyads came to power, a great debate ensued about **AL-QADA** and **AL-QADAR**. As articles of faith for unquestioned belief in Divine predestination, their necessity was reconfirmed after about three centuries of debate among Muslims. Such debate was possible because Muslims realized that the Quran, in particular, and Islamic teachings in general held contradictory texts on predestination versus the free will (as a philosophical subject). Islamic commandments relating conformity to reward and nonconformity to punishment, and the concept of a covenant between God and humans, obviously implied the existence of the capacity to will and choose. Several Quranic passages make people responsible for the consequences of their actions (See, e.g., Q41:46; Q53:39-40 cf. T,29:206; Q99:7-8; Q103). Similarly, numerous Hadith reports warn of punishment for acting in one way and promise reward for doing otherwise. The contradictions, particularly in the Quran, are too obvious to disregard. Sometimes, the Quran stresses both free will and predestination in the same passage. In Q10:41-4 the Prophet (and the believers) are told not to bother about continuing disbelief in Islam by non-believers because, the Quran says, the nonbelievers - inherently 'blind' and 'deaf' - cannot accept the message of Islam. But the same passage ends with the assertion: "Surely God wrongs not men [in] anything, but men wrong themselves." Another example runs:

And every man - We have fastened to him his bird of omen upon his neck; and We shall bring forth for him, on the Day of Resurrection, a book he shall find spread open. Read thy book! Thy soul suffices thee this day as reckoner against thee.' Whosoever is guided, is only guided to his own gain and whosoever goes astray, it is only to his own loss; no soul laden bears the load of another. We never chastise, until we send forth a Messenger (Q17:13-15 cf. T,15:50-53).

The first part (17:13) of this passage is usually quoted to prove predestination. In Tabari's words, for every one born, a sheet is already written determining whether he will be a wretched or a blessed one -- **MA MIN MAULUD-IN YULAD ILLA WA FI UNUQIHI WARAQAT, MAKTUB-UN FIHA "SHAQIYY" AU "SAID"**. On the basis of this predestination in the "Book" a person will go to Paradise or Hell (T,15:50-3).² The second part (17:15) unambiguously makes 'souls' responsible for their own burdens, and stresses they will be punished for their rejection of the Prophets, rather than being doomed anyway to punishment.

Argument, however, was not generated merely by such apparent contradictions. Before the Umayyad period no significant controversy rose among Muslims on this subject per se. The great medieval debate on the topic came from two extraneous developments: 1) the schism in the community of Islam and 2) Muslim contact with Indo- Iranian, Hellenistic and Christian material on the topic.³

The schism started with the Prophet's death. After a series of civil wars the Umayyads emerged as eventual victors, though active and passive opposition to them continued. The Kharijites and the supporters of AHL AL- BAYT, "People of the House (of the Prophet)," were the most prominent anti-Umayyads. The AHL AL-BAYT and their supporters preceded those crystallized later as Shiites. Let us call them early Shiites, including, for our purposes, the pre-750 CE Abbasids.⁴

Both the Umayyads and anti-Umayyads confessed Islam. Whatever other historical and social-political reasons may have been present, both groups based their cases on the Quran (and the Sunnah to some extent). Material apparently related to predestination and free will helped both sides. Though for different reasons and goals, the puritan Kharijites and the early Shiites both alleged that the Umayyads had sinned by violating the Quran. The former also justified their resistance (against Umayyad 'sinners') as a duty enjoined by the Quran. That is, their salvation depended on the performance of this duty. It was not guaranteed by predestination. The Kharijite rigorism and the early Shiite activism

implied that free will made a difference leading to salvation or damnation; God's commandments and prohibitions, they implied, made no sense if people had already been blessed or condemned. Besides, clear, specific Quranic verses supported the idea of free will and choice.

Pro-Umayyads and the neutrals (like the followers of the line of Abd Allah b. Umar) found it difficult to prove the Umayyads were better Muslims and the Kharijites and early Shiites were sinners. Kharijite puritanism and simplicity, with their strict adherence to Islamic rituals, were universally respected. Ali and Abbas (for whose families' cause the early 'Shiites' fought) were too closely related to the Prophet to be ignored by Muslims. Muslims also remembered how the ancestors of the Umayyads were latecomers to Islam. The tragedy of Karbala permanently embarrassed Muslim masses, the pious pro-Umayyads and the neutrals. The pro-Umayyads and neutrals could use only two Quranic-Islamic arguments in favor of the Umayyad status quo, and against anti-Umayyad activism: 1) the need for Islamic unity -- **JAMAAH** and 2) predestination. T h e earliest philosophical proponents of predestination became known as Murjiites, "the Postponers," or "those who refer decision-making to (God in the Hereafter)." The Murjiites argued that action against perceived Muslim sinners should be delayed or given to God in the Hereafter, which implied that if found out, sinners face the Almighty Himself, who will deal with them. This argument hinged on the point that the civil wars, tragedies, perceived un-Islamic actions of the Umayyads were all predestined by the Almighty. This also implied that resistance to the Umayyads was tantamount to challenging God's will. Both the Murjiites and their adversaries could easily draw on Quranic passages and on genuine or concocted Hadith reports to prove their cases.

Extreme determinists were derogated by their opponents as **JABRIYYA** (Jabrites), believers in **JABR** ("compulsion"), i.e., those who believe that human actions and events are caused by compelling Divine predetermination. Remembering that the meaning of the root word **QUDRAH** is "(having) effective power (to perform deeds unrestricted by any eternal Divine

decree)", believers in human free will were (also derogatorily) called **QADARIYYA** (Qadarites). [The **QADARITES** in this usage should not be confused with those who believe in **QADAR** or **QADR** "preordainment." The Qadarites here are just the opposite of predestinarians.]

After the Abbasid revolution of 750 CE, the Umayyad domination as an issue was irrelevant. The Abbasids, part of the early Shiites of "the House of the Prophet," now held power and no longer needed to deploy "free will" to fight the Umayyads. As the Twelver Shiites began to believe in the future reappearance of the Twelfth Iman to establish an ideal state, they became for all practical purposes a kind of predestinarians. Orthodox Shiites were no longer active intellectual partisans of free will. (The Mutazilites are not here included among orthodox Shiites). But this did not close debate on the subject. Once the Quran and Tradition were involved in the debate, the relevant material was treated academically regardless of political partisanship. It was as if this material had originally meant to address the subject of 'predetermination-free will' seriously., Using the Quran and Tradition as touchstones, arguments and counter-arguments created an enormous Islamic literature.

Before the Umayyads were overthrown, both sides (the real or alleged Jabriyya and Qadariyya) had accumulated enough Quranic-Traditional reports to continue the debate. By the ninth century Muslim scholars had found the Hellenistic-Christian and Indo-Iranian sources on liberium arbitrium vs. determinism. As in many other fields, Islamicate scholars expanded the debate generically and philosophically. Also, as in other fields, Muslim scholars on both sides looked to the Quran and Tradition to back them up. As believers, they thought all knowledge stemmed from the Quran and Tradition.

The Mutazilites of the eighth to tenth centuries, by and large, succeeded the Qadarites of earlier generations as upholders of Free Will. Because of their systematic statement of their doctrines, and thanks too to the support they gained from the Abbasid political-intellectual

establishment, the Mutazilites proved to be more formidable adversaries for orthodox Traditionists than the Qadarites were. This was so because on logically convincing grounds they defended God's Unity, Justice and Righteousness, rather than on Umayyad (or any other ruling family's) interests.

The Mutazilites systematically divided human actions into the Natural and the Moral, which they called "actions of the members, and actions of the heart," i.e., involuntary and voluntary actions. "The moral act," they said, "is Man's own property acquired by his own exertions" (DeBoer:51); thus man is responsible for it. Articulating Kharijite and Qadarite implications, the Mutazilites asserted that "binding injunctions and prohibition presuppose Freedom of Will and capability of acting in accordance therewith" (DeBoer:51). The idea that God gives rise to evil, the Mutazilites maintained, contradicts the concept of Divine Righteousness; God "rewards or punishes man according to his deserts" (DeBoer:45). Doing otherwise, i.e., punishing one for the evil deed foreordained by God would be injustice. According to the Mutazilites,

the responsibility of man, as well as the holiness of God, who is incapable of directly causing man's sinful actions, had to be saved by asserting the freedom of the will. Man must therefore be lord of his actions... A production or object of Divine activity, evil is not (DeBoer:45-6).

While the earlier Mutazilites had argued that "God may be able, indeed, to act wickedly and unreasonably, but he would not do it," the later Mutazilites asserted

that God had no power at all to do anything which is... repugnant to His nature (*ibid*:46). God can do absolutely no evil thing; in fact he can do that which he knows to be the best thing for his servants. His omnipotence reaches no farther than what he actually does (*ibid*:52)... (The Mutazilites) held it to be true that man measures and determines his actions himself by his KADAR; this is by reason of a KUDRA, an effective power which belongs to him but which has been created by God in each man (E1²,4:366). They took as their starting point divine justice instead of human "freedom to do evil": God must keep His word [and be logical and consistent... because] a TAKLIF BIMA LA YUTAQ ["asking one to do something that one cannot do"] is impossible, [they argued] (E1²,4:371; brackets added)

All these arguments, though aimed at restoring the Almighty's justice and

"good" nature, contradict the overwhelming predestinarian material in the Quran and Sunnah.

The Mutazilites were part of a broader rationalistic movement generated by contact with Hellenic thought, not limited to the topic of Free Will versus determinism. The Orthodox, however, could see that the Mutazilites' new, rationalistic systems and doctrines were alien to the Quran's simple religion and precepts. For the orthodoxy and Muslims masses "whatever went beyond the regular ethical teachings was heresy... for faith should be obedience and not - as was maintained by the Murjiites and Mutazilites, knowledge" (DeBoer:43). On the other hand, because the Mutazilites were defending God's Righteousness and Justice, and the Quranic contradictions were too obvious to ignore, the Traditionist orthodoxy felt itself cornered in the Christian cul-de-sac on the same topic. Prolonging the debate might have permanently weakened orthodoxy: the support the Mutazilites had from al-Mamun and other Abbasid caliphs, and also from higher intelligentsia, weakened the orthodox position further. Some Mutazilites had gone beyond what the orthodox could stomach. Abu'l-Hudhayl al-Allaf (c. 800-860 CE) believed that the Will of God was not to be regarded as eternal (DeBoer:50). An-Nazzam (d. 845 CE) though "it possible for the whole body of Muslims to concur in admitting an erroneous doctrine, as , for instance, the doctrine (that) Muhammad has a mission for all mankind in contradistinction to other prophets" (DeBoer:53). This referred particularly to the Sunni faith based on Hadith reports that Muslim masses would never concur in erroneous beliefs. I.e., what the majority of lower clergy and the masses believe must be right. An-Nazzam also challenged the idea of the inimitable excellence of the Quran (DeBoer:53).

The Traditionist ulama and the masses, however, remained impervious to philosophical debate on al-qada wa'l-qadar. Without making Islamically-required deeds irrelevant to salvation, the necessity of belief in predestination was emphasized - with its limited purpose in mind. Those who disbelieved in predestination, the so-called Qadarites,

were vehemently condemned . On the basis of Hadith reports, the believers were told that the Qadarites do not belong to Islam (Tir.30:13; IM., Intr., b.9 bis; AbH,1:330), that they "are the Magians of the community and therefore excluded from the common honors" (AD:39:16 etc.), and that they are partisans of the Dajjal, the Islamic version of the Antichrist (AD,39:16). The bond between Muslim masses and the Traditionist lower clergy, the 'ulama', was too strong and extensive to be broken by a small group of high rationalist intellectuals. For their daily prayers, fasting, zakat and hajj, for marriages and burial rites and for their numerous daily transactions and activities to be performed properly, Muslim masses needed the literalist, Traditionist ulama to tell them how to perform according to the Quran and Sunna. Particularly after the Mutazilites lost the support of the Abbasid caliphs, they soon realized that "the communities of men are more ready to accept a religion sent down to them from on high, than an enlightened explanation of it" (DeBoer:49). The orthodox ulama and the masses had never appreciated the use of the Quran for extra-Islamic philosophical discourses. However, because KALAM, "theological dialectics" and scholasticism had become fashionable among high scholars in the Muslim world, the regression from rationalistic trends to Islamic literalist fundamentalism had to be done by some trained as dialecticians and schoolmen. The conversion of Abu'l- Hasan al-Ashari (b. 873- d. 936) from the Mutazili school to orthodoxy (and, later of al-Ghazali) fulfilled this purpose, thus changing the course of intellectual history in the world of Islam.⁵

Al-Ashari symbolized the beginning of the fundamentalist orthodox counter-attack on rationalistic intrusions into Muslim thought. Here, we examine only his role in the debate on predestination versus the free will.

In contrast to the emphasis of the Mutazila on the reality of choice in human activity, al- Ashari insisted on God's omnipotence; everything, good and evil, is willed by God, and He creates the acts of men by creating in men the power to do each act ("W. Montgomery Watt, Al-Ashari, Abu'l-Hasan", EI²,1:694).

The teachings of the Ashari school on this subject, and on other

theological issues, "(fused) with orthodoxy, and in a sense it has remained so until the present time" (ibid). Divine Decree for the al-Ashari school,

in so far as it is (realized within) creation (KHALQ), it relates as much to the true as to the false, to acts done in obedience to the Law as to impious acts. Nothing escapes it: the decree and its object coincide. But insofar as it is the Command (AMR) of God, the Decree is simply rectitude and justice, for it is distinguished from that which is decreed... QADA is the very expression of the Divine Will... and thus eternal... (El²,4:365).

The Asharites

endeavored to affirm both the existence of the Divine Decree and man's responsibility, which latter is dependent on the Decree itself, through the KASB, the relationship, created by God, between acts and the subjects who performed them (El²,4:366).

By this al-Ashari (or the Asharites) meant to say that man is

able to give assent to the works which are accomplished in him by God, and to claim these as his own (DeBoer:56).

For the Asharites the Qadarites are seen to have totally rejected determinism and are outright disbelievers and the Mutazilite argument "is false though less reprehensible" (El²,4:366).

The Asharite formula about al-qada and al-qadar was embraced by the orthodox and Muslim masses. It was an authoritarian reconfirmation of the primacy of determinism without any meaningful explanation of logical and philosophical contradictions between both types of Islamic material on the subject. Al-Ashari's scholastic explanations reconciling the free-will-related material with the confirmed idea of predestination are as clear and convincing as any of those of Thomas Aquinas on the same subject. Indeed, al-Ashari's use of BILA KAYF "(ask) not how" as his basic method precludes rationalistic debate on such subjects. Al-Ashari's

Cosmology, Anthropology and Eschatology did not depart too far from the text of the Tradition... Ashari relies upon the revelation contained in the Quran. He does not recognize any rational

knowledge with regard to Divine things that is independent of the Quran (DeBoer:56-7).

Neither side of the debate nor Ashari's so-called compromise formula explain the logical contradictions meaningfully. Nor do they tell us how the vast amount of material affects Muslim thought and behavior. The masses and the orthodox had always remained uninterested and unimpressed by the cerebral debate because they thought about the apparent contradictions quite differently; they knew the sophisticated debate meant nothing to the fundamental purposes the material served.

If, as the Asharite so-called synthesis implies, the material related to predestination does not cancel out the material related to free will, then the existence side by side of Quranic materials confirming predestination and demanding action (as if one enjoys free will) is yet to be explained. Similarly, given that belief in predestination is unquestioned (and supporting material in Islamic sources is enormous), we need to understand how this belief works in the Muslim mind and how relevant material influences Muslim thought and action. The problem of internal contradictions can be solved only when looking -as Muslims do without saying so - at the purpose the predestination-related materials served as their author meant. (All materials, in fact, in Islamic sources concerning the five basic items of the Islamic synoptic credo influence Muslim images and treatment of the world beyond Islam.)

Were it conceivable for the debating parties to think and talk about the roots of predestinational material, they would not have left the copious and tedious literature on the subject. The Quran as it unfolded during the twenty-three years of Muhammad's Prophetic career was simple and functional. It lacked the kind of sophisticated thought that medieval Islamicate scholars, inspired by the Hellenic, Hellenistic, Indo-Iranian and Judeo-Christian heritages, imposed on it. The Quran was a day-to-day response to changing situations Muhammad confronted. The Almighty and Muhammad were influenced by shifting circumstances and their own varying moods. The Quran and early Tradition did not anticipate the link between

the two types of material, nor the philosophical debate on the generic subject of determinism versus free will. The Quran and Tradition, as on many other subjects, approach this subject atomistically.

Had God and Muhammad thought philosophically and logically on "determinism versus free will," they would not have declared the game of destiny to be over while simultaneously relating salvation to the acceptance of the Islamic belief system and actions. Muslim scholars, however, could not say all this. By the time of the debate, Muslims had internalized the belief that all knowledge stemmed from the Quran and Tradition, that nothing could be said to challenge the primacy and logical consistency of the Quran, that no one could imply the Quran was concocted or produced in response to unforeseen events. Al-Ashari's principle **BILA KAYF**, i.e., the prohibition against asking rational questions, was grounded in **IMAN BI'L-GHAYB**, "belief in the unseen" (Q2:3), in the belief that human knowledge is limited --**WA MA UTITUM, MIN AL-ILM ILLA QALIL-AN** (Q17:85), and in the belief that the Quran and Muhammad encompass all knowledge. Asking questions, the orthodox knew, would cut the roots of the Faith. A believer was obliged to think entirely within the Faith. The free-thinkers knew that to challenge this would lead to apostasy and instant condemnation to death. Like modernist believer-scholars who look for a Locke, a Rousseau, a Marx and a Trotsky in Muhammad, Umar, Ali and Abu Dhar, even medieval Islamicate **FALASIFAH** "philosophers" had to reconcile their Prime Being and Ultimate Uncaused Cause with the Allah of the Quran - or, like Ibn Khaldun, pay contradictory and inconsistent lip service to what is divine in Islam. They definitely enjoyed less security and a less supportive climate of opinion than Mahmud Taha or Salman Rushdie today.

The predestination-related material and its effects on Muslim minds become understandable when the original purpose this material served for its author and his followers is seen. Through Quranic contexts, and with the help of Traditional reports about the "occasions/circumstances of revelations" for relevant Quranic passages, Muslims know what that was.

[Thanks to the fact that the compilers of reports about the "circumstances or occasions of revelations" did not anticipate the modern historical analytical method. Note that Muslim belief in the institution of **NASKH**, abrogation of certain passages by others and in the primacy of some passages over others, is not based on a rationalistic, logical method. Muslims believe in **NASKH** for no other reason than that Tradition tells them to do so.] The 'predestination passages' were primarily produced in confrontations with non-Muslims, and meant to indicate particular Muslim images and treatment of non-Muslims. Tradition reports augmented this purpose. This aspect of the predestination-related material is what Muslims internalize, rather than its relevance to the debate. A historical-analytical Weberian method determines the understanding and explanations of Quranic-Traditional material on Predestination here. Just as the Protestant concept of predestination mediated through Calvinism had, according to Max Weber, its socio-economic repercussions, the Islamic concept of predestination affects how Muslims see and treat the world beyond Islam (regardless of any inconsistency with other Islamic demands). What is more, the Quranic text and Tradition reports unwittingly tell believers that this material was produced for exactly such a purpose. Belief in predestination, as the Quranic method indicates, does not absolve a Muslim from acting as a Muslim. Rather, it encourages Muslims to act as Muslims because, as in Calvinism, it is the only way to be sure of one's foreordination as a believer. Primarily, belief in predestination is another ideological tool to encourage Muslims to think of non-Muslims as ungrateful to God, to fight them ruthlessly and to think of them as hopeless, wretched creatures, to be looked down upon. Belief in predestination aims to enhance Muslim self-images, justifying their negative treatment of non-Muslims. The predestination-related Quranic passages, if studied, as believers do, within the context of the Quran - with the help of Tradition, when necessary - are revealing. Quranic passages including predestination-related phrases and verses may be divided into three main categories, according to the three purposes they

served during three kinds of occasions for the Prophet. First are the passages designed to emphasize God's omniscience and omnipotence, leading Muslims to think that non-Muslims were ungrateful to God. Most of these belong to the Prophet's early Meccan phase. Second come passages exhorting the believers to participate in jihad and fight the nonbelievers ruthlessly. These are mostly Medinan. Third are the passages that explain non-Muslims' resistance to Islam, telling the believers how to think and act in response. These mostly belong to the middle and late Meccan phase, and early Medinan phase. Each of these kinds of passage is illuminating. During the early Meccan phase, the Quran projected God's all-powerfulness to tell believers that the Almighty was on their side. The Quran also emphasized that God sustains all, including the nonbelievers. It is He, they were told, who provides them RIZQ, sources of livelihood. This was to shame non-Muslims and tell them how ungrateful they were by refusing to follow His Messenger. God's immense capacities were also projected to warn the nonbelievers that the Almighty could punish and destroy them if they rejected Islam. The Prophet also confronted the Meccans' disbelief in an afterlife and related concepts. They thought Resurrection after death, and phenomena like Paradise, Hell, etc., were impossible. The Almighty responded that He was indeed capable of working wonders.

They shall every one of them be arraigned before Us. And a sign for them is the dead land, that We quickened and brought forth from it grain, whereof they eat; and We made therein Gardens of palms and wines, and therein We caused fountains to gush forth, that they might eat of its fruits and their hands' labor. What, will they not be thankful? Glory be to Him, who created all the pairs of what the earth produces, and of themselves, and of what they know not. And a sign for them is night; We strip it of the day and lo, they are in darkness And the sun - it runs to a fixed resting place; that is the ordaining of the All-mighty, the All-knowing. And the moon - We have determined it by stations, till it returns like an aged palm bough. It behooves not the sun to overtake the moon, neither does the night outstrip the day, each swimming in a sky. And a sign for them is that We carried their seed in the laden ship, and We have created for them the like of it whereupon they ride; and if We will We drown them, then none have they to cry to, neither are they delivered, save as a mercy from Us, and enjoyment for a while. And when it is said to them, 'Fear what is before you and what is behind you; haply you will find mercy' - yet never any sign of their Lord comes to them, but they are turning away from it... (Q36:32-46).

Such phrases as "God has fixed the resting place of the sun," "has ordained the moon by station" were intended to demonstrate God's power rather than to initiate a philosophical discussion of predestination per se. In similar contexts, and for similar purposes, the Quran asserts that God "created" and "determined a term" known only to Him (Q6:2), "gives life, and makes to die" creates at will and "decrees" (Q40:68; 56:60), "created everything in measures" (Q54:49), recorded their deeds "in the scrolls, and inscribed "everything great and small" (Q54:52-3), and "appointed a measure for everything" (Q65:3).

God created you of dust, then of a sperm-drop, then He made you pairs. No female bears or brings forth, save with His knowledge; and none is given long life who is given long life neither is any diminished in his life, but it is in a Book. Surely that is easy for God (Q35:10-11).

God controls resources:

God outspreads and straightens His provision unto whomever He will (Q13:26). Surely thy Lord outspreads and straightens His provision unto whom He will (Q17:30 cf. 82:82); If thou askest them, 'Who created the heavens and the earth and subjected the sun and the moon?' they will say, 'God.' How then are they perverted? God outspreads and straightens His provision to whomsoever He will of His servants; God has knowledge of everything (Q29:61-2). Have they not seen that God outspreads and straightens His provision to whom He will? Surely in that are signs for a people who believe (Q30:37).

Rebutting the belief that Jesus is God's son, the Quran asserts two points: 1) God can create by will a person without a human father and 2) all as God's creatures, including Jesus, obey Him.

And they say, 'God has taken to Him a son.' Glory be to Him! Nay, to Him belongs all that is in heavens and the earth; all obey His will... and when He decrees a thing He but says to it 'Be' and it is (Q2:116-7; cf. Q3:47; Q19:35). God creates what He will. When He decrees a thing He does but say to it, 'Be', and it is (Q3:47 cf. Q19:35).

When Muslims changed the gibla from Jerusalem to Mecca they met criticism from their adversaries. Justifying the Prophet's shifting mood on the basis of God's unrestricted will, the Quran declared:

'To God belong the East and the West; He guides whomever He will to

a straight path' (Q2:142).

In all these passages the Quran projected God's omnipotence in great detail to impress the nonbelievers, implying the Almighty was on the believers' side. This was usually done by telling stories of the past. The Prophets and their followers were helped, and nonbelievers destroyed, through extraordinary means. Some passages spoke of God's power to reinforce Muslim belief in extraordinary phenomena (e.g., resurrection after death), and to rebut non-Muslims' disbelief of them. Others sought to justify certain Islamic stands, e.g., change of the qibla on the basis of God's unlimited authority to do what He wants. As he emphasized God's all-powerfulness, the author's particular linguistic modes carried him/Him in all directions. He asserted that 'God does everything' without ever thinking of the logical-philosophical consequences of certain utterances. As Gardet (El²,4:365), discussing Q2:117; Q3:47; Q19:35 and Q40:68, and Ringgren⁶ in general have pointed out, these Quranic passages "indicate the absolute power of God free from any type of intermediary" (Gardet) and emphasize "God's omnipotence, not predestination itself" (Ringgren).

2. The exhortations to believers to fight nonbelievers, putting aside their reason, and those passages which condemned the revisionists like "the Hypocrites," generated further predestination-related passages in the Quran. A series of verses encouraged Muslims to fight non-Muslims. Muslims were told it was God who set life and death, not apparent causes. Besides, death for the sake of Islam in this world is rewarded in the Hereafter. [Juxtaposing reward with action in this world indicates the Quran did not contemplate serious discussion of predestination versus free will.]

It is not given to any soul to die, save by the leave of God, at an appointed time. Whosoever desires the reward of this world, We will give him of this, and whoso desires the reward of other world, We will give him of that; and We will recompense the thankful. Many a Prophet there has been, with whom thousands manifold have fought, and they fainted not for what smote them in God's way, neither weakened, nor did they humble themselves; and God loves the patient (Q3:145-6). They were concealing in their hearts that they show not to thee, saying, 'Ah, if we had had a part in the affair, never would we have been slain here.' Say: Even if you had been in your

houses, those for whom slaying was appointed would have sallied forth unto their last couches'... (Q3:154).

Q3:154 reflected the al-Munafiqun's criticism of what they thought was a senseless war against non-Muslims. Their desire to avoid unnecessary disasters was condemned by asserting that "wherever you may be, death will overtake you, though you should be in raised-up towers ..."everything is from God" (Q4:77-8). The Prophet was told to say

Naught shall visit us but what God has prescribed for us; He is our protector; in God let the believers put their trust (Q9:51).

The Quran also remarks:

No affliction befalls in the earth or in yourselves, but it is in a Book, before We create it; that is easy for God (Q57:22-4 cf. T,27:233-6; also see Q64:11).

The effect on Muslim minds desired from such predestinarian Quranic passages is well explained by Sayyid Sulayman Nadavi (d. 1953), a famous Indo-Pakistani orthodox Muslim scholar. In his discussion of **QAZA-O-QADAR** (al-qada wa'l-Qadar), i.e., predestination in Islam, Nadavi emphasizes the practical and pragmatic (what he calls 'moral') aspects.⁷ "The Holy Quran has also made it obvious," Nadavi maintains,

that it gives more importance to the moral aspects of the concept of predestination than to its philosophical reality -- **QURAN-I-PAK NE IS KO BHI ZAHIR KIYA HAI KE QAZA-O-QADAR KI FALSAFIYANAH HAQIQAT SE ZIYADAH IS KI NAZAR IS AQIDEY KI AKHLAQI AHMIYAT PAR HAI** (Nadavi, SIRAT, 4:864).

Nadavi cites some passages quoted here correctly maintaining that belief in Islamic predestination teaches believers to live courageously without fear and undue pride. Predestination should be understood the way the Prophet's Companions realized it, Nadavi emphasizes. Knowing Islamic materials properly, the Companions of the Prophet were always

ready to indulge in the most dangerous ventures because they believed that death will come at its fixed time and that whatever is destined to happen will happen. Consequently, there was such a strong determination in their hearts (sic) which could neither be moved by mountains, nor carried away by oceans nor could be uprooted by the flood of difficult events nor could be burned by the flames of blazing fire (ibid,866).

Relying on the Prophet's sayings, Nadavi, like all other orthodox Muslim scholars, reminds us that any philosophical discussion of predestination is undesirable and discouraged by Islam. The concept should teach believers, he emphasizes, to be patient in times of trouble and to be valiant and gallant against non-believers. Whatever the social consequences within Muslim society of this way of understanding predestination, in a confrontation with non-believers, belief in predestination is likely to bar Muslim believers from rational calculation. To what extent occasional kamikaze ventures by Muslim fundamentalists against perceived non-believers begin in this aspect of predestination is better left for conjecture. However, we know well that in the Quran these passages are related to the contexts of Jihad and qital against the non-believers - and are not written to engage believers in an abstract discussion of predestination versus free will. Their purpose was and is, for believers, to inculcate courage and zeal, and to encourage them to shun all rational calculations while confronting perceived nonbelievers. The Islamic concept of predestination in such cases thus becomes the source of Islamic fanaticism in dealings with non-Muslims.

3. Most of the predestination-oriented Quranic passages were produced to tell believers that those who refused to acknowledge Islam were hopeless, wretched, and doomed by the Almighty Himself to act accordingly so that they would go to Hell. This Quranic line of argument responded to specific circumstances Muhammad confronted in Mecca and Medina. The majority of Meccan pagans remained unconvinced that God's omnipotence and omniscience had anything to do with Muhammad's claims and demands. The pagans were also not influenced by Quranic stories telling them the Almighty had always destroyed nonbelievers in this world through miraculous disasters, and had made believers victorious. The Meccans began to ridicule the Prophet's claims and assertions. If Muhammad was right that his God could make wonders as the Quran stated, the pagans argued, why was it not happening in a visible way for the Prophet and against his adversaries? They demanded, rhetorically, to see with their

own eyes the kind of miracles attributed to the past. If the all-mighty and wonder-making God was with Muhammad and interested in the propagation of his cause, why not let the angel Gabriel appear openly from the heaven with the Book in his hands so that all could see him? Why did not the Almighty change the barren desert of Mecca into a prosperous lush green valley with streams of cool water flowing around? Why not change the rocks of Arabia into gold? (see. e.g., Q17:90-3). Some adversaries went beyond this: they said that if Muhammad was right that God would punish his opponents, why not here and now? Why was it so that with all the failure and humiliations Muhammad and his followers were facing, nothing unusual was happening to their opponents? Why did they later continue to prosper? These questions faced the Prophet with a new challenge, impossible to answer with force. The Quran had to convince, at least, the Prophet's few followers with a new argument. If the Quran did not respond with a new type of argument, the believers were likely to think that something was wrong with the Prophet's call and claims.

The Quran therefore used another rhetorical tool. The believers were told that the reason so many refused to accept Islam was that the Almighty had predestined them to do so. God planned to make the wretched refuse Islam so they would be doomed to Hell. Thus, the believers were told there was nothing wrong in Islam; the nonbeliever's rejection of Islam was God's curse upon them. The Quranic verses stating this idea include strong words in order to create a feeling of shame, demoralization and defamation among the nonbelievers and also inculcate a sense of pride among the believers for being among God's chosen people.

The Quranic context of certain predestination-related verses, and Tabari's exegeses, make it plain these passages responded to the challenge rather than treating the subject philosophically. And many of them, by relating salvation to Islamic belief and actions, inherently contradict the idea of absolute foreordination. Muslims are not encouraged to act against the Islamic system of belief and actions depending solely on preordination. The predestination-related material tried only to create

a negative image of nonbelievers, reinforcing among Muslims the belief in Islam and the desire to act accordingly. The Meccan passages will be examined first, following generally the Quran's order (which does not necessarily follow a chronological order of revelation). Otherwise unexplained references to Tabari's Tafsir generally indicate that (as Tabari has mentioned) these Quranic passages were revealed in response to particular situations the Prophet confronted.

In circumstances already mentioned here, the Quran began to tell the Prophet (and the believers) to "turn away from the idolaters. Had God willed, they were not idolaters" (Q6:106-7 cf. TS,12:32-3). The believers were told to praise the Lord "who guided (them to Islam)" and to think that "had God not guided us, we had surely never been guided" (Q7:43). This was to inculcate the feeling that the believers were God's chosen people - compared to the wretched nonbelievers "(whose) hearts were sealed (by God)" (Q7:101). Explaining Q7:101 and its like, Tabari refers to Hadith reports telling us that God took all the progeny of Adam from his loins long before their real birth - foreordaining some to be wretched nonbelievers and predestining others to be blessed believers. Tabari says Q7:101 refers to that eternal decree. God knew, Tabari maintains, that those who rejected the Prophets would do so! Tabari rejects the Mutazilite-scholastic argument that God's all-encompassing knowledge is different from His determining act. "His knowledge of the past and the future has determining force, indeed -- **INN ILMUHU NAFIDH-UN FI MA KAN WA FI MA YAKUN**, Tabari asserts (TS,13:8,7-10). Tabari further states that God, by telling the Prophet about the wretched of the past, also informs him that those who reject his call are as a matter of fact among those who have been doomed by the Almighty to do so. So, the Prophet (and the believers) need not grieve about rejection by these non-believers (ibid:10). Regarding the non-Muslims' persistent disbelief and the believers' concerns about this, the Quran addressed the Prophet in a predestinarian tone:

What, wilt thou make the deaf to hear, though they understand

not? And some of them look unto thee; what, wilt though then guide the blind, though they do not see? Surely God wrongs not men anything, but themselves men wrong (10:42-4).

Obviously, the last part of this passage contradicts predestination in its logical sense, but the purpose was to degrade non-Muslims - not initiate a discussion. The nonbelievers' wretchedness is explained more clearly:

Had thy Lord willed, He would have made mankind one nation; but they continue in their differences excepting those on whom thy Lord has mercy. To that end He created them, and perfectly is fulfilled the word of thy Lord: 'I shall assuredly fill Gehenna with jinn and men all together' (Q11:118-9).

According to Tabari's explanation of Q11:118-9, God told Muhammad that those (the Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians and others) who refuse to become Muslims are doomed by Him to be so; it is God who foreordained some to be Muslims while others remain non-Muslims - and go to Hell (T,12:141-5). Q11:105-9 reminds the Prophet (and the believers) not to be perplexed about the heathens' disbelief; they are doomed to be wretched -- SHAQIYY, as the believers are predestined to be blessed -- SAID (T,12:115-22). As to the Meccan intrasigence, the Quran dogmatized:

God leads astray whomsoever He will, and He guides whomsoever He will; and He is the All-mighty, the All-wise (Q14:4). God's it is to show the way; and some do swerve from it. If He willed, He would have guided you all together (Q16:9. According to Tabari "the way" in this passage means Islam; see T,14:81-5). Whomsoever God guides, he is rightly guided, and whomsoever He leads astray, thou wilt not find for him a protector to direct (Q18:17).

Tabari explains Q18:17: Good and bad fates are determined by God. God told the Prophet:

Let not the turning away of your people from you nor their rejection grieve you; because, had I willed, I would have guided them and they would have believed. The guidance and leading astray are in My hand (T,15:213).

Explaining Q18:29 ("say, 'the truth is from your Lord...'",) Tabari maintains that it is God who leads to bliss or wretchedness, to belief or disbelief, whomsoever He will. God tells the Prophet to say that he is helpless in this matter -- QUL YA MUHAMMAD: 'WA ILAYH AT-TAWFIQ

WA'L-KHIZLAN WA BI YADIHI AL-HUDA WA'D-DALAL; YAHDI MAN YASHA MINKUM LI'R-RISHAD FA-YUMIN, WA UUDILL MAN YASHA MIN AL-HUDA FA-YAKFUR. LAYS ILAYYA MIN DHALIK SHAY-UN (T,15:237 Cf. 237-42). After condemning the Meccans for turning away from Islam (as if they could do otherwise), the Quran told the believers:

Surely, We have laid veils on their ears heaviness; and thou callest them to guidance. Yet they will not be guided ever (Q18:57) because God has put seals on their hearts, ears and eyes (T,15:268. Also see Q22:46 and Q47:16-7 for similar statements).

The predestinarian sense is stronger in other passages and Tabari's explanations. (Note that the context is Meccan, as has been explained.)

If We had so willed, We could have given every soul its guidance; but now My word is realized - Assuredly I shall fill Gehenna with jinn and men all together (Q32:13 cf. T,21:98-9). The Word has been realized against most of them, yet they do not believe. Surely We have put on their necks fetters up to their chins, so their heads are raised; and We have put before them a barrier and behind them a barrier; and We have covered them, so they do not see. Alike it is to them whether you hast warned them or thou hast not warned them, they do not believe (36:7-11).

God has sealed their fate in the Mother Book as the ones who do not believe in God, nor will acknowledge His Prophet -- LI ANN ALLAH QAD KHATAM ALAYHIM FI UMM AL-KITAB ANNAHUM LA YUMINUN BI'LLAH WA YUSADDIQUN RASULAHU (T,22:150; cf. 150-3). Those who are forbidden by God (to join Islam), Tabari adds, cannot act otherwise -- MAN MANAA'LLAH LA YASTATI (ibid:152). God "determines" and "guides" (Q87:3); i.e. it is God who determines some to be wretched and others to be blessed, and it is God who guides to good or evil -- LI'SH-SHAQAWAT WA'S-SAADAT... LI SABIL AL-KHAYR WASH-SHARR (T,30:152 cf. Q87:3).

It is interesting that the Quran threw back the same argument at the Meccan intrasigents:

The idolaters... say, Had God willed, we would not have been idolaters, neither our fathers, nor would we have forbidden aught... Say: 'to God belongs the argument conclusive; for had he willed, He would have guided you all (6:148-9). But He did not will to do so, and opposed (divided) His creatures (into two groups) as He willed; as He willed, among them were the nonbelievers and among them were the believers (TS,12:211-2 cf. Q6:148-9).

Q16:36-7 repeats Q6:148-9, almost word for word, adding

Though thou art ever so eager to guide them, God guides not those whom He leads astray (Q16:37; also see Q6:88-9).

In some passages the demand for miracles that will convince of Muhammad's authenticity is answered directly using the same predestinarian argument. The Quran told the believers that God is certainly capable of performing extraordinarily, but He does not want to do so. Why? Because He already predestined the non-Muslims to remain wretched nonbelievers. Because they are doomed, miracles will not have the desired effects. God does not work against His own will. Even the Satans (sic) are God's tools to reinforce disbelief among non-Muslims. It is a Divine trick to leave the non-Muslims to persist in their disbelief, Muslims are told, so that they are sent to Hell. [Unlike the Mutazilite tenderheartedness, the Almighty did not care for justice.]

Though We had sent down the angels to them, and the dead had spoken with them, had We mustered against them everything, face to face, yet they would not have been the ones to believe, unless God willed; but most of them are ignorant. So We have appointed to every Prophet an enemy - Satans of men and jinn, revealing tawdry speech to each other, all as a delusion. Yet had thy Lord willed, they would never have done it. So leave them to their forging, and that the hearts of those who believe not in the World to come may incline to it, and that they may be well pleased to it and that they may gain what they are gaining (6:111-3 cf. TS,12:46-50). Whomsoever God desires to guide, He expands his breast to Islam; whomsoever He desires to lead astray, He makes his breast narrow, light, as if he were climbing to heaven. So God lays abomination upon those who believe not (Q6:125 cf. TS,12:98-112).

God, Tabari tells us, imposes the Satan on non-Muslims to mislead and bar them from joining the Way of the Truth, i.e. Islam -- **YUSALLIT ALLAH ALAYH WA ALA AMTHALIHI MI'MMAN ABA'L-IMAN BI'LLAH WA RASULIH, FA-YAGHWIH-I WA YASUDDUH-U AN SABIL AL-HAQQ** (TS,12:110 cf. Q6:125). One passage refers to the Meccans' demand for miracles. God told Muhammad the Quraysh would not believe even if such extraordinary events such as the setting of mountains in motion - as the Quraysh had reportedly demanded - had happened (T,13:152 passim).

If only a Koran whereby the mountains were set in motion, or the earth were cleft, or the dead were spoken to - nay, but God's is the affair altogether. Did not the believers know that, if God had willed, He would have guided men all together. Messengers indeed were scoffed at before thee, and I respited the unbelievers; then I seized them - and how was my retribution? (Q13:31-2 cf. T,13:151-7). Indeed, We sent Messengers before thee, among the factions of the ancients, and not a single Messenger came to them, but they mocked at him; even so We cause it to enter into the hearts of the sinners - they believe not in it, though the wont of the ancients is already gone. Though We opened to them a gate in heaven, and still they mounted through it, yet would they say, 'Our eyes have been dazzled; nay we are a people bewitched!' (Q15:12-5 cf. T,14:8-13).

Those destined to be good (Muslims) are also foreordained to think and act as Muslims. Those doomed to be evil (non-Muslims) are also damned to think and act as non-Muslims (Q92:4-13 cf. T,30:219-25; also see Q39:3 cf. T,23:192). A related belief is that God made the actions of nonbelievers look good to them. So, for example, in modern terms, there is no reason for a Muslim to understand why modern ideas and concepts (such as respect for basic human rights, pluralism, liberalism, representative government, secularism, peaceful coexistence, etc.) are appreciated (at least in principle) by everyone but Muslims. In response to similar questions the Quran told believers that non-Muslims like their ways because the Almighty, as a part of His grand foreordainment to keep the wretched wretched, "decks out fair" to them their ways

to destroy them, and to confuse their religion for them. Had God willed, they would not have done so; so leave them to their forging (Q6:137 cf. TS,12:135-9).

For a believer, as well, a modernist who does not comprehend the Muslim demand for Salman Rushdie's death is nothing but a "confused" person doomed by God to be so. A modernist cannot receive appreciation for what he may deem enlightenment. The believer can only think in Quranic terms: God has "decked out fair" such enlightenment in order to "destroy them," to lead them to Gehenna.

So the evil of his deeds was decked out fair to Pharaoh, and he was barred from the way, and Pharaoh's guile came only to ruin (Q40:37 cf. T,24:66).

In Medina particularly, the Jewish refusal to acknowledge Muhammad as the Messenger of God, and "the Hypocrites" opposing the Prophet's policies, created a situation like the one in Mecca. As long as Islam could not overcome by force, the Quran reverted to a predestinarian rationalization repeating all the arguments it had used against the Meccans. Mentioning the Medinan Jews' and al-Munafiqun's persistent disbelief, the Quran said:

As for the unbelievers, alike it is to them whether thou hast warned them or hast not warned them, they do not believe. God has set a seal on their hearts and on their hearing, and on their eyes is a covering, and they awaits them a mighty chastisement... In their hearts is a sickness, and God has increased their sickness and there awaits them a painful chastisement for that they have cried lies (2:6-7, 10).

In further explanations Tabari tells believers that the Jews and al-Munafiqun are among those God had predestined to be nonbelievers (TS,1:258-62). Another passage repeats the theme: the Jews did not acknowledge Muhammad's Prophethood because God had "sealed" their hearts, "so they believe not" (Q4:155). The combined denial by non-Muslims of Islam was also explained to believers as a Divine act (Q6:129), of course, in order to punish them in the Hereafter. After calling nonbelievers "the worst of beasts in God's sight" and "deaf and dumb" in a predestinarian sense, the Quran told the believers

If God had known of any good in them He would have made them hear; and if He had made them hear, they would have turned away, swerving aside (Q8:20-5).

Tabari states that the nonbelievers are those about whom God knew that they would not believe; He knew already that there is no good in them -- **LA KHAYR FIHIM**; and, that they were among those for whom it was 'written' that they would be wretched unbelievers (TS,13:462-3). The Quran explained Al-Munafiqun's rejection of jihad (and Muhammad's inability to punish them physically) by telling believers that God had "cursed" al-Munafiqun "and so made them deaf, and blinded their eyes" and that God had put "locks upon their hearts" (Q47:20-4; also see Q9:123-7 cf.

T,11:75; Q61;5 cf. T,28:86-7; Q83(Meccan):14 cf. T,30:97-100).

Most of the predestination-related Hadith/Tradition reports quoted earlier were generated to augment Quranic arguments concerning the hopeless wretchedness of non-Muslims. Tabari repeatedly relates these Tradition-reports to the Quranic passages that explain non-Muslim disbelief in a predestinarian sense (see, e.g., TS,13:7-10 cf. Q7:101; Q7:172 cf. T,9:110-8). Similarly, Traditional reports about Adam's inherent weaknesses mostly relate to those Quranic passages about Adam that are a part of the Quran's explanations of the Meccans', Medinan Jews', and al-Munafiqun's refusal to acknowledge Islam. (See, e.g., the Quranic contexts of Q2:36 passim; Q7:20 passim).

ENDNOTES

PART V: BELIEF IN AL-QADA WA'L-QADAR, PREDESTINATION

¹For detailed references in Hadith-Tradition literature to various aspects of this belief see "Decree" and "Qdaraites" in Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition.

²It is interesting to compare A.J. Arberry's translation of Q17:13 quoted above, which accords with Tabari's understanding of it, to that adopted by a modern Muslim apologist, F.R. Ansari, The Quranic Foundations and Structure of Muslim Society, Pakistan, 1973, vol. 1, p.357: "Every man's deeds We have fastened on his own neck: and on the Day of Judgment We shall bring out for him a scroll (containing the record of all his thoughts and actions), which he will see spread open" (parentheses in original; stress added).

³About this discussion of AL-QADA and AL-QADAR in Islam (for brief references to the subject and further secondary and primary sources see "Al-Ashari, Abu'l-Hasan," "Ashariyya," "Al-Qada Wa'l-Kadar," "Kadariyyah," "Djabriyyah," "Al-Murdjiah" "Al-Mutazila" in El; T.J. DeBoer, The History of Philosophy in Islam, translated by Edward R. Jones, Dover Publications, New York 1903/1967; W. Montgomery Watt, Free Will and Predestination in Early Islam, London, 1948; G.R. Hawting, The First Dynasty of Islam: The Umayyad Caliphate AD 661-750, Croom Helm, London, 1986, pp. 92-7; G.H. A. Juynboll (ed.), Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society, Southern Illinois University Press, 1982, pp. vide qadar, qadariyya, Murjites, Mutazilites, Asharites in general index; Laura Veccia Vaglieri, "The Patriarchal and Umayyad Caliphates", in The Cambridge History of Islam (1970), Vol. 1A, p. 98. The relationship of the early debate about Predestination-Free Will to the politics of the time is briefly mentioned or alluded to in many general histories of Islam in Western languages. My study of the secondary literature on this topic is limited. I am unaware of any work articulating the issue the way I have done. I apologize for not referring to particular works, if any, on the same line. To say that great minds think alike will be too immodest!

⁴Shia means "Party or supporters of." Originally it was used by all parties: the Shia of Ali, Shia of the **AHL AL-BAYT**, Shia of Muawiyah, etc. By the 'early Shiites' we mean those who wanted one of the progeny of Ali and Fatima (the Prophet's daughter), or any member of the Prophet's Hashimite family (which included also the progeny of Abbas, the Prophet's uncle) to become the **IMAM**, caliph, leader, of the Muslim community -- replacing the Umayyads. Because of this general or vague understanding (and other factors), when in 750 CE the Umayyads were overthrown, an Abbasid could replace the Umayyads as caliph. The Abbasids after 750 CE, however, are not strictly considered as Shiites as this term meant later.

⁵After the victories of the Renaissance, the Scientific Revolution and the Enlightenment and of their continuing evolving and maturing forms, the parasitic and intellectual fifth columnist stratagems of the (Christian, Muslim and other) believers have resurfaced in this century. Just as the medieval Christian and Muslim schoolmen and the so-called neoplatonists abused and misused Hellenic categories, methods and terminology to serve the Faith, modern believers and fundamentalists adopting a pseudo-scientific posture, exploit modern scholarly language, data and categories to convey disingenuously the impression to their audience that their Revelation-based worldviews are authenticated by humanistic and rationalistic scholarship. For example, a study of how Maududi of Pakistan, Jalal Al-e-Ahmad and Ali Shariati of Iran, Sayyid Qutb of Egypt and their disciples use fallacious pseudo-modern language, and

out-of-context references to modern data and authorities will be interesting.

⁶"Islamic Fatalism," in H. Ringgren, ed. Fatalistic Beliefs, 1967, pp. 52-62.

⁷See Sayyid Sulayman Nadavi, SIRAT-UN-NABI (Biography of the Prophet [in Urdu]), Azamgarh, India, fourth edition, 1967, vol. 4:860-8.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

ISLAMIC SYNOPTIC CREDO (IMAN MUJMAL) AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MODEL (SUNNAH) OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD

IMAN MUJMAL is the summary declaration of the Muslim belief in God, Angels, Books, Prophets, the Last Day and Predestination. This Synoptic Credo of Islam is based on various Quranic passages and Tradition reports. For example, the Quran exhorts:

O believers, believe in God and His Messenger and the Book He has sent down on His Messenger and the Book which He sent down before. Whoso disbelieves in God and His Angels and His Books, and His Messengers, and the Last Day, has surely gone astray into far error (Q4:136).

The Hereafter-and-Predestination-related Quranic passages are discussed in Parts IV and V of this study. The Synoptic Credo, **IMAN MUJMAL**, is also explained and emphasized in Tradition. The canonized anthologies of Hadith mention the following report in sections on the basic components of Faith, **IMAN**:

Umar b. al-Khattab said: One day when we were with God's messenger, a man with very white clothing and very black hair came up to us. No mark of travel was visible on him, and none of us recognized him. Sitting down beside the Prophet, leaning his knees against him, and placing his hands on his thighs, he said, "Tell me, Muhammad, about Islam." he replied, "Islam means that you should testify that there is no god but God and that Muhammad is God's messenger, that you should observe the prayer, pay the zakat, fast during Ramadan and make the pilgrimage to the House if you have the means to go." He said, "You have spoken the truth." We were surprised at this questioning and then declaring that the Prophet spoke the truth. He said, "Now tell me about faith." The Prophet replied, "It means that you should believe in God, His Angels, His books, His apostles, and the Last Day, and that you should believe in the decreeing both of good and evil." Remarking that Muhammad had spoken the truth, he then went away, and after I had waited for a long time (the Prophet) said to me, "Do you know who that questioner was, Umar?" I replied, "God, and His messenger know best." He said, "He was Gabriel come to you to teach you your religion."¹

The belief in the Quranas the final, comprehensive, undistorted and perfect version of God's Books, and also, the belief in Muhammad as the last and perfect Messenger of God are of central importance in Muslim belief in the "Books and Messengers." Tabari's following exegeses of Q4:136 quoted above explain the concept. In Tabari's words, God says:

It is incumbent on the Jews, Christians and all other peoples to believe in God, acknowledge Muhammad as His Messenger and the Quran as the revealed Word of God. Disbelievers in Muhammad and the Quran are no more considered as believers in God even if they (claim to) believe in Him and in one or more of the (pre-Muhammad Islamic) prophets and revealed Books such as the Torah and the Gospel -- **FA INNAKUM LAN TAKUNU BIHI MUMININ WA ANTUM BI MUHAMMAD MUKADH-DHIBUN - - FA AMINU -- FI ITTIBAIKUM MUHAMMAD WA ILLA FA ANTUM BIHI KAFIRUN**

= as long as you do not believe in Muhammad (and do not follow him as the last Messenger of God), you will never be considered as believers in God. You must believe in Muhammad (that is what God means in the passage, according to Tabari) by following him, otherwise you are (considered as) disbelievers in God. (TS, 9:312-4).

The non-believers in any component of the **IMAN MUJMAL** mentioned in the above Quranic passage "have surely gone astray" which means such people "are out of the religion of God and have fallen into damnation, ruin and perdition." The Almighty, according to Tabari, by mentioning the obligation of belief in God, Angels, Books, Messengers and the Last Day, is, "as a matter of fact" -- **WA MANAHU**, emphasizing the central importance of the belief in Muhammad.

"Those who are said to have gone astray are the ones who disbelieve in Muhammad and repudiate his Prophethood." Emphasizing again the central importance of the Prophet Muhammad as the last and perfect Messenger of God and that of the Quran as His final and comprehensive Book, Tabari maintains that disbelief in any one component of the **IMAN MUJMAL** is tantamount to disbelief in all. "Because the belief of none among the creatures is genuine without belief in all that God has commanded to believe in, and disbelief in one (of the above) is equivalent to disbelief in all." The passage addresses particularly, Tabari reminds us, the People of the Book, the Jews and Christians, who claim to believe in all of the above save Muhammad and the Quran.²

The belief in the necessity of following the Sunnah of Muhammad is another important corollary to belief in the Messengers of God mentioned in the **IMAN MUJMAL**. "According to the usual explanation, Muhammadan Sunnah comprises his deeds, utterances and his unspoken approval... Observances of the sunnah might in a way be called: Imitatio Muhammadis."³ For J. Robson, the Sunnah refers to a normative custom of the Prophet or of the early community to the extent the Prophet sanctioned it directly or tacitly. Hadith reports or Traditions, according to Robson, are the "account of what the Prophet said or did or of his tacit approval of something said or done in his presence" (J. Robson, "Hadith", EI², 3:22). This explanation of the Sunnah and its vehicle, the Hadith, is consistent with the definition in Ibn Manzur (CE:1233-1311), **LISAN AL-ARAB**.⁴

AS-SUNNAH... WA IDHA UTLIQAT FISH-SHAI FA INNAMA YURAD BIHI MA AMAR BIH'IN-NABIYY WA NAHA ANH, NADAB ILAYH, QAWL-AN WA FIL-AN MIMMA LAM YANTIQU FI ADILLAT ASH-SHAR', AL-KITAB WA'S-SUNNAH, AY AL-QURAN WA'L-HADITH = The Sunnah... when used in the context of Islamic canonical law means what the Prophet commanded to do, prohibited, and complied with in words or actions concerning what the Venerable Book (the Quran) has not mentioned. Therefore, (in discourses) in the context of (Islamic) canonical attestations (the phrase) 'the Book and the Sunnah' means the Quran and the Hadith.

The obligation to follow the Quran as well as the Sunnah of the Prophet is stressed by the Quran and Hadith literature in various ways. One need not emphasize the necessity for a Muslim believer to follow and apply the Quran which is the final Word of God. Throughout the Quran, the believers are reminded that the Book has been revealed by God to be followed and practiced. It is "the Book, wherein is no doubt, a guidance to the God-fearing who believe in the unseen" (2:2-3). Those refusing to make the Quran the basis of their decision for action are the unbelievers. Those exhorted by the Quran to obey God are meant to obey and follow in action the decrees of the Quran.

Excepting a few unimportant dissenters, Muslims continue to acknowledge universally the Sunnah as a binding source of Islamic law and that of imitation and inspiration for Muslim thought and action. The Muslim belief in authorization by God of only the Prophet Muhammad to explain the Quran's hidden and controversial meanings and supplement it with his additional statements makes the knowledge of the Sunnah a prerequisite for an understanding of the Quran. Given the fact that Muhammad was the divinely chosen liaison for communication with human beings, Tabari asserts consistently: "The knowledge of the Book of God cannot be obtained but with the accompanying explanation and elucidation by the Messenger of God -- **KITAB ALLAH, ALLADHI LA YUDRAK ILMUHU ILLA BE BAYAN RASUL ALLAH**" (TS,1:79). In the introductory section of his Tafsir, Tabari quotes the Prophet and his Companion to emphasize the necessity of understanding the Quran with the help of Tradition and that of rejecting any **TAWIL BI'RRAY**, exegesis based on individual judgment out of Traditional context (TS,1:3-106).

The importance of following the Model, Sunnah, of the Prophet Muhammad has been deduced from the Quran. The concept also implied that the Quran is to be understood and practiced in accordance with the Sunnah of the Prophet.⁵ Some of these verses refer to situations concerning relations with non-Muslims.

The necessity to follow the Sunnah of the Prophet applies to all situations and times; the Almighty exhorts:

O believers, obey God, and obey the Messenger... If you should quarrel on anything, refer it to God and the Messenger, if you believe in God and the Last Day (Q4:59).

According to Tabari:

This is a general commandment of God to obey His Messenger and follow his Sunnah during his lifetime and after his death, and (this commandment) is not limited to a particular situation -- **HUA AMR MIN ALLAH BI TAAT RASULIHI FI HAYATIH FIMA AMAR WA NAHA WA BAD WAFATIH BI ITTIBA SUNNATIH, WA DHALIK ANN ALLAH 'AMM BI'L-AMR BITATIHI WA LAM YAKHSUS/YUKHASSIS BI DHALIK FI HAL-IN DUN HAL** (TS,8:495-6).

The believers are told by the Almighty that "Whoso obeys the Messenger, thereby obeys, God" (Q4:80). They are warned:

It is not for any believer, man or woman, when God and His Messenger have decreed a matter, to have the choice in the affair. Whoso disobeys God and His Messenger has gone astray into manifest error (Q33:36).

The Quranic demands for obedience to God as well as to the Prophet Muhammad and his Sunnah, in all situations, including those related to the treatment of non-Muslims, are repeated in many other passages.⁶ Those who conform are blessed by God and promised reward in this life as well as Paradise. For the nonconformists there "awaits the fire of Gehenna" [Hell] (9:61-3), to say the least, wherein they will be "roasted".

The Tradition emphasizes the importance of the Sunnah in various ways. The Prophet has explicitly commanded the believers to follow his model (AD,39:5). Muhammad is reported to have warned that those who tire of following his Sunnah do not belong to him (Bu,67:1). Neglect of the

Sunnah has been equated by the Prophet with secession from the Community of Islam (AbH,2:229).

The believers are told that God is connected with Muslim community by the Quran, and the Prophet by his Sunnah (MU,1:246). Just like the Quran, the Sunnah of the Prophet was Divinely revealed to Muhammad through the Angel Gabriel -- **KAN JIBRIL YANZIL ALA'N-NABIYY BI'S-SUNNAH KAMA YANZIL ALAYH BI'L-QURAN**,⁷ In other words, the Prophet's words, actions and tacit approval of his contemporaries' behavior had Divine sanction. Muslims are warned against the disastrous consequences of abandoning the Sunnah of Muhammad.⁸

Muslims who deviate in their behavior from the model -- **SUNNAH** of the Prophet will be punished by God (Da. Intr.:38-9). They are also warned that they will go astray when they cease to follow the model of the prophet -- **LAU TARAKTUM SUNNAT NABIYYIKUM LADALALTUM**.⁹ They are told that abandonment of the Sunnah of the Prophet may lead to disbelief -- **KUFR** (Da., Intr.:49). Those who abandon the Prophet's Sunnah are cursed by God, Muhammad and all other Prophets (Tir., 30:17). The degree of knowledge of the Sunnah indicates the extent of faith in a Muslim community (Bu, 81:35). The more a Muslim has the knowledge of the Sunnah, the more his legitimacy to lead the prayers.¹⁰ The Companions of the Prophet were praised for their propagation of the Sunnah (Mu,1:80). Muslims with the knowledge of the Sunnah of the Prophet are considered superior for the interpretation of the Quran (Da., Intr.:6).

Muslims are obliged to follow the pattern of the Prophet in their actions (AbH,2:94); the prohibitions by Muhammad are equal to prohibitions by God (Da., Intr.:48). The converts to Islam used to request the Prophet to teach them the Quran as well as the Sunnah.¹¹ This is another way of emphasizing the importance of the Sunnah along with the Quran as a foundation of Muslim behavior and action. Along with emphasizing the importance of following the Sunnah of the Prophet in various contexts, Hadith anthologies have compiled separate chapters to demonstrate the necessity for Muslims to adhere to the Quran as well as to the Model of the Prophet -- **ITISAM BI'L-KITAB WA'S-SUNNAH**.¹² Let us remind our readers that the whole corpus of the Hadith literature and the biographies of the Prophet were produced in order to tell the believers what the Prophet Muhammad said and how he acted in various situations.

ENDNOTES

APPENDIX I

¹Mishkat, tr. J. Robson, 1:5 slight changes in English translation added. See also Bu.,2:37; Mu.,1:1, 5, 7; Tir.,38:4; N.,47:5-6; IM, intr., b.9; AbH,1:27, 28, 52-3, 319.

²TS,9:312-4. Summarized and simplified.

³A.J. Wensinck, "Sunnah," EL, 4:555-7.

⁴Lisan al-Arab, Dar al-Maarif, Cairo,3:1224.

⁵See for example, TS,3:86-7; TS,3:211; TS,5:15; TS,7:369; T,28:94. Also see J. Robson, "Hadith", EL²,3:23-8; A.J. Wensinck, "Sunnah", EL,4:555-7. A few modernists of our time (such as Ghulam Ahmad Parviz of India - Pakistan and Abu Riyyah of the Arab world) refer to some obvious problematics of the Hadith literature and, consequently, question the religious necessity of following the Sunnah beyond what is reported in the Quran. They maintain that the Quran is sufficient source for ascertaining Divine guidance. In response to these so-called **AHL AL-QURAN** (the People of the Quran) Muslim ulama of all traditional sects and schools through an enormous literature have reasserted the necessity of following the Sunnah as described in Traditional Hadith literature. See, e.g., Muhammad, Abu Shuhbah, **DIFA AN AS-SUNNAH WA RADD SHUBHAT AL-MUSTASHRIQIN WA'L-KUTTAB AL-MUASIRIN** ("In defense of the Sunnah and a Refutation of the Orientalists' and Contemporary Writers' Uncertainties"), AL-AZHAR University Press, Cairo (19?); Mustafa As-Sibai, **AS-SUNNAT WA MAKANATUHA FI'T-TASHRI AL-ISLAMI** (The Sunnah and its Authority in Islamic Legislation), Cairo (1966); Abul-Ala Maududi, **SUNNAT KI ANI HAYSIYYAT** [in Urdu] (Constitutional Position of the Sunnah), Islamic Publications, Lahore [Pakistan], (1963). Also see

"Introduction" to this study for more detailed discussion on this subject.

⁶See for example, the Quran 3:31-2; 4:13-4, 61, 64, 65, 69, 115, 5:92, 7:157-8; 8:1, 20, 24, 46; 9:61-3; 24:52-6; 26:216; 33:71; 47:31-3; 48:17; 49:14-5; 53:2-4, 69:7; 72:23.

⁷Da., Intr.:48-9 cf. Mu.,5:256-7.

⁸Bu.,8:26; 10:132; Da., Intr.:15; AbH,1:417; 5:396. The necessity of following the Sunnah is also emphasized in IM, Intr.:6; Da., Intr.:15; AbH,4:126.

⁹AbH,1:382, 415, 419, 455.

¹⁰Tir.,2:60; N,10:3.

¹¹Mu.,33:147. Also see Bu.,92:13, 96:2, Mu,1:23; Tir.,31:17; IM,36:27, AbH,5:383.

¹²See, for example, Bu.,96; Mu.,1; AD,39.

APPENDIX I-A

GOD'S ASMA AL-HUSNA, MOST BEAUTIFUL NAMES

The concept of God's "Most Beautiful Names" is derived from both the Quran and Tradition. In four different passages the Quran says: "to God belong the Names Most Beautiful" (7:180; 17:110; 29:8; 59:24). The Prophet said there are ninety-nine such "Names" of God (TS,13:282 cf. Q7:180). He also said that all these "Names" are mentioned in the Quran -- **INN LI'LLAH TISAT-AN WA TISIN ASMA, KULL-U-HUNN FI'L-QURAN** (T,15:183). The Prophet said anyone who enumerates (and chants?) all of these ninety nine ("Names" of God) will be awarded Paradise -- **MAN AHAHA KULLAHA DAKHAL AL-JANNAT** (TS,13:282; T,15:183). Inspired by this Muslims have Traditionally prepared lists of these particular ninety-nine Divine "Names" derived from the Quran. These Traditional lists slightly differ as to which particular "Names" mentioned in the Quran form the ninety-nine "Most Beautiful" ones. Consequently we know of more than ninety-nine "Names" of God all derived from the Quran. As mentioned below, Kassir lists 126 such "Names" which he correctly calls "Divine Names and Attributes". (See Hanna E. Kassir A Concordance of the Quran, University of California Press, 1983 - henceforward mentioned as Kassir -- pp. 1357-8.) Kassir's list is organized alphabetically according to the English translations of the Divine Names and Attributes. In some cases, Kassir has given a single translation of more than one Divine Name-Attribute. **Note that not all the Quranic-Arabic equivalents of the Divine Names-Attributes provided by Kassir are necessarily in the active participle form.** Kassir's list of the Divine Names-Attributes is as follows.

Able -- QADIRA	Fashioner -- SAWWARA
Absolute -- SAMAD	First -- AWWAL
Answerer -- AJABA	Forgiver -- GHAFAR; GHAFUR
Aware -- KHABIR	
	Gatherer -- JAMA'A
Beneficent -- RAHMAN	Generous -- KARIM
Benign -- BARR	Gentle -- LATIF; RA'UF
Bestower -- WAHHAB	Giver -- WAHHAB
Blameless -- HASHA	Glorious -- 'AZIM; AKRAMA
Bountiful -- AKRAMA; TAWL	God -- ALLAH; ILAH
	Gracious -- LATIF; RAHMAN
	Grateful -- SHAKARA
Clement -- AFUW; HALIM; RA'UF	Great -- KABIR
Compassionate -- RAHIM	Guardian -- HAFIZ; WAKIL;
Compeller -- JABBAR	WALIY
	Guide -- HADA
Creator-- BADI; BARA'A;	He -- HUWA
FATARA; KHALLAQ; KHALLAQ	Hearing --SAMI
	High -- 'ALIY
Deliverer -- FATTAH	Holy -- QUDDUS
Disposer (of affairs) --	Honourable -- AKRAMA
WAKIL	
Embracing -- WASI'A	Informed -- KHABIR
Eternal -- QAYYUM; SAMAD	Inheritor -- WARITHA
Everlasting -- QAYYUM	Inward -- BATANA
Everlasting Refuge -- SAMAD	Irresistible -- JABBAR
Evident -- ZAHARA	
Exalted -- TA'ALA	Judge -- HAKAMA
Exalter -- RAFI	
	Kind -- LATIF; RA'UF
Faithful -- AMANA	King -- MALIK; MALIK

Knower -- 'ALIM; 'ALIMA'	Quickener -- AHYA
KHABIR	Reckoner -- HASIB
Last -- AKHIR	Sagacious -- KHABIR
Laudable -- HAMID	Seeing -- BASIR
Light -- NUR	Shaper -- SAWWARA
Living -- HAYY	Splendid -- AKRAMA
Lord -- RABB	Strong -- QAWIY
Loving -- WADUD	Sublime -- TAKABBARA
Majestic -- JALAL; KABBARA	Subtle, Subtile -- LATIF
Master of the Kingdom -- MALAKA	Sufficient -- GHANIY;
Merciful -- RAHMAN	ISTAGHNA; KAFI
Mighty -- 'AZIZ; 'AZIM	Superb -- TAKABBARA
Omnipotent -- IQTADARA; QADIR;	Supreme -- TAKABBARA
QAHARA; QAHHAR	Sure -- MATIN
One -- AHAD; WAHID	Tender -- LATIF
Originator -- FATARA	Thankful -- SHAKARA; SHAKUR
Outward -- ZAHARA	True -- HAQQ
Overseer -- AQATA	Trustee -- WAKIL
Pardoner -- 'AFUW	Turns, One who -- TAWWAB
Peaceable -- SALAM	Watcher -- RAQIB
Powerful -- QADIRA; QADIR; AQATA	Wise -- HAKIM
Praiseworthy -- HAMID	Witness -- SHAHID
Preserver -- HAY'MANA	
Protector -- MAWLA; WALA; WALIY	
Provider -- RAZZAQ	

Disregarding the alphabetical order, Traditional Islamic lists of the "Most Beautiful Names" of God divide these Divine Names-Attributes in various clusters. Also, according to Traditional explanations, each Divine Name-Attribute, along with its common-sense meaning, has its special emphasis and connotations which are not reflected in Kassis's English translations. Connotations and shades of the meaning of a single "Name" may refer to more than one particular attribute of God. Some of these "names" in their **FAIL**, active participle, form occur more frequently in the Quran than others. For example, **ALLAH** is mentioned more than 162 times, **ALIM** "All-knowing" more than 70 times and **AHAD** "One" only once. The active participle is not the only form to convey the sense of certain Divine attribute to a reader of the Quran. While God is mentioned as **KHALIQ** "Creator" only in twelve verses [e.g., 59:24 **HU ALLAH AL-KHALIQ AL-BARI AL-MUSAWWIR; LAHU'L-ASMA AL-HUSNA... WA HU AL-AZIZ AL-HAKIM** ("He is God, the Creator, the Shaper out of naught, the Fashioner; His are the Most Beautiful Names... and He is the All-mighty, the All-wise"], more than 200 verses using various forms of the root-word **KHALQ** "to create, creation" articulate God as the Creator. (See Kassis:692-6.) Similarly, while the attribute of God as **AL-HADI** "the Guide" in the active participle form occurs in about nine verses, the concept of Divine guidance, using different forms of the same root-word, is emphasized and articulated on more than 200 occasions in the Quran. (*ibid*:484-7).

Our discussion here is based on the Traditional list of the "Most Beautiful Names" provided by L. Gardet (see L. Gardet, "**ASMA AL-HUSNA**," *EI*²,1:714-7). We will add some "Names" to the Traditional lists. This will, however, be based only on those of God's attributes the Quran mentions and Muslims acknowledge. As Gardet mentions, Muslim thinkers and scholars have divided God's "Names" into different clusters, each emphasizing certain particular attributes. Many of these "Names," however, connote more than one particular attribute. For our specific purposes discussed in Part I of this study, "the Most Beautiful Names" of Islamic God may be divided into six categories. In our following categorization of the Divine "Names" the explanations in parentheses are borrowed from Gardet. For his explanations, Gardet frequently refers to authentic Traditional Islamic sources. I have added for example one or two reference to the Quranic verses in which each "Name" occurs. Note that most of these "Names" and attributes occur frequently (in the active participle or other forms) in the Quran. Translations of Divine "names" and attributes (other than those of Gardet put in parentheses) are borrowed mostly from A.J. Arberry, the Koran Interpreted (1974) and occasionally, from M.M. Pickthall, The Meaning of the Glorious Koran.

CATEGORY I.

To this category belong the Divine "Names" and attributes which emphasize God's uniqueness, eternality, mysteriousness, inaccessibility, extraordinary majesty and glory, omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence and related characteristics.

- ***AHAD** (112:1), One. "Naught is like unto Him" -- **LAYS KA-MITHLIHI SHAY-UN** (42:11);
- ***ALWAHID** (4:171; 39:4), The One;
- ***AL-AWWAL** (57:3), The First;
- ***AL-AKHIR** (57:3), The Last: "He is before everything and nothing is before Him; He is after everything and nothing is after Him. (He is the) Primary cause, efficient and final";
- ***AL-BAQI** (28:60), The Enduring, "the Eternal who permanes, - without end";
- ***AL-WARITH** (15:23) "the Inheritor, - who continues to exist after the annihilation (FANA) of His creatures";
- ***AL-QAYYUM** (2:255) Everlasting "the Self-Subsisting... who rules and

- coordinates creatures, and none can subsist without Him";
- *AL-GHANI (13:97), All-sufficient; "the Rich, who lacks nothing";
- *AL-QUDDUS (59:23), "the Holy, in the sense of separated, the absence of all blemish... signifying that neither imagination nor sight can penetrate the mystery of God";
- *AL-AZIM (2:255), "the Inaccessible... beyond the limits of human understanding, just as the earth and sky cannot be taken in at a single glance";
- *AL-JALIL (55:78), "the Majestic, worthy of veneration...";
- *JALL JALAL-UHU, "the Lord of Majesty and Generosity";
- *AL-MAJID (11:73), "the Glorious... whose actions are resplendent, whose favors abound... the praise due to Him belongs to Him alone";
- *AL-HAMID (4:131), All-laudable "worthy of praise";
- *AL-WAJID, "the Opulent (the Perfect) to whom nothing can be lacking or be needed";
- *AL-MAJID, "the Noble, the High";
- *AL-QADIR (2:20), the Powerful, Able (to do anything and act in any manner);
- *AL-MUQTADIR (18:45), the All-powerful;
- *QAWIY (8:52; 58:21);
- *AL-AZIZ (3:4; 35:28), the All-mighty, "the Inaccessible... beyond the limits of human understanding, just as the earth and sky cannot be taken in at single glance";
- *ALIYY (4:34), All-High;
- *AL-QAHIR, Omnipotent, as in HU AL-QAHIR FAUQ IBADIH-I, WA HU AL-HAKIM AL-KHABIR (He is Omnipotent over His servants, and He is the Wise, the Knower 6:18; 6:61). God is AL-QAHIR in the sense that He is "the Dominator,... who always subdues, dominating and never dominated." God's omnipotence is projected in Muslim mind by the off-repeated verse in the Quran: ALLAH YAFAL MA YURID/YASHA, i.e., God does what He will/desires (2:253; 3:40; 14:27; 22:18);
- *AL-QABID (2:245), One who grasps; "he who restrains";
- *AL-BASIT (2:245), "One who outspreads; "he who expands (the lives, the hearts of his servants)";
- *AL-KABIR (3:34), All-great "the Great... stressing the absolute perfection of God, whose eternal existence is the source of the being of all creatures";
- *AL-MATIN (51:58), Ever-sure, "the unshakable whose power is without limit";
- *AL-ZAHIR (57:3), Outward; Evident; "the Patent... known by decisive proof, which manifestly dominates all things";
- *ALIM (4:11; 76:30), All-knowing, "knowing in perfect manner everything which is knowable";
- *A'LAM (3:163; 84:23), "knowing very well and having greater knowledge";
- *KHABIR (2:234; 64:8), Aware and Sagacious, "knowing the intimate of secrets of creatures";
- *AL-BASIR (2:96;64:2), All-seeing;
- *AS-SAMI (3:181; 58:1), All-hearing. "God hears and sees all things... which reason, this time cannot prove.";
- *AL-WASI (2:115), All-embracing; "the omnipresent, who embraces and contains all things: He extends His generosity to everything which exists, His knowledge to everything which is knowable, His power to everything which may be determined by it, absolutely and without His having to pay attention successively to things";
- *AL-BATIN (57:3), Inward; "latent... screened from the senses... who knows the hidden things."

CATEGORY II.

We have put in this category the Divine "names" and attributes which project God as Creator ex nihilo of creatures, of states of body and mind, of capacities and attributes, as the shape-giver, nourisher and destroyer, able to recreate after destruction and annihilation.

- *AL-KHALIQ (2:228; 59:24), The Creator;
- *AL-MUBDI (29:19), Originator-Creator; "the Innovator;... absolute creator of beings...";
- *AL-BADI (2:117; 6:101), "the Inventor-Creator, who is at the beginning of everything... who creates and invents without a model... who is Himself First absolutely, and nothing is similar to Him";
- *AL-BARI (2:5; 59:24), the Shaper, Maker, One who knows how to shape;
- *AL-MUSAWWIR (7:11; 40:64; 64:3), the Fashioner, "the organizer, who ordains and composes the forms (SUWAR) of things... (these Names) have related sense to that of absolute KHALIQ, Creator." As in AL-KHALIQ, AL-MUBDI and AL-BADI', AL-BARI and AL-MUSAWWIR "connote the passage from nonbeing to existence... first towards determination in accordance with divine decree (KADAR),... towards existentialization properly so called (WUJUD)... towards the coordination of forms, according to the best of ordinances";
- *AN-NUR (24:35), the Light has a similar sense: "God is Light... of a perfect and manifest evidence in Himself,... and He it is who makes all things manifest and evident, by causing them to pass from non-being to being";
- *AL-MUHYI, "the Creator of Life";
- *AL-MUMIT, "the Creator of death." It is "He who causes to live and die." Only He is the Absolute Eternal;
- *AL-HAYY (40:65), "the Living one," uncreated -- LAM YULAD (112:3) by someone else;
- *AL-BAITH (2:56), "the Revivifier, who will revivify every creature on the day of the Resurrection";
- *AL-MUQIT (4:85), "the Nourisher, source of strength, for He creates nourishment (physical and spiritual: synonym of
- *AR-RAZZAQ" (51:58; 4:39; 65:11), "All-Provider";
- *AL-MUQIT also means that God is "the Determiner, who decrees and fixes destiny...";
- *AL-MUID (7:29), "He who resuscitates, who causes the creature to "return" after its destruction";
- *AL-BARR (52:28), All-benign; He "who causes piety (BIRR) to function in the heart and is the source of benefits,"
- *AL-JAMI, "Assembler," signifying God's capacity to resurrect all human beings in the Day of Judgment;
- *AL-MUGHNI (4:130), "the Enricher, who embellishes every creature, from whom creatures derive their perfection."

CATEGORY III.

The Divine "Names" and attributes that emphasize God's Lordship and sovereignty.

- *AR-RABB (1.1), the Lord (of all Being);
- *AL-MALIK, "the King independent towards all things, everything dependent on Him, perfect in divine power";
- *MALIK AL-MULK (3:26), "the Master (King) of the Kingdom, who possesses in complete sovereign independence the world and each creature." The Owner of whatever exists;
- *AL-WALI (13:11) , Protector, "the Reining";
- *AL-MUQADDIM "he who brings near";

- ***AL-MUAKH-KHIR** (14:44) "He who sends away: He who brings near to Himself whomsoever He wishes and shows him his preference; He sends away and sets aside whomsoever He wishes";
- ***AL-MAJID** (11:73), All-glorious, in the sense that to "(Him) sovereignty and power belong."

CATEGORY IV.

In this category we have put the Divine "Names" and attributes which emphasize and explain Divine Guidance, the rationale for the superiority of such guidance, and God's watchfulness about obedience or disobedience to His Guidance.

- ***AL-HADI** (25:31), "the Guide who creates the "right direction (**AL-HUDA**) in the hearts of believers and leads every being, rational and irrational, toward its end." God's direction or guidance -- **HUDA** is the only correct guidance because He is
- ***AL-HAQQ** (22:6; 31:30), "the Real, supreme Truth..."; because He is
- ***AL-HAKIM** (2:32), All-Wise, "the Wise... endowed with wisdom, i.e. with knowledge of things as they come from Him and with the production of actions according to what is expedient; ... He is prudent in His decisions: which corresponds to the perfect soundness of His providence in the guidance of the world and to benefit from accomplishment of His decrees"; also because God is
- ***AL-MUHSI** (19:94), "the Numberer who comprehends and knows comprehensively all numbered things". The "Name"
- ***AR-RASHID** (21:51), One who gives rectitude, complements these images of God. It means "the Leader: who directs with justice; who leads on the way of the Good"; the Name
- ***AL-WAKIL** (3:173), Disposer of affairs, Guardian; "The Trustee," reflects a similar sense along with its other connotations. It means God is "he to whom everything is entrusted, who takes care of all the needs of creatures," including their need what to think and do about everything. Some of the "names" such as **AL-ALIM** (All-Knowing), **AL-BASIR** (All-Seeing) and **AS-SAMI** (All-Hearing) mentioned above also relate to this category.

- The Almighty is not indifferent and unconcerned about human responses to His **HUDA**, guidance. He is
- ***AL-HAFIZ** (12:64; 42:6), Warden and "the Vigilant Guardian... continually in action... by this action watching over the whole universe... assuring the permanence of created forms" and the adherence or lack of adherence to His Guidance. He is
- ***AL-SHAHID** (3:98; 85:9), the Witness to human thoughts and actions, and
- ***AL-MUHAYMIN**, "the Vigilant, ever present witness, whose cognizance is on guard over everything." So is He
- ***AL-RAQIB** (4:1), Watcher; "the jealous Guardian..."

CATEGORY V.

Includes the Divine Names and attributes which project God as a just and sovereign judge.

- ***AL-HAKAM** (6:114), "the judge in His act of sovereignty... involves the idea of God's wisdom and providence...";
- ***AL-ADL** (6:115), "the Just, who is supreme Justice - nothing bad can come from Him";
- ***AL-MUQSIT**, "the just... on the Day of Judgement";
- ***AL-HASIB** (4:6), Reckoner; "the Calculator, He who settles accounts... who gives sufficiency, for He creates for His servants what is sufficient for them... who by His words, asks whomsoever is submissive to the Law, account of what he does of good and

evil..."

CATEGORY VI.

In this category we have put those Divine Names and categories that portray God as one who is affectionate towards some and rewards them, and is harsh towards others whom He punishes.

Type A (Showing benefaction etc.):

- *AR-RAHMAN (1.1), All-merciful; "the Benefactor (or the Merciful)";
- *AR-RAHIM (1.1), "The Compassionate";
- *AS-SALAM (59:23), "All-peaceable; "Peace: possessor of a flawless peace... Giver of peace and salvation at the beginning of the creation and at the time of resurrection... will pronounce the benefaction of peace over His creatures";
- *AL-MUMIN, "the Believer." Signifies "God's increate faith in Himself... He authenticates His Messengers by His supreme veracity; this He accomplishes either by affirming Himself and His Messenger... or by working, by creating the miraculous proof;... God may also be called MUMIN towards his disciples as a source of security and protection (AMAN)";
- *AL-GHAFFAR (20:82), All-forgiving; "the Indulgent, pre-eminently the Pardoner, who knows how to remit the sentence of punishment even for one who deserves it...";
- *AL-WAHHAB (38:35), All-giving, Bestower, "the constant Giver, who gives abundantly, receiving nothing in return";
- *AL-LATIF (6:103), All-subtle; "the Benevolent, who creates in His servants a grace of benevolence (LUTF), to come to their help."
- *AL-HALIM (64:17), All-clement; "endowed with gentleness, who is slow to punish";
- AS-GHAFUR (2:173), All-forgiving; "the Very Indulgent, who pardons much";
- *AL-KARIM (27:40), "the Generous... endowed with liberality... who fixes the measures of generosity... from whom comes all nobility... who pardons faults."
- *AL-MUJIB (11:61), Answerer; "the Assenter, who grants prayers... who hastens to satisfy the needs of creatures, who anticipates them."
- *AL-WADUD (11:90), All-loving; "the Very Loving... who loves the wellbeing of His creatures and procures it for them gratuitously... refers to the attribute from which proceeds the praise He bestows on the believer and the reward which He gives him";
- *AL-TAWWAB (2:54), One who turns; "The Repentent: God by pure and gratuitous favor, returns to His servants if they return to Him, repenting of their faults";
- *AL-AFU (4:43), Clement, Forgiving; "who rubs out the traces of faults on the leaves where actions are inscribed";
- *AL-RAUF (59:10), All-gentle; "the Merciful, the Compassionate who wishes to lighten the burdens...";
- *AL-NAFI (7:188), One who profits; "He who favors";
- *AL-WALI (2:257), Guardian; "the Friend, the Protector, in the sense of helper, defender";
- *AL-MUNIM (1:7), . One who blesses; "the Benefactor";
- *AR-RAFI' (2:253), "who raises in dignity";
- *AL-MUIZZ, "who gives honor and strength";
- *AL-FATTAH (34:26), Deliverer; "the Victorious, who vanquishes difficulties and brings about victory... the Judge, whether pronouncing sentence or making known the decision... the Revealer, who discloses to men that which remained concealed from them";
- *AS-SATTAR, "who protects and who veils etc.";
- *AL-M'UTI (93:5), one who gives; "He who gives, who grants His gifts";

*ASH-SHAKUR (35:30), All-thankful; "the Very Grateful, in a metaphorical sense..., i.e., who gives much as reward for little... and proclaims the eulogy of whomsoever obeys him."

Type B (showing Harshness...)

- *AL-MUNTAQIM (32:22), "the Avenger, chastising whomsoever disobeys Him";
- *AD-DARR (6:42), "He who afflicts";
- *AL-KHAFID, "who humbles and humiliates";
- *AL-JABBAR (59:23), Haughty, All-compeller, Irresistible; "the Very Strong, the Oppressor which no thing or will may resist... who sets to right, who restores, according to His Desire, what concerns His creatures...";
- *AL-MUTAKABBIR (59:23), All-sublime, Superb, Majestic; "the Haughty... everything seems base to Him in the sight of His Essence";
- *AL-QAHHAR (12:39), Omnipotent, "the Dominator, He who always subdues, dominating and never dominated";
- *AS-SABUR, "the Very Patient, slow to punish, and who always acts in due time";

The Traditionally enumerated "most Beautiful Names" do not exhaust and detail all aspects of God's attributes and acts articulated by the Quran and Tradition. For example, based on various forms of the root words occurring in the Quran we may coin and add to the sixth category such Names-attributes as

- *AL-MUADH-DHIB, the Tormenter, Chastiser;
- *AL-MURIB, the Terrorizer;
- *AL-MAKIR, the Deviser, Schemer, Plotter;
- *AL-KHADI, the Deceiver;
- *AL-MUHIBB, the Lover;
- *GHAYR AL-MUHIBB, the One who does not love, the One who hates, dislikes;
- *AN-NASIR and AN-NASIR (the Helper) or its opposite etc.

Using various forms of the same root word, ADHB including its active participle form MUADHDHIB, more than 300 Quranic verses tell Muslims of God's tormenting, torturing and chastising of nonbelievers in this world and in the Hereafter (see Kassis:224-31). Similarly, the Quranic passages 3:151; 8:12; 18:18; 33:26; 59:2 tell of God using RUB, "terror," against non-Muslims and 3:54; 7:99; 8:30; 13:42 and numerous other verses talk of the Almighty as a great schemer against nonbelievers (see Kassis:762-3). For God as AL-KHADI (the Deceiver) see 4:142, as AL-MUHIBB (the Lover of some) and as the one who hates others see various Quranic references in Kassis" 509-10. For God as AN-NASIR/AN-NASIR (the Helper) or opposite in the Quran see ibid: 857:-60

APPENDIX I-B

A REPLACEMENT NOTE

This appendix, intended to be a comparison and contrast of modern Muslim movements and trends (beginning with the Jihadist Movements of the eighteenth century) to the Resurgent Movement of our time, became too long for an already oversized dissertation. By the Resurgent Movement I mean, basically, the Jamaat Islam founded by Abul Ala Maududi, The Muslim Brotherhood founded by Hasan al-Banna, MASJUMI of Indonesia, Fidaiyyan-e-Islam and Khumayni-inspired groups of the Shiite world, and similar other parties inspired by one or more of the above-mentioned founding parties. For reasons explained in my essay, I call a combination of such groups Islamic International.

APPENDIX II

THE ORDINANCE OF MEDINA

Ibn Ishaq records this document in full (1.1:231-3). Ibn Hisham makes no significant addition, nor expresses any reservation about its authenticity. Modern writers, generally, call the document "Constitution of Medina." Guillaume in his translation of Ibn Ishaq-Ibn Hisham entitles it "The Covenant Between the Muslims and Medinans and with the Jews" (1.1:231). In the al-Azhar (Cairo) Arabic edition (1978) of Ibn Hisham (Ibn Ishaq incorporated), AS-SIRAT AN-NABAWIYYAH, edited by Muhammad Fahmi as-Surjani (Sirjani?), henceforth mentioned as IH(1.1)-MFS, the document appears under the title AR-RASUL YUWADI AL-YAHUD, "The Messenger Makes Peace/Reconciliation with the Jews" (IH(1.1)-MFS,2:88). This al-Azhar edition of Ibn Hisham-Ibn Ishaq in its FIHRIST, list of contents, mentions the material as AR-RASUL YUHADIN AL-YAHUD, "the Messenger Makes Truce with the Jews" (ibid:320). Ibn Ishaq's introductory sentence takes the unity of the document for granted. Guillaume's translation of WADA'A FIH AL-YAHUD WA AHADAHUM has a questionable first sentence "he made a FRIENDLY agreement with the jews." It could be translated as "he made peace (or reconciliation) and a compact with the jews." In Lisan al-Arab and in Edward W. Lane's Arabic-English Lexicon, MUADA'AH, MUAHADAH and MUHADANAH or HUDNAH do not necessarily connote "friendliness." In fact Lisan al-Arab emphasizes the temporariness of the peace or truce when made with non-Muslims. In his selection of the Arabic text and translation thereof, Hamidullah ignores Ibn Ishaq's introductory sentence.

Julias Wellhausen and other Western scholars divide the document into 47 clauses (MH, Const.:19-20). Hamidullah reasonably divides some of the clauses into sub-sections. Relying on Ibn Ishaq's full text, we follow this division into 47 clauses, maintaining only some of Hamidullah's sub-divisions. Some of the sentences appear in Ibn Ishaq, but not in Hamidullah. The following text is based on Guillaume's translation of Ibn Ishaq's Sirat Rasul Allah. However, we add 1) some original Arabic terms and phrases, as in IH (1.1)-MFS text, 2) Hamidullah's translation and explanation of some clauses, in part or full, followed by the initial MH in brackets, 3) our original explanations, followed by the initials MT in brackets, 4) Ibn Hisham's notes, followed by the initials IH in brackets, and 5) an important endnote mentioned at the end of the document by Muhammad Fahmi as-Surjani.

THE TEXT OF THE ORDINANCE OF MEDINA

The Covenant Between the Muslims and the Medinans and with the Jews. (The title given by Guillaume).

I. Introduction

The apostle wrote a document concerning the emigrants and the helpers in which he made a friendly agreement with the Jews and established them in their religion and their property, and stated the reciprocal obligations as follows (Ibn Ishaq's introductory sentence translated by Guillaume).

In the name of God the Compassionate, the Merciful.

1. This is a document, **KITAB**, from Muhammad the Prophet [governing the relations] between the believers and Muslims of Quraysh and Yathrib [Medina MT], and those who followed them and joined them and laboured with them. [Instead of "join," Abu Ubayd's version is "settle among." MH].

2. They are one community, **UMMAH**, to the exclusion of all men. [Verily they constitute a political unit (ummah) as distinct from all the people. MH.] [Note MH's emphasis on the "political" nature of the "unit" thus formed. This reflects depreciation of the alliance with non-Muslims, i.e., the Jews here. MT].

3. The Quraysh migrants according to their present customs shall pay the bloodwit within their number and shall redeem their prisoners with the kindness and justice common among believers.

4. The Banu Auf according to their present custom shall pay the bloodwit they paid in heathendom; every section shall redeem its prisoners with the kindness and justice common among believers. [As in Guillaume's note the Banu Auf and those mentioned in 5-11 were Medinan Muslims, the Helpers. Whether the non-Muslim members of these clans were included is unclear. MT.]

5-11. The Banu Saidah, the Banu'l-Harith, and the Banu Jusham and the Banu al-Najjar [and Banu Amr, Banu an-Nabit and Banu al-Aus, MT] likewise. [The three clans missing in Guillaume are added on the basis of the Arabic text of IH(1.1)-MFS. MT]

12/a. Believers shall not leave anyone destitute among them by not paying his redemption money or bloodwit in kindness. [The destitute, **MUFRAH**, is one burdened with debt and a large family... IH Note 283.] [Note that the beneficiaries of the prescription and recommendations are only the believers; other parties of the "political unit" are excluded. MT.]

12/ A believer shall not take as any ally the freedman of another Muslim against him. [**LA YUHALIF** translated correctly by Guillaume "shall not take as any ally" is **LA YUKHALIF**... "shall not oppose the client of another believer in MH's text. In IH(1.1)-MFS, 2:89 it is **LA YUHALIF**, as translated by Guillaume which makes more sense. The gist of the clause is this; no Muslim shall help - or seek help from - a person against another Muslim. MT]

13. The God-fearing believers shall be against the rebellious, **BAGHA**, or he who seeks to spread injustice **IBTAGHA DASIAT ZULM**, or sin, **ITHM**, or enmity, **UDWAN**, or corruption, **FASAD**, between believers; the hand of every man shall be against him even if he be

a son of them.

14. A believer shall not slay a believer for the sake of an unbeliever, nor shall he aid an unbeliever against a believer.

15. God's protection, **DHIMMAH**, is one; the least of them may give protection to a stranger on their behalf. Believers are friends one to the other to the exclusion of outsiders. [According to MH the right to give protection in this clause is limited to believers. Although clauses 14, 20b, and 43 limit a believer's right to give protection to nonbelievers and act accordingly, this clause authorizes a believer to give protection to "a stranger" who may be a non-Muslim, and expect other Muslims to respect the pledge. MT]

16. To the Jews who follow [help (MH)] us belong help and equality. He shall not be wronged nor shall his enemies be aided. [MH translation: "... neither shall they be oppressed nor shall any help be given against them" is clearer. MT.]

17. The peace of the believers is indivisible. No separate peace shall be made when believers are fighting in the way of God. Conditions must be fair and equitable to all.

18. In every foray a rider must take another behind him.

19. The believers must avenge the blood of one another shed in the way of God.

20/a. The God-fearing believers enjoy the best and most upright guidance.

20/ No polytheist shall take the property or person of Quraysh under his protection or shall he intervene against a believer. [Guillaume correctly presumes the "polytheists" are the heathen Arabs of Medina." The Quraysh are Meccan non-Muslims. MT.]

21. Whoever is convicted of killing a believer without good reason shall be subject to retaliation unless the next of kin is satisfied (with blood-money), and the believers shall be against him as one man, and they are bound to take action against him. [Note the concern shown only for believers. MT.]

22. It shall not be lawful to a believer who holds by what is in this document, **SAHIFAH**, and believes in God and the Last Day to help an evil-doer, **MUHDITH**, or to shelter him. The curse of God and His anger on the Day of Resurrection will be upon him if he does, and neither repentance nor ransom will be received from him. [Of **MUHDITH** Guillaume says: "Commentators do not explain this word and it is somewhat obscure. Possibly it means 'adulterer' here, though a wider meaning suits the context better." According to MH, it means a "murderer." Possibly it means a "mischief-maker" in general. Obviously the "mischief" was defined according to Muhammadan-Islamic standards. Also note that according to Clause 14 "a believer shall not slay... (nor) aid an unbeliever against a believer." MT.]

23. Whenever you differ about a matter it must be referred to God and to Muhammad. [This and the tone of preceding clauses indicate the end of part I of the document as an independent unit promulgated in the first year after the hijra, alluding to the pre-Badr situation in general. The following clauses concerning the Jews exclusively allude clearly to the post-Badr time of uncertain and tense relations between Muhammad and the Jews. For the believers and an average reader, however, the whole document was proclaimed

just after the hijra. MT]

24. The Jews shall contribute to the cost of war so long as they are fighting alongside the believers -- **INN AL-YAHUD YUNFIQUN MA DAMU MUHARIBIN** [See the note following Clause 47. MT]

25. The Jews of the Banu Auf are one community with the believers - the Jews have their religion and the Muslims have theirs - their freedmen and their persons except those who behave unjustly and sinfully, for they hurt but themselves and their families.

26-35. The same applies to the Jews of Banu al-Najjar, Banu al-Harith, Banu Saida, Banu Jusham, Banu al-Aus, Banu Thalaba, and the Jafna, a clan of the Thalaba, the Banu al-Shutayba, the freedmen of Thalabah and the **BITANAH**, close, friends (sub-branches, MH), of the Jews. Loyalty is a protection against treachery. [In the original text, these Jewish groups are mentioned separately, referring to the contents of Clause 25 applicable to the groups mentioned here. I have also adjusted Guillaume's sentence construction concerning 26-35. MT.]

36. None of them should go out to war save with the permission of Muhammad, but he shall not be prevented from taking revenge for a wound. He would slays a man without warning slays himself and his household, unless it be one who has wronged him, for God will accept that.

37/a. The Jews must bear their expenses and the Muslims their expenses. Each must help the other against anyone who attacks the people of this document. They must seek mutual advice and consultation, loyalty is a protection against treachery.

37/ A man is not liable for his ally's misdeeds. The wronged must be helped. (MH translates the first sentence, **WA INNAHU LA/LAM YATHAM IMRA-UN BI-HALIFIH**, as "And verily no one shall violate the pledge of his ally," which does not make sense. The second sentence makes more sense if we accept Guillaume's translation. The whole clause means: The wronged must be helped regardless of his ally's misdeeds. MT.]

38. The Jews must pay the believers so long as war lasts. [See note following 47. MT.]

39. [The valley, **JAWF**, of (MH)] Yathrib (Medina) shall be a sanctuary for the people of this document. [This means no blood of Medinan Jews, who are among "the people of this document, will be shed in Medina. MT.]

40. A stranger under protection shall be as his host doing no harm and committing no crime -- **WA INN AL-JAR KA'N-NAFS GHAYR MUDARR WA LA ATHIM**.

41. A woman shall only be given protection with the consent of her family -- **WA INNAHU LA TUJAR HARAMAT ILLA BI-IDHN AHLIHA**. [The MH translation, "And verily no refuge will be given (i.e. by the protected person to others) (sic) without the permission of the original people of the place", is far-fetched. MT.]

42. If any dispute or controversy likely to cause trouble should arise it must be referred to God and to Muhammad the Apostle of God. God accepts what is nearest to piety and goodness in this document.

43. Quraysh and their helpers shall not be given protection.

[Quraysh are Meccan non-Muslims. MT.]

44. The contracting parties are bound to help one another against any attack on Yathri

45/a. If they [i.e. the Jews, MH.] are called to make peace and maintain it they must do so; and if they make a similar demand on the Muslims it must be carried out except in the case of a holy war. [If they (the Muslims) ask the Jews to make peace with any ally of theirs, they shall make peace with him; and if they ask us for a similar thing, the same shall be incumbent upon the Believers, except one who fights for the cause of religion (Abu Ubayd in MH, Const: 5.)]

45/ Everyone shall have his portion from the side to which he belongs. ['This is not clear to me": Guillaume.] [MH's translation "On every group shall rest the responsibility for the part (of the city?) (sic) which faces them," makes it clearer. It refers to the post-Badr situation, in which the Meccans - as they did during Uhud and Khandaq - were likely to attack Medina. The Prophet wanted the Jews to defend their sections of the oasis. MT.]

46. The Jews of al-Aus, their freedmen and themselves have the same standing with the people of this document in pure loyalty from the people of this document. Loyalty is protection against treachery: He who acquires aught acquires it for himself [i.e. disloyalists and traitors will earn their own ruin. MT]

47. God approves of this document. This deed will not protect the unjust and the sinner. The man who goes forth to fight and the man who stays at home in the city [Medina?] is safe unless he has been unjust and sinned. God is the protector of the good and God-fearing man and Muhammad is the apostle of God.

Note: Muhammad Fahmi as-Surjani (as-Sirjai?), the al-Azhar editor of Ibn Hisham (Ibn Ishaq), adds this footnote to the document:

As said by Abu Ubayad in his Kitab al-Amwal, the Messenger of God indeed wrote this document, Kitab, before jizyah was enjoined [i.e. before the revelation of Q9:29 etc. MT] at a time when Islam was weak. (As Abu Ubayd) said the Jews, then, had a share in the booty if they fought along with Muslims as they were obliged in this document to bear (their share of) expenses of wars -- QAL ABU UBAYD FI KITAB AL-AMWAL: INNAMA KATAB RASUL ALLAH HADHA'L-KITAB QABL AN TUFRAD AL-JIZYAT WA KAN AL-ISLAM DAIF-AN. QAL: WA KAN LI'L-YAHUD IDH DHAK NASIB-UN FIL-MAGHNAM IDHA QATALU MAAL-MUSLIMIN KAMA SHURIT ALAYHIM FI HADHA'L-KITAB AN-NAFAQAT MAAHUM FI'L-HURUB (IH(1.1.)-MFS,2:91; brackets and stresses added).

APPENDIX III

TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE QURANIC-ISLAMIC LEXICON

The problem of misunderstanding the Quranic-Islamic lexicon was well articulated by Mr. Islambuli, the Muslim fundamentalist killer of Egyptian president Anwar as-Sadat. During his trial, Islambuli bragged to the court (and to the world through the media): "I killed Sadat; he was a tyrant." Apparently, most of the Egyptians and the Muslim world agreed. This was demonstrated by the mysterious, nonchalant, indifferent response of the Egyptian people to Sadat's death and his burial ceremonies. To an uninformed observer this must have looked strange, particularly compared to the Egyptians' tumultuous grief at the death of Umm Kulthum, the famous woman singer - a sinner, according to Islam. The civilized world was further shocked when Sadat's death was wildly and indecently celebrated in many Islamic countries. Had President Husni Mubarak and his comrades not maintained their sense of decency - resisting the temptation of becoming (in the eyes of hysterical mobs and fanatic and hypocritical leaders) instant **BATAL JALIL** (sing.) "great heroes," by openly disowning Sadat -- the fate of his (Sadat's) dead body would not have been different from those of Nuri as-Said, Abd al-Ilah of Iraq and Abd ar-Rahman b. Muljim.

Did Islambuli use the word 'tyrant' as we understand it? The Oxford English Dictionary (1933) and Webster's Third New World Dictionary, Unabridged (1981) define "tyrant" as "an absolute ruler... who exercises power in an oppressive, unjust or cruel manner; one who treats those under his control tyrannically, acting in a cruel, violent or wicked manner; a cruel master..., a ruffian, desperado, a villain." A tyrant is "a usurper of sovereignty"; "one who by unfair or unreasonable demands or rigorous exploitation imposes burdens and hardships on those under his control." Similarly, tyranny according to these dictionaries is "... rigorous, cruel oppressive and unjustly severe government... It is an unjust domination of a harsh overseer."

With these denotations in mind, for those familiar with contemporary history, the application of "tyrant" so vigorously to Sadat - and the Muslim world's response to his death - must have been perplexing. After decades of suffocating, hysterical military dictatorship, Sadat introduced glasnost and perestroika in Egypt long before they happened in the Soviet Union. It was a unique example of comparative liberalization by a military regime at that time. Sadat's treatment of the Muslim Brothers and of the Left was more generous and lenient than any other contemporary Egyptian ruler. The change was especially striking compared to Sadat's predecessor, could not survive physically had he insulted and ridiculed Abd an-Nasir the way he did Sadat. Neither the Left, nor the liberal-social democrats, nor the Muslim Brotherhood were allowed to exist formally. Sadat released hundreds of Muslim Brothers kept in dungeons for two decades. Contrary to Abd an-Nasir, who hanged almost the entire top leadership of the Brothers and outlawed their organization and publications, Sadat allowed them and other political groups to resume activity. In terms of basic human rights, comparatively, Sadat was one of the most liberal and cultured rulers in the Muslim world. Defining tyranny in terms of numbers of those jailed, tortured, and killed or in terms of social, religious, cultural, and political freedoms, President Sadat was one of the least qualified in the Third World to be called a tyrant.

According to general religious (including Islamic or Sufi) standards, Anwar as-Sadat was more pious than his predecessor and most of his contemporary Muslim rulers. It was his religiosity that had qualified him to be a liaison between the Free Officers and the Muslim Brothers,

planning the coup d'etat of 1952. In his personal life Sadat performed Islamic rituals and prayers regularly. He was definitely less concerned with his hair-style than Colonel Qaddafi. Sadat's youthful reputation was closer to piety and sobriety than that of King Fahd. His lifestyle was more 'Islamic' than that of Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the founder of the first Islamic Republic (Pakistan) in our time, or many other Muslim leaders reputedly indulgent in drinking and womanizing.

It was also not Sadat's economic policy that Islambuli had in mind when he called Sadat a tyrant. The Egypt Sadat inherited was not more prosperous before he came to power. He simply inherited a devastated economy caused by earlier short- and long-range events and phenomena. Thanks to his predecessor's authoritarian regime none could see or talk about it. Sadat's liberalization simply exposed the situation.

Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi of Iran was another recipient of the title "tyrant" bestowed systematically and persistently by Islamic circles. Undoubtedly, the Shah's record concerning political freedoms is less defensible than Sadat's, yet it is questionable to say that his tyranny exceeded many others who have escaped the label as far as Muslim fundamentalists are concerned. Compared to Soeharto of Indonesia, who massacred thousands and kept millions in sordid, isolated labor camps for decades, compared to the world-famous Pakistani "butchers of Bengal and Baluchistan," compared to Hafiz Asad of Hama fame, compared to the Saudis and Sudanese who have publicly flogged, beheaded and hanged violators of Islamic rules and deprived non-Muslims of basic human rights, and compared to the Turkish and Syrian-Iraqi Arab treatment of the Kurds and Armenians, and, non-the-less, compared to Khomeini who continued to talk of Pahlavi tyranny, the Shah would look like an angel, if we consider facts and figures objectively. Politically (and only politically) the human right situation was terrible during the Shah's regime (though not more than in many other Muslim countries). Pahlavi Iran was more civilized, economically more prosperous - and for the future more inspiring, and religiously, socially, and culturally, more liberal and tolerant - than any other period in Iran's Islamic history and any other Muslim country. Even politically, only the brief era of Dr. Mohammad Mosaddegh can claim superiority. Social, educational and economic developments during the Pahlavi era had benefited a much larger portion of the population of all classes. Besides, these developments had provided the inevitable ground for further political liberalization.

Although contemporary Muslim fundamentalist-activists, particularly when not in power, may intentionally mislead their audience to think that Quranic-Islamic terms such as "corruption," "tyranny," "cruelty," "justice," "reform," "innovation" etc. have modern connotations, they know well how to interpret them when they rule. Some semi-modernist Muslim thinkers and their young followers have sincerely read these terms in the image of their modern meanings. But we know that the Quran has to be understood exactly the way Muhammad interpreted and applied it. The Quran and Sunnah are inseparable. Following perhaps, the Islamic concepts of **HILAH**, **MAKR** and **TAQIYYA**, Khomeini and his like may allow a Shariati, a Mujahid or a duped audience to translate ADL "(Islamic) justice" as 'social justice,' **TAWHID** "(Islamic concept of) monotheism" to **TAWHIDI** and then to 'classless society,' **SHURA** to 'participatory', representative parliamentary democracy, **MUSTADAFIN** to 'expropriated oppressed masses' and **JABBAR** to 'tyrant' as it is commonly understood. But the performance of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the application of Shariah law in the Sudan, and primary Islamic literature leave no doubt it is not so. The 76-year-old scholar Muhammad Mahmud Taha who, on the basis of the Prophet's Meccan career (misguidedly, though sincerely, from our point of view) insisted implicitly on the separation of religion from state politics, and interpreted passages such as al-Kafirun (Q109) to prove Islam's toleration of other creeds, was openly hanged (1985) as an apostate by a Sunni fundamentalist, Muslim-Brotherhood-dominated regime.

Husayn Murawwah of Lebanon, a 'Marxist'-Leninist ideologue, who along with others had discovered 'Islam as a liberation theology' and Muhammad and some of his Companions like Ali, Hasan, Husayn and Abu Dhar al-Ghifari as radical socialist revolutionaries remained unthanked by the ulama and Islamic fundamentalist circles. Eventually, after the "dirty reformist bourgeois" system (loathed so much by Murawwah and his like) in Lebanon collapsed, Husayn Murawwah was gunned down by the "Party of God" -- **HIZB ALLAH**, a Shiite wing of fundamentalist Islam.

Before we discuss what is "tyranny" in Islam and why figures such as Sadat and the Shah were particularly called "tyrants," let us state categorically that tyranny per se is not an Islamic concern. Muslim fundamentalists use the word as the only available translation in English of the Quranic term **JABR/JABBAR**, though some of them may intentionally mislead us to believe that our believers are socialist-liberal revolutionaries.

JABBAR 'tyrant'.

All Traditional Muslim historians, like Tabari in his 'universal' history TARIKH AR-RUSUL WA'L-MULUK (History of Prophets/Messengers and Kings), divide human societies of world history into two categories: 1) Those ruled by a Prophet, such as Solomon, or a **KHALIFA** "caliph" or **MALIK SALIH** "righteous king," i.e., a Muslim believer applying Islamic law, or 2) those not ruled by Islam as above. The same concept is articulated by Islam's division of states, domains, and jurisdictions into **DAR AL-ISLAM** and **DAR AL-HARB**. As evident in his text, Tabari's adoption of the title "History of the Messengers and Kings" means some societies in the past were ruled directly or indirectly by the Messengers according to their **SHARIAH** (Islamic Law), as revealed through them. The rest were ruled by "non-righteous" (**GHAYR SALIH**), i.e., non-Muslim "kings" who did not apply the **SHARIAH**. Now, throughout his History Tabari (like other Muslim historians) calls these non-'Muslim' rulers **JABABIRAH** (sing: **JABBAR**) or/and **FARAINAH** (sing: **FIRAUN** "Pharaoh"). When Tabari tells us of **ABJAD**, **HAWWAZ**... that they were 'tyrant' kings -- **KANU MULUK-AN JABABIRAH**, (TT-1,1:195), the context makes it clear: Tabari means they were non-Muslim kings. Again, the context of his remark that Namrud was the first 'tyrant' on earth -- **ANN AWWAL JABBAR KAN FI'L-ARD NAMRUD** (-1,1:287) -- clarifies that Tabari is referring to Namrud's stubborn disbelief in Abraham's God and his Prophethood, not to his tyranny per se. This usage in Traditional Islamic literature is directly inspired by the Quran. We study with the help of Tabari the meaning of **JABBAR**, "Tyrant" as it ??? in Q11:59, Q14:15; Q19:14, Q19:32; and Q40:35.

The Ad whom the Prophet Hud had addressed "denied the Revelations of their Lord and flouted His Messengers and followed the command of every froward tyrant" -- **JABBAR ANID** (Q11:59). Here, Tabari tells us, **JABABIRAH** (plural of **JABBAR**) are those who repudiated God's guidelines, and disobeyed God's Messengers sent to call them to acknowledge His unity and obey His command -- **JAHADU BI-ADILLAT ALLAH WA HUKUMIHI, WA ASAU RUSULAHU'LLADHIN ARSALAHUM ILAYHIM LI'D-DUA ILA TAUHIDIHI WA IIBA AMRIH-I** (T,12:61). A **JABBAR** is one who "magnifies himself against God by refusing to accept the Truth" -- **MUTAKABBIR AL'ALLAH HAID AN AL-HAQQ LA YADHAN LAHU WA LA YAQBILUH-U** (*ibid*). A **JABBAR** is one with evil inclinations against the Truth/God, refusing to acknowledge It/Him humbly -- (*ibid*). He is a **MUSHRIK**, attributes copartners to God, i.e., does not believe in the Islamic version of godhood and monotheism (*ibid*:62).

Q14:15 *passim* (cf. T,13:193-4) refers to some past Prophets, Noah, Hud and others, calling their adversaries **JABBAR ANID** "froward tyrant." They will go to Hell and be forced to drink "festering water" etc. (Q14:16-22). Here, Tabari tells us, a **JABBAR** is one who magnifies himself against God, refusing to acknowledge God's unity and worship Him exclusively -- **MUTAKABBIR JAIR, HAID AN IQRAR BI-TAWHID ALLAH WA IKHLAS**

AL-IBADAT LAHU. **JABBAR** is one who deviates willfully from following the Truth and takes distance from it -- **MAN ANAD AN IIBA AL-HAQQ WA TAJANNABAHU**, the one who resists stubbornly the Truth -- **MUANID LI'L-HAQQ**, the one who deviates from following the path of the Truth -- **AL-HAID AN TARIQ AL-HAQQ**. Tabari's repetitive explanations signify that the alleged **JABBAR**, tyranny, had nothing to do with the tyranny of governments or people against people. Rulers were called "tyrants" in the sense that they "refused to follow the (Prophets') Path of the Truth (Islam), i.e., (sic) they deviated from the Path of the Truth, they refused to (confess Islam) say 'There is no god but Allah'" -- **HUAN- NAKIB AN TARIQ AL-HAQQ: AY AL-HAID AN IIBA TARIQ AL- HAQQ ALLADHI ABA AN YAQUL: LA ILAH ILLA'LLAH** (T,13:193-4). In this context, Tabari gives the example of those as **JABBAR** who asked the Prophets and the believers to return to these peoples' non-Islamic creed (ibid).

JABBAR in Q19:14 means to be disdainful about obeying the Lord and one's parents, to disobey God and the parents out of pride -- **MUTAKABBIR AN TAAT RABBIH-I WA TAAT WALIDAYH-I** (T,16:58-9). In Q19:32 it means disdainfully refusing to follow God's commandments -- **MUTAKABBIR-AN ALA'LLAH FIMA AMAR...** **WA NAHA**; its opposite is to obey God humbly (T,16:81-2). In Q40:35, **JABBAR**s are the ones who argue about God's signs/Revelations without any authoritative proof -- **ALLADHIN YUJADILUN FI AYAT ALLAH BI-GHAYR SULTAN**; the one who is too proud to admit God's unity -- **MUTAKABBIR ALA'LLAH AN YUWAHHIDAHU**, and acknowledge His Prophets -- **WA YUSADDIQ RUSULAHU**; it is the state of arrogant refusal to follow the Truth, (i.e. the Divine religion of God, Islam) -- **MUTAAZZIM AN IIBA AL-HAQQ** (T,24:63).

The most striking difference between Islamic Traditional connotations of a Quranic-Islamic 'tyrant,' and a tyrant per se, is the absence of God in the latter. Tyranny for us is exclusively concerned with relations between the ruler and the ruled, here and now. The Quranic-Islamic 'tyrant' is the one who "magnifies" himself against God, refusing to accept the Truth, i.e., Divine creed. "Tyranny" is the rejection of Islamic credo. Islamic 'tyranny' refers to relations with God. When a Muslim fundamentalist calls someone a tyrant he does not refer to his usurpation of people's sovereign democratic rights or to oppression, tortures and killings by the ruler. Islam does not allow sovereignty for the people. No Muslim fundamentalist would call Khomeini a **JABBAR**, though he jailed, tortured and killed many more than Sadat, if any. Indeed, those such as Hasan at-Turabi (the leader of the Sudan's Muslim Brotherhood), who prefers to starve hundreds of thousands of non-Muslim Sudanese to death rather than give them equal rights as Sudanese citizens, are heroes in the eyes of Islamic fundamentalists throughout the world.

Muslim fundamentalists called Sadat and the Shah "tyrants" for specific Islamic reasons - touched by particular Islamic sensitivities which give more importance to a loud adherence to Islam and an open disavowal of un-Islam and of "friendship" with non-Muslims than to quiet, unassertive piety and spirituality. From a fundamentalist Islamic point of view we can only briefly refer to the "crimes" of Sadat and the Shah.

After Kamal Ata Turk, Sadat and the Shah were the only contemporary leaders openly to challenge some fundamental Islamic dogmas and basic Muslim sensitivities. Both violated Islamic principles of conduct of relations with non-Muslims, internally and externally. Sadat's internal political reforms were moving Egypt towards a Wafdist secular parliamentary democracy where, e.g., the Christian Copts would automatically become equal citizens - not Dhimis, i.e., third-class humiliated subjects as the Quran prescribes. It became obvious that Sadat, though personally more pious than Fahd, wanted to separate religion gradually from politics. This would be the end of the Muslim Brothers' dream of establishing a Dar al- Islam in Egypt. Sadat. For the Muslim

fundamentalists, a secular parliamentary democracy where they would be allowed to compete for votes was more undesirable than Abd an-Nasir's dungeons. By Sadat's time, the Muslim Brothers had learned from the experience of Jamaat Islami in Pakistan that Muslim masses, if given a choice, reject Islamic fundamentalism.

The Pahlavis, though not as bold and decisive as Ata Turk, are known for their un-Islamic leanings within Iran. In practice, for the first time in Islamic and Shia Iran's history, non-Muslims (Zoroastrians, Jews, Christians), non-Shiites (the Sunnis) and 'heretics' (Bahais) could hope and feel, during the Pahlavi era, to be treated as equal citizens. This and the Pahlavis' encouragement and enhancement of social and educational liberalization on all levels clearly violated Islamic laws. The Shah's pride in Iran's pre-Islamic legacy, his open celebration of the grandeur of pre-Islamic Iran, of the 'JABABIRAH' and 'FARAINAH' such as Cyrus the Great and, finally, his changing of the basis of the Iranian calendar from the establishment of the first Islamic state at Medina to the establishment of the first Iranian ('JABBAR') empire at Persepolis were steps no other contemporary Muslims had dared to take.

Both Sadat and the Shah openly and sincerely recognized Israel and established normal, friendly relations with the Jewish state. This was Sadat's death knell. The Shah's friendly relations with Israel (and other non-Muslims) and Sadat's shaking hands with Menachem Begin at Jerusalem, calling him a friend, broke the Quran's injunction LA TATTAKHIDHU' L-YAHUD WA'N-NASARA AULIYA "take not Jews and Christians as friends" (Q5:51) repeated so clearly and vehemently by God (see Q3:28, 118; 4:89, 89, 139, 144; 5:57; 9:23; 18:50). For believers, Sadat and the Shah were "tyrants" because they deviated 'stubbornly' from the "Path of the Truth," refusing openly to rule according to the Shariah, not for their usurpation of people's sovereignty or for their violations of human rights. They were called tyrants for doing just the opposite: (Sadat at least) for moving towards a recognition of people's sovereignty rather than insisting to rule by Divine law, and for honoring non-Muslims' fundamental human rights.

In his personal life, Sadat might have been more pious than Fahd of Saudi Arabia, but to a believer Sadat's piety and religiosity were more like those of the Hanafist Muslims, al-Munafiqun, who were more sober in their sex-related activities than the Prophet and some of his great Companions (such as Uthman, Ali and Abu Said al-Khudri). Even the Shah, the believers know, was not as notorious a debauchee as many caliphs of Islam or Saudi princes. The Shah, conforming to the principles of modern piety, preferred to divorce a wife - at the cost of the support of her influential family - before marrying another woman. But for the believers this symbolizes adherence to modern Jahiliyyah 'piety' - worth nothing - while Saudi harems are authorized by the Sunnah of the Prophet. Believers know that al-Munafiqun were doomed to Hell for their 'secularism' in Islam, refusal to follow Islam totally, and specifically for their friendly relations with non-Muslims, not for their lack of sobriety and piety per se.

Here is a list of some condemnatory terms used in their various forms to signify the crimes of those condemned to Hell. Their Traditional explanations indicate that disbelief of the condemned in Islam is the cause for damnation, not evil deeds per se. Two terms (KUFUR and TAKDHIB) are of basic importance; the rest follow in alphabetical order.

KUFUR, "unbelief, disbelief, rejection, denial, faithlessness," is variously used about 500 times in the Quran. KUFUR is the main charge against those doomed to Hell. A "mighty chastisement," "an awful doom" awaits "the unbelievers" (Q2:6-7). "The meaning of KUFUR (here)... is repudiation... of the prophethood of Muhammad" (T-OXF,1:107). The Jews of Medina, for example, were "unbelievers" because they refused to

acknowledge Muhammad as the Messenger of God (ibid:105 passim). "The mighty chastisement" is for those who oppose Muhammad (ibid:113), i.e., disbelieve in him as God's last Messenger to be obeyed and followed. In Q11:42; 14:9; 23:24; 38:8; 40:6; 66:10; 71:26, KUFRA means refusal to believe, as explained by the Prophets, in the oneness of God, and also disbelief in the authenticity of the Prophet's claim that they had received Revelation from God and, thus, were entitled to obedience from the people (T,13:190 cf. Q14:9; T,24:43 cf. Q40:6). Any disrespectful thought or remark about the Prophets is KUFRA. One of Noah's wives committed KUFRA by calling him insane, MAJNUN -- IMRAAT NUH KANAT KAFIRAT, TAQUL LI'N-NAS: INNAHU MAJNUN (T,28:169 cf. Q66:10. For a similar definition of KUFRA also see Muq., item no. f2, "AL-KUFRA," pp. 95-6. The two fundamental elements of KUFRA, polytheism and disbelief in the institution of Prophethood (implying revelation from the One God to particular individuals) are the charges repeatedly mentioned against Noah's people. They are charged of worshipping gods, AL-ANDAD WA'L-ALIHAH (such as idols and graven images), AL-ASNAM WA'L-AWTHAN, other than the One God who Noah claimed to have revealed Himself to him. Noah warned the people of the chastisement of a "dreadful day" -- ADHAB YAUM AZIM/ALIM if they continued to worship what they were allegedly worshipping (Q7:59 cf. TS,12:502; Q11:26-8 cf. T,12:26; Q14:9 cf. T,13:190; Q23:23; Q71:234).

TAKDHIB, "to cry lies to, deny, belie, reject the Truth," occurs about 200 times in the Quran. "As for the unbelievers who cry lies to our signs, those shall be the inhabitants of the Fire, dwelling therein forever" (Q2:39). "...the signs of God are His proofs and indicants of His oneness and lordship and the indications and evidence which the Messengers have brought of this and of their truthfulness in what they impart from their Lord" (T-OXF.,1:268); i.e. TAKDHIB means disbelief in the authenticity of Muhammad as the Messenger of God and of the Quran as God's revealed Word.

It is another quality ensuring Hell. The people of Noah "denied" or cried him lies, KADHDHABU." This means they refused to acknowledge that Noah was the Messenger of God to them and that by God's authority Noah was commanding them to shun polytheism -- ANNAHU LI'LLAH RASUL-UN ILAYHIM YAMURUHUM BI KHAL AL-ANDAD. For their refusal, the nonbelievers were called "a blind people, QAWM 'AMIN (Q7:64 cf. TS,12:502; Q10:73 cf. T,11:144; Q23:26; Q25:37; Q26:105; Q38:12).

ASY/ISYAN, "disobedience, rebellion..." The Jews "were laden with the burden of God's anger; that, because they had disbelieved (KUFRA) the signs of God... that because they disobeyed (ASY) and were transgressors" (ITIDA) (Q2:61), i.e. "because of their disobedience towards their Lord and transgressing His limits. 'Transgression' is the overstepping of the limit which God has set for His servants" (T-OXF,1:355). Noah complained of his people's ISYAN "rebellion against him" and of "following those whose wealth and children increased them only in loss" (Q71:21). The nonbelievers are charged of disobedience to Noah and of following those who had greater wealth and more children (though, it is asserted, their wealth and children had caused a distance between them and God; this distance was naught save ruin and loss) (T,29:98). These people's interest in their children and worldly welfare is thus contrasted to obedience to the Messenger of God - and called ISYAN.

FASAD "corruption" and ISLAH "improvement (of relations)": See part IV of this study.

FISQ "to be ungodly, licentious, to commit ungodliness, wickedness." "...the Hypocrites and unbelievers are called FASIQUUN (those who commit FISQ), because they have departed from obedience to their Lord. This is why God says, when describing Iblis (Satan), he was one of the jinn and committed ungodliness -- FASAQA -- against his Lord's command (Q18:50), meaning by this 'he departed' from obedience to Him and compliance with

His command. ... (Similarly) for their ungodliness, **FISQ** in Q2:59, i.e. for their going far from My (God's) command" (T-OXF,1:185 cf. Q2:25; parentheses added). Referring to disbelievers in the authenticity of Muhammad's Messengership and Revelation he received from God, Q2:99 ascribes **FISQ** to these nonbelievers. For the interpretation of **FISQ** "ungodliness" and **KUFR** "unbelief," Tabari refers back to his commentaries on Q2:26 (T-OXF,1:471). **FISQ**, in Q46:20, means rejection and disobedience of God (T,26:22), i.e., denial of Muhammad's guidance for knowing the right way to believe in God and obey Him.

Noah's people were ungodly and licentious, **QAWM FASIQIN**, in the sense that they opposed God's commandments and refused to obey Him as Noah asked; for their refusal to acknowledge Noah as the Messenger of God, and shun idolatry they are called **FASIQ**, licentious (T,27:7 cf. Q51:46). For Tabari, **FISQ**, "licentiousness or ungodliness," as used in the Quran means disbelief in the oneness of God and in the authenticity of Islamic prophets including the Prophet Muhammad (Q2:99; 5:59; 9:24, 67, 80; 10:33; 32:18, 20; 63:6 cf. T relevant parts; also see Muq., item no. 185: **AL-FISQ**).

AL-GHAVIN, 'Deviators. **AL-GHAVIN** in Q26:91, to be hurled into Hell, are those who are told by the Quran and Tabari, who worship persons and things other than God; they are the Devil-worshippers (T,19:87-8).

GHAYR SALIH, Unrighteous. One of Noah's sons was called "not righteous, **GHAYR SALIH**" because of his disobedience to the Prophet of God and because of his polytheism -- **LI-M'ASTIYATHI NABIY ALLAH... KAN AMALUHU FI'SHSHIRK** (T,12:51-3 cf. Q11:46).

ITHM, "sin," in 44:44 is disbelief in God and opposition to Muhammad (T,25:130-1).

AL-ITIDA, "transgression, aggression, showing enmity, exceeding the limits." Noah's people were called "transgressors," **AL-MUTADIN** because they violated the belief in the oneness of God and opposed the Prophet's call for obedience to God (the way he prescribed) -- **FA TAJAWAZA MA AMARA BIHI MIN TAWHIDIHI WA KHALAF MA DAAHUM ILAYH RUSULUHUM** (T,11:145 cf. Q10:74).

JAHL "ignorance," "vulgarity" etc. "(Moses) said: 'I take refuge with God, lest I should be one of the ignorant' i.e., one of the foolish who relate untrue and false things about God" (T-OXF,1:377 cf. Q2:67). The Quran constantly charges those doomed to Hell with **JAHL/JAHALAH**, ignorance. Nonbelievers are called ignorant for opposing Islamic Prophets and their worldview. In the story of the people who asked Noah to shun the company of the faithful who had questionable character, the Quran calls these nonbelievers **QAWM-UN JAHILUN** "an ignorant people" (Q11:29-30 cf. T,12:29-30).

JURM, sin, guilt, crime, seduction... The people of Noah were called "a sinful or criminal people -- **QAWM MUJRIMIN**"; their sins or crimes consisted of their unbelief in the Islamic God -- **ATHIMIN BI RABBIHIM BI KUFRIHIM BI'LLAH** (T,11:145 cf. Q10:75).

Elsewhere, Tabari says **al-Mujrimun**, the ones who commit **JURM**, are those who refuse to believe in the authenticity of Muhammad as the Messenger of God (T,19:1- 2). **JURM** in Q7:40 refers to the arrogant refusal to accept God's signs, i.e., Muhammad and the Quran as the Messenger and Word of God ().

KIBR/ISTIKBAR, "waxing proud, arrogance". By refusing to prostrate before Adam, as God commanded, Iblis, the Devil, "waxed proud, and so he became of the unbelievers" (Q2:34).

Although this is a statement by God about Iblis, it is [also]

a rebuke to those creatures of God who are like him and are too arrogant to follow the command of God, to acquiesce in obedience to what He commands and forbids them to do, and to submit to Him in the rights between them that He has imposed [on them]. Among those [like this]... were the Jews who inhabited the abode of migration [Medina] of the Messenger of God, and their rabbis who were aware of the Messenger and his attributes, and knew that he was a Messenger of God. Despite their knowledge of this, they arrogantly refused to affirm his prophethood and to submit in obedience to him, revolting against him and envying him. So God rebuked them by means of His statement about Iblis, who revolted and acted enviously in arrogantly refusing to prostrate before Adam, just as they revolted and acted enviously in arrogantly refusing to submit to Muhammad, the prophet of God, and his prophethood, when he brought them the truth from their Lord.

Then He described Iblis in the likeness of those for whom He coined him as a metaphor of arrogant, jealous, and haughty refusal to submit to whomsoever He commanded him to submit, and said "and so he", i.e., Iblis, "became one of the unbelievers", one of those who deny God's blessings and favours towards him, by opposing Him in His command to him to prostrate before Adam. In the same way, the Jews denied the blessings which their Lord had bestowed upon them and their forefathers before, [such as] God's feeding their ancestors with manna and quail and shading them with clouds, and innumerable other blessings of His to them, especially when He favoured those who came in touch with Muhammad with their contact with him and with their witnessing God's proof for them; then they denied his prophethood, through rebellion and jealousy, after coming to know of him and his prophethood.

So God linked him with the unbelievers, and made him one of their number in religion and faith, although he differed from them in kind and kinship. In the same way, He made the hypocrites as one another, because they were united by hypocrisy, although they differed genealogically and in kind, when He said: "The hypocrites, the men and the women, are as one another" (9:67), meaning thereby that they resembled one another in hypocrisy and errancy. Similarly, He said about Iblis that he was one of the unbelievers, that he was one of them with respect to disbelief in God and opposition to His command, although he was different in kind and kinship from them. The meaning of "and so he became one of the unbelievers" is that, when he refused to prostrate, he became one of the unbelievers... (T-OXF,1:242-3).

When the Quran says that Noah's people "waxed proud" -- **ISTAKBARU**, it means they were too proud to worship God and acknowledge Noah's Messengership -- **AL-IDHAN L'ILLAH BI'L-UBUDAT WA'L-IQRAR...** **BI'R-RISALAT** (T,11:145 cf. Q10:75). It does not refer to the arrogance of some individuals towards others. **KIBR/ISTIKBAR** "arrogance" in Q39:59-60 means rejection of the Book revealed to Muhammad (as the Word of god) and refusal to admit God's unity (T,24:21-2) in the Islamic sense. **SLH** "righteousness" in Q32:12 refers to obedience to God, confirmation of His unity, His worship exclusively etc.; "that is what righteous deed means," Tabari asserts (T,21:98).

SARF/ISRAF, extravagance, prodigality, giving to excesses, exceeding all bounds. **SARF/ISRAF** in 5:32 means disobeying God, opposing God's commandments, and hurting God and His Messengers by following one's own whims **AMILUN BI-MAASI'LLAH, WA MUKHALIFUN AMR ALLAH WA NAHYAHU, WA MUHADDULLAH WA RUSULAHU, BI-IIBATHIM AHWAHUM** (TS,10:242). God will put the "prodigal," those who commit **ISRAF**, in Hell (Q20:127). Here **ISRAF** means rebelliousness against God,

disbelief in His Messengers and Books -- **ASA RABBAH, WA LAM YUMIN BI-RUSULIHI WA KUTUBIHI** (T,16:230). In Q21:9 God says, "We destroyed the Prodigal." As the context tells us, these nonbelievers' **ISRAF** was "their disbelief in their Lord -- **ASRAFU ALA ANFUSIHI BI-KUFRIHI BI-RABBIHI** (T,17:6). The Prophet Salih told his people to be "godfearing" and not to be "prodigals who do corruption (cf. **FASAD**) in the earth and set not things right" (Q26:150-1). This means, according to Tabari here "godfearing," i.e., those fearful of God's chastisement reaching those who disobey Him and do the opposite of His commandments, "prodigal," i.e., those who invite God's wrath by disobeying Him; "corruption," i.e., disobedience to God; and "set not things aright," i.e., do not act in obedience to God -- **BI'L-AMAL BI-ITAAT ALLAH** (T,19:102 *passim*). The Prophets called the disbelievers "a prodigal people" (Q36:19), i.e., a people who had committed sin against God -- **QAUM-UN AHL MAAS LILLAH WA ATHAM** (T,22:158). As usual, Tabari does not explain their "sins" further. However, the whole passage and Tabari's detailed commentaries tell the reader that, here, the disbelievers' "sins" were their disbelief in the authenticity of these Prophets and their concepts of godhood and worship of God (see T,22:155-61 cf. Q36:13-27). The Quran addresses nonbelievers as "people who have been prodigal against (themselves)" (39:53) i.e., those who were polytheists and did not believe in God (T,24:14). "Surely, God guides not him who is prodigal..." (Q40:28), i.e., primarily, who ascribes partners to God, is a polytheist -- **MAN HUA MUSHRIK-UN BIHI** (*ibid*:63). **ISRAF**, in Q40:43, basically signifies the Pharaoh's disbelief in Moses' Prophethood and in his God (T,24:68-70).

SU', "evil"

Those doomed to Hell were "an evil people" -- **QAWM- UN SU**, because of their disobedience to God in a doctrinal sense (T,17:50).

TAGHY/TUGHYAN, "insolence, transgression"

One uses the word **TUGHYAN**... when someone exceeds the limits of something and does wrong. Therefore God says: "No indeed; surely man transgresses (**YATGHA**), for he thinks himself self-sufficient" (Q96:6-7), that is, he exceeds his bounds... **TUGHYAN**... means... unbelief (T- OXF,1:135-6 cf. Q2:15).

Thought of "self-sufficiency" in Q96:6-7 refers to Arab/Meccan humanism. The thought that any could live without Divine guidance and help - **ISTIGHNA** - is condemned here as **TUGHYAN**. Those people of Noah were the worst in **ZULM** and **TUGHYAN** (Q53:52), i.e., they were the most unjust to their own souls and were the greatest in disbelief in the Lord and the most intense in their rebellion against God (by their disbelief in Him -- **KANU HUM ASHADD ZULM-AN LIANFUSIHI, WA AZAM KUFRAN BI RABBIHI WA ASHADD TUGHYAN-AN WA TAMARRUD-AN AL'ALLAH** (T,27:78). In Q38:55 a **TAGHI** (one who commits **TAGHY**) is the one who rebels against God by disobeying His orders (as conveyed by Muhammad) (T,23:175-6). The same term in Q78:22 means magnifying oneself against God by rejecting Muhammad and refusing to worship Him (as told by the Prophet) (T,29:1-9). In Q96:9, it refers to have pride against God in the same sense (T,30:253).

ZULM, "to do or work wrong, to wrong, to do evil, to act unjustly, to oppress, to be oppressive." Usually, in Arabic and many Islamicate languages (e.g., Persian, Urdu, Turkish, Baluchi) which have adopted **ZULM** like many other Quranic-Arabic words in their various forms, it signifies inequity, injustice, iniquity, unfairness, oppression, repression, suppression, cruelty, tyranny, etc., inflicted by human beings on others. However, **ZULM** in its various Quranic forms (some 250 times) is devoid of

these connotations when it implies condemnation of nonbelievers. It is used to indicate disbelief in Islam. "The basic meaning of **ZULM**... is to put something elsewhere than in its place" (T-OXF,1:249 cf. Q2:35). It means to "set up worship where it (does) not belong, for no worship is proper except to God" (T-OXF,1:313 cf. Q2:51). Following these 'basic' meanings, Tabari explains **ZULM** throughout the Quran as disbelief in - and disobedience of - God and His Islamic Messengers in general, worship of things other than God, and refusal to follow the Prophet's creed, i.e., Islam. Usually, Quranic passages tell a reader that **ZULM** refers to the above. The peoples of Noah and other Prophets are charged with **ZULM** for their refusal to acknowledge them as authentic Messengers of God and obey them - not for their oppression of others (See, e.g., Q11:31, 37, 44; 14:13; 23:28; 25:37; 53:52; 71:28). The adversaries of Noah were called **ZALIMIN** in the sense, Tabari tells us, that they were unfair and unjust to themselves by their disbelief in God, which entitled them to His wrath. They were called "evildoers" because of their worship of idols. Referring to the etymology of **ZULM**, which is to put something in a wrong place, Tabari maintains that by directing their worship to a place other than its rightful one, i.e., worshiping others than God, they committed **ZULM**. It is so that the Quran calls someone cruel, oppressor, wrongdoer, evildoer etc. (T,13:193 cf. Q14:13; also see T,12:31 cf. 11:31; T,12:34 cf. 11:37; T,12:46 cf. Q11:44; T,18 cf. Q23:27-8; T,19 cf. Q25:37; Q29:14; T,29:100 cf. Q71:28). **ZULM** in Q7:41, 44, 47 that causes one's damnation in Hell means arrogant refusal to accept God's 'signs,' i.e., Muhammad and the Quran and other Prophets... (T,12:427). **ZULM** means being unjust to oneself which, in turn, means that by disbelieving in God and rejecting the Prophets, earning God's wrath (T,12:436). In Q49:47, it refers to doing wrong to oneself by ascribing partners to God and by disbelieving in the Hereafter and related concepts, thus, earning God's wrath (T,24:11). **ZULM** means **SHIRK BI'LLAH**, setting partners to God (T,19:130-1), i.e., not accepting Islam's specific concept of monotheism that implies acknowledgement of Muhammad as His Last Messenger.