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INTRODUCTION

The history of Christian missions has been written predominantly from a Christian, missionary perspective. Missions have scarcely been studied from the perspective of the people among whom missionaries worked, in the case of the present research: the Muslims in the Middle East in the early 20th century. The available studies on the history of missions among Muslims are, in fact, incomplete, for they do not give detailed accounts of the reactions and interpretations of the people to whom the missionaries had been sent. Moreover, they do not tell us whether the missionaries themselves were aware of the Muslim reactive positions and writings, and the influence of their work on mutual Muslim-Christian perceptions and misperceptions. Main problems that still need to be examined are: How did Muslims, in various regions and under various circumstances, perceive the missionaries and their work? What ideas did Muslims develop about Christianity as they saw it enter Muslim societies? How did the direct encounter between Islam and Western Christianity through the emergence of missionaries in the Muslim world influence the Muslim polemics against Christianity?

The present work is a critical study of the dynamics of Muslim understanding of Christianity during the late 19th and the early 20th century in the light of the polemical writings of the well-known Syro-Egyptian Muslim reformist Sheikh Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā (1865-1935) and his associates. It is observable that neither Muslim nor Western scholars paid due attention to his views on Christianity. No full-scale study of his perspectives on that subject has been undertaken so far. Although there are scattered and brief remarks in some indi-

vidual studies on some of his works on Christianity, investigation is still needed by focusing on his polemics and answers to the social, political and theological aspects of missionary movements among Muslims of his age.

The base of our analysis in the present study encompasses Riḍā’s voluminous publications embodied in his magnum opus, the journal *al-Manār* (The Lighthouse). The core of these writings on the Christian beliefs and scriptures consisted of polemic and apologetic issues, which had already existed in the pre-modern Islamic classification of Christianity. However, *al-Manār* polemicists have added to their investigations many modern aspects largely influenced by Western critical studies of the Bible. As a matter of fact, there is no documented public debate (*munāẓarah*) between Riḍā and his contemporary missionaries. But *al-Manār* developed certain sorts of arguments drawn from critical studies about Biblical texts, church history, political confrontations in the period of colonialism, and evidence of what it perceived as the wrong picture portrayed by missionaries (and some Christian Arabs) of Islam.²

**A Biographical Sketch**

As one of the most significant Muslim religious figures during the first half of the 20th century, the life of Riḍā, his journal and his religious and political thought have been extensively studied (see bibliography). Biographical information on him is mostly taken from his autobiography, which he published more than thirty years after his migration to Egypt.³ His famous biography of his teacher Muḥammad ʿAbduh (1849-1905), *Tārīkh al-ʿUstādh al-ʾImām*, is also marked as one of the important sources for his life.⁴ By writing this work, Riḍā

---


not only ‘wrote the history of his Sheikh, [but also] what he did [himself] as though he were writing his own history as well.’

Born in al-Qalamūn, a village near Tripoli (Lebanon), in 1865, Riḍā belonged to a religious Sunnī family claiming its kinship to the descendants of the Prophet. In his young years, he was deeply involved into the Naqshabandī Ṣūfī Order. In the circle of Sheikh Mahmūd Nashshāba of Tripoli (1813-1890), Riḍā read the Ḥadīth collection of *al-ʿArbaʿīn al-Nawawiyya*, and obtained his *ʾijāza* (diploma) in the field of Prophetic Traditions. The well-known Muslim scholar Sheikh Husayn al-Jisr (1845-1909), the founder of the National Islamic School of Tripoli, extended to him another *ʾijāza* certifying him to teach and transmit religious knowledge. In al-Jisr’s school, emphasis was laid upon the combination between religious education and modern sciences, especially mathematics, natural sciences, French, alongside Arabic and Turkish. In the meantime, Riḍā’s uncle, Muḥammad Kāmil Ibn Muḥammad (1843-1939), taught him Arabic, and had an impact on his religious knowledge.

Riḍā’s fascination with the significance of the press for religious reform started when he came across some issues of the short-lived *al-ʿUrwa al-Wuthqā* (*The Firmest Bond*, co-published by Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī (1839-1897) and Muḥammad ʿAbduh during their exile in Paris) among his father’s papers. In his village Riḍā started his preaching career, and took the central mosque as a place for teaching religious sciences to its people, especially *Tafsīr* lessons. In his autobiography, he also mentioned that he regularly went to cafés to deliver

---

10 ʾAbyāḍ, *op. cit.*, p. 258.
sermons among Muslims, who were not habitual visitors of the mosque. He also gathered women in a room inside his house, where he instructed them about the rules of rituals and matters of worship.11

By the end of 1897, Riḍā had left his birthplace searching for more freedom in Egypt. A few months later, he embarked upon publishing the first issue of his journal *al-Manār*, the name he later exploited for his private printing house in Cairo. Islamic journalism experienced its earliest zenith in Egypt with the publication of Riḍā’s journal. Through this he established himself as the leading Salafī scholar in the Muslim world. From the time of its foundation, *al-Manār* became Riḍā’s life work in which he published his reflections on spiritual life, his explanations of Islamic doctrine, endless polemics, his commentary on the Qurʾān, *fatwās*, and his thoughts on world politics.12

Through his journal, Riḍā claimed himself to be the organ and disseminator of the reformist ideas of ‘Abduh, a man of paramount importance in his life. After ‘Abduh’s death, Riḍā established himself more as a leading heir to his reformist movement by taking over the commentary of the Qurʾān known as *Tafsīr al-Manār*, which ‘Abduh had begun. The impact of ‘Abduh on Riḍā’s thoughts is noticeable in his writings, especially those written before ‘Abduh’s death. In various ways, he imbibed ideas akin to those of his mentor, and was closely involved in his teacher’s vigorous defenses against the aspersions cast upon Islam.13 In his journal, for instance, Riḍā gave much attention to ‘Abduh’s debates on the comparison between Islam and Christianity, especially his well-known confrontations with the French historian and ex-minister of foreign affairs M. Gabriel Hanotaux (1853-1944)14

---

13 Assad Nimer Busool, ‘Sheikh Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā’s Relations with Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī and Muḥammad ‘Abduh,’ *The Muslim World* 66, 1976, pp. 272-286. There are still, however, other far-fetched theories, which attempt to disassociate Riḍā from ‘Abduh, and doubt that he was the real disseminator of his ideas. See the reconsideration of the Tunisian researcher Muḥammad al-Ḥaddād, one of Muḥammad Arkoun’s students, *Muḥammad ‘Abduh: Qirā’ah Jadīdah fī Khitāb al-ʾĪṣlāḥ al-Dīnī*, Beirut, 2003.
14 The article of Hanotaux appeared in the *Journal de Paris* in French in March and May 1900 under the caption: ‘Face to face with Islam and the Muslim Question.’ ‘Abduh’s reply firstly appeared in *al-Mu‘ayyad* and *al-Ahrām* journals, see, Riḍā,
and with the Christian journalist Faraḥ Anṭūn (1874-1922). In his answers to Westerners, ‘Abduh habitually attempted to explain his arguments with the help of Western works, primarily quoting from authors, such as John William Draper (1811-1882), Gustave Le Bon (1841-1931) and Edward Gibbon (1737-1794).

Unlike ‘Abduh, there is no mention in the available sources that Riḍā was an active member in any inter-religious society of his time. We know that ‘Abduh had founded a political-religious society known as Jamʿiyat al-Taʿlīf wā al-Taqrīb bayna al-ʿAdyān al-Samāwīyya during his stay in Beirut (circa 1885). Its major aim was to call for harmony and rapprochement among the so-called heavenly revealed religions. The society attracted many Jewish, Christian and Muslim (Shiʿī and Sunni) members. One of the political objectives behind the society was to try to diminish the pressure of European colonial powers in the Orient (especially among Muslims); and to improve the image of Islam in the West. The most prominent Christian members of this organisation were the Canon of York, Reverend Isaac Taylor (1829-1901) (see, chapter 3), and the Orthodox archimandrite Christophoros Gibāra (d. 1901). In his early years in


Hasselblatt, ibid., pp. 184-199.


Little is mentioned in the available sources about Gibāra. What I know about him so far is that he—despite having considered himself a Christian, denied the concept of Trinity. In his writings he endeavoured to bring the three religions—Judaism, Christianity and Islam—together. Georg Graf mentioned him in his work on the history of Christian Arabic literature; see Georg Graf, Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur, Citta del Vaticano, 1966, p. 165. According to the collection of the titles of Arabic books published in Egypt (1900-1925), Gibara was the author of Wifāq al-ʿAdyān wā Waḥdat al-ʿIsmāʾīlī fī al-Tawrāh wā al-ʾInjīl wā al-Qurʾān, Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Maʿārif, 1901, 64pp. See, ʿAydah Ibrāhīm Nuṣayr, al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyya al-Latī
Egypt, Riḍā constantly praised the members of the organisation, but never became a member. His sympathy probably resulted from the fact that ‘Abduh was its president. Despite his belief in the co-existence among religions, Riḍā’s interest in such ideas dwindled after ‘Abduh’s death.

As a ‘print’ scholar and mufti, Riḍā was able to reach readers from all over the world through his community-building works; and to take a highly prominent position in modern Muslim intellectual life in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. Since the early establishment of the journal, he managed to gain subscribers and to extend the influence of his religious ideas in Russia, Tunisia, India, Sudan, Sierra Leone, Bosnia, the Far East, Europe and America. Riḍā produced the majority of the articles published in the journal, but was keen on making it a good podium for many contributors among outstanding Arab men of letters concerning a wide range of religious matters, such as theology, law, historiography, and Qur’ānic exegesis.

Riḍā took a significant part in Islamic politics of his time. He renewed Afgānī’s call for pan-Islamic unity, and developed ʿAbduh’s ideas of returning back to the pristine Islam. He was one of the most

---

*Nushirat fi Miṣr BaynaʿAmay 1900-1925*, Cairo: American University in Cairo, 1983, p. 129. After Gibāra’s death, neither Christian nor Muslim groups accepted burying his body in their graveyards. In order to solve the problem, an Egyptian Christian witnessed before the Patriarch that the late Gibāra returned to his belief in the Orthodox Church before his death. Gibāra was then buried according to the Orthodox tradition. See, al-Manār, vol 4/12 (16 Jumāda al-ʿŪlā 1319/31 August 1901), pp. 478-480. More about Muslim polemics against Gibara and his journal Shahādat al-Haqq, see the work of Muḥammad Ḥabib, a Christian convert to Islam, al-Suyūf al-Battāra fi Madḥhab Khīrusṭuphoros Gibāra (The Amputating Sword to Christophoros Gibarah’s Doctrine), Cairo: al-ʿĀṣimah Press, 1313/circa 1895.


dedicated people to the idea of a caliphal government during the first quarter of the 20th century.Unlike his two forerunners Afghānī and ʿAbduh, Riḍā witnessed various upheavals in the Muslim world from the First World War to the abolition of the Caliphate. Riḍā reacted strongly to such events, and other ‘external dangers’ threatening the Muslim identity, especially the military armies of Europe occupying most of the Muslim lands, the Christian missionaries preaching their Gospel among Muslims, and the ideas and institutions imported from the West which influenced young Muslim minds in particular. Besides this he preoccupied himself with fighting other ‘internal danger,’ namely—superstitions and un-Islamic beliefs and practices, the attachment to the Taqlīd (imitation) and the abandonment of Ijtihād.

Following the Young Turk revolution in 1908 Riḍā returned to his homeland, Syria, and opened a propaganda campaign in favor of unity between Arabs and Turks in the Ottoman Empire. In the following year he traveled to Istanbul with two aims: to raise fund for his Islamic missionary school (see, chapter 3) and to help improve Arab-Turkish relations. He failed in both goals. In 1910, after a year in Istanbul, he reached the sad conclusion that Young Turks were just mocking him. After that, Riḍā no longer had faith in the Ottoman Empire. E. Tauber divided Riḍā’s political activism in the years preceding the First World War into two: open activity and secret activity. Open activity focused on his above-mentioned missionary Islamic school. Secret activity was expressed in the establishment of the ‘Society of the Arab Association.’ He saw the Great War as an opportunity for the Arabs to launch a revolt against the Ottomans and liberate their countries from the Empire’s yoke. He also tried to persuade the British Intelligence Department in Cairo of the influence which the Arab Association had on the Arab officers of the Ottoman army and the officers’ willingness to rebel against their Turkish and German commanders. His attitude towards the British has always been reserved on the account of their suspicions and their ambitions in regard to Arab countries. At that time Riḍā developed anti-

22 Id., ‘The Concept of Religious Authority according to Muhammad ʿAbduh and Rashid Riḍā,’ The Islamic Quarterly 30, 1986, p. 159.
23 E. Tauber, ‘Rashid Riḍā and Political Attitudes during World War I,’ The Muslim World 85/1-2, 1995, pp. 107-121
24 Ibid., p. 107
Hashimite feeling especially after King Ḥusayn rejected his plan for Arab union. Riḍā came therefore closer to the Saudi Royal family and their revival of the Wahhābī ideas, whose ideas he considered as the nearest to his Salafī views. He also believed that Ibn Saʿūd was the only person capable of expelling King Ḥusayn from the Ḥijāz. ²⁵

Riḍā stressed to Ibn Saʿūd the necessity of reaching an alliance between the rulers of the Arabian Peninsula in order to strengthen the political power of the Arabs. He approached Imam Yaḥyā of Yemen and al-Sayyid al-Idrīsī of ‘Asîr. The war prevented the continuation of contacts with Yaḥyā and al-Idrīsī. In 1912 Riḍā had gone to India on a lecture tour and on his way back to Egypt he passed through Kuwait and Masqat and made contacts with Arab leaders there, trying to persuade them of the necessity to establish an independent Arab state. ²⁶ His fear that the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire would fall into the hands of imperialist European powers was another important motive behind his establishment of the Arab Association. His fear increased after the defeat of the Empire by the Italians in Libya (1911) and its defeat in the Balkan War (1912-1913). For example, he published a pamphlet in which he strongly warned the Arabs of the intention of foreigners to gain control over Syria and the shores of the Arabian Peninsula as a first stage in their plan ‘to destroy the Kaʿba and transport the Black Stone and the ashes of the Prophet to the Louvre.’ ²⁷

Riḍā recapitulated the concept of Sunnism within the framework of Hanbalism. This led him to give fervent support to the revival of Wahhabism in Centeral Arabia. What attracted him in their doctrines was their call for pristine Islam and the full rejection of sainthood and superstitions. ²⁸ Riḍā disliked the later development of mystical thought and practice in Sunnī Islam. He regularly attacked what he saw as the ‘spiritual dangers’ of excessive mysticism. These practices within such mystic orders could lead to the neglect of the forms of worship indicated in the Qurʾān and Sunna. The neglect of religious duties by those Şūfīs could lead, in Riḍā’s mind, to weakness in Islamic society, and to the corruption of the umma by teaching that Islam is a religion of passive submission. ²⁹

²⁵ Ibid., p. 120
²⁷ As quoted in Ibid., p. 263
²⁸ Hourani, Arabic Thought, p. 231
²⁹ Ibid., p. 232
As evidenced in his unrelenting tide of writings, Riḍā placed a high premium on fighting against the state of stagnancy among Muslims, and defending Islam against its opponents. He endeavoured to achieve reform in the Muslim world while at the same time preserving its identity and culture. As a Muslim reformist, Riḍā not only has historical importance, but also continues to exercise overt influence on modern Muslim thought today. His journal, which started as a private project, signposted the path for many subsequent Muslim thinkers in developing their ideas on many political, social and religious issues. For instance, the religious activism and ideological career of Ḥasan al-Bannā (1904-1949), the founder of the movement of the Muslim Brothers, has its roots in Riḍā’s religious thought. As a young man, al-Bannā frequented his circle and regularly read his journal. He received his early religious training in Islam from his father Aḥmad al-Bannā, who was a close friend of Riḍā and a subscriber to his journal. Al-Bannā also attempted to continue Riḍā’s work by carrying on al-Manār after the latter’s death in 1935.

**Previous Studies**

A few studies have drawn attention to Riḍā’s views on Christianity. As early as 1920, Ignaz Goldziher noted that missionary writings in Arabic on Islam, namely in Egypt, lay the foundation for an ‘energetic reaction’ from the side of the group of al-Manār publicists. The Hungarian orientalist gave a short mention to the Arabic edition of the Gospel of Barnabas, describing it as ‘eine apokryphe Fälschung.’ In his own words:

Kräftiger ist die gegen die Missionsarbeit in umfangreichen Abhandlungen entfaltete positive Apologetik und Polemik. Zu bemerken ist der stetig wiederkehrende Hinweis auf die unbestrittene Authentie des Korans gegenüber der von christlich theologischer Seite selbst angezweifelten und bestrittenen Authentie ganzer grossen Teile der bibli-

---

30 Letter, Aḥmad al-Bannā to Riḍā, Cairo, 10 August, 1935; Riḍā’s private archive, Cairo.
In his *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*, Charles Adams hinted that *al-Manār* placed particular emphasis upon the necessity of counteracting Christian missions in the Muslim lands by forming the school of Dār al-Da’wa wā al-Irshād (he translated it as ‘the Society of Propaganda and Guidance’). He made brief mention of the anti-Christian writings of Riḍā and of *al-Manār*’s most prolific polemicist Muḥammad Tawfīq Ṣidqī (1881-1922), which we shall discuss in detail (see, chapter 6). In his study of the *al-Manār* commentary on the Qurʾān, the Dominican Islamicist Jacques Jomier devoted one chapter to the ideas of the commentary on Christianity and Judaism. The author noted that ‘le Commentaire du Manār parlera donc beaucoup de la personne de Jésus et de la Trinité.’ He discussed in some detail Riḍā’s counterattacks against missionary writings on Islam, and his views on the figure of Jesus, his presumed divinity, the Trinity, the authenticity of the Gospels, the Crucifixion, the veneration of saints, etc. He maintained that ‘la lutte, on le voit, est serrée et Rachīd Riḍā se lance dans une apologétique infatigable.’ At another level, Henri Laoust followed the great stages in the career of Riḍā with special emphasis on his role in the formulation of the modern Da’wa (or what he labelled as missionary apologetics), comparing his practices with those current in the Middle Ages. He paid little attention, however, to Riḍā’s works on Christianity and other principal publications, which he used as reading materials for future Muslim missionaries trained in his Dār al-Da’wa wā al-’Irshād.

As an attempt to understand the concept of ‘l’amitié des Musulmans pour les Chrétiens’ in the verses of al-Māʾidah (5: 82-83) and their place in the field of Christian-Muslim dialogue, Maurice Borrmans,
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33 Ibid., pp. 342-43.
37 Ibid., p. 307.
38 Ibid., p. 314.
the editor of the Catholic journal *IslamoChristiana*, made an annotated French translation of the *al-Manār* commentary on these passages.\(^{40}\) In the context of Muslim discussions on Christianity, the Lebanese scholar Mahmoud Ayoub analyzed Riḍā’s work *Shubuhāt al-Naṣārā wā Ḥujaj al-ʾIslām* (Allegations of Christians and Proofs of Islam), a collection of sixteen articles which firstly appeared in *al-Manār* (see, chapter 4). The author discussed a few themes of the book, comparing it with ʿAbduh’s above-mentioned work on Islam and Christianity, and with two later studies, namely: *Muḥāḍarāt fī al-Naṣrāniyya* by Sheikh Abū Zahrah (Cairo, 1965), and his *Muqāranat al-ʾAdyān* (Cairo, 1966).\(^{41}\) He concluded that the attitudes of both ʿAbduh and Riḍā were not intransigent, but could be regarded as conciliatory. ‘While asserting the superiority of Islam as a comprehensive guide for human life and a rational faith,’ Ayoub argued, ‘Riḍā wished that the men of faith in both Christian and Muslim communities would live in harmony and amity.’\(^{42}\) In her *Qurʾānic Christians*, Jane D. McAuliffe studied the interpretations of *Tafsīr al-Manār* as part of the long tradition of Islamic exegesis. She dealt mainly with such Christian themes as ‘Nazarenes of faith and action’ and the ‘followers of the Qurʾānic Jesus.’\(^{43}\) Christine Schirrmacher studied the introductions written by the Lebanese Christian Khalīl Saʿādeh (1857-1934) and Riḍā to the Gospel of Barnabas. In his Arabic translation of that Gospel, Saʿādeh depended on the English translation made by the Anglican clergyman and scholar, Lonsdale Ragg, and his scholarly collaborator and wife, Laura, from the Italian manuscript (preserved in the Austrian National Library in Vienna).\(^{44}\) Schirrmacher observed that Riḍā held an attitude similar to some Western scholars in the eighteenth century who were convinced the Gospel of Barnabas, because of its ancient pre-Islamic
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\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 60.


character, was not invented by Muslims. J. Toland was, however, ironical in his comment on the Gospel: ‘Here you have not a new Gospel, but also a true one, if you believe the Mahometans’ [...]

How great (by the way) is the ignorance of those, who make this [Gospel] as an original invention of the Mahometans!’ Although Schirrmacher placed both introductions in the context of prior Western treatment and of the later Muslim apologetic use of the Gospel, she did not critically examine the whole text of the introductions themselves, especially against the background of the whole corpus of al-Manār; including Riḍā’s perception of this Gospel before and after the appearance of his edition. Therefore, Saʿādeh’s introduction should be studied in relation to the English one of the Raggs, which he sometimes quoted literally.

In his Muslim Perceptions of Christianity, Hugh Goddard described Riḍā’s views in a similar brief way. For him, Riḍā’s works on Christianity were influenced by the Indian Muslim polemicist Raḥmatullāh al-Qairanāwī (1834-1891). In his three-page analysis, the author maintained that since Riḍā’s Arabic edition of the Gospel of Barnabas appeared it has become a standard work in Muslim writings about Christianity. In his Images of Jesus Christ in Islam, Oddbjørn Leirvik shortly examined the teachings of Jesus and the concept of the Crucifixion and death of Jesus according to the thoughts of both Riḍā and ʿAbduh and their general skepticism towards the canonical Gospels. Olaf Schumann dedicated one chapter of his work, Jesus the Messiah in Muslim Thought, to the ideas developed by ʿAbduh and the school of al-Manār on Jesus. The author studied Riḍā’s method of interpreting the relevant Qur’anic passages on the divinity of Jesus, his miracles, as well as his publication of the Gospel of Barnabas.
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46 John Toland, Naẓarenus or Jewish, Gentile and Mahometan Christianity, London, 1718, p. 15.
47 Ibid., p. 17.
50 Olaf Schumann, Jesus the Messiah in Muslim Thought, ISPCK/HMI, 2002, pp. 112-144; id., Der Christus der Muslime: christologische Aspekte in der arabisch-islamischen Literatur, Cologne/Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1988; id., ‘Arabische Schrift-
In his PhD thesis, Simon Wood made an annotated translation of Riḍā’s aforementioned work *Shubuhāt al-Naṣārā*.

Riḍā’s writings, Wood argued, ‘reflect an overwhelming awareness of Muslim weakness relative to non-Muslim strength. The tone of calm confidence one finds in earlier classical Arabic texts is altogether lacking in the works of Riḍā and his contemporaries.’ In Wood’s view, following Riḍā’s steps, later contemporary influential Muslim thinkers staunchly upheld the ‘traditional supersessionist position on pluralism in general and Christianity in particular.’ Wood applied the term of ‘supersessionism’ in studying Muslim traditions. The same view was held by the controversial polemicist Bat Ye’or, who defined the Muslim ‘supersessionist’ current as claiming that the whole Biblical history of Israel and Christianity was Islamic history, that all the Prophets, Kings of Israel and Judea, and Jesus were Muslims. That the People of the Book should dare to challenge this statement is intolerable arrogance for an Islamic theologian. Jews and Christians were thus deprived of their Holy Scriptures and of their salvific value.

**Sources and Organization of the Study**

The current study makes use of several sources. First of all, it aims at examining the bulky corpus of *al-Manār*, attempting to trace the development of the thoughts of its author on Christianity and missionary activities of his time, and to determine the circumstances, which affected his discourse.

Besides surveying *al-Manār*, I will make use of Riḍā’s private papers remaining in his personal archive in the possession of his family in
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52 Ibid., p. 22.

53 Ibid., p. 59.

Cairo.55 The archive contains thousands of papers, letters, documents, and published and unpublished manuscripts. The papers were unorganised in carton boxes and plastic bags. I have generally studied and organised the whole collection, which can be divided as follows:

1) His diaries, which date from his arrival in Egypt in 1897. I have found about 25 booklets in which he registered his personal memoirs, telling us about his health problems, national and international events, his meetings with various figures, his living costs and the administrative affairs of al-Manār, etc.

2) Documents of Arab organisations and societies to which he contributed, such as Shams al-ʾIslām (The Sun of Islam), the aforementioned Dār al-Daʿwa wal-ʾIrshād, and Jamʿiyyat al-Rābiṭa al-Sharqiyya (Association of Oriental League).

3) His correspondences with contemporary Muslim and Arab figures.

4) Other personal documents and belongings, such as the contract of the establishment of Dār al-Manār, his bank transactions, and the documents of the waqf of al-Qalamūn Mosque, established by his family in his village of origin.

5) Drafts of published and unpublished memoirs and articles by ʿAbduh.

In the course of the preparation of the present study, and as a result of my findings in Riḍā’s archive, I managed to discover the family archives of two of Riḍā’s associates. The first one contains the archival material of the Syro-Turkish ex-military captain in the Ottoman army Zekī Ḥishmat Kirām (1886-1946), which was preserved by his son in Kornwestheim, near Stuttgart in Germany. Kirām was one of Riḍā’s informants and translators, who also kept Riḍā up to date about the developments of German orientalism, and briefed him about the situ-
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55 The research took place in July-August 2004. I am very indebted to Riḍā’s grandson Mr. Fuʿād Riḍā for giving me access to the papers of his family archive in Cairo. Some of the materials of this collection have been used in two earlier studies. In his biography of Riḍā, Ahmad al-Sharabāṣī made use of many documents of the archive in documenting Riḍā’s life and works; A. al-Sharabāṣī, Rashid Riḍā ʾṢāḥib al-Manār ʾAṣruhu wā Ḥayātuḥ wā Maṣādīr Thaqāfatih, Cairo, 1970. In his study, Ahmad Fahd al-Shawābika also employed the archive material in sketching Riḍā’s political and intellectual life; A. Fahd al-Shawābika, Muḥammad Rashid Riḍā wā dawruh fī al-Ḥayāh al-Fikriyya wā al-Siyāsiyya, ’Ammān: Dār ’Ammār, 1989; originally a PhD thesis presented to the Department of History at ʾAyn Shams University in Cairo in 1986.
Polemics are never produced in a vacuum. They should always be seen against the background of their author’s political and social context. The first three chapters of this study try to set a clear scene for assessing al-Manār’s views of Christianity. It is also important to underscore the development of al-Manār’s contributions to Christianity by analysing Riḍā’s major polemical works on the subject in more detail; and to investigate his position, which went through a full circle of development in more than three decades.

The first chapter investigates the methods that Riḍā, who had no command of Western languages, used in compensating his lack of direct access to primary sources on the West. As al-Manār’s views on Christianity and polemics against Christian missions comprised a part of Riḍā’s whole understanding of the West, I would argue that one should first look at al-Manār’s sources of knowledge of the West before discussing his polemics on Christianity. The chapter will try to map out a significant part of the literary setting of Riḍā’s journal in that regard by dwelling upon two different aspects. First of all, we focus on Riḍā’s readings of various translated European works, which
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56 Special gratitude is due to Dr. Harūn Zekī Kirām, Kornwestheim–Germany, his son, for gifting me the whole archive of his father during my one-week research in Germany in January 2005.

57 It took place in January-February 2006. I express my thanks to Dr. Abdel-Illāh ljami, who introduced me to al-Hilālī’s family, Mr. Abdel-Ghani Bū Zekrī, the grandson of al-Hilālī, and Dr. Mohammad Daraouī of the University of Meknès, one of Hilālī’s students, for their generosity and good reception during my stay in Morocco.

58 Emad Eldin Shahin, Through Muslim Eyes: M. Rashīd Riḍā and the West, Virginia: IIIT, 1994, p. 91 (Quoted below, Eyes). Peter Watson was mistaken when he stated that Riḍā spoke several European languages and studied widely among the sciences. See his ‘Islam and the West: why it needn’t be war,’ The Times, London, 29 April, 2004.
In his polemics, Riḍā made use of Western discussions on Christianity and discoveries on Biblical themes which were investigated in Arabic journals and newspapers of his time. It has sometimes been very difficult to trace the Western sources used in al-Manār, since Riḍā usually cited titles in Arabic translation with names of authors transliterated in Arabic. During my research I have managed to identify most of these cases and their religious backgrounds, especially within the history of Christian modern movements and controversies in Europe. Two cases are selected for further special analysis. We firstly examine the controversy known as the Babel-und-Bibel-Streit (1903), which had been launched by the German Professor of Assyriology and Semitic languages Friedrich Delitzsch (1850-1922). Riḍā used this case as a tool in order to prove the Qur’ānic insistence on the corruption of the Holy Scriptures. The second one is his reaction to the Arabic translation of the Encyclopedia of Islam (EI), and his harsh response to the analysis developed by the Dutch orientalist A.J. Wensinck (1882-1939) on the figure of ‘Ībrāhīm. This affair led to the dismissal of Wensinck from his post as a member of the Royal Academy of the Arabic Language in Cairo in 1933. As his ideas were not agreeable with Islamic traditions on this subject, and were considered disrespectful by many Muslim religious circles, Wensinck’s dismissal came after an anti-orientalist press campaign, initiated mostly by religious activists. As the two cases are different both with regard to their contents as well as dates (the first from 1903 and the second from 1933), a comparison between the two reflects how Riḍā’s treatment of such subjects had changed over the years. In the second place, we shall discuss the question of how Riḍā’s network in the Muslim world and abroad played an important role in his acquisition of knowledge both on topics pertinent to Christianity and on Western scholarly works on Islam. The three hitherto unstudied archives will be of great importance for this part. To establish the precise extent
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of this transnational network would fall outside the scope of the chapter. But some unpublished documents present an interesting picture of his regular requests to friends with knowledge of Western works to brief him with Arabic translations. We will focus our attention on some of the prominent figures, known as the Manār literary group, who contributed to the journal with their reflections on the West and Christianity or directly with polemical reactions to Christian writers. Our point is not to discuss individual interpretations, but rather to make a coherent presentation of those contributors, whose thoughts would imply positions accepted by Riḍā himself.

In the second chapter we shall examine the diversity of Riḍā’s relations with prominent Arab Christian luminaries by illustrating his cooperation, conflicts, and religious and political confrontations with them. What concern us here are his intellectual (mis)perceptions of this generation of Christians, who made a great contribution to the formation of the modern history of the Arab world. In order to get a good overview, three different aspects are put forward for discussion. Firstly, as a point of departure we briefly sketch Riḍā’s political activities with other Syrian Christian nationalists who had similar political ideas. A more focused attempt is made to revisit responses to the writings of Syrian Christian intellectual émigrés, such as Faraḥ Anṭūn (1874-1922), Jurjī Zaidān (1861-1914), the Syrian doctor Shiblī Shumayyil (1850-1917), Khalīl Saʿādeh, and others. Most of these Christian partners were very critical of their own religion and its clergy. Secondly, it will be important to shift the discussion to investigate some of Riḍā’s heavy responses to the mouthpiece of the Syrian Jesuit community, al-Machreq, and its criticism of his ideas, especially his last work, al-Waḥī al-Muḥammadi (mentioned below, al-Waḥī). Why was Riḍā more drawn to these secularists (who were of Christian origin, but sharp critics of the clerics and the ʿUlamā), while vigorously attacking the Jesuit magazine for its critique of Islam? Thirdly, the chapter moves to speak about Riḍā’s attitude towards the question of Egyptian nationalism and the status of the native Egyptian Coptic community. For the sake of comparison, it is appropriate to probe Riḍā’s relationship with them over the years. An important historical point was his reaction to the Coptic Congress in 1911 in Asyūṭ (Southern Egypt). The prime reason behind organising the Congress was the assassination of the Coptic Prime Minister Buṭrus Ghali Pasha

in 1910 by a member of the National Party, the 25 year-old Ibrahīm Naṣīf al-Wardānī. This period is considered as one of the most critical points in the history of the Muslim-Coptic relations in Egypt. The Copts had seen his assassination as the culmination of the anti-Christian propaganda by Muslims. The Congress resulted in a petition briefing Coptic demands, which was presented to the Khedive and the British. As a Muslim thinker, Riḍā immediately embarked on responding to the Coptic demands in a series of articles, which he later collected in his work: *Muslims and Copts or the Egyptian Congress*. 

The third chapter is devoted to a general overview of al-Manār’s response to missionary work by analysing the reflections of Riḍā and his associates on the theological and social effects of missions in the Muslim world in the late 19th and early 20th century. We shall see that even Riḍā’s separate works on Christianity came as reaction to missionary attacks against Islam and its doctrines. As Christian missionary groups in Western colonies used to consider themselves the religious spokesmen of the dominant Western civilisation, Riḍā’s understanding of missions should be seen within the background of the history of European colonialism. By investigating Riḍā’s views over the years, the chapter paves the way for the last four chapters by specifically highlighting al-Manār’s various confrontations with the missionary enterprise in the Muslim world. What was the nature of Riḍā’s combat against missions? How did he judge missionary education? We shall also consider Riḍā’s deployment of his energetic activity of Daʿwa and his aspiration for the conversion of non-Muslims to Islam, such as the well-known case of Lord Headley in England. He saw the conversion of Europeans to Islam as a sharp indication
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of the failure of Christian missions to convert highly educated and real Muslims. How did Riḍā understand the significance of propaganda for religions? Did he relate the missionary work to colonialism? How far did he interact with his Muslim readers in their daily encounter with missionary work? How effective were his efforts of enhancing Islamic missionary work in the face of Christian missionary work?

The fourth chapter takes up a detailed analysis of Riḍā’s above-mentioned work Shubuhāt al-Naṣārā, which has been recently translated in English by Simon Wood. As a collection of articles (later compiled in one volume), this specific work represents al-Manār’s formative views, which Riḍā began to write as response to a variety of Christian publications on Islam as early as 1901, two years after his arrival in Egypt. As Riḍā wrote his replies occasionally, his articles came out as incoherent, but full of lively polemics against various contemporary missionary writings on Islam. For the sake of clarity, I shall not follow the chronological order of Riḍā’s discussions according to their appearance in al-Manār. In order to have a more systematic analysis of his ideas, it is appropriate to set up the structure of the chapter on the basis of the replies Riḍā developed to each of his counterparts separately. The most significant among these Christian writings were: 1) a piece of work by a certain Niqūlā Ya’qūb Ghabiyyāl, an Egyptian missionary, which he entitled as Researches of the Diligent in the dispute between Christians and Muslims,64 2) the Protestant monthly magazine, The Glad Tidings of Peace, which was founded by a certain George Aswan in the town of Bilbis (al-Sharqiyya province) in 1901,65 and 3) the mouthpiece of the Society of Christian Education
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of the Orthodox Church, *The Standard of Zion*, which was founded in 1894. Unfortunately I have not been able so far to find the last two works. We depend in our investigation on Riḍā’s citations of them.

The fifth chapter assesses Riḍā’s attempt to search for a ‘true’ Gospel by discussing his acceptance of the controversial Gospel of Barnabas. We shall discuss Riḍā’s previous initiative to find another ‘true’ Gospel by publishing some fragments from the Gospel according to Tolstoy before his publication of the Arabic edition of Barnabas. I will also show that his introduction to the Gospel was one of his many strenuous efforts to prove the authenticity of the Islamic narrative on Jesus and his disciples, and his prediction of the coming of the prophet Muhammad. In order to determine Riḍā’s motives for publishing this Gospel, we shall focus on this Arabic edition by studying the two Arabic introductions, one written by Saʿādeh as its translator and the other by Riḍā as publisher. It should be noted that Riḍā published the Gospel in two different editions: one prefaced by the two introductions, and the second including the text of the translation without any preface, which he probably published as a cheaper and popular edition. Riḍā, however, published his own preface in *al-Manār* simultaneously with the publication of the Gospel. The reason why he did not print that of Saʿādeh in his journal is not known. Another question that springs to the mind of any researcher of the Arabic edition is: why would Saʿādeh, as a Christian, embark upon such an initiative, and cooperate with Riḍā, while being aware of the sensitivity of the whole subject? Did Saʿādeh actually believe in the authenticity of the Gospel of Barnabas? Another significant point is that no previous research, to my best knowledge, has studied Riḍā’s publication of this Gospel against the background of the response of indigenous Christians of his age. Also *al-Manār* does not give a clear picture about whether there had been any anti-Barnabas polemics on the part of Christians in the Muslim world. It is significant, therefore, to examine: how did the Christians (especially in Egypt) perceive the Gospel, when they saw it translated into Arabic and published by a Syrian Muslim? What kind of polemical tone did they develop against it and
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66 Arabic: *Rāyat Soḥyūn: Majalla ʿIlmiyya Dīniyya*. No. 1569, see, *Reviues*, p. 84; and the *Fahras*, p. 143.
its publisher? In this chapter a hitherto unstudied anti-Manār treatise is presented. In the light of Riḍā’s relation with the Coptic community, we shall examine the reaction of an Egyptian Muslim convert to Christianity and a follower of the Anglican missionary Temple Gairdner (1873-1928) against the Gospel under the title: The Helmet of Salvation from the Hunting Trap of the Fra-Marinian Gospel of Barnabas. The author of the treatise was a certain ʿIskandar Effendi ʿAbd al-Masīḥ al-Bājūrī, who identified himself as the ‘missionary of Giza.’

The sixth chapter evaluates the polemical contributions of the above-mentioned prolific polemicist Tawfīq Ṣidqī to Riḍā’s journal. It is a follow-up to the first chapter in which we discuss some biographical information about him. In the period 1912-1916, Ṣidqī achieved considerable prominence in al-Manār due to his writings on various subjects, especially those related to the reliability of the Sunna, Christianity, and the application of modern medical and scientific discoveries to Islamic concepts. Most relevant for us in the chapter are his polemical articles, in which he, as a physician, was able to extensively exploit English critical works on Christianity and the life of Jesus. He also attempted to analyse a wide range of Biblical passages in order to prove many ‘errors’ and ‘contradictions,’ which could not be explained away. Our discussion shall centre on three works: 1) The Religion of God in the Books of His Prophets, 2) The Doctrine of Crucifixion and Salvation, and 3) A View on the Scriptures of the New Testament and Christian Doctrines. All three
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68 Tawfīq Ṣidqī, Dīn Allah fī Kutub ʾAnbyāʾih, Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Manār, 1330/1912 (Cited below, Dīn). For technical reasons, I shall use the treatises, not the articles, as references below.

69 Rashīd Riḍā & Tawfīq Ṣidqī, ʿAqīda al-Ṣalb wā al-Fidā, Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Manār, 1331/1913 (Cited below, ʿAqīda)

works were first published as articles in *al-Manār*, and later compiled in separate treatises. Riḍā always published Ṣidqī’s views alone, except in the case of the *Doctrine*. In corporation with him, Riḍā published the first edition of this treatise in 1331 (circa 1913). *Al-Manār* later published several editions. The first part contained Riḍā’s commentary on the Qur’anic verse related to the slaying and Crucifixion of Jesus (Sūrat al-Nisāʾ, 157), earlier published in *Tafsīr al-Manār*. At the request of some of his readers, Riḍā decided to publish his commentary as a supplementary part to Ṣidqī’s views. As the chapter is primarily devoted to a systematic and general analysis of Ṣidqī’s ideas, I shall elaborate on Riḍā’s reflections at the end of our discussion in order to keep the thematic lines of discussion as clear as possible. It is not my intention to rehearse all the christological attitudes expounded by Ṣidqī at length. My purpose is to examine these particular works, and to study their methods and the sources they have used.

The *seventh* chapter closes the analysis by examining how Riḍā exploited all these views in his *fatwās*. *Fatwās* are very important sources, not only because they enable us to understand the muftī’s thoughts but they also reflect the urgent and appealing themes occupying Muslim societies. The chapter aims at serving two purposes. First of all, it sums up some elements which Riḍā already raised in his discussions on Christianity. Since its very beginning, different people in various regions brought their petitions to *al-Manār* inquiring about many subjects, including theological issues related to other religions. Secondly, it examines Riḍā’s thinking in a wider perspective by focusing on the reception of his ideas by studying the dynamic contact with his readers. As we shall see, the petitions of most of these *fatwās* came as a result of the encounter of those Muslims with Christians and missionaries. The questions to be answered here are: What were the most urgent topics in the minds of his questioners? What was the influence of missionary activities and polemics against Islam (as circulated among Muslims of that time) on the contents of the questions?

Each chapter ends with a conclusion in which a summary of the headlines of its arguments and general remarks is mentioned. The whole study will be ended with a general conclusion in which its main observations are summarised.
Before dealing with Riḍā’s sources of knowledge, it is significant to note that various researchers have already agreed that Western writings of the Higher Biblical Criticism which emerged in European universities in the 19th century had a great deal of influence on Muslim apologetic literature on Christianity. All the critical questions regarding the Biblical miracles and historical events were rapidly transferred to the Muslim lands, especially after the famous debate between the German missionary Karl Gottlieb Pfander (1803-1865) and the above-mentioned Indian polemicist al-Qairanāwī. Al-Qairanāwī used different works of famous European theologians, such as Thomas Hartwell Horne (1780-1862) and David Friedrich Strauss (1808-1874), who were influenced by the historical criticism of European theology. The Pfander-Qairanāwī public debate represents a crucial point in Christian-Muslim controversy in the modern time.1 The arguments used by al-Qairanāwī affected most of the subsequent Muslim writings, including those of Riḍā, who often praised him as a great debater.

Albert Hourani described Riḍā as a Muslim scholar, who ‘belonged to the last generation of those who could be fully educated and yet alive in a self-sufficient Islamic world of thought.’ 2 Riḍā, moreover,


2 Hourani, Arabic Thought, p. 83.
believed that if it were not for the Church, for politicians, and for the inner decay of the Islamic tenets of faith, Europe might well become Muslim.  

Unlike his mentor ʿAbduh (who had close personal relations with a number of Europeans, traveled more than once in Europe, and was able to read French), Ridi could not read in any foreign language, except very little Turkish. But he managed to draw his vast knowledge of the Western world from various sources. On more than one occasion, he stated that he acquired his primary experience about the modern progress of the West, when he was in Lebanon through his discussions and personal contact with those whom he labelled as ‘liberal Christian intellectuals’ and with American missionaries. As a studious visitor of American missionary bookshops and Christian societies, he started to read their books and journals, such famous Arabic journals as al-Muqṭataf and al-Ṭabib. In addition, the Arab world witnessed at this time a rapid increase in the number of translated books in various fields. Publishing ventures (mostly dominated by Syrian Christians) brought their readers news and popular treatment of Western thought and institutions from many perspectives. This provided Ridi with another opportunity to compensate his inability to read in Western languages with the help of translated books.6

The present chapter is devoted to study Ridi’s attempts to find his sources of knowledge on the West. Although al-Manār gives a good picture of Ridi’s line of thought in this regard, his remaining papers in the family archive could add to our knowledge more about other dynamic factors, which obviously contributed to al-Manār’s conceptualisation of the West in general, and of Christianity in particular. A detailed analysis of Ridi’s sources would go beyond the scope of this study. I also admit that it will be unattainable to systematically trace all the sources exploited by Ridi throughout his journal’s thirty-
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3 Ibid., p. 236.
4 ʿAbduh was a friend of the English writer Wilfrid Scawen Blunt. See, Blunt’s diaries, My Diaries: Being a Personal Narrative of Events, 2 parts, London: Martin Secker, 1918. See also the account of his visit accompanied by Blunt to the English philosopher Herbert Spencer in his house in Brighton (August 1903), part II, pp. 69-70.
seven years of publication. Selecting representative samples of these sources, however, would be sufficient to evaluate adequately the kind of approach he was using both in his criticism of other religions and his own justification for defending Islam.

1.1. Western Ideas in Arabic Print

In his pioneering study of Rīḍā’s views on the West, Shahin has noted that the introduction of many European writings on sociology, jurisprudence and politics into the modern Arabic literary movement played an important role in moulding the political and social awareness of Muslim thinkers. In 1876, for instance, a disciple of Afghānī translated *Histoire de la Civilization en Europe* by the French historian F. Guizot. ʿAbduh also admired the book and read it to his Azhari students in his house.7

Rīḍā too was keenly aware of the significance of making use of such works in his journal. Shahin has traced a few of the Western works, which Rīḍā read and fully admired. Among the names which his journal introduced and reviewed were Dumas, Tolstoy, Hugo and Homer, Gustave Le Bon, E. Desmoulins, Shaw, and others. Three pieces of writing which had a particularly profound impact on his thought, and that he frequently quoted in *al-Manār*, were Le Bon’s *Les Lois Phycologiques de l’évolution des Peuples*, Desmoulins’ *A Quoi Tient la Supériorité des Anglo-Saxons?*, and Spencer’s *Education and The Principles of Sociology*.8 One of his most important objectives in analysing them was, besides, to sustain his arguments against Western missionary assaults on Islam. He and his group of apologists often quoted these studies in order to justify Islam as a way of life that is in harmony with the 20th century ethics and beliefs.9

In its early years, *al-Manār* enthusiastically reviewed works translated by the Egyptian jurist Aḥmad Fathī Zaghlūl (1863-1914),10 such as his translation of *L’Islam: impressions et etudes* by Henry de Castries.
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7 Shahin, *Eyes*, p. 25.
8 Ibid., p. 27.
10 Ibid., Zaghlūl was the brother of the well-known political leader Sa’d Zaghlūl, who was known for his translations of works by people such as Jeremy Bentham on the principles of Legislation, ad the French works of Descartes, Desmoulins and Le Bon, see, Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid, *Egypt and Cromer, A Study in Anglo-Egyptian Relations*, London: John Murray, 1968, p. 152
(1850-1927). Riḍā’s citation of Zaghlūl’s translation was said to contribute largely to the fame of his journal among the Egyptian audiences. As a result of their reading of Zaghlūl’s translation in al-Manār, a group of notable jurists and lawyers became subscribers to the journal. In the period October 1899-September 1906, al-Manār published a translation series of the educational work, L’Émile du dix-neuvième siècle, by the French writer Alphonse Esquiros (d. 1876). The translation was prepared for al-Manār by the Egyptian jurist ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Efendi Muḥammad, the attorney general at the Zaqāzīq Court in the Nile Delta, who was motivated by ʿAbduh to translate the book.

Riḍā believed that most of these European philosophers and writers had not entirely relinquished religion, but rejected the traditions of the Church and perceived its hierarchy as responsible for their backwardness. As compared with missionaries and Western medieval writers, he admitted the moderateness of some of these modern Western scholars who studied Islam fairly and did not intend to attack its scriptures and history blindly. He moreover criticised Muslim scholars for not taking any initiative to learn foreign languages or at least to know what is written in foreign languages on their religion. Admiring the ideas contained in such works, he constantly urged his Muslim fellow scholars to use them as a good instrument in ‘convincing Europe that Islam is a religion of knowledge and cultivation.’

In a similar way, Arabic journals extensively published many of the views of Western writers and politicians on Islam and Muslims, which Riḍā also eagerly followed and used in his refutation of any attack on Islam. An important example was his regular citation from the London-based monthly review The Nineteenth Century and After, which was a widely known periodical in Arab journals. He selected

---

11 Paris: Colin, 1896. The book was also quoted by subsequent Muslim scholars, such as Muḥammad al-Ghazālī, see, al-Tāʿāṣub wā al-Tasāmuḥ bayna al-Masiḥiyya wā al-ʿIslām, Cairo, 1965, pp. 149-196.
12 Riḍā, Tārīkh, pp. 1006-1007.
15 Shahin, Eyes, p. 68.
some of its articles containing views of Western scholars on Eastern and Islamic issues. He also knew the name of the Scottish diplomat and writer David Urquhart (1805-1877), and some of his writings on the ‘spirit of the East.’ In February 1914, he quoted and gave a detailed commentary on a lecture delivered in the same year by the Dutch orientalist Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje (1857-1936) at Columbia University on the religious state of Muslims and the relationship between Islam and Christianity in the Dutch East Indies, which was earlier translated by the Syrian Arabic journal *al-Hudā.*

Riḍā’s illustration of these views sometimes carried a double message to those whom he considered ‘atheists among Muslims.’ For instance, he quoted the New York-based tri-weekly Arabic newspaper *al-Bayān* on the renunciation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South to the Lausanne Treaty between the U.S. and Turkey. The background of that event dates back to 1923, when the Presbyterian missionary groups denounced this treaty. Later in 1926, Bishop William T. Manning of the Episcopal Church induced 110 bishops to sign a memorial in which they condemned it, as they believed that it negatively affected their missionary work by enforcing laws that would prohibit the teaching of religion. But Senator William Edgar Borah (1865-1940), the Chairman of the Senate’s Foreign Affairs Committee and the Administration, backed the treaty by rejecting their appeal because of his country’s international commercial and political
relations. Riḍā drew the attention of those whom he named ‘geographical’ Muslims to the renunciation of those bishops of the treaty as a sign of their strong religious sentiments and solidarity. Those Muslims should learn a lesson from that, and should not be ‘tempted’ by any slogans indicating that Europe was completely on the secularization path. Religion, in Riḍā’s evaluation, was still playing an important role in Western politics.

At another level, al-Manār polemicised against Christianity by using the well-known controversy around the views of the former dean of Saint Paul’s Cathedral in London W.R. Inge (1860-1954) on Christianity. Inge was known in his time as the ‘outspoken Dean’ or sometimes ‘Mr. Valiant-for-Truth.’ In his career, he contributed extensively to different magazines and papers. In April 1927, Riḍā eagerly cited a report made by The Daily Express on some of Inge’s conclusions on the relationship between the natural sciences and religious knowledge, which he had set out in a book under the title Science, Religion and Reality. The book had ‘a practical object, that of indicating possible terms of peace [...] between religion and science.’ Riḍā quoted The Daily Express which described the controversy as a ‘bombshell with heavy clatters’ in the body of Christian churches. As a modernist (although he himself disliked the term), Inge accepted the ‘unfettered’ criticism of the Bible in general, but he felt strongly the tension it created for orthodoxy. He rejected the miracles as props or proofs for the Christian creed, and made a clear distinction between natural and supernatural sciences. Riḍā’s

30 Fox, op. cit., pp. 174-175.
idealism led him wonder: ‘Had Inge read his writings [in al-Manâr] on the miraculous nature of [the Qur’ân], he would have become one of its preachers.’ He even added that ‘Inge, and people like him, searching for [the truth] had no other resort but the religion of the Qur’ân, which combines ‘reason’ with ‘heart,’ and is supported by logic and science.’

Al-Manâr was always searching for Western views which might support the Islamic views that negated the divinity of Jesus. For example, Riḍâ quoted an article from the Swiss daily Journal de Genève (27 January 1928) dealing with a controversial lecture given in Geneva on early Christian history. Riḍâ had received the Arabic text of the article from one of his readers who had a good command of French. It referred to a lecture delivered by the Swiss theologian Auguste Lemaitre (1887-1970) at the Society of Protestant Friends in Geneva in which he raised critical questions on various subjects, including the divinity of Jesus. The Journal commented that the problem of the nature of Jesus is as old as Christianity. All Churches, Protestant or Catholic, still believe in his divinity, and make this article of faith a basis of their theology. Faith in the divinity of Jesus requires a new rational theory regarding the relation between the Father and the Son. As a liberal theologian, Lemaitre was against ‘rigidity’ and ‘returning back to old formulas.’ He argued that ‘investigating the essence of God and the approach of understanding of the real meaning of Christ in history changes through ages. It is possible that the relationship between Christ and God is neither decided at the moment, nor in any historical period. It is rather better to amend the constitutions of faith according to the age while completely keeping up the traditions; but one should seek the real links between this tradition and the modern age.’ Riḍâ was convinced that such Christian forums

---

31 Al-Manâr, vol. 28/2, op. cit., p. 149.
32 Ibid.
34 Ibid., p. 693
in the West would be enough verification that the Qur’ān had brought forward clear-cut evidence with regard to the Christian belief many centuries ago. In this vein, he continued, the Church resisted such voices, since it was worried that Christians would one day become free-thinking and their researchers would convert in droves to Islam.\textsuperscript{36}

Religious developments in Germany, especially Adolf Hitler’s pressure on German churches, were also widely discussed in Egyptian journals. In 1934, for instance, Riḍā published two articles on what he titled: ‘The Nazi Irreligious Movement and the Bravery and Frankness of the Vatican,’ and ‘Religious Conflicts among German Protestant Sects.’\textsuperscript{37} The historical background of these two articles was the opposition of a group of young pastors to Hitler and the policy of ‘Nazification’ of the German Protestant Churches, when he had nominated the fervent pro-Nazi bishop Ludwig Müller (1883-1945) as the country’s Reichsbishop and ‘Delegate and plenipotentiary for all questions concerning the Evangelical churches.’ The resistance movement, known as the so-called *Bekennende Kirche* (or Confessing Church), was primarily led by Martin Niemöller (1892-1984), Dietrich Bonhöffer (1906-1945) and Heinrich Gruber (1891-1975).\textsuperscript{38} The Pope was alarmed by the whole series of events, especially by the conflict with the Evangelical church. The Vatican expressed its serious anxiety about the Church and Germany, and that it might be a rehearsal for a similar treatment of the Catholics.\textsuperscript{39} Al-Manār also referred to the rejection of the Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg (1893-1946) of the fundamental tenets of the Christian doctrine, and his desire to build up what Riḍā called ‘a new racist religion.’\textsuperscript{40} Riḍā did not give any analysis of the situation, except a short comment that ‘Germany and

\textsuperscript{36} Al-Manār, vol. 29/9, p. 695.

\textsuperscript{37} Al-Manār, vol. 34/1 (Muḥarram 1535/May 1934), pp. 73-78. Al-Manār cited here the Egyptian dailies, *al-Muqaṭṭam* (7 March, 1934) and *Kawkab al-Sharq* (12 April 1934).


\textsuperscript{39} Conway, ibid., p. 100.

\textsuperscript{40} ‘Al-Nizā’ al-Dīnī fī Almāniya: Ba’d Riḍā al-Kanīsah yataḥadawna al-Nāzī (Religious conflict in Germany: Some Clergymen challenge Nazism),’ al-Manār, vol. 33/9 (Dhū al-Qi‘da 1352/February 1934), pp. 692-696. Al-Manār quoted here another article published in *Kawkab al-Sharq* (22 January 1934). Rosenberg pleaded for a new ‘religion of the blood,’ based on defending the Arian soul and its noble character. More about Rosenberg’s ideas on Christianity, see, for example, Richard Steigmann-
its people—the most civilised in the world— […] were trying to get rid of such a ‘falsified’ religion [Christianity], which is contradictory to scientific facts and rational self-evident truths; […] including] its strict rules, church system, big wealth, fanaticism of its bishops and priests, and their spiritual authority on the people.’

Within the above-mentioned context, archaeological discoveries on Biblical themes on the one hand and Western contemporary discussions on Biblical figures and their relation to Islam on the other attracted al-Manār’s attention. We turn now to compare Riḍā’s early polemical treatment of the discovery of the Code of Hammurabi and the famous Babel-und-Bibel-Streit with his later harsh response to the release of the Arabic translation of the Encyclopaedia of Islam and the ideas of A.J. Wensinck, mentioned above.

1.1.1. Hammurabi and the Babel-und-Bibel-Streit (1903)

Riḍā considered such discoveries as ‘great news,’ ‘a step from within Europe [to] jump to Islam,’ ‘a new line of thought in Christianity,’ and ‘the appearance of a new Qur’ānic sign.’ Al-Manār must have depended on various Arabic papers and journals, which followed these discussions. In his journal, Faraḥ Anṭūn (see, chapter 2), for instance, published lengthy quotations from Western and Arabic periodicals on this subject as front-page in his famous paper al-Jāmiʿa. Friedrich Delitzsch was the major figure behind the Streit. In his lectures, delivered at the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft before an audience including the emperor of Germany Wilhelm II (1859-1941), Delitzsch found a certain relationship between the Old Testament and Assyrian creation myths. He not only pointed to the presence of Babylonian ideas in Biblical texts, but ultimately opposed the Church’s concept of divine revelation as well. His ideas on the subject triggered


41 Al-Manār, vol. 34/1, p. 78.


vehement controversies and many articles appeared contradicting him.\textsuperscript{44}

Riḍā was aware of the historical arguments that the Mosaic laws were similar to the Code of Hammurabi, whose black diorite block (2.25 metre) had been discovered in 1901 under the ruins of Susa, the ancient capital of Babylon.\textsuperscript{45} He maintained that German scholars identified King Hammurabi with the Biblical figure Amraphel (Genesis 14: 18-20).\textsuperscript{46} He argued that Amraphel was the Biblical figure Melchizedek, who blessed Abraham according to the story of the Old Testament, and was also mentioned in the New Testament in Paul’s Epistle to the Hebrews (7: 1-3). But Riḍā reconfirmed that Hammurabi, unlike Moses, was an idolater and his scriptures were of a pagan nature.\textsuperscript{47}

Riḍā criticised Muslim scholars, such as Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī and others, for their conclusion that the Torah was transmitted by uninterrupted chains of transmission (\textit{tawātur}), and that its distortion (\textit{taḥrīf}) according to the Qur’ānic verses was not related to the text. According to this Islamic view, any scripture that has been passed down by means of this successive transmission was not prone to textual corruption. God would not allow His word to be distorted so that it was no longer truthful.\textsuperscript{48} Riḍā maintained that such views gave missionaries the chance to convince common people that Muslim scholars admitted the invulnerability of the Torah against textual


\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 6/3, p. 89.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., p. 94.

corruption. He argued that later Muslims attempted to study the Scriptures carefully, and reached other conclusions. The Qur’ānic affirmation of the corruption of the Scriptures in their present form, he went on, became much clearer after Western scholars had historically criticised them.⁴⁹ Riḍā challenged Christian missionaries to refute these archaeological discoveries. He saw a positive aspect of Christian missionary attacks on Islam that they should stimulate Muslims to study and translate such Western books on the Bible, and to make it known for everybody that ‘the Bible contains information which is fully contradictory to science.’⁵⁰

Riḍā labelled the discovery of the Code of Hammurabi as a ‘quake’ in Europe with regard to the history of the Bible. Al-Manār dealt in some detail with the repercussions of the Bible and Babel controversy, and its impact on the belief in the divine nature of the Bible in Europe. In the wake of Delitzsch’s first lecture in 1902, public opinion forced Kaiser Wilhelm II to distance himself from Delitzsch’s proposal that the Old Testament was nothing but transcribed Assyrian wisdom.⁵¹ The Kaiser met Delitzsch in the presence of his wife Auguste Viktoria and the Oberhofprediger Ernest Dryaner (1843-1922). Al-Manār, probably following al-Jāmiʿa of Faraḥ Anṭūn, quoted the Arabic translation of the German text of the Kaiser’s letter to Admiral Friedrich von Hollmann (1842-1913) in which he tells the story of his meeting with Delitzsch.⁵²

Riḍā was not surprised by the interest of Wilhelm II in the issue. He was persuaded that the Kaiser interfered in the affair only to use such religious sentiments as an instrument for achieving his political success; demonstrating that politics is no enemy of science, but its strongest tool.⁵³ Riḍā described the Kaiser’s letter to Hollmann as ‘illusive’ and ‘contradictory.’ However, it showed his ‘impulsiveness, deep understanding and experience.’⁵⁴

Depending on the Kaiser’s own words, Riḍā made an Arabic analysis of the arguments. The Kaiser divided the revelation into two kinds:

---

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 89.
⁵¹ By 1905, the controversy had resulted in the publication of 1,650 articles and 28 pamphlets, see, Suzanne Marchand, ‘German Orientalism and the Decline of the West,’ Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 145/4, 2001, pp. 468-469.
⁵² About the letter, see, Lehnmann, op. cit., pp. 220-230.
⁵³ Al-Manār, vol. 6/3, p. 96
the first historical and ongoing, while the second is purely religious.\textsuperscript{55} As for the first kind, the Kaiser said: ‘It [the revelation] sometimes appears in the shape of a great man, a priest, or a king, either amongst the heathens, the Jews or the Christians. Hammurabi was one of these; Moses, Abraham, Homer, Charles the Great, Luther, Shakespeare, Goethe, Kant, and the Emperor Wilhelm the Great as well. God chose them and saw them qualified to achieve great and everlasting deeds; and to be in service of their people according to His will, both in spiritual or mundane acts.’\textsuperscript{56} The second kind of revelation had started with Abraham and was ended by the coming of Jesus.

Riḍā was, however, extremely astonished that the Kaiser did not include Islam as a religious community beside the heathens, Jews and Christians, and did not consider Muḥammad as a prophet beside other prophets. Wilhelm II, according to him, was either ‘ignorant’ or ‘fanatic.’\textsuperscript{57} It was the German Emperor, who as part of his Weltpolitik visited Constantinople and Damascus (autumn 1898) and in a flirting spectacular speech declared himself as a friend of Islam and the protector of the sultan and the Muslim world.\textsuperscript{58} Riḍā ironically indicated that the Kaiser mentioned his grandfather among great historical figures as if he intended to portray him as ‘a tool’ in the hands of God, which was entitled to preserve the German glory and establish the German Empire. But this alleged divine message was, in Riḍā’s view, baseless, as his grandfather was none but an ‘instrument’ in the hands of his Chancellor, Otto von Bismarck (1862-1890).\textsuperscript{59} Riḍā contended that the prophet of Islam has proved to be greater than Bismarck, and there would never come any new discovery to discredit the divine origin of his mission.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{55} In German: ‘Eine fortlaufende, gewissermaßen historische [Offenbarung]’ and ‘eine rein religiöse auf die spätere Erscheinung des Messias vorbereitende Offenbarung.’ As quoted in, ibid, p. 224.


\textsuperscript{57} Al-Manār, vol. 6/3, p. 98

\textsuperscript{58} Holger Weiss, ‘German Images of Islam in West Africa,’ Sudanic Africa 11, 2000, p. 53.

\textsuperscript{59} Al-Manār, vol. 6/3, p. 101

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., p. 101
Riḍā accepted the aspects that were in agreement with Islam in Holman’s letter. In the letter, he accepted the existence of God as the only creator of the world, and that people were in dire need of revelation in their search for knowledge about God. But he primarily rejected the Kaiser’s division, and found it absurd and impossible that the divine entity would be ‘split into parts.’ Human beings, according to him, are tiny creatures as compared to the ultimate and countless beings in the universe. It was also arrogant to confine the divine to some individuals on earth, which is a tiny planet in the universe. God, Riḍā continued, diffuses a spiritual world in the cosmic system with all its astonishing secrets and comprehensiveness. In their pagan phase, human minds recognised that divine world, and called it ‘the world of deities,’ and believed that every part of the universe was organised by its own god. But prophets receiving revelation named it ‘the world of angels,’ which illustrates that the prophet’s spirit is highly connected with these spirits in their acquisition of the divine knowledge.  

Riḍā differentiated between the knowledge of prophets and that of poets and kings. The former cannot be acquired (muktasab), but can be revealed to them through the Spirit that preserved a specific connection between God and people. The latter kind of knowledge is acquisitionable with no specified subject, but includes imaginations, fantasies, stories and policies.  

Riḍā concluded that the Kaiser was mistaken in many of his remarks. He firstly argued that monotheism was known among nations before Abraham. Although there was no historical sign of its existence, there were prophets before him who had also propagated it. Secondly, God’s manifestation in Christ was less than His manifestation in Moses, since Jesus only follows the Law of Moses with little reforms: ‘I came not to change the law.’ His manifestation in the Prophet Muḥammad, Riḍā went on, was more than that in Abraham, Moses and Jesus, as he was the only figure to whom Jesus’ prophecy (John, 16: 12-14) was applicable.

---

61 Ibid., pp. 102-103.
62 Ibid., p. 103.
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1.1.2. Arabic Translation of the Encyclopaedia of Islam (1933)

Thirty years later, the already mentioned Dutch orientalist A.J. Wensinck summarised the thesis of his teacher Snouck Hurgronje on the position of the prophet 'Ibrāhīm’ in a lemma in the EI. Snouck never attempted to translate his dissertation, but his ideas became widely known through Wensinck’s article in the EI. The sensitivity of the historical analysis of the figure of Ibrāhīm dates back to the well-known case of the Egyptian liberal intellectual Ṭahā Ḥusayn, almost seven years before the publicity of the ideas of the EI.

In his article, Wensinck argued that major attention was paid to Abraham in the Qurʾān only after Muḥammad migrated to Medina, and not before the outbreak of the dispute between himself and the local Jewish community. In this manner Abraham was presented as the forerunner of Muḥammad, precursor of Islam, preacher of pure monotheism, and founder of the Kaʿba with his son Ismāʿīl inviting all mankind to perform Hajj. This would have allowed Muḥammad to claim priority for Islam over Judaism and Christianity. The reason behind the acceptance of the Abraham concept was primarily designed to provide the Prophet with a new means to demonstrate the independence of the Islamic faith vis-à-vis Judaism and to present Islam from that time on as the originally revealed religion.

The present writer has elsewhere analyzed the Wensinck affair in the context of the question of academic freedom and Western scholarship on Islam with an example from Egypt in the early 1930s. It

---


has been shown that as soon as the Egyptian Royal Decree of nominating five orientalist members in the Academy became known in the press, the Egyptian physician and health inspector Ḥusayn al-Harrāwī launched a most virulent attack against orientalist circles, especially against Wensinck. His first article appeared as a front-page in the famous Egyptian newspaper *Al-Ahrām* as, ‘Orientalists and Islam: Arabic Language Academy member Wensinck ridicules Islam.’ He severely attacked the *EI*, and accused the Dutch scholar of ‘assuming a premise and then searching the Qurʾān for those verses that support this premise, discarding anything that would contradict it so as to produce a conclusion that plants the seeds of doubt in the mind of the reader. This is the method that orientalists used in their studies on Islam, on the life of the Prophet or on any matter to which they wished to bring the Qurʾān to bear as evidence. It was an old ruse, the purpose of which was to arm evangelists and colonialists with pseudo-logical arguments to shake the beliefs of the Muslim people and cause them to abandon their religion.’

What concerns us here is Riḍā’s reaction to the publication of the Arabic edition of the *EI* as part of his evaluation of Western scholarship on Islam. These scholars of Islam were trained in theology and Semitic languages, and tried to apply similar historical methods their colleagues used in their study of the same Biblical stories and their counterparts in the Qurʾān, such as the story of Abraham in the case under discussion.

Before treating Riḍā’s partaking in the controversy, we should say something about his relationship with Wensinck. It should be first of all stressed that Wensinck’s reputation among Muslim scholars in Egypt had been much connected to his most famous work, *A Handbook of Muḥammadan Traditions* (1927), more than his contributions to the *EI*. The prominent Muslim jurist Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (1892-1958), one of Riḍā’s students, was perhaps the first Muslim

---

scholar to pay attention to Wensinck’s work. In October 1928 he received the *Handbook*, which he considered as a treasure that should be known to Arab and Muslim readers. Two years later Shākir met Wensinck for the first time in the Salafiyya Library in Cairo, and requested his permission to embark upon translating the work into Arabic. In the same year, Shākir’s enthusiasm about the work stimulated Rīḍā to personally direct the same request to Wensinck, who replied in the affirmative: ‘Yes, I wish that the book would be of much use, especially among the people of Egypt and Ḥijāz whom I respect and love much.’

It is also worthy to note that Wensinck probably saw Rīḍā for the first time when the latter was giving a lecture (February 9, 1930) at Jam‘iyyat al-Rābiṭa al-Sharqiyya (mentioned above) in Cairo. In his travel diary, Wensinck gives a caricatural description of Rīḍā: ‘The Sayyid [Rīḍā] is a corpulent small man without legs, big turban, a fat nose, and a full beard, superb when he speaks. The subject was ‘old and new.’ The majority of the audience was enthusiastic. Before he started a young man showing great approval had stood up and said: ‘Yahyā [long live] al-Sayyid Rashīd Rīḍā.’ This lecture [went on] with some interruptions, and sometimes the Sayyid would interrupt himself.’

Although *al-Manār* was not directly involved in the controversy, and did not utter any explicit view on his dismissal, Rīḍā’s general attitude towards Wensinck and his *Handbook* was ambivalent. In the very beginning he had highly praised the author’s meticulous efforts in compiling the Ḥadīth. Wensinck’s great critic, al-Harrāwī, belonged

---

70 Letter, Wensinck to Rīḍā, 1st September 1930, Leiden; the letter is found among Rīḍā’s personal papers in his archive. As Shākir could not finish the whole task of translation, Rīḍā recommended Muhammad Fu‘ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī (1882-1968) to continue carrying out the translation work. The controversy around Wensinck’s writings on Islam did not influence the continuation of the translation work. Shākir invited readers from all over the Muslim world to use the work. ‘Abd al-Baqī has been able to publish the Arabic edition of the *Handbook* under the title *Miftāḥ Kunūz al-Sunna* (or Key to the Treasures of Sunna), Cairo: Maṭba‘at Miṣr, 1934. The work was published a few months after Wensinck’s dismissal from the Academy. In his introduction (written 23 July, 1934), Shākir still appreciated the work, and did not refer to the stormy debate around its author.

71 In Dutch: ‘zonder beenen.’ Wensinck probably means that due to his thick body and the religious dress it was difficult to see his legs.

72 See, Wensinck’s travel diary in Egypt, Jeddah, Syria and Jerusalem (end 1929-early 1930), Leiden University Library, p. 38. UB Bijzondere Collecties (KL)—Or. 25.686.
to Riḍā’s circle, but he did not contribute to al-Manār journal with any anti-orientalist polemics during Riḍā’s life. His work was, however, later published as a series of articles in Riḍā’s journal and later in one volume by Dār al-Manār in 1936, a few months after the latter’s death.

In August 1934 (seven months after Wensinck’s dismissal), Riḍā wrote the preface of the Handbook in which he positively praised the work. He maintained that due to his many commitments, he had not able to fully participate in the editing of the work. He stressed the usefulness of the Handbook for Muslim scholars in tracing all kinds of traditions; and this work would have spared him ‘three quarter’ of his preceding work and effort in the study of Ḥadīth.73 As an orientalist, Riḍā went on, Wensinck had finished his work for the purpose of serving his career and for the sake of other orientalists; but Muslims rather needed it for the sake of having knowledge about the sayings and traditions of their Prophet. He cited one Ḥadīth saying that ‘Verily, God will support Islam through men who do not belong to its adherents.’74

One year later, Riḍā, in the introduction to his last work al-Waḥī al-Muḥammadī, all of a sudden renounced his appreciation for Wensinck’s efforts. According to him, most orientalists did not belong to the class of independent and fair-minded European scholars, because they did not study Arabic or the books of Islam in order to know the truth about it. They were only seeking out its weak points by describing Muslims in a disfigured way so that their people would be driven away from Islam. Riḍā had a similar attitude towards the EI. The EI and Wensinck’s Handbook, which were two key examples that had already disappointed his high expectations about their scholarship. Riḍā recanted his earlier lofty impression and rendered it as a futile piece of work. He believed that the translation of al-Waḥī would have the effect of influencing fair-minded Europeans and convert them to Islam. Riḍā was, however, surprised that when he sent copies of al-Waḥī to all orientalists, it sufficed Wensinck to thank him without giving any review of the book.75

As soon as the Arabic translation of the EI appeared, Riḍā rushed to admit that Western scholars did Muslims a great favor. However,

---

73 Miftāḥ, op. cit., p. 3.
75 Al-Manār, vol. 35/1 (Rabī’ al-ʾAwwal 1354/July 1935), pp. 36-37.
he pointed out that Muslims also had a record of early achievements in organising such encyclopaedias, but had become stagnant in preserving their own heritage. He recommended Muslim readers everywhere to purchase the Arabic translation, as reading the *EI* in Arabic, the ‘public language of Islam,’ would be more useful than the English, French or German editions. He summed up some reasons: 1) Man’s prime need is to know oneself, it is very useful that Muslims better know themselves through the eyes of the fair-minded, biased or opponents among the orientalists. 2) The materials on which the authors depend are abundant in Europe, and orientalists follow scholarly lines of investigation. European public opinion depended on their analyses by which they make judgments on the Orientals. 3) The translation should be supplemented with corrections and analysis made by Muslim scholars in order to guarantee the ‘adequacy’ of given data according to the mainstream of Islamic thought.\textsuperscript{76}

Riḍā’s main concern was that Western historical and literary critical views on Islam should be evaluated in the light of the criticisms of Muslim scholars, who should also take part in the project. A few years earlier (1926) he had welcomed an invitation provided by *Die Deutsche Gesellschaft für Islamkunde*, presided by Georg Kampffmeyer (1864-1936), inviting him and other Muslim scholars to cooperate with its editorial members. He had high expectations that their invitation to work together with Muslim scholars would result in great success.\textsuperscript{77} Riḍā’s suspicion of the *EI* concentrated only on two of his opponents, whom its editorial committee had chosen in the advisory board: namely the anti-Salafi Azhari scholar Sheikh Yūsuf al-Dijwī (1870-1946)\textsuperscript{78} (see, chapter 3) and the fervent Muslim propagandist and Egyptian nationalist Muḥammad Farīd Wajdī (circa 1878-1954).\textsuperscript{79} Dijwī’s views as a traditionalist scholar were, according to Riḍā, not to satisfy the minds of ‘educated’ Muslims, let alone orientalists. As for Wajdī’s views, they did not directly ‘refute the allegations.’ Riḍā requested the committee to appoint other scholars of higher

\textsuperscript{76} *Al-Manār*, vol. 33/6 (Rajab 1352/October 1933), p. 477.


scholarly position, such as Sheikh Al-Azhar Muṣṭafā al-Marāghī (1881-1945) and the Mufti of Egypt ʿAbd al-Majīd Salīm (1882-1954).\textsuperscript{80} Riḍā, however, did not further develop any scholarly historical response to Wensinck’s article on Abraham, nor did he critically study the views of Dijwī and Wajdī.\textsuperscript{81}

Riḍā showed a completely different attitude by publishing a more severe article in which he talked about the ‘corruption’ of the \textit{EI}. ‘A deceiving name,’ he wrote, ‘[…] for an encyclopedia pieced together by a group of Western scholars for the sake of serving their religion and colonial states in the Muslim world. [It was intended] to destroy Islam and its forts, after all the failure of missionary attempts to attack the Qur’ān and its prophet or spread false translations of the Qur’ān.’\textsuperscript{82}

He harshly attacked the contributors of the \textit{EI} of intentionally presenting Islam and its men and history in a ‘twisted’ way. In general he believed that ‘Westerners are highly qualified in science, arts and industry, but their qualifications in fabricating things are more effective.’\textsuperscript{83} Riḍā plainly revoked his earlier recommendation of the Arabic version, as the translators did not comply with his former advice of supplementing the criticisms of Muslim scholars to what he saw as ‘distorting’ information on Islam. He therefore believed that their ‘useful’ work had now changed to become ‘harmful.’ He requested the \textit{EI} subscribers to appeal to the editorial committee that the translators should add ‘corrections’ in the margins, otherwise they should end their subscription, by which they would be financially supporting those who attack Islam. For him, the publication of the Arabic version of the \textit{EI} was even more dangerous than missionary books and journals. Missionary writings would hardly betray any Muslim, but the danger of \textit{EI} could not be avoided, especially among the educated class.\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 33/6, p. 478.
\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 33/8 (Ramaḍān 1352/December 1933), p. 630.
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.
1.2. Al-Manār Literary Figures

Riḍā wrote most of the articles in his journal, but he regularly made use of the writings of other publicists and scholars since its early appearance. In his *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*, Charles Adams (having written his book during Riḍā’s lifetime) branded those who gathered around Riḍā’s journal and had sympathy for ‘Abduh’s ideas as the *al-Manār* party.\(^{85}\) He spoke of different types of people who associated themselves with the literary, political or reformist concepts laid down by ‘Abduh. In collecting his information, Adams mainly depended on references in *al-Manār* itself or the biography of ‘Abduh. The study of Riḍā’s archive adds many more figures to the list of Adams. Mahmoud Haddad, however, has correctly remarked that not everyone who wrote in *al-Manār* can be considered a Manārist.\(^{86}\) The Mararists were not a homogenous group, nor even a group, and even when taken as individuals they are not devoid of contradictions and inconsistencies in their various expositions.\(^{87}\)

Nevertheless, in order to put Riḍā’s works to be dealt with in the ensuing chapters into their particular historical context at the time of their production, one has to pay attention to the social and religious setting of some of the writers of *al-Manār* by giving brief accounts of their lives and places in Riḍā’s circle; and most importantly the sources they brought forward to his journal. This group of writers on whose writings Riḍā depended in his knowledge of Western sources can be divided into two categories: 1) those who were living in Egypt or elsewhere in the Muslim world, 2) and his associates of network among Muslim activists and writers living in the West.

1.2.1. Muslims Living in the West

Riḍā was in contact with many Muslims living in Europe and the United States. *Al-Manār* had, for example, its own correspondent in Cambridge, U.K.. In 1922, its anonymous correspondent wrote a report on the Girton conference held in the city (1921) on the general

---


\(^{87}\) Ibid., p. 56
theme of ‘Christ and the Creeds.’ The report tells us that two of the key speakers were Hastings Rashdall (1858-1924), the Dean of Carlisle, and H.D.A. Major (1871-1961), principal of Ripon Hall in Oxford. Both theologians were connected to the Modern Churchmen’s Union, which developed a movement of opposition to the doctrine and practices of the Anglo-Catholic party. The Union achieved its highest public notice with its Cambridge conference. Major was accused of heresy because of his denial of the physical resurrection of the body. Rashdall’s paper ‘Christ as the Logos and Son of God’ aroused sharp controversy with such statements as: ‘It is impossible to maintain that God is fully incarnate in Christ, and not incarnate at all in anyone else.’

The Druze prince Shakīb Arslān (1869-1946) was one of the foremost sources that provided al-Manār with information about Western religious, social and political ideas. Much has been written about his political cooperation with Riḍā in integrating Arab nationalist movements with the idea of pan-Islamism. It suffices here to analyse a few of Arslān’s relevant contributions to al-Manār. This serves our aim not only in understanding Riḍā’s various sources, but also to show Arslān’s use of these Western discussions on Christianity in consolidating his arguments how important Islam was in his anti-imperialist struggle.

From Europe, Arslān was able to make his Geneva exile residence ‘the umbilical cord of the Islamic world.’ His effectiveness as an exiled agitator rested with his ability to attract attention to his activities, to publish frequently in the Arabic press, and to maintain contact with influential groups within Arab [and Muslim] states. For exam-
ple, he extended his ‘transnational network’\textsuperscript{94} to include the nationalist Salafiyya movement in North Africa, and there he became ‘a mentor of a generation.’\textsuperscript{95}

Arslān repeatedly argued that pan-Islamism should be the ideal accredited remedy for the decline of Muslims and their lagging behind the Christian West. For him, Europe did not entirely succeed in separating religion from politics. It was inevitable that many politicians still interfered in matters of religion. He used the controversy around the Anglican Prayer Book, which erupted in England in July 1927, to prove his point.\textsuperscript{96} Arslān intended to send an indirect message to the growing Westernising movement in the East. Those who were propagating the strict separation between religion and state should not be ‘deluded’ by the conviction that Europe’s progress had only been fulfilled by its total separation of religion from politics.\textsuperscript{97} Arslān attempted to deduce from this postulate that religion and politics were still enmeshed in Europe, and were not completely detached. He cynically compared the English parliament’s interference in the case to be like ‘a religious synod’ giving much of their attention to the Book of Prayer, while ignoring all other urgent political issues.\textsuperscript{98} ‘The English nation as the most civilised,’ he went on, ‘cannot pray but under the official approval of the parliament and after the royal order. Such purely confessional issues and discussions had taken place in irreligious and political councils.’\textsuperscript{99}

Arslān read various Western works and introduced their ideas to Arab readers. A significant example was his comments and additions to the Arabic translation of Lothrop Stoddard’s \textit{The New World of Islam} made by the Palestinian translator ʿAjjāj Nuwayhiḍ.\textsuperscript{100} In \textit{al-Manār} he praised some orientalists, while blaming and sometimes

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{94}{Raja Adal, ‘Constructing Transnational Islam: The East-West Network of Shakīb Arslān,’ in Stéphane A. Dudoignon (et al), \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 176-210.}
\footnotetext{95}{Cleveland, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 91-114.}
\footnotetext{98}{Ibid., p. 214.}
\footnotetext{99}{Ibid.}
\footnotetext{100}{New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1921; ʿAjjāj Nuwayhiḍ, \textit{Ḥāḍir al-ʿĀlam al-ʾIslāmī}, 4 vols., Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Saliyya, 1352/circa 1932-33.}
\end{footnotes}
attacking others. He was impressed by the French translation of the Qur’an made by the Swiss orientalist Edouard Montet (d. 1934).\footnote{Al-Manār, vol. 30/5 (Jumādā al-‘Ūlā 1348/November 1929), pp. 377-380; vol. 30/7 (Sha‘bān 1348/January 1929), pp. 524-534.}

\textit{Al-Manār} cited his preface to the translation in which the translator described the origin of the Qur’an as: ‘The Qur’ānic doctrine has a strong relation with Jewish and Christian doctrines. Jewish historical reports related to Prophets and Fathers, and also the Christian ones related to Christ represent the subject of various pages of the Qur’ān.’\footnote{Al-Manār, vol. 30/5, p. 378. Compare the French text: ‘Cela est si vrai que, dans les éléments communs au Christianisme et au Judaïsme, dont nous constatons la présence dans le Coran, le texte arabe du Prophète est pénétré de l’inspiration juive plutôt que de l’inspiration chrétienne: c’est la forme juive qui l’emporte.’ Edouard Montet, \textit{Mahomet: Le Coran}, Paris: Payot, 1929, p. 29.}

In his criticism, Arslān gave a systematic analysis of Montet’s concept of revelation and the early history of Islam. Riḍā nevertheless did not go further than giving an emphatically traditional response that ‘all Muslims disagree with the translator in his view, and they believe that all that is mentioned in the Qur’ān on the beliefs of Christians and Jews, their conditions and histories is a revelation from God.’\footnote{Al-Manār, vol. 30/5, p. 387.}

Under the title ‘what is being said about Islam in Europe,’ Arslān translated and gave his critical views on what the French military interpreter Jules Sicard wrote on ‘Abduh’s movement of Islamic reform.\footnote{Jules Sicard, \textit{Le monde musulman dans les possessions françaises: Algerie, Tunisie, Maroc, Afrique Occidentale Française}, Paris: Larose, 1928. Al-Manār, vol. 30/1 (Muharram 1348/June 1929), pp. 33-46.} Aḥmad Balāfrīj (b. 1908),\footnote{Al-Manār, vol. 30/3 (Rabi‘ al-‘Awwal 1348/August 1929), pp. 211-224.} Arslān’s Moroccan secretary and right hand and the later founder of the Istiqlāl Party, translated another part of the same work, which is relevant to our discussion. Balāfrīj was the founder of the Association des Etudiants Nord-Africains (1927) during his study at the Sorbonne. Between 1926-1932, he regularly visited Arslān in Geneva.\footnote{About their relation, see, for instance, Cleveland, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 94-102; John P. Halstead, ‘The Changing Character of Moroccan Reformism, 1921-1934,’ \textit{The Journal of African History} 5/3, 1964, especially pp. 443-444.} Balāfrīj was described by a later analyst as follows: ‘he knows the works of French writers better than most French people, and on many an occasion when I called on him a year earlier I would find him engrossed in some new book by a French philosopher or historian.’\footnote{Rom Landau, \textit{Moroccan Journal}, London: Rebert Hale Limited, 1952, p. 4.}
Again Arslân and Balâfrîj vouched their sharp critique against the West. It was not only Western clergymen who tried to prove the superiority of Christianity upon Islam, but also people in functions among colonial policy-makers and officers (such as Sicard). Sicard discussed the Muslim contact with Christianity in five different points: 1) is the conversion of Muslims to Christianity possible or desirable?; 2) his own attitudes towards the political-religious terrain of Islam; 3) the dogma of the Trinity; 4) the harmony [between Christianity and Islam] on matters of doctrine; and 5) moral consequences. Sicard bluntly assumed that ‘in the hearts of Muslims there is irreducible hostility towards the dogma of the Trinity. This is serious and worth being noted as it has important results in separating us [Christians] from them [Muslims]. […] They [Muslims] do not understand, or at least their majority, that Christianity does not use the words ‘father’ and ‘son’ in the mortal sense, but strictly spiritual; we should therefore limit ourselves to this simple declaration, when discussing this subject.’

In his general comment on Sicard’s work, Riḍā also scornfully added that the author, as a French military officer, tried by his writings to agitate the spirit of hostility between his French homeland and Islam in order to justify its colonial presence, and to guarantee his position in the French army. Riḍā vigorously reacted that it were the Christians who adamantly adhered to their hostility against the concept of ‘pure’ monotheism in Islam by their attachment to some ‘ancient pagan doctrines.’ ‘It is stupid of the writer,’ he continued, ‘to think that he would deceive Muslims by using such puzzling and decorated words in his attempt of harmonising the concept of Trinity [for Muslims].’
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108 Al-Manâr, vol. 30/1, p. 223.
109 Sicard, op. cit., pp. 74-97
110 Al-Manâr, vol. 30/1, p. 218. Compare: ‘le dogme de la Trinité se heurte à une hostilité irréductible. Il s’agit là d’un point de doctrine très important et dont la portée a des conséquences très sérieuses, du point du vue qui nous sépare des sectateurs de l’islam […] Ils ne se rendent pas compte, du moins en grande majorité, que les mots : Père, Fils, le Christianisme ne les entend pas d’une manière charnelle, mais strictement spirituelle; la discussion sur le terrain doit se borner à cette simple déclaration.’ Ibid., pp. 91-92.
111 Al-Manâr, vol. 30/1, p. 223.
112 Ibid., pp. 223-224.
113 Ibid.
As early as 1930, Muhammad Basyūnī b. Muḥammad ‘Imrān (1885-1953), one of the followers of al-Manār in Indonesia (Sambas, West Borneo), sent Riḍā a query requesting him to refer it to Arslān. The query focused on the causes of Muslim decline as compared to the progress of the Western world. Arslān promptly answered the question in the form of a well-known treatise tackling the reasons why Muslim nations stagnated while the others experienced rapid progress. The treatise has become one of the significant contributions by Arslān to al-Manār.114 ‘Imrān brought forward his appeal to Arslān to write on the subject as a continuation of what ‘Abduh and Riḍā had already written in their defense of Islam. Although it addressed Muslims, the treatise was primarily an indirect response to the Western incursion in the Muslim world. As Riḍā put it in his foreword to the treatise, Arslān was spurred to respond to the questions: ‘after his return from his trip to Spain and Morocco (summer 1930), and after he was aroused by the scenes of the remnants of Islamic civilisation in Andalusia, and witnessed the French attempts to christianise the Berbers in Morocco as a beginning to christianise all the Arabs in North Africa, just as Spain had christianised their ancestors in Andalusia in the past.’115 Arslān elucidated that he agreed with the Protestant view that the cause of decadence in Medieval Europe was not Christianity as such, but the Catholic Church under the Pope. Christianity, however, should be given the credit for saving Europe from paganism.116 Arslān also briefly alluded to the above-mentioned Sicard in order to disprove the contention of certain European writers that Christianity was a bar to the progress of civilisation and had been the cause of the decline and downfall of the Greeks and the

---


115 Arslān, Our Decline, p. xxi

116 Ibid., pp. 88-89
Romans. According to him, Sicard, as a French agent in the Department of Religious Affairs in Rabat, was ‘a very conceited person […] who played a key role in the process of Christianising the Berbers.’

In the wake of Wensinck’s affair, Arslân acknowledged orientalist works to be one of the major sources of information on Islam and Muslims for Europe. The orientalist, according to Arslân, is the tarjumān (translator), whose honesty or dishonesty would affect the public opinion. In the case of dishonesty, his works could agitate European hatred against Islam. Arslân divided orientalists into three categories: 1) Those who only searched for and enlarged the failings and weaknesses of Muslims in the eyes of Europeans. Their main intention was to serve Christianity by ‘defaming’ Islam and representing it as evil. Examples of this category were H. Lammens (1862-1937), Martin Hartmann (1851-1918), D. S. Margoliouth (1858-1940) and Wensinck. 2) The second, whom he called ‘sensible enemies,’ were those whose main concern was to serve European civilisation and Christian culture and to spread them among Muslims, but with no ‘deception.’ Although they followed specific scientific methods, they never felt any restrain to write ‘allegations’ and ‘poison’ against Islam whenever needed. People under this category were Louis Massignon and Snouck Hurgronje. 3) A rare third class consisted of serious and objective scholars, who had no prejudice against Islam and whose critical approaches were produced after deep investigation. He counted among these Ignaz Goldziher (1850-1921), G. Kampffmeyer, Max Mayerhoff (1874-1945), and others. This group, according to him, knew perfectly well that they were raised with negative attitudes widespread in the West against Islam. They tried, however, to contribute in a positive way to lessen the remaining medieval perceptions and bad image of Islam in Europe.

Arslân never read Wensinck’s work, but he included his name under his first category on the basis of Harrāwī’s articles. Presumably Arslân’s views in this regard had an impact on Riḍâ’s above-mentioned hesitation. He had nothing to say on the dismissal of Wensinck from the Academy, but considered the case an internal question asso-
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117 Ibid., pp. 92-93. The translator wrongly read him as Saicar.
associated with Egyptian politics. As he was no Egyptian, he preferred to remain silent on that point.  

Arslân must have known Wensinck personally, as he attended and presented a paper on Arabic philology at the International Congress of Orientalists in Leiden, presided by Snouck Hurgronje in 1931. During this event he had a short discussion with Snouck, and concluded that his views on Islam in Java proved that he was ‘a wise person,’ ‘one of the less fanatic scholars,’ and ‘a great orientalist.’

Arslân, on the other hand, deemed the Arabic translation of the *EI* as a useful and necessary project for young generations, despite its many ‘biased attitudes,’ ‘mistakes’ and ‘grave scientific errors’ on Islam. He assigned these errors to the first category of orientalists. Arslân made it clear to the translation committee that they should not underestimate the diversity of contributors to the *EI*, which would make their task more difficult. The advice of historians, chemists, geographers, jurists, philosphers, astronomers, and theologians should be taken into consideration in order to be able to create a rather faultless translation, and to avoid the ‘deluding’ of young generations.

Elsewhere I have studied the life and works of the Syro-Turkish officer in Berlin Zeki Kirām, who was one of Riḍā’s informants in Europe, and also belonged to the circle of Arslân. Kirām kept Riḍā up to date with the developments of German orientalism and briefed him on the situation of Muslim institutions in Berlin and other significant news items in the German press (see, appendix I).

Kirām met Riḍā for the first time on October 13, 1921, during the latter’s only visit to Europe. In his diary, Riḍā writes: ‘[Then] we visited [probably with Arslân] Zakī effendi Kirām al-Dimashqī in his bookstore. He is an active young man whose leg was injured during the last war, and he was treated in Germany. Then he married his
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119 Ibid., p. 436.
121 See, his article in *Ḥādir al-ʿĀlam al-ʿIslāmī*, vol. 3, pp. 372-374.
123 More about his life, see, Umar Ryad, ‘From an Officer in the Ottoman Army to a Muslim Publicist and Armament Agent in Berlin,’ *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 63/3-4, 2006, pp. 235-268 (Quoted below, ‘Kirām’). It is interesting to note that I have been able to trace the family of Kirām in Germany by checking the telephone directory of Germany on the Internet.
nurse, and they opened a bookstore together where he sells books with her. He is now studying medicine.\(^{124}\)

In February 1926, Riḍā wrote to Arslān to send him Kirām’s address.\(^{125}\) Since that time, their relation grew. In Kirām’s eyes, Riḍā was his ‘guide,’ ‘teacher,’ ‘lighthouse,’ ‘elder brother,’ and ‘father.’ For Riḍā, Kirām was a ‘good and sincere friend.’ Kirām had also some business with Dār al-Manār in Cairo where he had labels printed for medicines made in his private laboratory in Berlin.\(^{126}\) Kirām also asked Riḍā to send him information or Islamic books, which he sometimes needed when writing German articles or giving lectures to German audiences on Islam.\(^{127}\)

Kirām translated one of the works of the German orientalist Max Horten on the Islamic Geisteskultur. He sent a summary of his translation to Riḍā to publish in his Manār. His Arabic style was not perfect, and his writings in Arabic also contained occasional grammatical mistakes. Riḍā revised the Arabic translation and sent it back to Kirām for correction. Kirām suggested that he should include the original German terms when sending the revised version to Horten to compare them to the Arabic sources he used.\(^{128}\) A summary of his translation of some of Horten’s ideas was later published in al-Manār under the title: ‘Testimonies of Fair-minded Western scholars about Islam, the Prophet and the Muslims (1929).’\(^{129}\) In another article in al-Manār, he discussed some Western medical discoveries on the ‘bad effects’ of pork and wine on the human body. Kirām argued that pork was prohibited by the divine revelation only because there were no microscopes that would have revealed its ill-effect on the human body. For Riḍā, the divine revelation must be applicable to all people in all ages, and not restricted to such arguments. God, and not Muḥammad or Moses, was the one who prohibited eating pork in the Torah and the Qur’ān.\(^{130}\)

\(^{124}\) Riḍā’s diary, October 13, 1921.
\(^{126}\) Letter, Kirām to Riḍā, Berlin, 19 Muḥarram 1350/5 June 1931.
\(^{128}\) Ibid.
He also sometimes translated German orientalist works at Riḍā’s request. Riḍā urgently requested him to study the work *Mohammed, sein Leben und sein Glaube*\(^\text{132}\) by Tor Andrae (1885-1947), on the life of the Prophet Muḥammad and his faith, and to provide him with a summary of the book. Kirām wrote Riḍā back that he did not know the author, but promised him to translate the book into Arabic.\(^\text{132}\)

The purpose of briefing al-Manār’s founder about the German press was that Riḍā, as an influential Muslim scholar, should get acquainted with the opinions of policymakers in Europe. He should also ‘convey the current events [to his readers] as soon as possible in order to confront the Zionists and other enemies, who spend millions on disseminating news to the press in order to mislead the public opinion.’\(^\text{133}\) The ill propaganda of some ‘intruders trading in the name of Islam’ also caused Islam gross damage. The propagation of ‘false beliefs’ under the name of Islam, such as those of Bābīyya, Bahā’īyya or Ahmadiyya, were, in Kirām’s view, the reason behind the decline of the spread of Islam in Europe.\(^\text{134}\) He repeatedly complained to Riḍā about the degeneration of Muslim institutions in Berlin and their feeble role in serving Islam. He was convinced that Muslims in Berlin suffered from ill-information and lack of understanding of the European mentality and did not have any capability of presenting Islam to the Western public in a proper way. In one letter, he directed his severe attack against the Ahmadiyya *Islamische Gemeinde zu Berlin*.\(^\text{135}\) He had serious doubts about their way of serving Islam. In his view, their work would, on the contrary, defame the image of Islam in the West. He moreover labeled the five board members of the *Gemeinde*, without giving any names, as ‘charlatans,’ ‘five fanatic communists,’ and ‘opportunists who knocked at all doors to get financial benefits for their own interests.’\(^\text{136}\)

Kirām bemoaned the state of Muslims who, like him, had nothing to defend their oppressed rights, but the ‘Islamic feeling’ and the
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\(^{131}\) Tor Andrea, *Mohammed, sein Leben und sein Glaube*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1932

\(^{132}\) Letter, Kirām to Riḍā, Berlin, 8 Muḥarram 1352/May 1933.

\(^{133}\) Letter, Kirām to Riḍā, Berlin, 9 October (no year).

\(^{134}\) Letter, Kirām to Riḍā, Berlin, 3 Dhu al-Ḥijja 1351/March 1932.

\(^{135}\) Arabic: *al-Jam‘īyya al-Islāmiyya fi Berlin*; founded by Maulana Sadr-ud-Din of Lahore in Berlin Charlottenburg 1922.

\(^{136}\) More about this, see, Ryad, ‘Kirām,’ pp. 245-249. See, letter, Kirām to Riḍā, Berlin 3 June 1926.
‘Oriental Arab heart.’ He also tried to convince Riḍā that, ‘due to his own vast readings and solid belief based on knowledge […], he was able to launch a strong movement for the cause of Islam and Arab Islamic peoples.’ He considered himself as ‘one of the pivots of ʿimān (faith), and a missionary of Islam.’ The only way to destroy the ‘allegations’ of Zionism, Christianity, Jesuitism and Freemasonry, in Kirām’s mind, was to use weapons of their own and select some of their controversial books for translation. Kirām maintained that his financial situation and lack of time prevented him from exerting more effort in ‘defending Muslim rights,’ and ‘devoting all his time to missionary work.’

In al-Manār, Riḍā praised Kirām’s efforts of ‘reproaching Christian missionaries, and Muslims who give them support. In addition, he described those Muslims as ‘atheists, slaves of colonisers and enemies of their umma.’ Among Riḍā’s papers in Cairo, I have found two Arabic manuscripts which contain the Arabic translation of a text on the history of the Jesuits, which seemed to be a polemical treatise against the order. In my view, Kirām sent this translation to Riḍā, as they bear Kirām’s handwriting. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the manuscripts, which leads directly to the original work and its author(s).

On preparing his German lectures ‘Der Prophet Mohammed und die Frau,’ Kirām was advised by Arslān to consult Riḍā’s then recently published work on the rights of women in Islam, Nidāʾ ilā al-Jins al-Laṭīf. At his request, Kirām received the treatise with a word of dedication. He delivered those two lectures on the rights of women in Islam in one of the principal Berlin hotels. The Deutsche Allgemeine
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139 Letter, Kirām to Riḍā, Berlin, 8 Muḥarram 1352/May 1933.
140 Letter, Kirām to Riḍā, Berlin, 14 November 1929.
141 Letter, Kirām to Riḍā, Berlin, 8 Muḥarram 1352/May 1933.
142 See Riḍā’s comments on the margin of Kirām’s translation of Horten’s ideas. Al-Manār, vol. 30/2, p. 140.
Zeitung reviewed the lectures.\(^{144}\) The London-based Daily Telegraph also commented on them.\(^{145}\) Arabic journals, such as the Egyptian Wafdist journal al-jihād and the Palestinian al-Jāmiʿa al-ʾIslāmiyya (Pan-Islamism), quoted the lecture at length.\(^{146}\)

As an Arab activist in Berlin, Kiram was preoccupied with the developments of the Zionist question in Germany. He kept Riḍā updated with the news of the petitions and protests of German Jews against the Zionist movement.\(^{147}\) In order to substantiate the Arab cause, he believed that the Jewish statements would be of great benefit in fighting the enemy with his own ‘weapon.’ He was in contact with some anti-Zionist liberal Jewish organisations in Europe. In 1930, he sent al-Manār a translation of an article on the history of the Jewish migration to Palestine written by the Jewish German scholar H. Löwe in the Gemeindeblatt der Jüdischen Gemeinde zu Berlin. Kirām’s intention was to give the readers of al-Manār insight into ‘the persecution of the Jews by non-Muslims compared to the welfare they enjoyed under the banner of Islam.’\(^{148}\) The reason why the article never appeared in al-Manār is not known.

Following the steps of the above-mentioned Fathi Zaghlūl, another Palestinian student in Paris, ‘Ādil Zuʿayter (1895-1957), known as ‘the Sheikh of Arab translators,’ translated many Western works on history, philosophy, sociology and Arabic heritage into Arabic.\(^{149}\) Zuʿayter’s career as a translator started when he traveled to Paris to read law at the Sorbonne (1921). His favourite writer was Gustave Le Bon. He not only translated his works on the civilisation of Arabs, but also on the world of Indian civilisation, the psychology of socialism, the psychology of revolution and political psychology, etc.\(^{150}\)

Thanks to Zuʿayter’s translation, Le Bon’s works became widely

\(^{144}\) E. F., ‘Der Prophet Mohammed und die Frau,’ Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, Berlin, Nr. 414 (22 September 1933).

\(^{145}\) ‘Nazi Plans for Women,’ The Daily Telegraph, London, Nr. 24, 444 (Saturday, 23 September 1933). It is probable that it was Kirām himself who provided the Daily Telegraph, German and Arab newspapers with information about his activities in Berlin, or even wrote the articles himself.


\(^{147}\) Letter, Kirām to Riḍā, Berlin, 14 November 1929.

\(^{148}\) Letter, Kirām, Shawwāl 1348 (1930).


\(^{150}\) Ibid.
known in the Arab world. They also received, and are still receiving, much attention from many Muslim writers.\textsuperscript{151}

Zuʿayter was in contact with Riḍā, and tried to publish some of his works through \textit{al-Manār} (see appendix II). From Paris he was a subscriber to \textit{al-Manār}, and kept sending Riḍā his primitive draft translations in order to be edited and corrected.\textsuperscript{152} Riḍā praised Zuʿayter’s efforts to serve Arab culture by introducing his translated works, but reminded Arab readers not to adopt what he called ‘anti-religious theories’ in Le Bon’s works.\textsuperscript{153}

1.2.2. Writers in the Muslim world

The name of Muḥammad Tawfīq Ṣidqī has been frequently mentioned in the introduction. As we have already said, he was known to the readers of \textit{al-Manār} as one of the most productive contributors who vigorously attempted to apply his medical and scientific knowledge to Islamic subjects. As he also heavily criticised Christianity and its history, he played a most significant part in giving Riḍā new insights into the Western contemporary sources on Biblical studies.

Belonging to a middle-class Egyptian family, Ṣidqī was born in September 1881, and died in Cairo end of April 1920. At a young age, Ṣidqī memorised the Qur’an. He finished his primary schooling in 1896, his secondary education in 1900, and finished his medical studies in 1904. The Egyptian Ministry of Education honoured him for his success. He was later appointed as a physician in al-Qaṣr al-ʿAynī Hospital in Cairo, where he worked for one year. In 1905 he moved to the Prison Hospital of Ṭurah. In 1914 he moved to the Prison Hospital for Juveniles in Cairo.\textsuperscript{154}

Ṣidqī was known not only to the readers of \textit{al-Manār}, but also to those of other Egyptian periodicals such as \textit{al-Muʾayyad}, \textit{al-Liwāʾ},

\textsuperscript{151} See, for instance, Ana Belen Soage, “The Muslim Reaction to Pope Benedict XVI’s Regensburg Address,” \textit{Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions} 8/1, 2007, pp. 137-143.

\textsuperscript{152} Letter, ʿAdil Zuʿayter to Riḍā, Boulevard Brune, Paris, 14 October 1922.

\textsuperscript{153} \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 29/4 (Muḥarram 1347/July 1928), p. 317.

\textsuperscript{154} Biographical information is taken from \textit{al-Manār}. It is an article published in \textit{al-Majallah al-Tibbiyya al-Miṣriyya} (Egyptian Medical Magazine) after Ṣidqī’s death (May 1920). \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 21/9 (Dhū al-Ḥijja 1338/September 1921), pp. 483-495. It is also interesting to know that I managed to trace one of Ṣidqī’s grandsons in Cairo through the telephone directory on the Internet, but unfortunately they do not preserve any archival materials for his grandfather.
and al-‘Ilm. He started reading al-Manār when he was a student at the Khediviyya secondary school in Cairo. His interest in al-Manār grew and he eagerly followed Riḍā’s public lectures in the city. Later he became Riḍā’s family doctor and one of his close friends. When they were students, Ṣidqī had religious disputes with his Coptic friend ʿAbduh effendi ʾIbrahīm (1883-1920), who later converted to Islam.155 Both of them came in touch with Riḍā after having attended many of his public lectures. They used to visit him in his al-Manār Office to discuss their religious doubts regarding specific Christian and Islamic doctrines, such as ʿUlūhiyya (divinity), Rūḥ (soul), and Baʿth (resurrection).156

Unlike Ṣidqī, ʿAbduh ʾIbrāhīm did not write anything, nor did he make any attempt to publish in al-Manār. Ṣidqī started to publish his first series of articles in Riḍā’s journal in the summer of 1905 under the title: ‘Religion in Perspective of Sound Reason.’157 His very impetus to write on such issues was, according to Riḍā, to find answers to many questions and doubts which occurred in his mind with regard to his religion. Riḍā ascribed Ṣidqī’s doubts to his modern education and his personal debates with missionaries during his school time.158

In his comment on Ṣidqī’s articles, Riḍā showed that he was impressed by Ṣidqī and his classmate ʿAbduh ʾIbrāhīm and their way of deduction, especially their analysis and acquisition in matters of

155 ʿAbduh ʾIbrāhīm also studied medicine, and like Ṣidqī became a physician in the Prison Department in Cairo. When he converted to Islam, his family invited him for a debate with Coptic clergymen at their house in order to convince him to return back to his former Coptic belief. Riḍā provided him with needed literature (such as al-Qairānawī’s work) for that debate. In his biography of Ṣidqī, Riḍā made no mention to these debates. After his conversion to Islam, ʿAbduh later married a Muslim woman. His eldest son (ʿIsā, died 1980) became one of the prominent Muslim economists, who (together with the well-known Muslim scholar Yusuf al-Qaraḍāwī) was a pioneer in establishing Islamic Banks in the Gulf region. The story of ʿAbduh’s conversion to Islam is mentioned in ʿIsā ʿAbduh and Aḥmad Ismāʾīl Yaḥyā, Limādhā Aslamū? (Why did they convert to Islam?), Dār al-Ma’ārif, 1992, pp. 70-135. The story of conversion has been given as a model in a lecture by the Egyptian Salafī preacher and psychologist Muḥammad Ismāʾīl al-Muqaddam (b. 1952).

Audio version is to be found at: http://www.islamway.com/?iw_s=Lesson&iw_a=view&lesson_id=6752, checked, 24 November 2006.

My thanks are due to Mr. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb ʾIbrāhīm, ʿAbduh’s grandson, for sending me a copy of the book.

156 Al-Manār, vol. 21/9, pp. 486-487.


158 Al-Manār, vol. 21/9, p. 487.
‘aqīda (doctrinal). He also provided them with religious sources. Riḍā maintained that their studious discussions had helped to remove Ṣidqī’s religious doubts, and had lead ‘Abduh to be convinced by the truth of Islam.\textsuperscript{159} In his reply to missionary writings on Islam, Ṣidqī read Western works on Biblical criticism, and introduced them to the readers of al-Manār; such Western writers as the Englishmen Walter Richard Cassels (1826-1907), John Mackinnon Robertson (1856-1933),\textsuperscript{160} Christian Heinrich Arthur Drews (1865-1935),\textsuperscript{161} and William Harry Turton.\textsuperscript{162} Like Riḍā, his motive was to defend Islam against any accusations by using the works of fair-minded and atheist Western writers. However, Riḍā maintained that Ṣidqī’s writings in this regard were to be complemented by other Muslim works, such as the above-mentioned Iẓhār al-Ḥaqq.\textsuperscript{163}

Some of Ṣidqī’s articles in al-Manār aroused intense controversies in Egypt, and many religious scholars reacted strongly against them. Following the ideas of Muḥammad ‘Abduh, Ṣidqī, for instance, discussed the Qur’ānic narrative of Adam’s creation, and tried to reconcile it with the Darwinian evolutionist views. Sometimes Riḍā’s readers blamed al-Manār for opening its pages for such discussions which seemed to contradict the Qur’ān. Riḍā defended his friend’s arguments explaining that he discussed Darwin’s ideas as a scientific theory, and that his analysis was based on his own ijtihād (reasoning). His articles would only express his own views, and al-Manār was not responsible for any pieces written by others.\textsuperscript{164}

The most controversial debate was Ṣidqī’s criticism of the Sunna in his article ‘al-‘Islām huwa al-Qur’ān waḥdahu’ (Islam is the Qur’ān Only). In his view, Muslims should rely upon the Qur’ān, as the features of the Prophet’s behaviour were only meant for the first generation of Muslims, and not to be imitated in every particular case. Ṣidqī’s article in this regard came as a result of his deliberation (together with ‘Abduh ‘Ibrāhim) with Riḍā on his conviction that

\textsuperscript{159} Ibid., p. 488.

\textsuperscript{160} For example, J. M. Robertson, Christianity and Mythology, London, 1900.


\textsuperscript{162} William Harry Turton, The Truth of Christianity: being an examination of the more important arguments for and against believing in that religion, London: Jarrold & Sons, 1902.

\textsuperscript{163} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{164} Al-Manār, vol. 21/9, p. 490.
Muslims were in no need of the Sunna, as it was a temporary source for Islamic law during the time of revelation only. Riḍā suggested that it would probably be more fruitful if Ṣidqī formulated his arguments published in al-Manār, and put them forward for discussion among scholars of Al-Azhar and others. As we shall see, his polemical writings on Christianity even created a political controversy around al-Manār, especially after the interference of Lord Kitchener, the British Commissioner in Egypt (see, Chapter 3).

In 1922 Ṣidqī and his friend ʿAbduh ʿIbrāhim died of typhus. A few days before his death, Ṣidqī wrote one of his last contributions to Riḍā’s journal on the ʿaqīda, and asked his family to send it to al-Manār even after his death. The news of his death reached Riḍā, when he was in his birthplace preparing for the Syrian Congress. In an article entitled: ‘A Big Islamic Disaster,’ Riḍā paid his tribute to Ṣidqī and his friend ʿAbduh as two ‘spiritual brothers.’ He praised the former’s contributions to his journal, describing him as one of the ‘most God-fearing’ Muslims.  Riḍā showed his high esteem of Ṣidqī by representing him as one of the ‘pillars’ of knowledge and reform in Egypt. He concluded: ‘we have never found any other highly valuable friend or a highly esteemed student, who served al-Manār the way Ṣidqī did. He was benevolent and grateful to the favours given to him by the founder of al-Manār. However, we should admit that his favours to us were greater. Besides his sincerity in our friendship, he was above all our private physician, who also did my children great favours.’

Another significant polemicist was the Syrian Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Tannīr (d. 1933), who also introduced Western critical studies on the Bible throughout his book: Pagan Doctrines in the Christian Religion. Tannīr’s work was one of Riḍā’s favourite books, which he regularly quoted in his discussions, fatwās, and Tafsīr. The book enjoyed wide popularity in Muslim circles in Egypt and elsewhere.

---

167 Al-Manār, vol. 21/9, p. 495.
The author’s full name is Muḥammad Ṭāhir b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. Salīm al-Tannīr, who studied at the American Protestant College in Beirut. He was living at ‘Ayn ‘Annūb, a village near Beirut. In Beirut he published his own magazine *al-Muṣawwar*. After World War I, Tannīr moved to Egypt. Later he returned to Syria, and was buried in Dummar, on the outskirts of Damascus. Muḥammad Ṭāhir co-published a piece of work on astronomy with his father. 169 According to the Australian missionary scholar Arthur Jeffery (d. 1959), ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, Muḥammad’s father, specialised in exploiting the ultra critical Western theories on the Scriptures with a view to show that what was preached by missionaries in the East was not believed by the intellectuals in the West. The father’s works also caused many repercussions in Egypt shortly after the First World War. 170

Following his father’s steps, Tannīr brought forth his treatise as a reply to some of the contemporary Christian apologetic and polemic literature on Islam. 171 As we read in the beginning of the book, the author sarcastically dedicated his work ‘to the Crusaders of the Twentieth Century, the Missionaries.’ 172 The treatise continued to be one of the significant Muslim polemical works in the present time. It was reprinted in Tehran in 1391 (circa 1972). Muḥammad ‘Abdullāh al-Sharqāwī, a professor of philosophy at the Faculty of Dār al-ʿUlūm in Cairo, published a revised edition of Tannīr’s work in 1988. 173

Tannīr brought forward the theory of ‘Pagan Christs,’ and quoted from several Western sources in an attempt to prove the ‘absurdity’ of the Christian faith. Tannīr’s work caused reactions in Christian

---

169 Ziriklī, *op. cit.*, vol. 6, p. 173.
171 On the top of his list of missionary publications was *The Moslem World*, which he described as ‘a magazine full of slander and broadsides against Islam.’ Among the Arabic books are: al-Hidāyah (The Guidance), 4 vols., Cairo: The American Mission, al-Bākūra al-Shahiyya (Sweet First-Fruits), Cairo, The Nile Mission Press, n.d.; and the works of St. Clair Tisdall, M.A. Rice, Samuel Zwemer.
circles. Some of the sources maintained that due to its harsh attacks Tannīr’s small book was banned in Beirut (see chapter 2). In the preface, Tannīr stated that the motive behind writing the book was not ‘hostility’ or ‘fanaticism’ against people who confess other religions. First of all, he composed this small book as counter objections to missionary books which were according to Tannīr, full of ‘slander and attacks against Islam and Muslims.’ The second reason was to call the Christians back to the truth of Islam.

Tannīr emphasised that there were similarities between the story of Jesus and the stories of other ancient religions. These similarities allegedly prove that the Biblical story of Jesus was nothing more than a composite or rehash of ancient myths. His attention focused on seeking nearly identical parallels between the story of Jesus and other mythical figures, such as the Krishna story as told in the Hindu Vedas, dated to at least as far back as 1400 B.C., and the Horus myth, which was also said to be identical to the Biblical tale about Jesus. He developed these ideas from a long list of historical and Biblical Western studies, such as Huxley’s *Evidence as to Man’s Place in Nature*, Jameson’s *The History of Our Lord*, Bunsen’s *The Angel Messiah*, Fiske’s *Myth and Myth Makers*, and Ferguson’s *Tree and Serpent Worship*.

The method of drawing an analogy between Jesus and pagan deities or heroes of Antiquity was first introduced by Western authors in the nineteenth century. The American atheist Kersey Graves (1813-1883), for instance, found that stories of a crucified savior had circulated in the first civilisations. The story was very old and had been

---

174 Al-Machreq 15, 1912, p. 298.
175 Tannīr, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-8.
177 Jameson, *The History of our Lord: as exemplified in Works of Arts, with that of these Types; St. John the Baptist, and other Persons of the Old and New Testament*, Compiled by London: Lady Eastlake, 1892.
accepted in all of these cultures throughout the Far East, the Middle
East, and the Mediterranean countries.\footnote{Kersey Graves, The World’s Sixteen Crucified Saviors, New York: The Truth Seeker Company, 1875. According to Graves, the sixteen saviors are: Thulis of Egypt (1700 BC), Khrisna of India (1200 B.C.), Crite of Chaldea (1200 B.C.), Attis of Phrygia (1170 B.C.), Thammuz of Syria (1160 B.C.), Hesus of the Celtic Druids (834 B.C.), Bali of Orissa (725 B.C.), Indra of Tibet (725 B.C.), Iao of Nepal (622 B.C.), Sakia, a Hindu god, (600 B.C.), Alcestis of Euripides (600 B.C.), Mithra of Persia (600 B.C.), Quexalcoatei of Mexico (587 B.C.), Aeschylus (Prometheus) (547 B.C.), Wittoba of the Telingonese (552 B.C.), Quirinus of Rome (506 B.C.), and according to the author, Jesus Christ allegedly about the year A.D. 28 or A.D. 32. A soft copy of the book can be also found at: http://www.acwitness.org/essays/bkup/16_crucified_saviors/index.html; accessed on 11 July 2006} Gerald Massey (b. May, 1828), the English Egyptologist, also found over 100 similarities

From beginning to end, Tannir followed the comparative method of drawing an analogy between Christian doctrines and elements and traces in other different ancient beliefs. The main object of the book was to argue that there was wholesale influence of pagan mysteries and other foreign doctrines and practices on Christianity. The doctrine of Trinity, for example, which was taught by Christians, was borrowed from heathenism.\footnote{Tannir, op. cit., pp. 17-39.} He attempted to find parallels of such doctrines in other ancient religions in Egypt, India and elsewhere. The same held true for the cross, the incarnation, the virgin birth of Jesus, the appearance of the star in the East, and other events in the life of Jesus.

Christianity, according to him, largely borrowed from the records of older nations. He insisted that the idea of a suffering God atoning through his death for the sins of men, descending into the abodes of darkness and rising again to bring life and immortality to light, was found in the oldest records of the beliefs of the human race, such as those concerning Buddha and Krishna.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 55-58.} The question of the virgin birth was of special interest in the treatise. Tannir sought an analogy between the myths of the birth of Krishna and how the divine Vishnu himself descended into the womb of Devaki and was born as her son Krishna. In this, the deity was not only the effective agent in the
conception, but also the offspring. He also placed special emphasis on the relation which the idea of the virgin birth in the Gospels supposedly had with ancient Egyptian religious conceptions. However, he found that the Egyptian story of the virgin birth was much more complex and cruder than the Biblical one. In the story of the birth of Horus and in the idea of the divinity of the pharaohs a great resemblance was thought to be found. The concluding section of al-Tannîr’s treatise was again devoted to analogies; first between Krishna and Christ, and then between Buddha and Christ. He set out—in parallel columns the coincidences as related in pagan books and in the Gospels.

Another interesting associate of al-Manâr was the Moroccan Salafi scholar Taqī al-Dīn al-Hilālī (d. 1987), who travelled to Egypt for the first time in 1921 (see, appendix III). He soon contacted Ridâ and became a close friend and disciple of al-Manâr. As a strong sympathiser with the Saudi Royal family, Ridâ recommended Hilālī to Ibn Saʿūd for the position of religious teacher at al-Ḥaram al-Nabawī in Medina. Besides Saudi Arabia, Hilālī made many trips during his life to India (he taught Arabic at the Dār al-ʿUlūm of Nadwat al-ʿUlamā in Lucknow), Afghanistan, and Iraq. In the 1940s, he travelled to Germany through his connection with Shakīb Arslān, where he studied for his PhD at the University of Bonn, and became a Muslim activist and an active member of Radio Berlin in Arabic during the Second World War.

Hilālī’s correspondence with Ridâ contains important information about their relation, and that they shared the same political ideology of pan-Islamism. In al-Manâr, we can read Hilālī’s name appearing on the list of a manifesto against the Italian aggression on Libya in 1931, which was signed by Ridâ and other well-known names.

---

187 Ibid., pp. 73-74.
188 Ibid., pp. 149-184.
190 T. al-Hilālī, Die Einleitung zu Al-Bīrūnī’s Steinbuch, Gräfenhainichen: Druck von C. Schulze, 1941.
191 See the manifesto, al-Manâr, vol. 31/9 (Muharram 1350/June 1931), pp. 714-717.
During his various journeys, Hilālī attempted to disseminate al-Manār’s views in these countries.\footnote{Letter, Hilālī to Riḍā, Medina (23 Jumāda al-‘Ākhira 1346/December 1927).} A relevant example for our study was his defence of Riḍā’s acceptance of the possibility of a natural death of Jesus (see, chapters 6 and 7), when a certain ʿAbdullāh b. Ḥassan, a Najdī scholar, openly criticised al-Manār.\footnote{Letter, Hilālī to Riḍā, Mecca (10 Rabīʿ al-‘Awwal, 1346/September 1927).}

In addition to his contributions to Riḍā’s journal, Hilālī wrote to Riḍā about his experience with Muslim organisations as a Muslim preacher. In Lucknow, he became a senior teacher of Arabic (summer 1928).\footnote{Letter, Hilālī to Riḍā, Lucknow (27 Rabīʿ al-Thānī 1347/13 October 1928).} During his stay in India, he learnt English, and later co-published a printed English translation of the Qurʾān with the Indian physician Muḥammad Muḥsin Khān.\footnote{Al-Hilālī and Khān, Interpretation of the meanings of the Noble Qurʾān, Saudi Arabia: Maktabat Dār al-Salām, 1996.}

It is interesting to know that Hilālī learnt English from an American missionary in Lucknow. He believed that it was significant to have a good command of any Western language in order to promote his work of Daʿwa. Besides their three-times-a-week lesson, this American missionary requested Hilālī to attend his religious sermons in his missionary basis in order to improve his language. Like Riḍā, Hilālī praised the enthusiasm of Christians in disseminating their religion, while Muslims lacked zealotry in propagating Islam.\footnote{Taqī al-Dīn al-Hilālī, ‘Al-Barāhīn al-ʾInjīliyya ʿalā ʿanna Ἰσα ἀναλόγον ἐνthy Ἰσα ἐν Σαράκασα, unpublished typescript (Morocco, n. d.).}

On the eve of Christmas 1930, Hilālī met with a certain young American missionary by the name of William Smith (?) about whom we do not have any information. When they started their debate on the nature of the Bible and the Qurʾān, Hilālī made it clear that he never read the Gospel, and was now learning English to read it in its English version. Smith immediately ordered a copy for him from London, which he sent to Hilālī with a brief note: ‘Asking God to bestow on you many blessings through this book.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 6.} Hilālī instantly embarked upon drafting his polemical commentaries on this version, and gave Riḍā a summary of his findings. In one of his letters, for example, he informed Riḍā that he wrote these Arabic notes on the margins of the Gospel according to Matthew on the copy sent to him by Smith. Riḍā was much interested in reading Hilālī’s comments.
Arslān showed a similar interest in reading the comments. After having finished the translation, a proposal was made by Riḍā to let the treatise be published by the well-known Saudi businessman Muḥammad Naṣīf of Jeddah.

Hilālī explained his primary motive of translating the Gospels by writing to Riḍā: ‘I hope that some Muslim organisations would shoulder the task of translating the Gospels into eloquent and correct Arabic with annotations in order to expose the confusion of the Christians, just as what they did with our Book [the Qur’ān]. But we should only illustrate the facts, without imitating the Christians in their wrong-doing [with our Book].’199 His prime aim of producing an excellent translation with footnotes was also to convert Arab Christians to Islam and make it less likely that Muslims would be seduced by missionary attempts.200 But the ‘real enemy,’ in Hilālī’s view, ‘remains Western Christians, not the Eastern ones.’201 Hilālī unfortunately lost his copy of the Gospel with its notes, but later published his comments in the magazine of al-Shubbān al-Muslimūn (established by the Iraqi writer and lawyer Tāhā al-Fayyāḍ (1899-1964) in Basra) under the title: Hawāshī Shattā ‘alā ′Injīl Mattā (Various Footnotes on the Gospel according to Matthew).202

As a fervent advocate of disseminating the Arabic language among all Muslims, Hilālī established the Arabic Lucknow-based magazine al-Ḍiyā’, in cooperation with the Indian scholar ‘Abū al-Ḥasan al-Nadwī (d. 1999).203 Its main purpose was to promote the knowledge of Arabic among Indian Muslims. Al-Manār blessed his project by publishing the introductory statement of al-Nadwī in the magazine.204

---

200 Ibid.
201 Letter, al-Hilālī to Riḍā, Lucknow (14 Jumāda al-Ulā 1351/4 September 1933).
Besides his writings in Riḍā’s journal, Hilālī also tried to introduce al-Manār to many Indian scholars. He believed that the only way to propagate al-Manār’s reform mission was to encourage learning the Arabic language, and to combat the ‘rigid’ scholars who argued that reading classical sources in translations were enough for learning Islam.

A certain Badr al-Dīn al-Ṣinī, a Chinese Muslim, was in the same period on the Indian stage with Hilālī. Little is known about this person. However, he was important in Riḍā’s religious circle. Al-Ṣinī was actually known to the readers of Arab Muslim magazines in Egypt and elsewhere. In one of his letters, Riḍā asked Hilālī to take care of him by reading many Islamic sources with him. Riḍā also gave him the responsibility of translating his works into Chinese. Through Hilālī, al-Ṣinī made a proposal to Riḍā for translating his book al-Wahī into Chinese. Hilālī described al-Ṣinī as ‘an energetic self-made Muslim.’ Although he admitted the benefit of the Chinese translation, Hilālī believed that an English translation would be more effective. Among the names he suggested to make the translation was a certain Mirza Muḥammad Khān Bahādir, an Iraqi of Persian origin living in Basra.

1.3. Conclusion

Studying al-Manār in the light of the archive of its founder, we have found two focal categories of sources used by Riḍā in his efforts to collect relevant materials, which helped him to compensate for his lack of knowledge of Western languages (and subsequently influenced the development of his views on Christianity): 1) the critical Western works in Arabic print offered him a wide range of precedents related
to the West, and 2) the contributions of various individuals in his circle of associates who had a good command of Western languages (especially English, French and German), and possessed a certain degree of religious involvement in the subject.

These contributions included such subjects as the rise of new Christian movements in the West and historical and archaeological discoveries related to the Bible (such as the afore-mentioned German scholar Delitzsch). *Al-Manār*’s treatment of these subjects was to advocate the authenticity of Islam vis-à-vis Christian missionary claims of the superiority of their religion. It is apparent from Riḍā’s archive that he came into personal contact with various people, who influenced his journal and broadened his scope as a journalist immensely. In the first place, the objective of their works seems to have been to describe certain European ideas that would fit well in the *al-Manār*’s programme. Secondly, the effect of their interaction was also determined by the kinds of topics or discussions, which Riḍā finally selected for print.
CHAPTER TWO

RIDĀ AND ARAB CHRISTIANS:
ATTITUDES TOWARDS SYRIAN CHRISTIANS
AND THE EGYPTIAN COPTIC COMMUNITY

In order to present a good picture of Riḍā’s relations with Arab Christians, I shall first of all describe his relations with some of his Syrian Christian fellow-citizens, who, like him, made Egypt their new residence after migration. In the course of our discussion we shall turn our focus from a short sketch of Riḍā’s political ambitions with them and their struggle for independence from the colonial presence in the Arab East, towards an outline of the personal biographies of those among them with whom Riḍā had lively debates. This is suggested as a useful means of illuminating the historical context of the discussions at stake. Many of these Christian writers had championed secularism. Riḍā’s attitudes towards these individuals generated very interesting discussions on religion, history, Islamic philosophy and literature. At another level, Riḍā’s polemics with Syrians Christians was extended to include religious controversies with the Arabic Jesuit journal al-Machreq. The last part of the chapter is devoted to study his stances towards the Egyptian Copts, and his reflections as a Syrian émigré on their political demands, ending with his sharp reactions to the Christian writer Salāma Mūsā, who was a close disciple of Syrian Christian publicists in Egypt.


The Syro-Lebanese emigrant community in Brazil knew about al-Manār right from the start of its publication. The Sao-Paulo-based journal al-Asmaʿī, co-edited by the Christians Khalil Milūk and Shukrī al-Khūrī, reviewed al-Manār describing it as ‘one of the best Islamic journals.’1 Naʿūm al-Labakī (d. 1924), the founder of the Syrian

---

journal *al-Munāẓir* (The Debater) in Sao Paulo, blamed Riḍā for restricting the subjects of his journal to religious issues, and that he stopped his discussions on Syrian national problems and religious strife in their homeland Syria. The contents of the journal, according to him, were not in agreement with the subtitle of his journal: ‘scientific, literary, informative and educating journal.’ In his reply, Riḍā explained that he used to write such items before the banning of his journal in Syria, and they would have been valueless as no Syrian Muslim, Christian or Jew had access to his articles anymore. As the circle of his readers became limited to the people in Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, India, Java, and a group of Syrian emigrants in America, it was more appropriate for him to focus on other Islamic religious instructive issues. Riḍā was also convinced that his treatment of such Islamic themes was not only of benefit for his Muslim readers, but for Christians as well. He asserted that a Christian teacher at one of the high schools in Syria, after having read *al-Manār*, had ordered all previous issues. He also persuaded the director of the school to subscribe to the journal and collect its issues for the school’s library. Riḍā finally concluded that it was also reasonable to subtitle his journal as ‘informative and educating,’ since religious sciences are the most ‘venerated’ fields.

Born and bred in Syria, which is known for its religious and ethnic minorities, Riḍā was familiar with its substantial Christian population. His coming to Egypt coincided with the resumption of the emigration wave of Syrians (most of them Christians), who fled from the Hamidian oppression to Egypt towards the end of the nineteenth century. In his later political career, Riḍā gathered around his political project of Arabism an active group of Syrian émigré intellectuals, 
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2 ‘Al-Manār wā al-Munāẓir,’ vol. 2/40 (Sha’bān 1317/December 1899), p. 683. In 1908 Labaki returned back to his birthplace Beirut, where he continued its publication. He was the president of the Representative Council of Lebanon. See, Ziriklī, *op. cit.*, vol. 8, p. 40.


who opposed the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) and promoted the idea of an Arab monarch.\(^5\)

Political interests linked both Muslim and Christian elites in their cultural pride in Arab heritage, as a means to face the cultural expansion of the West.\(^6\) Syrian Christians, in particular, played a large role in the revival of the Arab literary movement. After his migration to Egypt, Riḍā drew closer to his Syrian Christian fellow writers and publishers. This group probably enjoyed the greatest freedom of thought that was experienced by any group of Arab intellectuals in the twentieth century.\(^7\) Most of these Syrians were Christians by origin, but adopted a strictly secularist agenda. Although the majority of those Christians enjoyed modern Western education and adopted Western methods of thinking, some of them, however, shared with Riḍā his resentment of the penetration of Western thought into the Arab world, including missionary activities. They also shared with him the same anxieties that ‘the Sublime Porte would fall in the hands of Europe.’\(^8\)

In 1912 and 1913 new Arab political groupings came into being. One of the best known among these new groups was Ḥizb al-Lāmarkaziyya al-Idāriyyā al-ʿUthmānī (Ottoman Administrative Decentralisation Party), which Riḍā founded in Cairo in December 1912. The party was dedicated to the achievement of self-government in the Ottoman Empire.\(^9\) Within the party, Riḍā called for an Arab revival as the necessary herald of the restoration of Islam. He also declared that as a Muslim he was a brother to all Muslims, and as an Arab a brother to all Arabs, and he saw no contradiction between the
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two. His model of ‘an Arab Empire’ would have recognised both Christianity and Judaism and would have given non-Muslims the right to serve in the administration of the government and the judicial system (except the Sharīʿa courts).

After the rise of the theory of Arabism, some Christian Arabs (mostly Syrians and Palestinians) had already implicitly accepted the theory that Islam is an essential part of Arabism because it brought grandeur to the Arabs. Many Arab Christians, such as Shiblī Shumayyil and the prominent lawyer Iskandar ʿAmmūn, had joined Riḍā’s Decentralisation Party. Being on close terms with many of these Christian Syrians of his generation, Riḍā managed in his political struggle to gain the support of those who ‘were unwilling to admit the inferiority of the East to the West.’ For him, Syrian Christians were ‘the most advanced class in education, wealth, generosity, courage and pride.’ By 1914 he had developed to the full his theory of Arabism, which was also accepted by a group of Christian Arabs.

The concept of the ‘Greater Syria’ sharpened Riḍā’s desire for Pan-Arabism. In his struggle against the imposition of the French Mandate in Syria, he played a prominent role with other Muslim, Christian and Druze nationalists. In 1918, a number of Syrian émigrés had established the Syrian-Palestinian Congress. During its first major session in Geneva (summer of 1921), where demands for Syrian unity and independence were presented to the League of Nations, Riḍā was elected as the vice-president. Its president Michel Luṭfallah


13 Ibid.

14 *Al-Manār*, vol. 15/1, (Muḥarram 1330/January 1912), p. 44.


16 Marie-Renée Mouton, ‘Le Congrès syrio-palestinien de Genève (1921),’ *Relations Internationales* 19, 1979, pp. 313-328. About Riḍā’s political ideas and activism,
(1880-1961), the son of a wealthy Greek Orthodox Christian émigré in Egypt, was the inspiration behind the establishment of the Congress and its major financier. But by 1922, disputes between Syrian factions became intense, a rift between Syrian and Palestinian members started to appear, and the Syrian membership was split into two. Luṭfallah, allied with the Damascene physician Abdel-Rahmān Shāhbandar (assassinated in 1946), chose to advocate a purely secular nationalism. The other group, headed by Shakīb Arslān, propagated the idea of Arabism, as based on the Islamic divine tenets. They clashed with Luṭfallah-Shāhbandar’s faction because of their links with the British and the Hashimite royal family. Riḍā chose to remain linked to the former faction, since this enabled him to concentrate on the ideological articulation of nationalism and particularly on the importance of the Islamic content in its formulation.

2.1.1. *Faraḥ Anṭūn* (al-Jāmiʿa)

Riḍā’s acquaintance with Faraḥ Anṭūn goes back to their youth in their hometown Tripoli. In their early years, he met with Anṭūn for the first time at the house of Jurjī Yannī, a teacher and writer in Tripoli. At that time, Riḍā saw Anṭūn as one of the most intelligent Christian young men in Syria. He was modest, shy, but eventually showed himself to be an irritable person. He often hesitated to give his opinions frankly in case he had not studied the matter in question thoroughly. Both young men agreed that the Syrian stage was too cramped for their dreams of entering the world of journalism. In see, for example, Eliezer Tauber, ‘Three Approaches, One Idea: Religion and State in the Thought of ‘Abd al-Raḥman al-Kawākibī, Najīb ‘Azūrī and Rashīd Riḍā,’ *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 21/2, 1994, pp. 190-198; id., ‘Rashīd Riḍā and Faysal’s Kingdom in Syria,’ *The Muslim World* 85, 1995, pp. 235-245; id., ‘Rashīd Riḍā as Pan-Arabist before the World War I,’ *The Muslim World* 79/2, 1989, pp. 102-112; id., ‘The Political Life of Rashīd Riḍā,’ *Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 19-20, 1998, pp. 261-272.


1897 they decided to travel to Egypt on an Austrian ship (3 December, 1897) heading towards Alexandria together.\textsuperscript{20}

During the early years of \textit{al-Manār}, Riḍā entrusted Anṭūn to translate French materials into Arabic.\textsuperscript{21} In Alexandria Anṭūn founded his journal \textit{al-Jāmiʿa} (firstly appeared 1899) through which he tried to disseminate his secularist views. Riḍā watched the progress of his friend’s magazine and brought its contents on ethics, philosophy and sociology to the attention of ‘Abduh, who, as a result, expressed his positive impression of Anṭūn and always recommended his magazine to his friends.\textsuperscript{22}

The young Christian journalist Anṭūn was much influenced by the ideas of the French writer Ernest Renan, and gave the most systematic presentation of his French writings in the Arab world. He published serial translations of Renan’s \textit{La Vie de Jésus}. Following the path of Renan, he very soon published another article in the spring of 1902 on Ibn Rushd in which he also stressed that religious orthodoxy had obstructed the spirit of free inquiry in Islamic civilisation.\textsuperscript{23} Renan’s skeptical attitude towards religion concurred perfectly with Anṭūn’s anticlerical feelings.\textsuperscript{24} In that article, Anṭūn extended his theory to maintain that Christianity, unlike Islam, had been shown to tolerate philosophy.

Alarmed by Anṭūn’s arguments, Riḍā promptly raised the problem with ‘Abduh, and fervently requested him to give a response. Anṭūn was very surprised to learn that it was Riḍā, as one of his best friends, who agitated the feelings of the mufti against his journal.\textsuperscript{25} Riḍā urgently requested ‘Abduh to defend Islam and its scholars against Anṭūn’s ‘blasphemy.’ While staying in Alexandria, ‘Abduh planned to meet with Anṭūn to discuss the contents of his article personally, 

\textsuperscript{20} Riḍā’s diary, December, 1897. The diary of his early months in Egypt reveals that he was on close terms with Anṭūn. When having visited Anṭūn in the hotel in Cairo, Riḍā used, for example, to observe his prayer in the latter’s room, since there was no mosque close in the neighbourhood.

\textsuperscript{21} Reid, \textit{The Odyssey}, p. ix.


\textsuperscript{23} Ernest Renan, \textit{Averroes et l’Averroïsme}, Paris, 1852.

\textsuperscript{24} About his anticlericalism, see, Reid, \textit{Odyssey}, pp. 70-74.

\textsuperscript{25} F. Anṭūn, \textit{Ibn Rushd wā Falsafatuh}, Alexandria, January 1903, p. 2 (Quoted below, \textit{Ibn Rushd}). At that time, ‘Abduh was traveling throughout Egyptian Northern cities to collect donations for the victims of a fire catastrophe in the Delta of Egypt.
but had no opportunity to do so. During a tour in Northern Egypt, ʿAbduh started drafting his articles of defence relying on his memory, while keeping Riḍā updated in a series of letters with the development of his investigations on the matter. He asked Riḍā to inform Anṭūn of his plan to write a refutation to his article on Ibn Rushd, and to ask him whether he was ready to publish it in al-Jāmiʿa. They agreed that Riḍā would edit the final drafts of the rejoinders in his own handwriting and send them to al-Jāmiʿa for publication. Anṭūn was in the beginning hesitant to give space to ʿAbduh’s refutation in his journal. But later he published most of his ideas in one separate volume supplemented with ʿAbduh’s response, which he dedicated to ‘the fairly-minded among the Easterners, Christians, Muslims, or followers of any other religion.’

Their arguments did not remain purely on an intellectual level. They quickly developed into insult and distortion of each other’s position, by changing the conflict into violent and contemptuous hostility. Riḍā and Anṭūn charged each other with having escalated the problem in order to gain popularity for their journals and raise the number of subscribers. The issue also spoiled Anṭūn’s friendship with Riḍā and both of them turned to accuse each other of being ignorant. Anṭūn suggested that Riḍā lacked the knowledge (especially, of the French language and of the science of Kalām) required to embark on such debates, and should have left the matter to his more erudite teacher. From his side, Riḍā maintained that his adversary had not simply made a well-intentioned mistake, but had purposely disparaged Islam as well. He also maintained that Anṭūn’s strategy was to separate the teacher from his disciple. Anṭūn declared that while ʿAbduh’s rejoinders took the shape of a respectable intellectual debate, Riḍā was inclined to slander and offense.

What irritated Riḍā was what he described as Anṭūn’s implicit intention to show up Islam as a religion that is against the spirit of science and wisdom, while Christianity was presented as the religion that promoted science in Europe. He further understood that Anṭūn’s ideas explicitly stressed that the nature of Islam predetermines lack of knowledge and civilisation; and that Muslims would never achieve
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26 Riḍā, Tārīkh., pp. 809-810.
28 Hourani, Arabic Thought, p. 254.
29 Reid, Odyssey, p. 87.
progress as long as they clung to their religion and did not convert to Christianity.\footnote{Al-Manār, vol. 3/12 (Jumāda al-Thāniya 1320/September 1902), p. 471.}

According to Riḍā, some of his readers notified him that articles like those of al-Jāmiʿa were more dangerous for Muslims than missionary publications. However, he maintained that Anṭūn had the right to defend his religion, but should have uttered his views in a moderate way. Riḍā portrayed al-Jāmiʿa as a ‘sectarian’ and ‘religious journal’ in content, although it did not overtly show any Christian tendency and still claimed itself as a platform for literary, scientific and medical subjects.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 474-475. Riḍā gave another example on how Christian magazines zealously supported Anṭūn in what he saw as anti-Muslim campaign, see, al-Manār, vol. 5/13 (Rajab 1320-October 1902), pp. 515-517.}

Anṭūn fervently accused Riḍā of having manipulated religious issues for propagating al-Manār among common Muslims.\footnote{Anṭūn, Ibn Rushd, p. 6.} It was observable that al-Manār’s reputation grew and witnessed a rapid increase of its circulation after Riḍā had published ‘Abduh’s defenses against Anṭūn’s work.\footnote{See my paper, ‘A Printed Muslim ‘Lighthouse’ in Cairo al-Manār’s Early Years, Religious Aspiration and Reception (1898-1903),’ Arabica: Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies 56, 2009, pp. 27-60.}

Anṭūn explicitly proclaimed that he never intended to take part in debating with the founder of al-Manār. By his discussion, he only endeavoured to address ‘Abduh as an authoritative and a highly-esteemed Muslim scholar. In Anṭūn’s eyes, Riḍā, whom he had known as a ‘sober’ and ‘restrained’ person, appeared to be of a ‘rash’ and ‘eccentric’ character after having propagated insults against him.\footnote{Anṭūn, Ibn Rushd, pp. 85-87, see also pp. 226-227.} His reaction, unlike his teacher, was ‘foolish’ and ‘imprudent.’ He was intolerant towards methods of scientific analysis and the conclusions of Al-Jāmiʿa’s article. In Anṭūn’s own words, ‘the irrefutable evidence of [al-Jāmiʿa] increased his [Riḍā] foolishness, and he was driven frenzied to the degree that we became anxious about his state of mind.’\footnote{Ibid., pp. 4-5.}

He moreover compared Riḍā in his aloofness to grasp the facts mentioned in al-Jāmiʿa in a mocking way with ‘a crocodile […] when you throw to him a pearl, he would immediately rush to smash it with his teeth, but never try to use it as an ornament to his ears. Having failed to smash the pearl, the crocodile would throw it again
and swoop down upon it while being enflamed with anger and grudge.\textsuperscript{36}

In a sixteen-page private letter addressed to ‘Abduh on the pages of his magazine, Anṭūn accused Riḍā of provoking the problem. His assault on al-Jāmi’a, said Anṭūn, was nothing but ‘envy and lack of decency.’ ‘Nothing,’ he went further, ‘would satisfy his [Riḍā’s] rancour, but insulting others.’\textsuperscript{37} Anṭūn drew ‘Abduh’s attention to the fact that the ‘recklessness’ and ‘foolishness’ of his disciple would harm his position as the Grand Mufti of Egypt.\textsuperscript{38} Finally, he made three suggestions to ‘Abduh: 1) to find two trustworthy arbiters among Al-Azhar scholars to judge the whole issue, 2) to disclaim all matters published in al-Manār, 3) or to bring the ‘attack’ of Riḍā against him and his journal to an end. In the event that Riḍā continued his campaign, Anṭūn warned ‘Abduh that he would instantly publish a hundred thousand copies of the letter and distribute them among the public.\textsuperscript{39}

The debate with ‘Abduh undoubtedly pushed the interest in Anṭūn’s magazine to its highest point. But it was Riḍā’s critique of al-Jāmi’a, which led to the immediate withdrawal of Muslim subscribers, which contributed to its collapse. Due to its sharp attack, al-Manār was said to be ‘the assassin of al-Jāmi’a.’\textsuperscript{40} But Riḍā believed that the reason for the latter’s collapse was its editor’s lack of knowledge of Islamic matters. After its first failure, Riḍā proudly taunted that ‘no Arab paper would ever survive without its Muslim readership, as they represented the majority of the nation.’\textsuperscript{41}

Al-Jāmi’a disappeared in 1904, and was revived irregularly after its editor’s move to New York in the period between 1906 and 1909. We notice that Riḍā’s attitude towards Anṭūn started to change, and he eulogised Anṭūn’s efforts to republish his journal in the United States. He described it again as ‘one of the best edited and most useful Arab papers.’\textsuperscript{42} He also welcomed the return of Anṭūn and his magazine
to Egypt in 1909. But Anṭūn only managed to publish two more issues of his journal, and it disappeared for good in the following years.

After Anṭūn’s death in 1922, it was Riḍā who demanded a ceremony dedicated to his memory. One of Anṭūn’s biographers believes that by this attempt Riḍā tried to make amends for their old conflict. In a letter (see, appendix IV), Rose Anṭūn, Farah’s younger sister, expressed her gratitude to Riḍā for his initiative by saying: ‘[since] I was staying with my brother in all his doings till the last moment of his life, I know perfectly well how he held you in very high esteem. […] Now with all what you did, you have added one new noble deed to all the ones we knew from you before. I shall never forget it that you were the first one my eyes had grasped during the funeral ceremony and the first to summon upon my brother’s commemoration.’

2.1.2. Jurjī Zaidān (al-Hilāl)

The Greek Orthodox Jurjī Zaidān (1861-1914) was an important member of the Syrian community in Egypt. In 1892 he founded his magazine al-Hilāl (The Crescent) in which he published much on ethics, sociology, geography, literature, Arab history, and world politics. He also published many works on many subjects such as the history of Lebanon, education and social order, Machiavelli and Ibn Khaldūn, and the siege of Damiette by the Crusaders. Just like many of his contemporary Syrian Christian intellectuals, Zaidān held the view that each religion is to a certain extent in agreement with the
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46 Letter, Rose Anṭūn to Riḍā, Cairo, 24 February 1923. The ceremony took place on the first of March 1923 at the American University in Cairo. Riḍā delivered a speech in which he referred to the history of his relation with Anṭūn. For more details about Anṭūn’s commemoration, see, the supplement of his sister’s magazine Majallat al-Sayyidāt wā al-Rijāl, Farah Anṭūn: Ḥayātuh wā Taʾbīnuh wā Mukhtārātuh, Cairo, September 1923.
sciences, though for him science should remain the decisive criterion in evaluating things. He was impressed by Muḥammad ‘Abduh and his recognition of the ‘duty to interpret the Qurʾān in such a fashion as to bring it into agreement with modern science.’\(^{48}\) As a Christian intellectual, Zaidān’s writings on Islam were, as described by T. Philipp, mostly ‘precarious.’\(^{49}\) When dealing with the relationship between Islam and Christianity he tried to play down any tension between both religions, and tended to show that Christians during most of history lived in harmony with their Muslim compatriots.\(^{50}\)

A few days after his arrival in Egypt, Riḍā met Zaidān in the company of Anṭūn for the first time in the latter’s office at al-Hilāl (January 1989). Their first conversation focused on the situation of journalism in Egypt.\(^{51}\) When Riḍā established himself as a Muslim journalist, Zaidān used to send al-Manār his novels on Islamic history and literature in order for Riḍā to review them critically.

In the early years of their relation, Riḍā, at many occasions, praised Zaidān as ‘a historian with objective eyes’\(^{52}\) who appreciated others’ criticism of his own views.\(^{53}\) While involved in his controversy with Farah Anṭūn, Riḍā was earnestly defending Zaidān against the criticism of some Muslims, who accused him of ‘religious fanaticism’ and tried to disqualify his works on Islamic history as a Christian thinker.\(^{54}\) Riḍā, on the contrary, saw the benefit of such

\(^{48}\) Philipp, Gurgi, pp. 58-59.

\(^{49}\) Ibid., p. 59.

\(^{50}\) Ibid., p. 60.

\(^{51}\) Riḍā’s Diary (1897-1898).

\(^{52}\) Al-Manār, vol. 5/9 (Jumāda al-ʿŪlā 1320/August 1902), pp. 356-357.

\(^{53}\) See, for example, al-Manār, vol. 6/10 (Jumadā al-ʿŪlā 1321/August 1903), pp. 391-398. Riḍā also received questions from his readers as a result of their readings in Zaidān’s novels on Islamic history, see, Riḍā’s fatwā on reciting the Qurʾān in the graveyard raised by a student of Al-Azhar, al-Manār, vol. 5/13, p. 508.

novels in educating Muslim youngsters about unknown parts of their own history. He often excused Zaidān for his historical mistakes, since he, as a novelist, was allowed sometimes to collect his information on a non-historical basis. In his historical novel *Fatāt Ghassān* (The Maiden of Ghassân), Zaidān went further by citing the controversial Muslim narrative on the story of *al-Gharāniq*. Riḍā mildly criticised Zaidān for having incautiously mentioned such a controversial story. Despite his strong conviction in its forged nature, Riḍā believed that Zaidān included the story in his novel on the basis of the account of the early Muslim historiographer al-Ṭabarī. He maintained that ‘he [Zaidān], as a Christian, should be forgiven if he believed in the story. Some early Muslim scholars mentioned it without giving any critical remarks.’\(^{55}\) Another noteworthy example was the harsh criticism of many Muslims against Zaidān’s acceptance of the story that the Prophet’s regular meetings with monks (such as Baḥīra) and other lettered people in his young age had an immense impact on his later religious career as a Prophet, especially during the commercial trips with his uncle.\(^{56}\) Although Riḍā rejected Zaidān’s interpretation, he was certain that he had no intention whatsoever of defaming Islam. Meanwhile he demanded that Muslims should learn only from authoritative and well-versed Muslim scholars instead of depending on such works. Despite all these critical remarks, Riḍā insisted on his appreciation of Zaidān’s enrichment of Arabic literature. He never thought that the latter had any intention of offending or attacking Islam, nor was he ever proved to be ‘a fanatic Christian.’\(^ {57}\)

Riḍā’s response to Zaidān’s works on Islamic history was inconsistent. His attitude towards the man drastically changed because of their political differences. The most significant example was Riḍā’s approach to the latter’s voluminous work on the history of Islamic civilisation.\(^ {58}\) When Zaidān embarked upon writing his work (1902), Riḍā regularly praised his endeavours as a service to Muslims and Arabs by compiling in one piece of work their history which was scattered through the various sources.\(^ {59}\)
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\(^{56}\) Zaidān, ibid, passim, pp. 32-36 & p. 72.

\(^{57}\) *Al-Manār*, vol. 7/13 (1 Rajab 1322/11 September 1904), pp. 514-518.


\(^{59}\) *Al-Manār*, vol. 8/13 (Rajab 1323/August 1905), pp. 511-512.
initiatives as unprecedented in furnishing the history of Islam, and
saw this specific work as ‘a useful example for Arab readers.’
He moreover urged other Arab historians to follow his steps. He again
disapproved of Muslim attacks on the book as ‘unfair to recompense
those who make efforts to serve [Muslims] by constantly stressing
their lapses before giving mention to the benefits of their works.’ Riḍā
continued to give his positive assessment for Zaidān’s works in
the following years, while he persistently kept requesting other authors
to critically review the author’s historical data.

However, by 1908 al-Manār turned to sketch its first detailed criti-
cism of Zaidān’s work on pre-Islamic history by publishing two
articles by Ahmad ʿUmar al-ʾIskandarī (1875-1938), a teacher of
Arabic Literature, in which he berated Zaidān’s work. In his articles,
al-ʾIskandarī criticised Zaidān’s ability to write on Islamic history.
Although his effort deserved appreciation as a historical piece of
work, it should have been written in a more accurate way. In January
1912 al-Manār published a sharper criticism launched by the Indian
scholar Shiblī al-Nuʾmānī (1869-1914), who accused Zaidān of
attempting to belittle the Arabs and to abuse them. Like Riḍā, Nuʾmānī
had been earlier on good terms with Zaidān. At the beginning of their
relation, Nuʾmānī did not believe any accusation against Zaidān of
blatantly misrepresenting Arab history. At a certain point, however,
Nuʾmānī shifted his attack to the personal integrity of Zaidān by
demonstrating that his sole attempt was to deliberately falsify and
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change the truth about Islamic history. The motive for Nu‘mānī’s response was that Zaidān had engaged in circulating ‘intrigues’ through the publication of such works, while nobody took the initiative to oppose him. Zaidān, on the other hand, habitually eulogised Nu‘mānī’s work and paid tribute to his scholarly prestige among Indian scholars. But this was no justification for Nu‘mānī to quit his religious ‘zealousness’ by giving concessions in matters of religious beliefs. He also made it clear that he was not ready to ‘accept his [Zaidān] praise in return for allowing him to attack the Arabs.’

In October of the same year, two other articles by al-ʾIskandarī appeared in Riḍā’s journal in which he again sharply criticised Zaidān’s work on the history of Arabic literature. Some of Zaidān’s shortcomings, according to al-ʾIskandarī, were his many mistakes in giving references and documentation for his data, his incorrect conclusions, contradicting information, his imitation of orientalists—who sometimes formulate their views without any verification, and his literal application of the theory of evolution in all aspects.

Riḍā gave the views of both al-ʾIskandarī and al-Nu‘mānī more credibility by reprinting their criticisms in a separate treatise together with another article by the Jesuit Louis Cheikho, the editor of al-Machreq. In his preface to the treatise, Riḍā also withdrew his support by saying that Zaidān, as a non-Muslim, wrote his history without any proper qualification in Islamic knowledge from real authoritative scholars. Zaidān, Riḍā contended, relied on the works of Western orientalists in his approach of collecting his historical data rather than making an effort to directly rely on Islamic sources. For this reason, his works came out with the gravest of errors. However, Riḍā denied that he had anything to do personally with these criticisms.
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and that al-Nuʿmānī (and other authors) must take the responsibility.\textsuperscript{72}

On his part, Zaidān was frustrated by this unexpected Manārist campaign against his works. A few months after the appearance of these articles in \textit{al-Manār}, he complained to his son Emile that the views of al-Iskandārī and al-Nuʿmānī showed some aspects of religious hatred and fanaticism that he had had to contend with occasionally during his career. They were therefore not worthy of any answer.\textsuperscript{73} Riḍā and al-Nuʿmānī, whom he had considered as good friends, had now turned out to be his adversaries. When al-Nuʿmānī was still extensively involved in writing against Zaidān’s work in \textit{al-Manār} and elsewhere, one of \textit{al-Hilāl}'s Muslim readers in Egypt tried to console the latter for al-Nuʿmānī’s harsh attack on his integrity. In his reply to this reader, Zaidān maintained that he was perplexed by reading these attacks, and had no clear answer why Riḍā and al-Nuʿmānī had turned against him in such a way.\textsuperscript{74} However, he had explicitly mentioned the direct reason behind their campaign in an earlier letter to his son Emile:

\begin{quote}
I read \textit{al-Manār} and saw, what you saw too. Grief prevailed over all other feelings in me. Not because this foolish criticism had any influence upon me. Indeed, the station of \textit{al-Hilāl} is too lofty as to be hit by any tasteless slander. But I was grieved by the deterioration of the character of our writers to such a level, that even from al-Nuʿmānī, the greatest scholar of India, emanated phrases that even the rabble would be ashamed to use. With all this we were friends for twenty years and our relations were amicable. When I read his criticism I wrote him a letter, reproaching him in very strong terms. A copy of it you will find enclosed […] As for the owner of \textit{al-Manār} he is excused by his exasperation with \textit{al-Hilāl}, the success of our books, our fame.\textsuperscript{75}
\end{quote}

In June 1910, Zaidān was invited to teach a course in Islamic history at the recently founded Egyptian University, but a few months later he was to learn that the University withdrew his appointment.\textsuperscript{76} He

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ware, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 198-199.
\item Letter to Emile, 14 November 1908, as quoted in Ware, ibid., p. 198.
\item Letter to Emile, Cairo, March 28, 1912; as translated and cited in Philip, \textit{Gurgi}, pp. 216-219.
\item Ibid., pp. 66-67; more about the affair, see, Donald Malcolm Reid, ‘Cairo University and the Orientalists,’ \textit{International Journal of Middle East Studies} 19/1, 1987, pp. 62-64 (Quoted below, ‘Cairo’).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
suspected that Riḍā had a hand in opposing his post at the university. He was convinced that the founder of *al-Manār* was angered by the appraisal letter of Prince Muḥammad ʿAli (b. 1872) in which he maintained that before the appearance of *al-Hilāl* nobody mentioned the history of Islam. Another factor for irritation was, according to Zaidān, Riḍā’s failure to imitate him in writing historical novels about Islam. In 1905, Riḍā had approached his Syrian friend Sheikh ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Zahrāwī (1871-1916) to help him to compose a series of historical novels about Islam because nobody had written about this subject in Arabic earlier. Referring to this imitation, Zaidān ended his letter to his son: ‘regardless of the fact that my novels fill his library and he has read all of them. If this did not change his irritation, how can we blame him that his vexation increased when he started with his project and did not even finish the first novel.’

In truth, Riḍā never openly accused Zaidān of any evil intention to misrepresent the history of Arabs and Islam. He explained his own reasons for publishing this collection of criticisms. Besides his incapability of writing on Islamic history, Riḍā made it clear that he was highly concerned that the Turkish translation of Zaidān’s works might add fuel to the fire of Young Turk chauvinism. The Turkish translation of his work was done by the Christian Zakī Maghāmiz of Aleppo, who was known for his anti-Arab sentiments. In one of his letters, Maghāmiz complained to Zaidān that the illustrations in his book showed Arab civilisation to be too superior. Maghāmiz also took part in the Turkish project of translating the Qurʾān. At another occasion, Riḍā suspected Maghāmiz of intentionally misrepresenting the Qurʾān through his assistance in the translation. Zaidān later became a sympathiser of the Young Turks Revolution and strongly opposed any Arab attempt to form independent organisations, such as the Decentralisation Party of Riḍā and his group. Riḍā was very disappointed in Zaidān’s stance towards the Turks against the Arabs.
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This attitude became clearer especially after Zaidān’s death. Not long after his death, Riḍā (who was also present at his commemoration ceremony) wrote a biography in which he discussed in detail the late Zaidān’s sympathy to the ideas of Ottomanism. For Riḍā, Zaidān was one of the pillars (rukn) of the modern Arab renaissance (nahḍa). However, after his trip to Istanbul (1908) Zaidān tried to revive the shuʿūbī (anti-Arab sentiments) beliefs among the Christian intelligentsia, and became convinced of the validity of absorbing the Arab provinces back into the Empire. He considered Zaidān’s tendency as an attempt to champion the Turkish culture over the Arabs. Riḍā, who previously praised his works on Arab civilisation, now viewed them as an attack on the Arab identity. For this reason, he allowed Nuʿmānī’s criticism to be published in his journal in order to prevent the Turks from using Zaidān’s works as a source of criticism against the Arabs.82

2.1.3. Yaʿqūb Šarrūf and Fāris Nimr (al-Muqtaṭaf)

As has been mentioned above, al-Muqtaṭaf was one of the Arabic periodicals that brought Riḍā into contact with the Western world during his Syrian years. It was founded by the Syrian Christians Yaʿqūb Šarrūf (1852-1927) and Fāris Nimr (1856-1951) after their arrival in Egypt in 1876. The great contribution of this journal was the revival of the Arabic language by introducing science and technology to an initially narrow, but ever-increasing Arabic reading public in a simple and sound language.83

Al-Muqtaṭaf met with strong opposition from entrenched traditionalist circles in the Muslim world. When its first issues arrived in Baghdad, for instance, conservatives in all communities, Sunnī and Shīʿī, Christian and Jewish resisted it because it preached new and ‘dangerous’ doctrines. Only some of the younger generation welcomed it.84 But its appeal to the awakening needs of the Arabic-
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speaking East was broad enough to quickly win the support of Muslim intellectual leaders.  
Riḍā had friendly relations with the editors of the journal, and never had any confrontations with them. He always paid tribute to the skills of the editors and the quality of their journal. His attitude should be explained against the background of al-Muqtaṭaf’s position towards religion in general, and Islam in particular. The journal in many places stressed that there was no conflict between science and religion, and that the revealed Scriptures were not to be read as scientific textbooks.

It was Jurjī Zaidān who recommended Riḍā to the founder of al-Muqtaṭaf. He also informed Ṣarrūf about Riḍā’s coming to Egypt. In their earliest meeting, Riḍā discussed with him various subjects, including his main goal of establishing a journal in which he intended to propagate religious reform and the reconciliation between Islam and Christianity. In their discussion, Ṣarrūf explained to Riḍā the difference between Syria and Egypt by attributing the spread of knowledge and reform in the Syrian territory to the consciousness of its people. But in Egypt its spread was due only to the efforts made by its government to establish freedom. As Ṣarrūf was greatly interested in philosophy, Riḍā made it clear that his intended journal was also an attempt to remove the idea in the minds of the majority of Muslims that philosophy contradicts religion.

In his speech during the tenth anniversary of al-Manār, Ṣarrūf expressed his admiration for Riḍā’s journal and its role in ‘serving religious freedom and fighting innovations and superstitions.’ He told the audience about his primary impression of Riḍā when he read the early issues of his journal. He became convinced at that moment that Muslims would one day esteem the reforms of Riḍā and his teacher ‘Abduh in Islam just as Calvin and Luther were highly regarded as reformers of Christianity. Muslims, Ṣarrūf went on, were in dire need of that kind of reformation, which was strongly endorsed in Riḍā’s journal by combining religion and civilisation. He also stressed that Riḍā’s work should please Christians as well as other minority groups.

86 Ibid., p. 142.
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Riḍā’s initial impression of the editors of *al-Muqtaṭaf* was that they tended to be ‘atheists’ or ‘antagonists’ in faith. Their later discussions on the divine and other religious issues revealed to him that they (especially Ṣarrūf) were not total disbelievers in the existence of God and His might over the world. He enthusiastically quoted the response of *al-Muqtaṭaf* to a letter by the Coptic writer Salāma Mūsā (more about him below) in which he declared his pride in becoming an agnostic and gave his full sympathy to socialism versus any faith in God. Ṣarrūf argued that ‘the rejection of God is the road towards the destruction of human civilisation.’ Riḍā praised this way of thinking, which to a certain degree resembles the Qur’ānic manner of proving the existence of God.

Riḍā’s admiration of *al-Muqtaṭaf* and its founders made him propose an event to celebrate the golden jubilee of the journal. In his speech during that event (30 April, 1926), Riḍā admitted the scientific contributions of the founders of *al-Muqtaṭaf* to the revival of the Arabic language and its serving the whole umma. However, he was certain that due to the stagnation of scientific and literal movements in the Arab world *al-Muqtaṭaf* did not receive the recognition or the circulation it deserved in its time. Riḍā expressed his strong belief that ‘the divine destiny was the moving factor in choosing the founders of *al-Muqtaṭaf* to be one of the corners of the Arabic scientific renaissance.’ He maintained that it was predestined by the divine providence that the Americans would come to the East to establish their missionary college in Beirut. In that institution the founders of *al-Muqtaṭaf* had the chance to become very qualified in their native language and skilled in other languages. The divine providence, Riḍā went on, was also behind their departure with their journal to Egypt.
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in order that they could enrich the Arabic language with their vast knowledge of science and foreign languages.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 790-791.}

2.1.4. Shibli Shumayyil: A Fervent Darwinist

Shibli Shumayyil (1860-1917), of Syrian Greek Catholic origin, was a graduate of the medical school of the Syrian Protestant College. He also studied medicine in Paris before he settled in Egypt, where he practised his profession as a physician and took part in the public and intellectual life of the country. As a young man he clashed with the staff of the College over the theories of Darwin on the evolution. He was a sharp proponent of scientism, and stood out as the foremost populariser of Darwinism. The Arab world became acquainted with the theory of evolution through Shumayyil’s translation of Darwin’s works into Arabic.\footnote{More about him, see, S. Shumayyil, Majmū‘at al-Duktūr Shiblī Shumayyil, 2 volumes, Cairo: Maṭba‘at Al-Ma‘ārif, n.d.; Jean Lecerf, ‘Shibli Shumayyil, métaphysicien et moraliste contemporain,’ Bulletin d’études Orientales 1, 1931, pp. 153-86; Donald M. Reid, ‘The Syrian Christians and early Socialism in the Arab World,’ International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 5, 1974, pp. 177-193; Hourani, Arabic Thought, pp. 248-253.}

Like Riḍā, Shumayyil escaped the Hamidian tyranny, and sought liberty in Egypt. Despite his agnostic and secularist line of thought, Shumayyil’s general views of politics, religion and sympathy towards Islam must have been the greatest motive for Riḍā to strengthen their relationship. In Shumayyil’s view, religion was a factor of division: not religion itself, but the religious leaders, who sowed discord between men; and this kept society weak. He further extended his view to postulate that all types of extreme solidarity taking the shape of national fanaticism had the same danger as religion, because they lead to the division of society. For him, Christianity sprang from egoism: from the love of domination on the part of religious leaders, and the ordinary man’s desire for individual survival. When Lord Cromer criticised Islam in his Modern Egypt as ‘a social system [that] has been a complete failure,’\footnote{Lord Cromer, Modern Egypt, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908.} it was the Christian Shumayyil who rushed to the defence of Islam by stating that ‘it was not Islam, nor the Qur‘ān; but the power of the Sheikhs which kept the umma weak.’\footnote{See his article, ‘Al-Qur‘ān wā al-‘Umrān,’ firstly published in al-Mu’ayyad (1908), reprinted in his Majmū‘at, vol. 2, pp. 57-63; cf. Hourani, Arabic Thought, pp. 250-253.}
In his eyes, there was no difference between Christianity and Islam (though he favoured Islam in other occasions) with regard to their inclination to achieve social equality among people, but his method of comparison between Islam and Christianity was sometimes seen by Christians as an attack on Christianity.

Shumayyil’s favourable impression of Ridā was reflected in his regular praise for him and his journal. For him, Ridā was a typical Muslim reformer who was ‘keen in his Manār on unshackling [...] Islam from all fetters imposed by [conservative] scholars as an attempt to liberate religion from any blemish, and to make it attain its ultimate goal through al-ʾAmr bi al-Maṣrūf wā al-Nahy ʿan al-Munkar (to enjoin what is good and forbid what is wrong).’

Ridā considered Shumayyil’s positive views of Islam as a kind of recognition by non-Muslims regarding the authenticity of its divine message. Shumayyil once wrote to him (see, appendix V): ‘You look at Muḥammad as a prophet and make him great, while I look at him and make him greater. Although we are in contrast with each other, what we have in common are broad-mindedness and sincerity [...]—and that makes our bond of friendship stronger.’ Despite the fact that Ridā was appreciative of Shumayyil’s high esteem of the Prophet, he did not accept his statement that the Prophet’s political career had been stronger than his prophecy.

99 Ibid., pp. 72-73.
100 The article was firstly published in the Egyptian daily al-Akhbār, 1907. It has been reprinted in Majmūʿat, pp. 243-244.
101 Al-Manār, vol. 11/1, pp. 10-11
102 Letter from Shumayyil to Ridā, n.d., the letter contained a poem by Shumayyil on the Prophet. It was also published in al-Manār, vol. 11/1, p. 11.
In a letter to Riḍā, ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Qabbānī (1848-1935), a Syrian journalist, disapproved of Shumayyil’s propagation of Darwinism as a sign of total rejection of religion. Riḍā was not alarmed by Qabbānī’s accusations, and saw them as little more than exaggeration, since the theories of Darwin were not ‘evil’ and did not in principle conflict with Islamic fundamental doctrines. Darwinism was merely a scientific school and should not be studied within the context of religious thought. Despite Shumayyil’s agnosticism, Riḍā defended him as somebody who never intended exclusively to disprove religions. For him, Shumayyil was one of the most erudite and independent people in his thinking. Just as with many educated Christians, the reason behind his scepticism was his training in the exact sciences according to the European traditions without having any parallel religious education that would convince him of the agreement between science and religion. He reminded his questioner that Shumayyil, on several occasions, had admitted that ‘there is no socialist religion, except the religion of the Qur’ān.’ Instead of accusing the Christian Shumayyil of unbelief, Riḍā requested Qabbānī and other Muslim writers to sustain him in his struggle against superstitions prevailing among Muslims. They should rather spare their efforts to fight those ‘ignorant scholars’ of Islam, whose ideas were, in his view, more dangerous to their religion than such theories as Darwinism. If his mission succeeded, Riḍā dared to guarantee that the educated class of non-Muslims (physicians, chemists, astronomers, socialists, lawyers and politicians) would one day convert to Islam!

As far as Shumayyil was concerned, Riḍā had a strong wish that he would once adopt Islam. He was also convinced that if he just had had the chance to study Islam in the way he had studied Darwinism, he would have become a Muslim. Riḍā once asked Shumayyil: ‘due to your respect of the Qur’ān and the Prophet you are symbolically
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105 The letter was sent to Riḍā as a result of Qabbānī’s reading of one of Shumayyil’s articles in *al-Hilāl*, (June 1909); ‘al-Duktūr Shiblī Effendi Shumayyil,’ *al-Manār*, vol. 12/8 (Sha’bān 1327/September 1909), pp. 632-637.
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a Muslim!’ In his answer, Shumayyil answered: ‘No, I am a Mohammadan!’

When the Iraqi-Kurdi poet Jamil Ṣidqī al-Zahāwī (1863-1936) published his article on women’s rights in Islam in the Egyptian daily al-Mu’ayyad (August 1910), he was dismissed from his job as a teacher of Sharīʿa at the College of Law in Baghdad. Many Muslim writers in Iraq, Egypt, Syria and elsewhere accused him of ‘infidelity’ and ‘atheism.’ In that article, Zahāwī criticised the position of women in Islam, the veil, the system of inheritance and Islamic regulations of divorce as unjust. In his writings, Zahāwī in general denied the existence of God as the Maker of the world, defied the authority of the Qur’an and was annoyed with the daily prayers and Ramadan.

Zahāwī was influenced by Shumayyil’s Arabic translation of Darwin’s works. As a result of the anti-Zahāwī campaign, Shumayyil requested Riḍā to write his views as a Muslim scholar on the ideas of the Iraqi poet. In December 1910, Riḍā responded to Shumayyil’s request. He was very cautious not to label Zahāwī as an infidel, although he could be seen as an ‘apostate’ on the basis of his anti-Islamic statements. Riḍā, on the other hand, was more inclined to remind those who supported Zahāwī (such as Shumayyil) that his expression of such views was ‘scorn’ and ‘ridicule’ of Islam as the official religion of the Supreme Porte. His words should not be defended under the rights of freedom of expression. Putting in mind that he was reacting at Shumayyil’s request (whom he earlier
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had praised for his independence of thought), Riḍā argued that Zahāwī should have pursued his mission of reforming the situation of Muslims in another way: by addressing those superstitions widely spread among Muslims, instead of attacking the religious fundamentals of Islam. Zahāwī was found by Riḍā as to have ridiculed the Islamic Law; and therefore was not entitled to teach it to Muslim students. In order to avoid chaos in society, he strictly forbade Muslim individuals to physically attack him, nor to raid on his property; but they were allowed to manifest their objections in all peaceful means.113

Forty days after Shumayyil’s death (January 1, 1917), a memorial ceremony was held at the Syrian Club in Cairo. In an article in his journal, Riḍā eulogised the late Shumayyil as one of the ‘unique and sincere seekers of civil and social reform.’114 Shumayyil’s influence, according to him, was extended to his genuine efforts for the socialist cause besides his profession as a physician. In his comment on Shumayyil’s affinity with Darwinism, Riḍā was astonished that the Catholics (especially the Jesuits) did not publicly attempt to criticise Shumayyil and his adherence to such theories. According to him, some priests were said to resist Shumayyil’s ‘infidelity’ and propagation of Darwinism by discouraging Christian patients to visit his clinic for treatment. But the majority of Christians acknowledged his social reform despite his atheism. In Riḍā’s understanding, Muslims did not see his manifestation of unbelief as a reason for ignoring him. They treated him, however, as a non-Muslim physician and sociologist.115 Shumayyil’s appreciation of the Prophet’s personality and his social role in Arabia enabled Riḍā to consider his adherence to atheism as less destructive. He believed that the only reason he did not embrace Islam was that he studied Islam while being an agnostic, who did not believe in the existence of God. For Riḍā, Shumayyil’s attribution of the Prophet’s success only to his human traits had prohibited him from studying his achievements as a Prophet dispatched by God to humanity. But in spite of Shumayyil’s materialism, Riḍā praised him for his ‘compassion, generosity, sincerity, bravery and sense of honour.’116
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2.1.5. ʾIbrāhīm al-Yāzijī

Sheikh ʾIbrāhīm al-Yāzijī (1847-1906) was one of the most well-known Christian Arab literary figures in the late nineteenth century. His father Naṣīf al-Yāzijī was also a man of letters and a great Arab philologist. Sheikh ʾIbrāhīm had contributed to the Jesuit Arabic translation of the Bible. Before that, he had embarked upon learning Hebrew and Syriac. By 1889, he became a freemason in Syria, and migrated to Egypt in 1897 with other Syrian publicists, where he established or contributed to many Arab magazines. 117 He belonged to the group of Christian intellectuals who participated immensely in the revival of the Arabic language in modern times, and was one of the earliest proponents of Arab nationalism as well. For him, the Arabs were ‘the most remarkable people among all nations.’ 118

During his early years in Syria, Riḍā had no personal contact with al-Yāzijī, but he formed an unfavourable judgement of him on the basis of stories attributed to him that he had attacked the Qurʾān and its language. At that time, Riḍā made no effort to get acquainted with him. Later in Egypt his image temporarily changed when he met with al-Yāzijī at the Egyptian Book Association. According to al-Manār, al-Yāzijī showed Riḍā ‘friendliness, gentleness and good manners.’ After that meeting, Riḍā started to praise him regularly as one of the most knowledgeable Syrian Christian literary figures. What attracted Riḍā to al-Yāzijī besides his earnest contributions to the revival the Arabic literary was his enthusiasm in opposing the archaic and foreign elements in the Arabic journals of his time. 119

In a personal article written two years later entitled: ‘We and al-Yāzijī,’ Riḍā, however, noted that many Syrian Christians were disappointed with al-Yāzijī’s pride and arrogance; and that his feeling of superiority had prevented him from sharing his knowledge with acceptance of Darwinism and having put Shumayyil above the Rightly-guided Caliphs. See, al-Manār, vol. 20/1 (Shawwāl 1335/July 1917), p. 6.

117 He established with other people newspapers and magazines before his migration to Egypt, such as al-Najāh (1872), and al-Ṭabīb (co-editors Khalil Sāʿādeh and Bishārah Zalzal, 1884-1885). In Egypt he established two: al-Bayān (1897-1989), and al-Ḍiyāʾ (1898). For more about his life and works, see, ʿIsā Mikhāʾil Sabā, al-Sheikh ʾIbrāhīm al-Yāzijī (1847-1906), Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1955.


others. Ridâ pointed here to Yâziji’s criticism of Ya’qûb Šarrûf, the founder of *al-Muqtaṭaf*, for his use of colloquial or foreign words, and for occasional slight grammatical mistakes in his writings. Ridâ’s view of al-Yâziji was that he himself often made mistakes in his writings.

In 1903, one of the missionary magazines attacked the Qur’ân on the basis of one piece of work attributed to al-Yâziji in which he was said to assault the Qur’ânic language. In his comment on Ridâ’s stance, al-Yâziji blamed *al-Manâr* for causing ‘chaos’ and ‘disturbance of thoughts’ among the public by stirring up such accusations with no verification. On the other hand, Ridâ accused him of arrogance, stating that if he had been really innocent, he should have taken the effort to clear his name by at least writing a letter to the editorial of *al-Manâr*. Ridâ repeated that al-Yâziji hardly had any sincere friends whether in Syria or in Egypt. He also concluded that *al-Manâr’s* critical response to him should not be seen as an attack on al-Yâziji’s person, but against the background of its general stance against missionary writings. There was thus in his view no contradiction in his eagerness to establish concord and friendship with fair Christians. Al-Yâziji died three years later, and *al-Manâr* was silent in giving any further responses to him during these years.

### 2.1.6. Khalil Sa’ādeh

Very little is mentioned in *al-Manâr* about Ridâ’s relation with the Syrian Orthodox Khalil Sa’ādeh (1857-1934), whose significance actually lay in their co-operation in editing the Arabic translation of the controversial Gospel of Barnabas (see chapter 5). In view of the importance of the Gospel, it might be useful to discuss their relation in the light of some biographical information about Sa’ādeh in order to place him in the intellectual and political setting of our discussion.

Sa’ādeh was known as a ‘politically engaged man of letters.’ He was born in Shuwayr, Mount Lebanon, and studied medicine at the Syrian Protestant College. In 1882 he was chosen as the spokesman of the
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in the College. After his graduation in 1883 he became a staff member of the editorial board of the short-lived scientific and medical review *al-Ṭabīb* in Beirut (mentioned above). In the following years, he worked as a medical advisor for the Ottoman government in Palestine. In 1901 he left Syria for Egypt, where he eventually stayed till 1913. Like many of his Syrian fellows, he became involved in journalism, and wrote articles for *al-Ahrām*. He also became a correspondent of English papers, such as *The Times* and *The Standard*. This period of his life witnessed an intense intellectual productivity and political involvement. He was able to read in French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Latin. Besides his work as a journalist, Sa‘ādeh gained special qualifying skills in English and was able to write literary works in that language. He in fact wrote two novels: *The Syrian Prince* (London, 1893) and *Cesar and Cleopatra* (London, 1895). He compiled also an Arabic-English Lexicon during his stay in Cairo in 1911.

Later he moved to Argentina, where he lived during World War I, until 1919. In 1919, he accepted an invitation from the Syrian community of Sao Paolo and moved to Brazil. There he founded the newspaper *al-Jarīda*, which developed into a cultural magazine and subsequently changed its name to *al-Majalla*. From 1930 until his death in 1934 he was the editor of the prestigious literary magazine *al-Rābiṭa*. During this period in South America, he did not write any direct contributions to Rida’s journal. But from the Diaspora he had been sharing with him the struggle for the complete independence of Greater Syria. He also founded the Syrian League and the National Democratic Party to support the Syrian quest for complete independence.
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126 See the speech delivered by his granddaughter Sofia Sa‘ādeh during the event of his honor held by the branch of the Society of Feminist Development in his village Shuwayr in 2002, p. 3; available at http://www.shweir.com/ain_el_assis.htm, accessed, 20 November 2006.

Sa‘ādeh regarded journalism as the measure for the advancement of nations, and the mirror of their morals and cultural refinement.\textsuperscript{128} According to Schumann, Sa‘ādeh believed that the state of journalism was tied to the state of the nation itself. The nation would decline if the press declined and stagnated. If the nation woke up and joined the ‘other living nations,’ it would be most visible in the awakening of its press. Sa‘ādeh wrote: ‘[Today] the hidden forces of the nation become evident in the advanced press. Its working spirits as well as its thinking brains become apparent, and its splendid literature emerges. There is no advanced press, however, unless it is based on excellence, unless its motto is knowledge and unless its strength is respect for the individual. Its content is nourishment for the brain the same way food is necessary for the stomach.’\textsuperscript{129}

Sa‘ādeh was a secularist, who was strongly convinced of the necessity of the separation between religion and state. In Sa‘ādeh’s view, Christianity (his religion by origin) had changed to be ritualistic. Contrary to early Christianity, whose followers had offered their lives for the cause of their faith, it had become one of the modern tricks in the hands of Christian states. He severely attacked religious fanaticism, but believed that religion is an integral part of the Oriental’s life, and he had his strong faith that life is meant to dignify religion.\textsuperscript{130} Like Riḍā, Sa‘ādeh was aware of the diversity of voices and religious orientations in the Syrian homeland as well as in the Diaspora communities in South America. It was definitely not his goal to eliminate these differences. Yet he wanted to ensure that his compatriots were united at least in the defense of the national cause in order to make the Syrian voice heard within the international arena, thereby giving hope to the Syrians who had lived in despair.\textsuperscript{131}

In 1906 Riḍā briefly mentioned one of Sa‘ādeh’s scientific works on pulmonary tuberculosis.\textsuperscript{132} Sa‘ādeh’s fame as a good writer in English was primarily the reason for Riḍā to entrust him with the Arabic translation of the Barnabas Gospel. In his short biography of Sa‘ādeh, Adel Beshara considered the publication of this Gospel as the most controversial event of his life. He wrote: ‘the publication of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{128} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{129} As quoted in ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{130} See the booklet in his honour, p. 29.
  \item \textsuperscript{131} Schumann, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 606-607.
  \item \textsuperscript{132} Khalīl Sa‘ādeh, \textit{al-Wiqāyah min al-Sull al-Ri‘awi wā Turuq ilājuh}, Cairo, 1906. See the review of \textit{al-Manār}, vol. 9/5 (Jumāda al-‘Ūlā 1324/June 1906), p. 394.
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Barnabas [Beshara reads it 'Barnabus'] in Arabic was met with some scepticism largely due to religious sensitivity. The late Rashid Riḍā inflamed the public by prefacing the work with a preamble that took its entire meaning out of context. The preamble was incorporated into the book without Saʿādeh’s prior knowledge. In his statement, Beshara relies on information cited by Badr Al-Hage, one of Saʿādeh’s biographers, in his collection of some of the unknown works by Saʿādeh. In his account, al-Hage quoted Anṭūn Saʿādeh, Khalil’s son and the later founder of the Syrian Social Nationalist Party. Tracing the exact source mentioned by al-Hage, I could not find the pages referred to by Anṭūn.

After the English publisher had sent him the English translation of the Gospel, Riḍā soon settled an agreement with Saʿādeh on publishing an exact Arabic translation by his Manār. It is conceivable that Saʿādeh must have known Riḍā’s reasons for publishing the Gospel. In his initial advertisement of al-Manār’s plan of cooperating with Saʿādeh, Riḍā explicitly maintained that the Gospel’s agreement with many Islamic principles stimulated him to think of translating it into Arabic. Besides, he was keen on making it known among Arab readers, just as the translators had done for English-speaking people. He also had a great desire that other translators would follow this step by increasing its publicity in all Western languages. One year after the appearance of the Gospel’s translation, Saʿādeh contributed to al-Manār by publishing one of his scientific articles on Substance theory. Saʿādeh’s granddaughter Sofia, presently professor at the American University in Beirut, rejects the argument that this period of her grandfather’s life was controversial. In her own words: ‘he was known among his contemporaries as a staunch secular person, and his translation of the Gospel was out of curiosity more than anything else. He tried also to refute the fact that it was genuine, but never
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136 Al-Manār, vol. 10/5 (Jumādā al-Ẓīlāl 1325/July 1907), pp. 385-387; Riḍā expressed his gratitude to the editors for sending him a copy of this work. This copy still exists in Riḍā’s family archive with his own signature: Milk al-Sayyid Muḥammad Rashid Riḍā (Owned by Al-Sayyid Muḥammad Rashid Riḍā).
publicly fought with Riḍā on this specific matter even after his migration to South America.\footnote{E-mail to the present writer, 28 April 2005.}

Later we shall discuss Saʿādeh’s detailed evaluation of the Gospel, but it suffices here to stress that his very objective of translating the Gospel was spelled out in his introduction by saying:

‘I started translating this book, which is called the Gospel of Barnabas well aware of the responsibility that I had undertaken. My aim was to serve historical studies and of course our language which is perhaps the most logical medium into which this work should be translated. This is the first time this book has come out in the Arabic language. It is a gospel about which scholars and historians have differed sharply. In these closing comments, though, I do have to stress that in this introduction all my discussions are purely scientific and historical in orientation and that I have been scrupulous to avoid all religious controversies which I left to those who are better equipped to deal with them.’\footnote{As quoted in Beshara, op. cit., pp. 68-69.}

Even after the Gospel’s publication, Saʿādeh remained in solidarity with other Syrian nationalists, including Riḍā himself (see, appendix VI). Among Riḍā’s papers, I found the charter of the Ottoman Socialist Party, founded in Cairo in December 1910. The charter was signed by Saʿādeh as its secretary general. Among the founders of the Party were its president Shibli Shumayyil and Rafīq al-ʿAẓm (1867-1925), the prominent Sunni Muslim and the chairman of the Decentralisation Party.\footnote{MS, the charter of Al-Ḥizb al-ʿUthmānī al-Ijtimāʿī, handwritten by Khalīl Saʿādeh, Riḍā’s private archive.} Although Riḍā’s name was not included among the founders, the party’s resolutions came close to his later Decentralisation Party, which demanded administrative autonomy for the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire. Saʿādeh, Shumayyil and al-ʿAẓm shared Riḍā’s political cause, and later became members of his above-mentioned Decentralisation Party.\footnote{See, Hamie, ‘L’homme,’ pp. 101-104.}

2.1.7. Al-Machreq: A Jesuit Syrian Review

Let us now turn to discuss Riḍā’s polemics with the Catholic Arabic magazine al-Machreq. As the mouthpiece of the Syro-Lebanese Jesuits in Beirut since its first publication in 1898, this magazine attempted to convey for the Catholic Arabic communities the value and signifi-
cance of Western science and technology as well as the cultural heritage of the Near East. Riḍā was involved in controversies with *al-Machreq* around a variety of issues, especially on what he often wrote in his journal on Christianity. According to Riḍā’s archival documents, he used to exchange the published issues of *al-Manār* with those of *al-Machreq*. The Oriental Library of the Jesuit Saint-Joseph College was subscribing to his journal, and many of its issues were kept there. Despite their heated polemics, the library secretary praised Riḍā’s journal as having been the ‘mouthpiece of the Islamic Salafi renaissance’ (see, Appendix VII).

As soon as the above-mentioned *al-Manār* polemicist Ṭāhir al-Tannīr published his anti-Christian book, Father Louis Cheikho (1859-1927), the editor of *al-Machreq*, fervently attacked the author. Tannīr’s treatise, for him, was nothing but ‘a childish’ attempt to emulate earlier European works of ‘unbelievers, Protestants, and heretics’ in their critique of Christianity. In the same year, *al-Machreq* accused Riḍā’s journal of having ‘exceeded the proper bounds by attacking the Catholic belief.’ When *al-Manār* quoted an article from the Russian Muslim paper *Shūrā* (Council, founded in 1908) in which Luther had been eulogised for his reformation, the editorial of *al-Machreq* immediately blamed Riḍā for praising him on the basis of his conflict with Catholicism. ‘Had the *Shūrā* and *al-Manār* known
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who Luther and his works precisely were,’ *al-Machreq* wrote, ‘they would have entirely discarded him and would have never contaminated their pages by mentioning his name.’

In response to *al-Manār*’s postulation of the doctrine of Trinity, Cheikho counterattacked Riḍā for using the Gospel of Barnabas as a weapon against it. *Al-Machreq* challenged Riḍā that he brought forward an Arabic translation of a ‘forged’ Gospel, when he lacked solid proofs against Christianity. Riḍā, according to him, failed to recognise the sense of the Trinity’s divine mystery. Cheikho’s article was specifically formulated in reaction to Riḍā’s views (mentioned in the context of his response to the Danish missionary Alfred Nielsen, see, chapter 3) that: ‘Muslim theologians agree that there is nothing in the Islamic faith which is logically impossible (*muhāl ʿaqlan*), meaning that the Muslim is not required to believe in anything that is logically impossible […] Other religions than Islam require people to believe in what is rationally impossible, *i.e.*, the reconciliation between two antitheses or opposites, such as the real Unity and the real Trinity. In other terms, that God is truly one, and truly more than one at the same time.’

Cheikho rebuked Riḍā for his allegation that the Catholic doctrine insists on combining contradictions. ‘It is not logical,’ Cheikho contended, ‘that such a paradoxical faith would be adopted by more than one third of the inhabitants of the globe among whom are the most civilised nations—such as the Greeks, the Romans and the Arabs.’ He insisted that Trinitarian concepts had been taken from the divine revelation, and Biblical prophets implicitly referred to them in the Old Testament. He pointed to many examples, such as God’s use of the plural form with reference to Himself, and to the plural form for ‘Lord’ used frequently in the Old Testament. In his conclusion, Cheikho reminded Riḍā that Catholic believers do not entirely grasp the mystery of the Trinity. But it is enough for them to know that God revealed it to them. He further upheld that there are many secrets that cannot be interpreted by human intellect, and that it is
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150 L. Cheikho, ‘Lā Tanāquda fī al-Tawḥīd wā al-Tathlīth,’ *al-Machreq*, vol. 22 (1924), pp. 737-744. Among Riḍā’s papers, I have found an unpublished anti-Cheikho article. It was written by a Shīʿī Muslim from Iraq, who signed it as Muslim Najafī under the title: ‘al-Qawl al-Saḥīḥ fī Daḥḍ ʿUlūhiyyat al-Masīḥ (The True Saying in Refuting the Divinity of Jesus).’ MS., Riḍā’s private archive.
impossible for human beings to grasp God’s true nature; otherwise they would share with God his divine essence.\textsuperscript{151}

\textit{Al-Machreq} had many criticisms with regard to Riḍā’s religious views of the church. For example, it suggested that his statement in one of his \textit{fatwās} on polygamy that the Pope had authorised Charlemagne’s polygamy was historically mistaken. As a matter of fact, although Charlemagne, who was holding power over both the Church and state, married many wives, the Catholic Church had never authorised him to do so.\textsuperscript{152} Riḍā, according to \textit{al-Machreq}, insisted on writing on many subjects about which his knowledge was deficient. A prominent example was his insistence that freemasonry organisations collaborated with the Jews to demolish the Papal power in Europe.\textsuperscript{153}

In 1922, one of \textit{al-Manār}’s readers in Beirut complained to Riḍā about the writings of \textit{al-Machreq} on Islam.\textsuperscript{154} When the tenth volume of \textit{Tafsīr al-Manār} was first published in 1932, \textit{al-Machreq} was critical of its author’s Islamic religious views. It described Riḍā’s commentary on the Qur’ān as a ‘naïve attempt to combine between the Qur’ān and modern scientific discoveries, which had been never known in the time of the Prophet of Islam.’\textsuperscript{155}

The controversy between Riḍā and \textit{al-Machreq} culminated in 1934, when the Catholic journal embarked upon reacting to his above-mentioned work \textit{al-Waḥī al-Muḥammadī}. \textit{Al-Machreq} introduced Riḍā to its readers as ‘a Muslim conservative luminary in Egypt, a friend of the Wahhābī Ibn Sa‘ūd, and a fervent Muslim apologist, who firmly adhered to the traditions and rejected anything that is not in agreement with the way of the Salaf.’\textsuperscript{156} It also depicted Riḍā’s work as an attempt to idealise Islam, which did not add any new aspect of knowledge to the understanding of the concept of revelation in Islam.\textsuperscript{157}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{151} Ibid., p. 743.
\item \textsuperscript{152} \textit{Al-Machreq}, vol. 5 (1927), pp. 397-398; see, Riḍā’s \textit{fatwā}, \textit{al-Manār}, vol. 28/1 (Sha‘bān 1345/March 1917), p. 29.
\item \textsuperscript{153} \textit{Al-Machreq}, vol. 30 (1932), pp. 143-144. See, \textit{al-Manār}, 14/3 (Rabī‘ Al-‘Awwal 1929/March 1911), pp. 178; vol. 15/1, pp. 32; vol. 29/4, pp. 271-72. Cf. his article on the role of the Jews in the Freemasonry movement, vol. 6/5 (Rabī‘ al-‘Awwal 1321/May 1903), pp. 196-200, see also, \textit{al-Manār}, vol. 8/11 (Jumādā Al-‘Ākhira 1323/August 1905), pp. 401-403.
\item \textsuperscript{154} \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 23/4, p. 267.
\item \textsuperscript{155} \textit{Al-Machreq}, vol. 30 (1932), pp. 237-238, cf. vol. 29 (1931), pp. 315-316.
\item \textsuperscript{156} \textit{Al-Machreq}, vol. 31 (1933), p. 956.
\item \textsuperscript{157} Ibid., p. 956.
\end{itemize}
The author’s exclusive concern was to respond to Christians and verify the superiority of Islam over Christianity without giving profound treatment to any of his themes. *Al-Machreq* did not deny the religious value of the Qur’ān and its impact on Muslim believers in their liturgy and prayers, but this was not enough to prove its miraculous nature. The writer of *al-Machreq* was of the view that the linguistic value ascribed to the Qur’ān was no miracle in its own, and should be seen as equal to the high standard of the English or German translations of the Bible. In spite of admitting its aesthetic elements, *al-Machreq* alleged that there are many other linguistic and historical contradictions and defects in the Qur’ān. With regard to Riḍā’s arguments that the Qur’ānic miracle was proved by its influence and the change achieved by Islam in many parts of the world—the same argument which was earlier used by Cheikho to prove the authenticity of Catholic belief—*al-Machreq* viewed it as improbable. The Arabs had conquered decadent nations with ease. Muslims also learnt philosophy and other sciences from other nations, not directly from the Qur’ān. In conclusion, *al-Machreq* wondered why Riḍā dedicated his book to the civilised nations: ‘Is it because he knows perfectly well that Islam has not gained any of the civilised nations in the modern time? Or because he knows that the majority of the more than 240 million Muslims [in the 1930s] were formerly heathens, who considered Islam civilised as compared to their previous paganism?’

In his introduction to the book, Riḍā’s stated that his work was primarily a proposal to ‘call civilised countries of the West and Japan (see chapter 3) […] and free-thinking Western scholars to Islam.’ He suggested that there were three obstacles that prohibit non-Muslims from grasping the divine message of the Qur’ān: 1) the Church, which opposed it by propagating a tirade of lies and accusations; therefore, its students believe every Muslim to be an enemy of Christ and Christianity; 2) Western politicians, who inherited antagonism from the Church, and accepted its fabrications in order to serve their imperialistic policy; and 3) the state of decadence among Muslims, who were blissfully ignorant of their religion.

---

158 Ibid., pp. 957-958.
159 For examples of these, see, ibid., pp. 958-959.
160 Ibid., p. 960.
On May 16, 1934, a letter from Beirut signed by a certain Cheikh & Ladki (?) drew Riḍā’s attention to Cheikho’s attacks on his book. According to this letter, a group of scholars intended to react to Cheikho’s critique of al-Manār. The sender of the letter (Cheikh & Ladki) advised them to wait, since it was the author of the book who should reply (see, appendix VIII). Some weeks later, Riḍā started to respond to Cheikho in a series of four articles in his journal. He understood that the writer’s aim to define him in such a way was to inoculate his readers with the idea that he and his journal would reject any modern religious, scientific and industrial innovations. Nonetheless, Riḍā defended himself by stating that his religious call was bound to the Qur’ān and the Sunna, while summoning Muslims to acquire all useful modern understanding in their lives, in as far as it did not contradict their religious principles. Riḍā was deeply frustrated by the writer’s belittling of his work, blaming him for looking at it ‘from behind a black-tinted Jesuit pair of glasses.’ On the basis of an Arabic translation of the secrets of the Jesuit order (probably made by Kirām, mentioned above, chapter 1), Riḍā judged that ‘the Jesuits are more extravagant and extreme in adoring money than the Jews and capitalists.’

In his reply, Riḍā again insisted that Islam remains a ‘friend’ of Christianity, but not a friend of the Church. For him, Islam was also completing the ‘real Christian message.’ As a Muslim scholar he still regularly wished to cooperate with Christian religious bodies (especially the Vatican) to oppose atheism. The author of al-Machreq criticised Riḍā’s delineation of Islam as the religion of freedom and brotherhood as contradictory. On the one hand, he asserted that Islam gives people of other religious denominations their rights under Muslim rule, while, on the other, he strove for ‘one Arab and Muslim world’ by claiming that social and political reform would never be accomplished without the unity of all nations in terms of religion, language, politics and judiciary system. Riḍā asserted that human reform cannot be entirely attained without homogeneity of the vari-
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162 Letter to Riḍā, Cheikh & Ladki, Beirut, 16 May 1934, Riḍā’s private archive.
164 Ibid., 148.
165 Ibid., p. 150.
ous aspects of life, even when there is no Arab nation or Muslim legislation. Riḍā insisted that Islam is the most homogenous religion capable of achieving this goal, when we compare it to other religions. The truth of Islam, he went further, does not rely on its acceptance by all human beings; and the goal of each religion is the attainment of the highest level of human perfection.\(^{167}\)

With regard to *al-Machreq*’s rejection of the miraculous nature of the Qurʾān, Riḍā argued that to compare the Qurʾān to English or German translations was not valid. The Qurʾān, in itself, was inimitable in its language. It had been revealed to those who were known in their age for their eloquence; while Muḥammad did not belong to the category of well-known Arab poets. Islam also challenged the Arabs to produce verses similar to the Qurʾān, but they failed. On the other hand, none of the English or the German translators had ever claimed that their work was inimitable.\(^{168}\)

Secondly, Riḍā defended the Qurʾān as the miraculous word of God by stressing again that many Western scholars agreed upon that and admitted the prophecy of Muḥammad. In his book, he cited scholars such as Edouard Montet (see, chapter 1), who explained the prophetic characteristics in Islam and stressed the rationalistic essence of Islam. Riḍā moreover tried to rationalise that the prophet, without having received such a divine message, would have never been able to bring out such an ‘excellent’ book containing all those religious, literary and legislative sciences after having reached the age of forty. Riḍā associated the success of the Prophet’s mission with the growing number of Muslims throughout history. He compared the Qurʾān to a medical guide brought forward by a physician to cure people. If he were able to cure all of his patients with the help of his guide, people would definitely believe in the soundness of his knowledge. In the same way, he went on, a huge number of non-Arabs adopted Islam because they believed in the power of its truth to guide them. As for the Arabs especially, they had adopted Islam as a result of the impact of its eloquent language on them.\(^{169}\)

\(^{167}\) Ibid., pp. 227-228.

\(^{168}\) *Al-Manār*, vol. 34/4, pp. 311-315.

\(^{169}\) Ibid., p. 315. See also, *al-Manār*, vol. 34/5, pp. 376-381.
2.2. The Egyptian Coptic Community

Some of the Egyptian Copts saw Riḍā as an intruding Syrian (dakhil), who had no right to interfere in Egyptian affairs.\textsuperscript{170} The first one to coin the term dukhalāʾ (intruders) for Syrians in Egypt was the founder of the Egyptian Nationalist Party Muṣṭafā Kāmil. He advocated that the Syrians (especially Christians) were collaborators with the British and hostile to the Egyptian nationalist cause at the beginning of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{171} In the following section we will discuss Riḍā’s various reactions to the Coptic community in Egypt.

2.2.1. Riḍā’s Attitudes towards the Copts before 1911

By the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the Coptic question and their demands for social and religious equality with Muslims had gradually become visible in the political scene of Egypt. In 1897, for example, a Coptic delegation handed a petition to the Egyptian Prime Minister and the British High Commissioner complaining that Copts were underrepresented in key political and administrative posts.\textsuperscript{172}

The Copts, who viewed themselves as alienated within their own society, undertook the defence of their interests in their different newspapers and periodicals. The years 1908-1911 witnessed one of the most critical moments of the Muslim-Christian relations in the country. Muslim and Christian papers launched mutual accusations and their confrontation came to a head. The debates focused primarily

\textsuperscript{170} Al-Manār, vol. 15/1, pp. 48-49.

\textsuperscript{171} For Kāmil’s ideas on the concept of nationalism, see, Fritz Steppat, ‘Nationalismus und Islam bei Muṣṭafā Kamil. Ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte der ägyptischen Nationalbewegung,’ Die Welt des Islams 4/4, 1956, pp. 241-341. Riḍā was a sharp critic of Kāmil’s nationalism, and was one of the early Muslim thinkers who at that moment saw the threat posed by the concept of nationalism to Islamic doctrine. About his rejection of nationalism, see, Safran, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 75-84. In his turn, Kāmil declared that the Khedive himself was not pleased with Riḍā’s stances (especially his regular critique of Al-Azhar), and had a serious plan to send him away from Egypt. See, ‘Al-ʿAṣabiyya al-Jinsiyya wā al-Liwāʾ,’ \textit{al-Manār}, vol. 10/7, pp. 536-540. Riḍā defended the existence of the Syrians in Egypt, and fervently propagated the idea that the Syrians were the closest and most united faction among all emigrants to the Egyptians. See, ‘Mūṣāfaḥat al-Sūriyyīn lil-Miṣriyyīn,’ \textit{al-Manār}, vol. 11/3 (Rabiʿ al-ʾAwwal 1326/ May 1908), pp. 230-231.

\textsuperscript{172} Al-Ahram Weekly, no. 691 (20-26 May 2004).
on representation in civil servant employment.\textsuperscript{173} In 1908 the Coptic Reform Party, founded by Akhnūkh Fanūs, a wealthy Presbyterian Coptic landlord and member of the Legislative Assembly, had highlighted the Coptic demands as discrimination in employment and promotion, and the practice of religious rights. But other Coptic groups were anxious about their Muslim fellow-citizens. Some prominent Coptic figures accused Fanūs of collaboration with the British authorities in destroying the national spirit in their homeland.\textsuperscript{174}

In the early issues of \textit{al-Manār}, Riḍā’s views of the Copts were positive in the general sense. He constantly praised their religious zeal and concern for education, emphasising that they were more organised than their Egyptian Muslim compatriots. He maintained that following the steps of other ‘civilised lands,’ the Copts set up schools to teach their children modern sciences, while keeping up their belief and religious identity. As an active class in society, they promoted proper education to the degree that it had been said that no illiteracy was to be found among them. Muslims, on the other hand, had hardly any similar organisations.\textsuperscript{175}

Riḍā later developed a negative attitude as a result of what he saw as a campaign of protest against Muslims. He denounced the way the Copts presented their demands by arguing that Muslims deliberately aimed at ‘rooting’ them out of the country. For him, it was natural from a sociological point of view that any religious minority group would be overzealous in striving for unification in order not to be assimilated within the majority group. Being of Syrian origin, Riḍā made no distinction between any of the Egyptian minority groups including the Jews, the Copts or naturalised Orthodox Christians of Syrian or Armenian origin. He affirmed that if the Copts were serious about raising their demands of equality in the public debate, they


would have included other Christians in their appeal. The Copts should also stop claiming in their newspapers that Muslims were colonisers and conquerors, and had no right to be in the country. However, he also criticised those Muslims who exceeded their boundary by taking harsh stances and constantly offending Coptic religious feelings.  

The Coptic newspaper *al-Waṭan* (‘Homeland’) was launched in 1877 primarily in order to provide the Coptic community with an outlet for its collective views and grievances. It soon became one of the strongest platforms for enflaming Coptic confrontation with Muslims. According to *al-Manār*, when the Egyptian government started the project of the revival of Arab literature in the beginning of the 20th century by reprinting famous literary works at the expense of the national budget, *al-Waṭan* vigorously attacked the project as a return to ‘backwardness.’ The Coptic journal criticised the Egyptian government for having embarked upon a project that would ‘adulterate its people’s taste for sound literatures and useful sciences.’ Instead of promoting the Egyptians to the level of civilised nations, the paper went on, the government aimed at ‘thrusting them to the darkness of Arab superstitions, nonsense and ignorance.’

*Riḍā* was very discontent with these writings and contrasted *al-Waṭan*’s stance with the initiatives of European scholars and other Arab Christians (such as the Jesuits in Syria), who were keen on preserving Arab literary works by printing them. Rīḍā counterattacked by maintaining that *al-Waṭan*’s campaign aimed explicitly at ‘erasing’ Islam, its language and literature from Egypt and replace them with their sense of ‘Coptism.’ He described the Coptic writer of this article as ‘fanatic,’ ‘rude’ and ‘ignorant’ of Arab literature and civilisation. The Arabic language was not confined to Muslims, but was always a common ground for Jews and Christians of the Arabian Peninsula before Islam. Rīḍā reminded the writer of ‘fair-minded’ Western thinkers (such as Le Bon and others), who admitted the significance and position of the Arabs and their language and literature in history. If the Coptic writer had been motivated to reach his conclusion by the anti-Christian statements in some of the circulating
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Arabic works, he should have not ignored the anti-Islamic tone in
Arabic Christian as well as in Western missionary works. Riḍā ascribed
all these remarks to al-Watani’s insistence on causing religious strife
between Muslims and Copts with confidence that the British authori-
ties would support them in their campaign.179

2.2.2. The Coptic Congress of 1911

Before analysing Riḍā’s response to the Coptic Congress and the assas-
sination of the Coptic Prime Minister Buṭrus Ghālī, we should dwell
briefly upon some parts of the historical background of the crisis and
its impact on the political scene of the Egypt of 1910-1911.

During his interrogation, the afore-mentioned al-Wardānī (see,
the introduction), confessed that he had murdered Ghali for his
mediation between British imperial officials and Egyptian officialdom.
Most Egyptian Muslim nationalists viewed Ghali as too pliant and
too willing to serve the British interests. He also represented the cabi-
et on the bench in the notorious Dinshiwy trial in 1906, which
resulted in the death sentences for many Egyptian farmers, the event
that gave rise to the National Party of Muṣṭafā Kāmil.180

Although al-Wardānī was sentenced to death, common Muslims
held him in esteem as a national hero. During his diplomatic trip in
Egypt, the former president of the United States Theodore Roosevelt
fanned the flames during his speech at the Egyptian University. In
that speech, he praised the British rule, condemned nationalists and
vilified the assassin.181 However, al-Wardānī made it clear that
although he was a Muslim and Ghali a Coptic Christian, religion had
no bearing on the motives for shooting the Prime Minister, whom
he considered a traitor.182

Soon in 1911, a lay Coptic Congress was convened at Asyūṭ
(Southern Egypt), whose main agenda was to ask for equal rights of
citizenship. Asyūṭ was chosen because it was an important center for

179 Ibid., pp. 908-912.
180 Charles D. Smith, “The Egyptian Copts: Nationalism, Ethnicity, Definition of
Identity for Religious Minority,” in Maya Shatzmiller, ed., Nationalism and Minority
pp. 81-82. More about Ghali’s life, see, for example, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Haikal,
Tarājim Miṣrīyya wā Ghārbiyya, Cairo, 1929, pp. 119-138; Arthur Goldschmidt, Bio-
181 Reid, ‘Cairo’, pp. 51-75.
182 Badrawi, op. cit., p. 22.
the Coptic community, a very significant centre for Protestant missionaries who also supported the idea. 183 The Coptic Congress, numbering 500 members or more (Riḍā counted more than 1000), was held in spite of the opposition of Patriarch Kyrollos V and many other notable Coptic figures. They, as well as the government, feared that the Coptic meeting in Asyūṭ would agitate the public. The Egyptian Khedive ʿAbbās Ḥilmī did not welcome the idea of the congress either, and refused to meet its delegation in the Palace. 184

The congress, however, resulted in a petition briefing the Coptic demands before the khedive and the British. The representative of the Coptic Press in London, Kyriakos Mikhail, recorded the works of the congress and other relevant discussions. 185 The congress demanded the government: 1) to exempt the Coptic government officials from their jobs and students from study on Sundays, 2) to open all administrative posts in the government services to the Copts, 3) to change the electoral system in the Egyptian provincial Councils to one similar to that in operation in Belgium in order to secure their rights as minorities, 4) the Copts should have equal rights to take advantage of all educational facilities provided by the new Provincial Councils; and 5) government grants should be bestowed on deserving institutions without any distinction of race or creed. 186

In April 1911, Muslim Egyptians denounced the requests by organising a rival congress in Heliopolis in Cairo under the auspices of the then Prime Minister Muḥammad Riyāḍ Pasha, and other politicians. The congress committee reported that the Copts were planning to establish ‘a separate state for themselves.’ 187 They also protested against the endeavour of the Copts ‘to divide the Egyptian nation as one political unit into two religious groups, a Muslim majority and a

183 Bishrī, op. cit., p. 88.
184 Ibid., pp. 86-87.
185 Mikhail, op. cit. The Coptic community was planning to hold such a congress even before the murder of Ghalī, but that incident encouraged them to put it into reality. See, Bishrī, ibid., p. 82. The demands of the Congress were not different from the ones presented to Lord Cromer and Muṣṭafā Fahmī Pasha (d. 1914), who was a strong supporter of British interests in Egypt. The Copts submitted a similar petition to Lord Cromer and Fahmi Pasha in which they requested complete equality in the appointment of administrative jobs, closing the courts on Sunday, appointing an additional member to consultative council, and teaching Christianity to Christian students in governmental schools, see, Tagher, op. cit., p. 215.
186 Mikhail, ibid., pp. 28-30.
Coptic minority. It also concluded that the prime reason behind the escalation of the problem was the close relation of the Coptic organisers with Western missionary bodies in Southern Egypt, who had convinced them that the Europeans could give them protection in the event that they failed to get their demands.

In his immediate reply, Riḍā reacted to the Coptic demands in some articles in *al-Manār* and *al-Muʿayyad*, which he later compiled in one small volume. He considered the Coptic congress as exercising influence in awakening Egyptian Muslims to organise their own Islamic one, and making them seriously deliberate their common social and religious affairs. He propounded to the Muslim Congress that its participants should try to avoid any discussions on politics, and to engage themselves instead of that in preparing statistical tables on the number of Coptic employees in various sectors in Egypt.

Riḍā deplored the loss of Buṭrus Ghālī as a prudent leader. Contrary to the organisers of the Coptic Congress, he was capable of defending the interests of his community in a peaceful way. Despite Ghālī’s participation in the Dinshiwāy trial and his siding with the British, Riḍā enumerated many of his attributes. The most important of these was his concern for his own community, while being fair in dealing with other groups. Riḍā was convinced that the real motive behind his assassination was secular, not religious. Al-Wardānī made his attempt on the basis of the ideas he learnt during his stay in Europe, not at Al-Azhar or any other religious institution. The Copts, in Riḍā’s view, were not satisfied with the official Muslim condemnation of the act, but intensified their accusation of Muslims as fanatics on the basis of this individual case only. It might be interesting to know that al-Wardānī had mixed with anarchists in Lausanne, and was influenced by their ideas. His two-year sojourn in Switzerland...

---

188 The congress proceedings, Cairo, 1911; as quoted in ibid., p. 218.
189 *Al-Manār*, vol. 14/5, p. 356.
190 Riḍā, *Muʿtamar*.
191 *Al-Manār*, vol. 14/2, p. 158. Participants of the congress probably presented such statistical numbers before the congress; see, for example, the report of education in Egypt and the share of Muslims and Copts. See, *al-Taʿlim fi Miṣr wa Ḥaẓ al-Muslimin wā al-Aqbat Minhū*, Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-al-Adāb wā al-Muʿayyad, n.d. In his report, Sir Eldon Gorst also presented statistics of employment of Copts and Muslims in the Civil Service, see, Mikhail, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-44.
193 Ibid., pp. 203-204.
stimulated his interest in European institutions, and induced him to obtain pamphlets on different aspects of humanitarian concerns.\(^{194}\)

In his judgement of the religious motives behind the Coptic Congress, Riḍā was cynical. He stressed that the Muslim majority would have the right to determine the weekly day off. ‘If they had no desire to work on Sundays in the Muslim government of Hajj ‘Abbās Ḥilmī [Khedive of Egypt],’ Riḍā said, ‘they would better relinquish their jobs and exclusively devote themselves to contemplation and prayer.’\(^{195}\) He also refused any Coptic claim that they as original inhabitants of Egypt had the right to rule the country. The Copts were, for Riḍā, subjects to the ‘Muslim Prince’ of Egypt, who granted them their posts in the government services by means of tolerance, and not as a matter of obligation.\(^{196}\)

Riḍā, nevertheless, demonstrated that the Islamic government throughout its history contained different people with other religious beliefs, though its legislative and political principles remained decided by the majority group. He also stressed that the Islamic law gave other religious groups the right to follow their religious laws freely, without complying with Islamic rules.\(^{197}\)

In Riḍā’s thinking, ‘Coptism’ should remain a religious identity, and not to be mixed with any political ideologies. In other words, the Christians of Egypt should use the word ‘Copt’ only in addressing their religious affairs. They should only express themselves as ‘Arab Egyptians.’ He warned the Copts that Muslims were the majority, and they should avoid any clash with them; otherwise it would certainly end up in the loss of their rights as a minority group in case Muslims decided to boycott them. Riḍā postulated that the Copts might have been swayed by the idea that ‘Christian Europe’ would interfere to force the Muslim majority to yield to their demands. In that case, Muslims would subtly try to exclude them from social life, by favouring Muslims by all means in all official posts.\(^{198}\)

\(^{194}\) His landlady in Lausanne would later speak of his gentleness, loyalty and kindness, but he became quite agitated and upset whenever he spoke of Egypt. Another Swiss would observe that the youth spoke of nothing but politics, and that he did so very passionately. Bardawi, *op. cit.*, p. 28.


\(^{196}\) *Ibid*.


\(^{198}\) *Ibid.*, pp. 211-212. In December 1930, Riḍā, as advocate of Arabism, was invited to take part in a public debate held at the Faculty of Law (the Egyptian University) on the concepts of ‘Coptism’ and ‘Pharaonism.’ His counterpart was the
In his address to the Coptic Congress, the orator of the Coptic movement Akhnūkh Fanūs stressed that working on Sunday was a violation of the divine obligation upon Christians as ‘a holy Sabbath.’ He further clarified that ‘any Christian who intentionally works on Sunday should be put to death.’ As a reply to the congress’ demand in this regard, Riḍā turned to expound his religious views on the ‘weekly feast’ in the three monotheistic religions. As compared to Riḍā’s analysis, the Muslim Egyptian Congress accused the Copts of raising the issue out of ‘greediness’ and ‘opportunism’ because they had certain expectations from the ‘Christian’ imperial powers to assist them in removing Islamic features from the whole of society.

Riḍā maintained that he did understand the prime significance of weekly holidays for all nations as a sign of unity, without which religious minority groups could also become weak and liable to vanish. But the national unity of each state should be given priority. He pointed out to the Coptic Congress that the Sabbath was clearly based on many passages in the Old Testament. The sanctification of Sunday, however, was not obviously established in the New Testament; and nowhere did we find in the Bible that Christ or the Apostles ordered the Sabbath to be changed from Saturday to Sunday. Riḍā referred to passages from the Old Testament relating that it was a ‘perpetual covenant ... [for] the people of Israel’ with regard to the day during which God rested after having completed the Creation in six days. He insisted that Jesus did not break the Sabbath, and did not permit his disciples to break it. Riḍā quoted other New Testament passages in which it was related that Jesus allowed his followers to do a little or good activity on the holy day. In order to differ from the Jews, Riḍā went on, the Church replaced Saturday with Sunday, and Paul named it the Lord’s Day. He also stressed that Jewish and Muslim scriptures proving the importance of the weekly day of rest were clearer than the Christian ones. Riḍā was not concerned that minorities would follow the majority in this regard,

---

as was the case with Christians leaving work on Fridays under the Islamic rule, and Muslims on Sundays under the Russian Christian government. Riḍā, however, lamented that religious Christians were able to convince Muslim traders in some Islamic states to leave work on Sundays instead of Fridays. Muslims were not entirely prohibited from working on Fridays. But Riḍā argued that it was not acceptable to open government offices on Fridays, because it was highly recommended in Islam to attend the service on Friday at the mosque as early as possible. For the sake of public interest and social unity, Riḍā concluded that all religious groups in Egypt should accommodate their official schedules according to the majority in matters of labour and government office hours.205

The Coptic Congress also raised the question of equality between Muslim and Coptic children in religious education. They pleaded that all the kuttābs (local religious schools) and the official schools should be open to all Egyptian children irrespective of their religion. The kuttābs were officially declared by the Ministry of Education to be purely Islamic institutions. The Coptic Congress requested that Coptic children should have their religious teaching within the kuttābs, just as their Muslim counterparts did. According to the Provincial Councils, none of the tax revenues were devoted to Coptic educational interests, and the children of poorer Copts were dependent for their education upon private enterprise and generosity.206

The issue of Copts partaking in religious education in primary schools had been debated in Egypt earlier. In 1907 Riḍā asserted that the Coptic demand had its religious and political aspects. From a religious point of view, accepting their demand would be also profitable for Muslims, who would be stimulated to revive their religious education parallel to that of their Christian fellows. Riḍā warned the Copts against the harm that might be caused by random attacks on the part of Muslim riot-makers in the event that the government should take any positive decision in that regard. The riot-makers would use it as a pretext to warn public opinion against what they would see as a potential plan to replace the Islamic government entirely. At that time, Riḍā however was not anxious about the introduction of Coptic religious education at primary schools, and did not

205 Ibid., pp. 218-219.
206 Mikhail, op. cit., p. 29.
fear that it would lead to any kind of religious fanaticism among the members of both communities. 207

In response to the Coptic Congress, Riḍā argued that it was known that there were many states which were not obliged to provide religious education to different religious groups. As it represented the majority group, the Russian state schools for instance did not teach any other religious faith, except the Orthodox doctrine. Jewish and Muslim communities had no right to give their children their own religious education in public schools. As part of the Ottoman Empire, Egyptian state schools confined their religious education only to Islam according to the Ḥanafī School of Law. For Riḍā, it was reasonable that the ruling majority would have the right to decide upon religious education. It was unreasonable of the Coptic Congress to appeal to the Muslim government in Egypt to change the religion of the majority. It would be unfair if the government introduced Coptic religious education in state schools, without including other religious denominations, such as all the various divisions of Judaism and Christianity. 208

‘Opening the gate’ of pluralism would also make the followers of the other Islamic madhāhib (schools of law) require the government to include their doctrines in religious education. 209

The Copts pleaded for more rights than any other religious community, as they considered themselves to be the native population of the country. Riḍā did not entirely disagree with that view. But his remark in this regard was self-contradictory. He contended that ‘suppose that you [Copts] were the original descendants of the ancient Egyptians, then we [Muslims] would also have the option to follow the model of America—the most civilised Christian government in knowledge, justice and freedom—in [persecuting] native Americans.’ 210

But he immediately renounced that by stating that the Muslim Egyptian government gave equal rights to the Copts as nationals of the country. All holders of Egyptian citizenship, Riḍā went on, had equal rights with no regard to their Pharaonic, Israelite, or Arab origin. However, if the Copts’ allegation of being descendants from the ancient Pharaohs was true, the Jews in their progeny should be, according to Riḍā, nobler, since they descended from the line of

208 Al-Manār, vol. 14/3, pp. 221-222.
209 Ibid., p. 224.
210 Ibid., pp. 222-223.
Prophets. But Islam did not make any differentiation between both groups regarding their religion.²¹¹

Riḍā argued that it would not have been unusual if the Egyptian government had followed the European example in stipulating one religion to be taught to all children in public schools. In Egypt, however, there were Muslim institutes, which were supported by the ʿAwqāf system (religious endowments) and fed by Muslims resources, donated for teaching Muslim children. Such institutes, which were run by the government, accepted both Muslim and Coptic children. These endowments, according to Riḍā, used to pay the Egyptian University five thousand pounds annually (which accepted members of both communities as well). Riḍā was convinced that although they were a minority, the Copts were more active, and their demands were merely a token of their being immoderately desirous of acquiring more power over the Muslims.²¹²

The Coptic press attacked Riḍā for his articles about their congress. Riḍā defended himself by stating that he never thought of causing discord between the two communities. His contribution to the whole debate was purely intended for the sake of public interest. He reminded his Coptic opponents of his earlier writings in which he as, a non-Egyptian, had drawn attention to the religious and social unity and strength of the Coptic minority community in comparison with their Muslim counterparts whom he frequently accused of religious laxity.²¹³

What troubled Riḍā was what he saw as a Coptic demand of establishing a secular system in Egypt. His reaction to this point can be seen as a new phase in his thinking. He considered their demand as a threat that would diminish the Islamic presence in Egypt. The Coptic Congress had actually softened its language by asking for equality between Muslims and Copts.²¹⁴ Despite its mild tone, Riḍā still understood the Coptic plea as an attempt to replace Islam altogether with a new Coptic religious system. In line with the Muslim Egyptian Congress, he reconfirmed that the Egyptian ‘Islamic’ government treated the Copts with ‘excessive tolerance and generosity.’ Foreign powers had accused the ‘fragile’ Muslims of discriminating against religious minority groups. He understood that members of the Coptic

²¹¹ Ibid., pp. 223-224.
²¹⁴ Bishrī, op. cit., pp. 97-100.
Congress not only claimed more rights for the Copts, but also pleaded for an Egyptian government which should remain Islamic. Despite the spread of non-Islamic ‘illicit’ acts (such as wine-drinking and adultery), Riḍā defended the Egyptian government as Islamic. Islamic Law, he argued, does not consider those who commit sins as unbelievers. Although the foreign authorities did not give Egypt complete independence at that time, Riḍā still believed that the government had not entirely lost its Islamic face. Many Islamic features characterised Egyptian society, such as the Sharʿī judicial system, religious endowments, Al-Azhar’s religious institutions, and religious feasts. In their demands, the Copts, Riḍā stressed, aimed indirectly at ‘erasing’ these Muslim aspects and replacing them with their own.215

Riḍā believed that due to their Western education Eastern Christians in general became very keen on power and authority; and had a strong desire that both Ottoman and Egyptian governments had to forsake their Islamic character altogether. He concluded that the Copts rushed to put forward their demands out of their ‘hatred’ against the Arabs. At the same time he referred to those whom he often called ironically ‘geographic Muslim leaders,’ who he had a stronger desire to remove the Islamic nature of Egypt as well. He was convinced that such a secularist group among Muslims would gradually attain the same aim by weeding out Islamic elements in their opposition to any Islamic initiative in the society. Riḍā again warned the Copts that they should remain content with the rights they had already been given enabling them to reach high official positions in Egypt. He further notified the Copts that their demands would agitate the Muslim public feelings against them, if their wishes to replace the Muslim character of the government were to be put into practice. The Supreme Porte might also take strict measures to retain its Islamic state. It would also widen the gap of understanding between Islam and Christianity in other Muslim lands, since Egypt was seen as one of the pivotal centres of Islam. The British officials, as a result, would try to quell any discontent among Muslims in their colonies (especially India) by opposing the Coptic plans. The Copts, Riḍā argued, would in this way harm their status and lose some of their rights instead of gaining any.216

---

216 Ibid., pp. 285-287.
Although he did not take part in its activities, Riḍā stood firmly behind the Muslim Egyptian Congress. It was, in his view, effective, but belated. The first fruitful consequence was the change of tone in the Coptic protest. He believed that the Copts adopted a milder tone in presenting their requests after they saw that the Muslim majority were attempting to recover their unity. He compared the situation in Egypt with India. Muslims of India had recognised the importance of their unity by holding their annual meetings and congresses, when they saw the Hindus trying to promote their social unity. The same held true for Egyptian Muslims who through this congress achieved a remarkable progress in the direction of their unity. The dependency of Muslim Egyptians on their government in regulating their affairs was, in Riḍā’s view, the reason they had been tardy in achieving integrity and unity. Following al-Afghānī’s political ideas, Riḍā strongly believed that any governmental reform could not be established without the reform of the state as a whole. The leaders of any state should also exert many of their efforts and the natural resources of their countries in serving their subjects, preventing their people from any unneeded involvement in politics. Politics, as well as religious, economical and social public affairs should be run by a group of experts whom the people trust. Riḍā related the success of Western societies to their careful concern to promote talented people in various fields and giving them leadership in offices and institutions. He was therefore satisfied with the decision of the Muslim Egyptian Congress not to interfere in any political discussion or conflict, and to concentrate on investigating the Coptic demands only, and on collecting facts and statistics about Coptic and Muslim officials in various offices. He again warned the Copts to stop accusing Muslims of stirring up religious fanaticism and to make an end to their writings in such a ‘despising’ language in their press.217

Riḍā concluded by recommending that the Muslim Egyptian Congress should regulate religious and social Islamic affairs. His proposal was general and did not include any suggestion directly related to the Coptic question. He prompted its members to have its center in Cairo and establish five permanent committees: 1) an administrative committee to regulate all further work; 2) a committee for education, which would organise charitable educational institutes and

schools, and would in the future make a plan for establishing an Islamic college for girls; 3) a committee for preaching and guidance (al-Waʿz wa al-ʾIrshād), which would be entrusted to supervise preachers who would be sent all over the country; 4) an economic and financial committee, which would take care of investigating the matter of giving loans to poor families and combating usury and non-Islamic financial transactions; and 5) a charitable committee, which would provide assistance for aged, orphans and needy people.  

2.2.3. Salāma Mūsā

Even after his sharp critique of the Coptic Congress, Riḍā still admitted its success in strengthening to the social and ethnical bond among the Copts. At the same time, he constantly accused ‘Coptic Egyptianists’ of attacking al-Manār as a platform for Islamic ideas. Some of the Coptic newspapers also heavily criticised Riḍā for his anti-Christian writings.

Riḍā took part in polemics against the Coptic intellectual Salāma Mūsā (1887-1958) for his writings on Islam and religions in general. It is worth noting that Mūsā was the foremost disciple of the Syrian intelligentsia in Egypt. By the 1920s, when the zenith of the Syrian Christians in Egypt started to be on the wane (Zaidān died in 1914, Shumayyil in 1917, Anṭūn in 1922, and Ṣarrūf in 1927), Mūsā adopted without any hesitation the secularism of Syrian Christians. His readings in their works had clearly moulded his ideas on various subjects. Unlike his Syrian mentors, Mūsā was blunt and straightforward in his critique of Islam. Zaidān once advised him to omit a few offending paragraphs in one of his articles on Islam. ‘Never mind,’ said Zaidān, ‘if we criticise the Christians, for they themselves have already written the critique of their religion [Christianity]. But we must treat Muslims with circumspection. They have not yet produced any self-criticism.’ Mūsā developed his philosophy of ‘Egyptianism,’ and advocated the idea of liberating society from what he deemed as shackles of theological traditions. Unlike the sense of ‘Arabness’ we have noted among Syrian Christians, Mūsā argued that Arabic should

218 Ibid., pp. 295-298.
be ‘declassicised’ for the sake of Egypt. He encouraged therefore the idea of promoting the Egyptian dialect in literary works.\(^{220}\)

In 1912 Salāma Mūsā published his Arabic translation of the treatise of the famous British writer Grant Allen (1848-99), *The Evolution of the Idea of God*.\(^{221}\) Throughout his work, Allen tried to demonstrate that theology is a product of the human mind, and Christianity is riddled with pagan traditions. Two years later, Riḍā reviewed the book by stating that such attacks of modern atheists on religion have no impact on the conception of monotheism in Islam. Such European writers, he argued, became very critical of Christianity once they observed its ‘pagan’ elements.\(^{222}\) Consequently, the Coptic newspaper *Miṣr* (‘Egypt,’ firstly published 1895) launched a campaign against Riḍā for his assault on Christianity as a pagan religion. The paper appealed to the Egyptian government to ban Riḍā’s journal and banish him from Egypt for causing religious strife among Muslims and Copts. Ḥusayn Rushdī (1863-1928), the then Prime Minister, invited Riḍā to his house to discuss the matter.\(^{223}\) Riḍā explained to him that he had published a review of the book just as many other Egyptian papers had done. He also elucidated that his intention was to defend Islam against missionary writings by using such critical writings in his counterattack. He adamantly added that his journal would continue its anti-missionary campaign as long as they continued to publish their attacks on Islam. Rushdī requested Riḍā to confine his writings to defence only. Riḍā expressed his readiness to prepare a long list of anti-Islamic citations in missionary literature. He also tried to convince the Prime Minister that the Coptic daily was seeking the support of British missionaries in order to close down his journal and his preaching of Islam in Cairo.\(^{224}\)

According to Riḍā, the anti-*Manār* campaign was led by Yūsuf al-Khāzin (died in Italy, 1944), a Christian Syrian editor in Cairo. He


\(^{224}\) Ibid., p. 479.
was a member of the staff editorial of the above-mentioned Coptic newspaper *al-Waṭan*. Riḍā accused him of being one of the most fanatic Christians. According to *al-Manār*, al-Khāzin was reported to have said that he ‘felt uncomfortable when a Muslim would greet him.’ Riḍā again claimed that his opponents made another attempt to request the British Commissioner and the Egyptian government to imprison or banish him from Egypt, but that their campaign was not successful. He moreover stressed that people knew the objective of his journal from its early beginning; it never intended to propagate any religious strife or animosity against Christians.

In Riḍā’s view, worse than missionaries were those westernised Muslims and Christians. He deemed that Salāma Mūsā, born a Christian, was one of the strongest propagators of ‘atheism’ and ‘absolute looseness,’ who certainly endangered the Egyptian nation through his contributions in *al-Hilāl*, in which he became the principal writer and a leading pundit by the 1920s. He had also published nine books since he had joined the staff of its company. Riḍā became upset that Emile Zaidān, the subsequent editor of *al-Hilāl*, gave Mūsā this opportunity of attacking religion, and did not follow the line of his father who was more mindful of religions, their values and the entity of the Arab nation. Riḍā saw Mūsā’s books published by *al-Hilāl* as a ‘destructive propaganda against any oriental nation, which might be dazzled by his subverting materialistic philosophy.’ On its part, Mūsā’s own magazine *al-Majalla al-Jadīda* accused Riḍā of accumulating huge wealth through the distribution of his journal in which he offended Muslim thinkers by constantly charging them with infidelity.

Riḍā was one of the founding members of the above-mentioned Jamʿiyyat al-Rābiṭa al-Sharqiyya (Association of Oriental League, established 1921-1922). The Association of the Oriental League was Egypt’s Asian affiliation. It aimed at disseminating the arts, literatures and sciences of the Orient, strengthening rela-
Majallat al-Rābiṭa al-Sharqiyya, first appeared in 1928, its editorial included the controversial modernist ‘Ali ʿAbd al-Rāziq, and several of its contributors were leading Egyptian liberals, including Salāma Mūsā. Mūsā openly proclaimed his ‘disbelief’ in the East and ‘faith’ in the West. His ‘anti-Easternism’ caused controversy and he was criticised for his assertions that Egypt was historically part of the Western rather than the Eastern world and that even the ethnographic and linguistic roots of Egypt were closer to the peoples of Europe as opposed to those of Asia.233

Riḍā immediately attacked the association for its drift towards ‘spreading atheist culture’ by publishing the views of such liberals in its magazine.234 He was disappointed that the association, which had earlier gained his support, had now given an opportunity to Mūsā as ‘propagator of unbelief and impudence’ and an ‘enemy of religions in general and Islam in particular, of morality and spiritual values, and of any Eastern nationalist, ethnical or linguistic bond.’235 Riḍā was concerned at Mūsā’s demands for a ‘westernised’ Egyptian society, and the excessive praise in his writings of the British as an attempt to convince his readers of the necessity of ‘assimilating Muslims into the English nation.’236 For him, the westernisation of Muslims would only be achieved at the expense of Islamic traditions and values. The present Christianity and its doctrine of the Trinity, for Riḍā, were far removed from the authentic message of Jesus, which was only to be found in the Gospel of John: ‘Now this is eternal life: that they may...
know You, the Only True God, and Jesus Christ, whom You have sent’ (3:17).

In the 1930s Riḍā became involved in public discussions about Egypt’s religious and national identity. A well attended debate over the issue of whether Egypt’s culture was ‘Pharaonic’ or ‘Arab’ was held at the Faculty of Law of the Egyptian University in December 1930. In this debate Riḍā claimed the massive and decisive Arab and Islamic character of Egypt, while his counterpart the Egyptian lawyer, Muhammad Luṭfī Jum‘ah, defended the uniqueness of Egyptian culture. Mūsā advocated the Pharaonic identity of Egypt as well, which he considered as superior to the Arab-Islamic heritage both by virtue of its more ancient age and its remarkable achievements. In his debates on the ‘Arabness’ of the Egyptian culture, Riḍā frequently ridiculed Mūsā for his backing of the concept of Pharaonism. What irritated Riḍā was Mūsā’s giving precedence to the ancient Egyptian culture above the Shari‘a besides what he understood as ‘insults’ and ‘offences’ against anyone who would advocate Islam and its establishments in Egypt. He was very saddened by Mūsā’s depiction of Shakīb Arslān as ‘villain’ (waghd). Riḍā also felt very offended and tried to prove his Egyptian nationality, when Mūsā personally debunked him as a non-Egyptian, who had no right to interfere in such Egyptian affairs. Mūsā now reminded his readers of Riḍā’s part in the ‘Abduh-Anṭūn debate by pointing out that al-Manār had assassinated al-Jāmi‘a. By this the Egyptian youth had thus lost one of the significant intellectual sources in the country. In his words, Mūsā commented: ‘we [Egyptians] should understand our duty […] the Egyptian press should remain an Egyptian craft, not only with its Egyptian public readers, but also with its craftsmen and editors, who must also remain Egyptian.’

Riḍā related Mūsā’s views on Islam to his ‘ignorance’ and ‘animosity.’ An example was his critique of the inequality between men and women in the inheritance law. Riḍā believed that the reason behind Mūsā’s criticism was his ambition to replace Eastern identity with Western models of life and style of dress. Again Riḍā was disappointed that the mouthpiece of the Oriental League had given Mūsā the chance

---

238 Egger, op. cit., pp. 136-139.
to spread his ideas. Unlikely, the famous Egyptian feminist Hudā Shaʿrāwī (1879-1947), according to Riḍā, had once rejected a request put forward to her and her feminist society by Mūsā in which he appealed to the Egyptian government for the equality of inheritance law. She rejected his request because she was convinced that any plan to reform the social standards of women should emanate from Islamic Law itself.240

Riḍā took up the issue of women’s inheritance law once again in a lecture which he delivered at the Egyptian University.241 He attacked Mūsā again, suggesting that the overriding reason for his hatred against the Arabs was that they had conquered his land and had changed it into a Muslim state. He added that he would probably have preferred that Egypt should have remained a part of the Christian Roman Empire despite their persecution of his Coptic people for many years. Looking at Mūsā’s own writings, we find that although he gave priority to the Pharaonic culture, he did not deny the social impact of Arabs and Islam on the Egyptians. He believed that the Arab conquest of Egypt had brought a new era of civilisation, and that Islam had unfettered its people from sectarian disputes and the Roman political and economical exploitation.242

In addition to his propagation of atheism, Riḍā continued, Mūsā in his animosity spared no effort to drive Muslims away from their religion. Some Muslim ‘atheists’ rallied behind him under the slogan of tajdid (renewal). Riḍā referred to one of the lectures delivered by Mūsā in 1928 to the members of the Association of Christian Young Men (A.C.Y.M.). In this he held that the status of women in Islam was inferior, especially in its stipulation of inheritance. Riḍā maintained that Mūsā was the first writer to raise these allegations. The Egyptian Constitutionalist Maḥmūd ʿAzmī and the Coptic-Catholic Faraj Mikhāʾil delivered a similar lecture on the same subject. The three of them, Riḍā believed, brought forward the issue of women’s inheritance not because they were concerned with removing inequality

242 See, for instance, Ghālī Shukri, Salāma Mūsā wā Azmat al-Ḍamīr al-ʿArabī, Beirut, 4th edition, 1983, p. 137. Mūsā admitted the tolerance of Islam given to other religious groups, and attributed the negative behaviour to some Muslim rulers, id., p. 219.
between men and women, but by raising such discussions they aimed at causing the umma to disintegrate.\footnote{\textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 30/9, p. 700.}

2.3. Conclusion

In order to evaluate Riḍā’s attitudes towards the Arab Christians of his age, we have analysed various cases. Syrian Christian émigrés in Egypt, who had lively relations with him, were mostly drawn to the world of journalism and political activism. We have observed how complex his approaches were towards them as secularists: sometimes they were on friendly terms, but he sometimes tended to have religious and intellectual controversies and heated polemics with some others as well. His positive or negative postures were mostly determined by his counterpart’s stances towards the concepts which he adamantly espoused in his writings, especially those related to Islamism or Arabism. He was therefore pragmatic in his political co-operation with them, and ready to co-operate with many of them as long as they accepted the Islamic character of society. Riḍā’s critique was coupled with an assault on those whom he called ‘geographic Muslims,’ who were also trying to weed out Islamic elements from society. I would venture to say that the rejection by Arab Christians of many Christian fundamentals and their sharp criticism of Christian clergymen were likely to be among the prime motives behind his willingness to cooperate with them. He, on the other hand, was not willing to tolerate the Jesuit attack on Islam and Mūsā’s critique of Islam.

Riḍā’s stance towards the Coptic community was more sensitive. Some Copts considered him a non-Egyptian ‘intruder,’ who had no right to interfere in Egyptian affairs. In its response to the Coptic Congress, \textit{al-Manār} did not attempt to analyse in depth the drastic impact of al-Wardānī’s assassination of Buṭrus Ghâlî on the long-standing and sensitive relation between Muslims and Copts. Riḍā’s position was more apologetic towards their demands. He did not take the issue further than discussing the status of non-Muslim minorities under Islamic rule, and accusing some Coptic groups of inflaming the religious strife among different communities. His tone was sometimes cynical. This was clearly shown when he cautioned the
Copts to be ‘satisfied’ with the rule of the Khedive ‘Ḥājj Abbās.’ Throughout his articles, Riḍā neither severely condemned Wardānī’s crime, nor extolled his act. He was also silent on the religious discourse prevalent among Muslim scholars (who did not condemn his act) and some other nationalist groups (who hailed al-Wardānī as a national hero).²⁴⁴

²⁴⁴ The then mufti of Egypt, for example, did not support the verdict of the Egyptian court by considering imposing the death penalty on al-Wardānī as unjustified from his own religious point of view. See, Badrawi, op. cit., p. 41.
CHAPTER THREE

AL-MANĀR VERSUS EVANGELISM: RASHĪD RIḌĀ’S PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL AND THEOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF MISSIONS

What follows here is a systematic treatment of Riḍā’s various polemics against missionary writings and activities of his time. The discussion is mainly meant to put Riḍā’s works on Christianity (discussed below), which he published in separate treatises, in its appropriate historical context in relation to the previous two chapters.

The present chapter traces his responses to the missionary work in the Muslim world, and his confrontations with some of the missionaries in Egypt. It will be divided into eight sections: 1) his early general understanding of the role of missionary work in each religion, and the development of his thinking over the years in this early phase (1900); 2) his perception of missions as part of Western colonialism in the Muslim world, and the concrete examples through which he tried to find a link between both forces; 3) al-Manār’s confrontation with the British authorities in Egypt because of its attacks on missions and severe critique of Christianity; 4) Riḍā’s evaluation of the missionary educational work and its (dis)advantages among Muslims; 5) the role of other Muslim writers and readers who reacted to missionary work in al-Manār from various regions in the Muslim world; 6) Riḍā’s short-lived project of Dār al-Da’wā wā al-’Irshād; 7) his zealotry in propagating Islam as part of his anti-missionary strategies; and lastly 8) his criticism of the religious official scholars of Al-Azhar in Egypt and their mild responses to missions.

1 An earlier version of the chapter has been read at the conference: ‘Social dimensions of mission in the Middle East (19th and 20th century),’ the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Marburg University and the Fliedner-Foundation Kaiserswerth, Düsseldorf-Kaiserswerth (13th-15th March 2006).
3.1. Mission is the Life of Religion

In 1900, Riḍā wrote two articles on the importance of propaganda for the spread of religions in reaction to the anger of Muslim public opinion because of the current news on missionary success in converting Muslims in Africa. Riḍā discussed their ideas chiefly in order to relieve sad feelings of Muslims about the conversion of Muslims to Christianity and to stimulate them to do more work in propagating Islam. He explained to those despairing Muslims the real reasons behind the spread of religions, asking them to develop a better understanding of missionary success. He rejected the common thought among Muslims that the spread of religions was only dependent on governments which use it as a policy tool. Governments can only facilitate the growth of a given religion, which has already been spreading on its own for many other fundamental reasons.2

In his analysis of these articles, Juan R. Cole notes that Riḍā’s encounter with non-Islamic missionaries led him to develop a ‘missiology’ (Ṭarīq al-Da’wa) for Islam, which was characterised by both modern pragmatic and aspects of traditional Islam. This missiology, Cole argued, rested upon the explanation of the dynamics of the spread of religions in terms of organisation and efficiency rather than in terms of the intrinsic truth of the message or the intervention of a supernatural agency. This secular explanation helped him to account for the successes of Christian missionaries in Africa in converting Muslims.3 Cole has actually based his observation only on these two particular articles with no consideration of Riḍā’s later, and more paradoxical views. His remark is true when it comes to Riḍā’s interpretation of the missionary enterprise in historical and social terms. Looking at Riḍā’s whole understanding of the subject-matter, as we shall see, one would easily conclude that he totally renounced such views when it came to the struggle between Islamic expansion and the endeavours of Christian missions in the whole Muslim world. In

2 Al-Manār, ‘Al-Da’wa Ḥayāt al-ʾAdyān (Mission, the Life of Religions),’ vol. 3/20 (Jamādā al-ʾŪlā 1318/September 1900), pp. 457-463; ‘Al-Da’wa wā Tariqūhā wā ʾĀdābūhā (Mission, Its rules and Methodologies),’ vol. 3/21 (Jumādā al-Thāniya 1318/September 1900), 481-490. The articles were written as a reaction to an article in the Egyptian paper al-Muʾayyād of Sheikh ʿAlī Yūsuf (September 1900) on the success of Christian missions in Sudan.

his conviction, the spread of Islam was caused by the power of the ‘truth’ of its divine message as compared to the ‘absurdity’ of the Christian creed.

As we shall see throughout the chapter, Riḍā’s views of Christian missions were not always coherent. In the two articles we just mentioned, Riḍā argued that all religions (including Islam) would successfully spread by propaganda regardless of its falsity or truth. But the rationality lying in true religions could in many cases help them to dominate over false doctrines. In historical terms, however, Riḍā maintained that without propaganda religions would have died out or vanished, as it had been attested that false beliefs are easily disseminated by propaganda, while true ones had disappeared when their followers exerted no vigorous missionary effort. But he insisted that due to its power and rationality Islam had higher esteem and more authority than all other religions.4

Riḍā moreover asserted that the methodology of religious propaganda should contain two aspects to achieve success: philosophical proofs for the intellectual elite and the rituals and sermons for the lay people. A missionary therefore needed specialised skills and knowledge. These included knowledge of the language and customs of the local population, and a broad acquaintance with their religious sects and rites. He should be capable of delivering the message according to their mentality and in words that they would easily grasp. Riḍā also stressed that the propagandist should be convinced of the inner truth of his message and must act according to it, evincing great endurance and a never-failing hope of success. This emphasis on the internal strengthening of the community rather than on foreign mission was natural in a situation where many Muslim countries were under European colonial rule. Muslims saw the need for self-defence and self-strengthening as more important, in a situation of economic and political dependency, than the need for an aggressive expansionism.5

Riḍā was much impressed by the methods followed by Western missionaries in propagating their religion. He demanded Muslim religious men to follow their model of training and propaganda. He summarised the merits of the success of Christian missions over Muslim propagandists in various points. He admitted that

---

missionaries received better training in secular sciences and the knowledge of the modern world than Muslim religious leaders. Christian preachers also exerted effort to learn foreign languages and translate their publications in local languages, while Muslim scholars sometimes considered learning foreign languages as a ‘deviance’ from Islam. Other factors were their amiable treatment and deep awareness of the traditions, desires, religious sects, norms and mentalities of the local population. Christian missionaries also used to present their religion in a way that would attract followers of other religions. Riḍā mentioned an example of missionaries in China, who succeeded in attracting Buddhists by dressing themselves in the native clothes of indigenous people; and by carrying the statues of their gods. In his view, missionaries had more unyielding endurance in propagating their religion unlike many Muslims. In Asia they suffered humiliation, but remained steadfast and resolute. An example of that was a story he read in a missionary periodical about one of the early missionary groups in China who remained for nearly eight years preaching without achieving any case of conversion. Their request to return back home was rejected. They received a demand from their mother institution in the West to remain determined in preaching the Word of God. As a result of their sincere missionary conviction, the local Chinese people began gradually to accept their work and converted to Christianity. 6

Cole did not refer to other attitudes shown by Riḍā, which implicitly contradicted his deep admiration for the religious aspiration of mission in many other places in his journal. One year after the publication of these articles, for instance, Riḍā stated that although there were many Christians preaching their religion out of belief in Christianity as the only truth, there were many individuals who committed themselves to missionary activity only because of the salaries they received from religious institutions. They used their job in most cases as a source of living without any conviction in spreading the truth. 7 In his view, the only ‘true’ mission of solid faith in Christian history was that of the disciples of Jesus; and any later missionary attempt was false. Riḍā constantly stressed that the Islamic Da’wa, on the contrary, had been gaining millions of converts over centuries despite the frail state of Muslims, their lack of knowledge, the fragility

of Muslim leaders and the weakness of their civilisation and culture. Despite their scientific, social and political shortcomings, Riḍā argued, Muslims were still motivated to preach their religion because of their conviction of the truth of the Islamic message. Missionary groups, on the other hand, were given all protection by their governments. European supremacy in the East ‘made them speak loudly […] Christians preach their religion motivated by politics, followed by money, and protected by weapons.’

In the meantime, Riḍā, backing his statements, enthusiastically quoted a full Arabic translation of some speeches delivered by the English Canon Isaac Taylor (mentioned above in the introduction) on the successful expansion of Islam in Africa. In 1887, Taylor announced to a British audience at a church conference in Wolverhampton that Christianity, because its message was ‘too spiritual’ and ‘too lofty,’ had failed to civilise the savage and barbarous Africans. Islam, he continued, had been more successful than Christianity in ridding that continent of its evils—evils like cannibalism, devil worship, and human sacrifice. This Islam-Christianity debate evoked many discussions in British newspapers, especially the London Times for several months after Taylor’s speech. Taylor admitted that missionaries did some good, but suggested that they failed because their

---

8 Ibid., p. 626.


efforts were misdirected. Riḍā’s enthusiasm about Taylor’s critique of the modest results achieved by missions in Africa somehow contradicted his above-mentioned theory that the spread of any religion relied only on organised propaganda. In his thinking, ‘although the vast sums of money and all the precious lives lavished upon Africa, Christian converts were reckoned by thousands, but Muslim converts [without missions] by millions.’

3.2. Mission and Colonialism

Like many Muslims of his age, Riḍā perceived the Christian missions as an integral part of the colonial presence in the Muslim world. He was convinced that Europe made use of religion as a political instrument for mobilising European Christians by inflaming their ‘fanatic’ feelings against other nations. This was manifest in the spread of missions in Asia and Africa as ‘tools for conquest.’ An example of that was the occupation of the Chinese harbour Kiao-Chau (1898) after the murder of two German Catholic priests by a mob in November 1897. On the pretext of protecting German missionaries in China, Kaiser Wilhelm II dispatched his brother with ships to enforce new German territorial demands, and the practical cession of the harbour from the Chinese government.

In his analysis of the association of missions with colonialism, Riḍā drew historical parallels, such as the collaboration of the Church in medieval Spain with the authorities in converting the Muslims and the Jews. He gave the example of the British Prime Minister William Ewart Gladstone (1809-1898), who was deeply imbued by Christian theology, and had hatred towards Islam. Another case was the English politician, Lord Salisbury, who, according to Riḍā, was re-

11 Cairnes, ibid, p. 211.
ported to say: ‘we should retrieve what the Crescent had taken from the Cross.’\textsuperscript{16}

One of Riḍā’s readers in East Africa reported to him cases of compulsory conversion of Muslims by the German colonial authorities. Riḍā remarked that the Germans tried to spoil the relation between Arab and indigenous inhabitants. Due to their excessive ‘egotism’ taught by Bismarck, the Europeans, in Riḍā’s view, were the only race throughout human history, who used compulsion in matters of religion. In comparison to the German behaviour in their colonies, Riḍā praised the British colonial policy of tolerance, asking the ‘Orientals to give them their preference over all other European governments.’\textsuperscript{17}

In an article on ‘the Muslim world and European Colonialism,’ Riḍā accused the Dutch authorities in Indonesia of adopting new schemes for christianising the whole Archipelago.\textsuperscript{18} He also criticised Indonesian students in the Middle East (especially in Mecca and Egypt) for their indolence in religious knowledge. He accused them of staying for long years in another country without committing any effort to read its newspapers or magazines or works of history, sociology and geography. Such a small country as the Netherlands was able to colonise and exploit millions of people. In Riḍā’s view, the Dutch had followed a unique and successful way in evangelising Muslims, especially in Depok, a village between Batavia and Bogor. He was told that missionaries were dispersed among Muslims in remote villages, while ‘enlightened’ Arab Muslims were entirely forbidden to enter them. They also studied religious superstitions and ‘false’ beliefs that circulated among the locals, describing them as part of the people’s faith in order to convince them of the ‘fallacy’ of Islam. They supported their arguments by focusing attention on the deteriorating state of Muslims as compared to the flourishing state of their Christian fellow citizens in knowledge, wealth and status. As a result, the inhabitants of these regions converted to Christianity, and started to ‘hate’

\textsuperscript{16} Al-Manār, vol. 1/26, p. 498.

\textsuperscript{17} Al-Manār, ‘Al-Mānya fī Sharqay ʾIfrīqiya wā Tanṣiruhā al-Muslimīn (Germany in East Africa and Christianising Muslims),’ vol. 7/18 (Ramaḍān 1322/24 November 1904), p. 720. Riḍā also received another letter from one of his readers in Dar as-Salam about discriminating the Arabs and the destruction of one of the mosques there, when two Greek employees complained about the voice of the \textit{adhān}, vol. 7/20 (Shawwāl 1322/23 December 1904), pp. 799-800.

\textsuperscript{18} Al-Manār, ‘al-ʿĀlam al-ʾIslāmī wā al-Istiʾmār al-ʿUrūbī (The Muslim world and Western Colonialism),’ vol. 14/5, pp. 347-352.
Muslims. Riḍā explained cynically that ‘when a Muslim entered [these villages], he would not find shelter. None of the inhabitants would give him a cup of coffee or water; nor would they meet him or talk to him. Was Jesus sent to instil animosity and hatred among people to such a degree? Or was it the European policy which was far from the religion of Christ?’

Riḍā’s critique also focused on the situation of Muslims on Java as the most ignorant and lax in religious matters. For him, ‘if the Dutch continued in their policy, all Indonesian islands would easily change into another Spain.’ Riḍā’s attack on the Dutch policy in the East Indies in that regard might sound extreme. But according to Harry J. Benda, many Dutchmen in the Indies had great hopes of eliminating the influence of Islam by rapidly christianising the majority of Indonesians. These hopes were partly anchored in the fairly widespread, if facile, Western belief in the superiority of Christianity to Islam, and partly in the erroneous assumption that the syncretic nature of Indonesian Islam at the village level would render conversion to Christianity easier in Indonesia than in other Muslim lands.

In his consultations to the Dutch government, Snouck Hurgronje welcomed the educational work of Christian missions in Indonesia, but deplored their confessional bias, and discouraged missionary work in the areas of religious Muslim majorities.

Also seeing it against the historical background, it should be emphasised that Riḍā wrote his article in 1911, when the Christian statesman A.W.F. Idenburg (1861-1935) was the governor-general (1909-1916) of the Indies. Idenburg was a fervent member of Abraham Kuyper’s Anti-Revolutionary Party. The newspaper Soerabaiaasch Handelsblad passed a judgment upon him: ‘we have a governor-general here whose thinking is too much influenced by Kuyper, who has too many apostolic aspirations.’ Idenburg’s christianisation policy...
even included his wish to officially involve civil servants in public festivities on Sundays, and to discourage Sunday markets.²⁴

The Javanese journal al-Wifāq (edited by the Meccan publicist Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Saʿīd al-Fattā)²⁵ reported to Riḍā that the Dutch authorities intensified their ‘prosecution’ of Muslims in Java by inspecting worshippers during the time of the prayer. The journal commented that Muslims should always obtain permission whenever they wanted to establish congregational prayers, whereas missionary workers were given all the space to hold their gatherings and spread their publications over the whole island.²⁶

Riḍā believed that, unlike the Indonesians, Tatar Muslims in Russia were difficult to convert because of their strong faith and firm adherence to the native language and culture.²⁷ Tatar Muslims were actually suspicious about Russian education and clothing. In their eyes, the ignorance of Tatar language would directly imply Christianisation.²⁸ Christian missionary activity also strove to shape Muslim education, literature and publishing, as they recognised its powerful impact on Muslim locals.²⁹

Riḍā made his point clearer by stating that the first step of European colonial conquest started with establishing missionary schools, hospitals and orphanages. Attendants of their institutions as a result would begin to doubt their doctrines and social constituents. The community would consequently be divided into two classes: those westernised who tried to replace their traditions with European habits,

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 147-48.
and those of conservative minds who cling firmly to the past. The clash between the old and new would consequently engender aggression on the part of Muslims against missions or Eastern Christians: a good excuse for colonial states to use military intervention under the pretext of protecting the interests and religion of minority groups in the East.

3.3. Confrontation with the British

As has already been mentioned, Riḍā praised the tolerance of the British in their colonies as compared to their German counterpart in East Africa. But due to Riḍā’s political activism and the pro-Caliphate tone in his journal, British authorities in Egypt entertained the idea of sending him to exile in Malta during the First World War. The British diplomat Sir Mark Sykes (1879-1919) described Riḍā after their meeting as ‘a leader of Pan-Arab and Pan-Islamic thought. In conversation he talks as much as he writes. He is a hard uncompromising fanatical Moslem, the mainspring of whose ideas is the desire to eliminate Christian influence and to make Islam a political power in as wide a field as possible.’

As early as January 1899, the British Commissioner of Egypt Lord Cromer delivered a speech in the Sudan, in which he promised the Sudanese people to establish justice and religious freedom under the British Protectorate. Riḍā believed that such ‘daring’ promises could not be fulfilled without taking definitive measures to bring missionary work to an end. It would be a ‘false’ pledge in case missionary workers were given the opportunity to intensify their work there.

As a matter of fact, the British were well aware of the Muslim religious sentiments. In order to maintain their political and economic interests in Egypt, they did not publicly encourage missionary work.

---

32 Haddad, ‘Nationalism,’ p. 268.
33 ‘Select Reports and Telegrams from Sir Mark Sykes,’ report no. 14; as cited in ibid., p. 268.
William Temple Gairdner criticised the British in Egypt by saying that ‘the Mohammedans think that the government is simply running the country for them; that they are the only people; that the British officials are afraid of them, and have implicitly declared the superiority of Islam. Such policy can bring nothing but difficulty and disaster in the future. It is cowardly and unchristian; it is not even neutral. It ought to be wholly changed. The British official may one day see that this subservience to the Muslims and neglect of his own faith gain him, neither respect, gratitude, nor affection of the people, but the very reverse of all three.’

During his stay in office, Lord Cromer had to interfere once or twice in cases of Muslims who were converted to Christianity by American missionaries. One of these cases was a student at Al-Azhar from Jerusalem, whose name was Maḥmūd (later Boulus or Paul), who entered the class of catechumens in October 1905. He confessed the Christian faith in February 1906. When the boy’s father learnt about that, he came to Egypt to take his son back. When the father appealed to Lord Cromer, the latter invited the boy to his office, and told him that he was old enough to profess whatever religion he preferred. Cromer asked the boy to sign a document to that effect in his presence and that of other witnesses. The Prime Minister of Egypt and the Minister of Foreign Affairs were present during the interview and witnessed the boy’s confession.

It cannot be argued that Cromer had joined missionary activity. However, he was not constrained to provide ‘the missionary, the philanthropists, the social reformer and others of the same sort, with a fair field. […] their interests are excellent, although at times their judgements may be defective. They will, if under some control, probably do much good on a small scale. They may even effect reforms more important than of the administer and politician who will follow cautiously in their track and perhaps reap the result of their labour.’

He was also not reluctant to describe Islam as an ‘inelastic faith that contained within itself the seeds of its own political decadence. As the power of the Crescent waned before that of the Cross, the Frank

---

38 Bishrī, op.cit., p. 566.
41 Cromer, op. cit, p. 642.
was gradually transformed from being a humble receiver of privileges into an imperious possessor of rights.'\textsuperscript{42} He also took pride in the so-called superiority of the Christian nations over the Muslims, quoting the words of Sir William Muir when saying: ‘Christian nations may advance in civilisation, freedom, and morality, in philosophy, science, and the arts, but Islam stands still. And thus stationary, so far as the lessons of history avail, it will remain.'\textsuperscript{43}

In 1913, Lord Kitchener (1850-1916), a British commissioner following Cromer, made an attempt to ban the publication of \textit{al-Manār} due to its anti-missionary writings. Kitchener was ‘in full sympathy with the work that the [missionary] Press is trying to accomplish.'\textsuperscript{44} He also had personal interviews with Samuel Zwemer (1867-1952), and Arthur T. Upson of the Nile Mission,\textsuperscript{45} who were critical of \textit{al-Manār}'s attacks on missionary activities. Zwemer saw it as one of the mouthpieces of hostility against Christianity and missions.\textsuperscript{46}

Magnus, a biographer of Kitchener, described him as a British colonial officer with religious sentiments.\textsuperscript{47} ‘The British imperialism was in its heyday during Kitchener’s lifetime, and there was confusion in regard to the meaning of the word. Some regarded it with horror as a cloak for barefaced exploitation; while others hailed it with exaltation as the religious mission of a great people elected by God. Kitchener believed in the reality of the white man’s burden. He considered that the reluctance to shoulder the idea of imperialism would have constituted a cowardly betrayal of a missionary duty, which God, or providence, had imposed upon the British race.'\textsuperscript{48} His ‘correspondence with the Coptic Archbishop of Sinai and the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem were of absorbing interest to him and received equally assiduous attention.'\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., p. 794.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., pp. 637-38.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{48} Magnus, ibid., p. 24.
\textsuperscript{49} Arthur, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. II, pp. 345-346.
Riḍā stated that, after Lord Cromer’s rule, the political and religious freedom guaranteed to the Egyptians was on the wane. He saw that Lord Kitchener had manifest sympathy towards missionary work. For instance, Lord Kitchener demanded the Egyptian Minister of al-Awqāf (Religious Endowments) to cancel his project of establishing a hospital in Old Cairo, which was planned to be situated nearby the British missionary hospital Herber. He feared that the Egyptian hospital would attract the attention of Muslims away from the missionary one. Riḍā was disappointed by the fact that although the Egyptian government had provided missionary societies with many facilities to establish educational and medical centres for the goodwill of the country, they did not cease to maintain an anti-Muslim attitude in their tracts and publications.

Driven by al-Manār’s anti-missionary stance, a group of American and British missionaries approached Lord Kitchener to take measures against Riḍā’s journal and his friend Tawfīq Ṣidqī. They moreover encouraged him to order a publication ban against al-Manār. Riḍā was convinced that missionaries aimed to silence his journal’s critical voice towards them because it was the only Muslim mouthpiece countering their allegations against Islam. It was Ṣidqī’s article on the image of Jesus in both Christian and Muslim traditions that caused the conflict. In the article, he accused missionaries of sowing hatred and animosity among people. He also asserted that ‘most Europeans (or even all of them) have made lying and breaking promises lawful in politics by using verses of the New Testament.’ The same held true,
Şidqī continued, for the lawfulness of wine-drinking, adultery, excessively violent wars for the minimum of reason, and animosity. 53

In his diary (7-8 November, 1913), Riḍā recorded that ‘Abd al-Khālik Tharwat (1873-1928), the then Public Prosecutor and later Prime Minister, visited him in his school of Daʿwa in Cairo (see below in the present chapter) to discuss this issue. Tharwat informed Riḍā that Kitchener was personally involved in the matter and formally complained to Muḥammad Saʿīd Pasha (1863-1928), the then Egyptian Prime Minister. Kitchener’s interference came as a result of a protest by the American ambassador whom missionaries managed to approach as well. After seeing Kitchener’s report, Riḍā insisted that his journal would not stop writing against missions so long as they continued to ‘defame’ Islam and preach Muslims to adopt Christianity. He developed his reply only as a refutation to their ‘misunderstandings’ of Islam, which he saw as binding on every capable and knowledgeable Muslim (see, Appendix IX). 54

The following day, Riḍā accompanied Şidqī to the office of the Prime Minister, who explained to them the impact of colonial control over the country. He himself was concerned about missionary writings against Islam, and complained many times to British officials about the probable danger of their work in causing riots in Egypt. Şidqī’s article, according to him, had three disadvantages: 1) it would not result in diminishing their anti-Muslim campaigns, 2) it would result to a publication ban on al-Manār, and 3) as a civil servant Şidqī had no right to involve himself in such affairs, otherwise he might be dismissed from his position. The Prime Minister appreciated the religious role of al-Manār in society, but requested Riḍā to bring his anti-missionary campaign to a standstill in order to convince Kitchener to withdraw his decision.

Riḍā explained that his writings in this respect were divided into two different sections: 1) his commentary on the Qurʾānic passages related to Christianity and their logical and historical authenticity,

53 M. Tawfīq Şidqī, ‘Naẓra fī Kutub al-ʿAhd al-Jadīd wā Kutub al-Naṣārā (A view on the New Testament and the scriptures of Christians),’ al-Manār, vol. 16/8 (Shaʾbān 1331/August 1913), pp. 598-599. He referred to the verses of Luke (22: 36-38) in which Jesus requested his followers to sell their garments and buy a new sword, while it is stated in Matthew 5: 44 that the believers must ‘love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you.’

54 Riḍā’s diary, 7-8 November, 1913, private archive in Cairo.
and 2) his defence of Islam against missionary attacks. Having been asked by the Prime Minister about the allegation of missionaries that it was al-Manār that usually started the attack, Riḍā answered that his journal was always in a ‘defensive arena.’ He had become dissatisfied with the colonial ‘tyranny and the great amount of the religious freedom given to missionaries, as measured up to the limitation imposed upon Muslims.’ The Prime Minister had agreed with him on this point, but asked him to calm down the tone of his journal.55

Finally Riḍā pointed out that he did not see Ṣidqī’s anti-European statements before publication, otherwise he would have corrected or deleted them. He moreover promised that Ṣidqī would discontinue his strongly-worded writings against missions, confining his writings to medical and scientific extracts and articles in the journal.56 Riḍā in fact stopped publishing Ṣidqī’s articles after this meeting.

In 1921 one of Riḍā’s informants in the Sudan reported to him that the British authorities had banned al-Manār at the request of Christian missions there. According to him, copies were confiscated and burnt before reaching his subscribers. Riḍā complained to Sir Wingate, the British administrator (1899–1916) of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, but with no result.57

At another level, Riḍā accused colonial politicians in Egypt of excluding devout Muslims from high positions, especially in the field of education. They would rather employ their own ‘fanatic’ clergymen. He referred here to the British consultant in the Egyptian Ministry of Education, Douglas Dunlop, who first came to Egypt as a Scottish missionary teacher.58 Dunlop was known among Egyptian nationalists as ‘the assassin of education in Egypt.’ He, for example, opposed the use of the Arabic language in Egyptian schools. Furthermore, he encouraged only the hiring of British teachers who knew no Arabic, and were then expected to teach subjects such as history, geography, and mathematics entirely in English.59

55 Ibid.
56 Al-Manār, vol. 16/12, p. 960.
58 Al-Manār, vol. 22/7 (Dhū al-Qiʿda 1339/August 1921), pp. 523-525.
3.4. Missionary Schools

Riḍā’s fatwās for his readers in al-Manār (see, chapter 7) could construct a general idea of his views of the social dimension and influence of missionary schools on the Muslim local population. His answers to the questions sent to him from various regions concerning attending these schools were apparently undecided, and sometimes incoherent. We find examples of complete acceptance of their existence and useful role in promoting the social life in the Muslim world, while in other cases he harshly attacked their methods of attracting Muslim children to Christianity through their educational institutions.

The earliest queries Riḍā received concerning missionary schools did not directly deal with the question whether it was permissible to join these schools, or not. In 1903, a Muslim student at a Christian school in Cairo asked Riḍā for a religious excuse not to fast during the month of Ramadan. Having been enrolled in this school with its heavy schedule and work overload, it became much more difficult for him to fast. Riḍā found utterly no excuse for breaking his fasting just because of work. The student’s work during the school day was no hard task, especially in the winter with short days and moderate weather. The only solution that Riḍā gave to this pupil was to pray that God would help the young man to endure fasting.

In the following year, an anonymous petitioner from the above-mentioned city of Asyūṭ (a southern province in Egypt predominately inhabited by Christians) raised a question with regard to an invitation by an American missionary school to attend its yearly festivals. Was it permissible for Muslims to attend missionary activities, while they usually started with religious prayers and supplications upon Jesus as the Son of God? For Riḍā, there was no problem in attending their festivities. He stated that only the emulation of non-Muslims in their religious rites was to be considered apostasy. However, it was not forbidden to witness their rites and listen to their prayers, unless it caused Muslims to adopt Christian practices (such as in the case of children).

In an earlier article (1903), Riḍā praised the American (Syrian) Protestant College in Beirut as the ‘most ideal’ educational institute.

---

60 Al-Manār, vol. 6/17 (Ramadān 1321/November 1903), p. 823.
61 Al-Manār, ‘Ḥuḍūr Ḥibbát al-Naṣārā,’ vol. 7/6 (Rābi’ al-Awwal 1322/June 1904), pp. 239-240.
for Muslims. He also described its then second President Howard S. Bliss, the son of its founder Daniel Bliss, as a ‘divine philosopher rather than a Christian priest.’\(^\text{62}\) Although he was deeply religious, Howard Bliss was ‘very modern in his ideas […] and accepted the implications of Higher Criticism and tried to make the students good members of their own sects, rather than Protestants.’\(^\text{63}\) Riḍā’s eulogy of the College came at the request of his Christian friend Jabr effendi Ūmīṭ (1859-1930), a teacher of Arabic at the College in Beirut (see, Appendix X).\(^\text{64}\) Ūmīṭ was grateful to Riḍā for his words, confirming that his request was not for personal concern, but for the public interest. In a letter to Riḍā, Ūmīṭ wrote: ‘I will not say that God would sustain me to reward you, as you [Riḍā] are like the sun that expects no acknowledgement or fame.’\(^\text{65}\)

Six years later Riḍā again issued a straightforward *fatwā* for the Muslim students at the College permitting them not to leave their school despite the compulsory rules laid down by its administration upon them to attend religious classes.\(^\text{66}\) Until the end of the nineteenth century the Trustees of the College remained adamant in their refusal to relax the rules concerning attendance at prayers and at Sunday school or to follow separate catering facilities for non-Christians. In the same year, Muslim and Jewish students went on strike against compulsory church services, and the Trustee affirmed: ‘The College was not established merely for higher secular education, or the inculcation of morality. One of its chief objects is to teach the great truth of Scripture; to be a center of Christian light and influence; and to lead its students to understand and accept a pure Christianity; and go out to profess and comment it in every walk of life.’\(^\text{67}\)

---


\(^\text{64}\) Letter to Riḍā, Ūmīṭ, 25 October 1903. His full name is Jabr Mikhāʾīl Ūmīṭ was born in Tripoli, and died in Beirut. He received his education at American missionary schools in Lebanon. He traveled to Alexandria in 1884 and worked as an editor at *al-Mahrūsa* newspaper. Later he became an interpreter during Gordon’s campaign in the Sudan. From 1889-1923 he had been working as a staff member at the American Protestant College in Beirut. See, Ziriklī, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 108-109.

\(^\text{65}\) Letter, Ūmīṭ to Riḍā, Beirut, 25 October 1903, Riḍā’s private archive in Cairo.


\(^\text{67}\) The Annual Report, as quoted in Kedourie, ‘American,’ pp. 83-84. For more about the history of the College, see, for instance, Bayard Dodge, *The American Uni-
Riḍā’s *fatwā* came as a result of the request of Muslim students to him during his visit to Beirut (1909). They complained to him about the College’s compulsion for all students to attend religious classes. They complained that they were asked to attend the daily chapel for fifteen or twenty minutes in order to listen to readings from the Bible. In the College, there were societies for the Armenians, Greeks, Egyptians (both Christians and Muslims). There were the Young Men Christian Association and the Jewish Student Society. But their request for permission to establish their own Muslim society was totally disregarded. Neither were they allowed to celebrate the *mawlid* (the day of the Prophet’s Birth); and some of the American teachers made negative and depraved comments about Islam and its prophet several times.

To calm down their sentiments, Riḍā delivered a speech asking them to keep their Islamic bond firmly, and to be faithfully dedicated to their religious practices and identity. In his sermon, he likewise asked them to be more tolerant with their non-Muslim classmates, while unifying themselves. He stressed the scientific significance and societal benefits of such Christian schools in spreading science and techniques in the Muslim lands, even though they were sometimes harmful for one’s belief. Riḍā told them:

> The founders of this school have sought to use education, which benefits all peoples, as a method to spread their languages and religious beliefs into the hearts and minds of whom they educate. That is a lesson for us. We should learn from it and improve ourselves so that we should be more qualified for this achievement than we are today. You must all cooperate, work together and seek the protection of group effort and consensus. You may face in this world malice and pressure to drive you away from the right path, away from your desire for cooperation and agreement. It behooves you, therefore, to try to be tolerant of all unacceptable treatment you might encounter from those around you [at the college], and to respond with courtesy in work and deed […] Although your conduct should seek only to satisfy your own conscience, and to apply your beliefs to your deeds, you should hold yourselves above intentional disobedience and stubbornness towards your superiors or your teachers, and above snobbery and false pride in your achievements.\(^{68}\)

\(^{68}\) As translated by M. Haddad, ‘Syrian Muslim Attitudes Towards Foreign Missionaries in the Late Nineteenth and Twentieth Century,’ in Teijirian & Simon, *op. cit.*, p. 259 (Quoted below, ‘Syrian’).
Riḍā tended to believe that America had no political aspirations in the East. For this reason, most American missionary schools in the East in general and the American Protestant College in Beirut in particular were better, more independent, and less prejudiced than other Western religious educational institutions of countries having political ambitions in the East (such as England). The fair-minded Muslims would know perfectly well and could estimate the zeal of the founders of these religious institutions to spread their religion. They wished that there would emerge among Muslims similar ‘generous’ groups who were ready to spend their money in propagating Islam by means of spreading ‘useful knowledge’ through schools and ‘good acts’ through medical aid. As compared with their Muslim fellows, Christians were geared up to spend a lot of money for many years despite their less success in converting Muslims. Riḍā moreover argued that missionary institutions sometimes exaggerated the number of converts by annually sending illusive reports to their indigenous institutions in the country of origin in order to raise more funds.69

In his analysis, Riḍā maintained that the scientific advance offered by such schools might encourage some Muslim parents to choose them for their own children because they firmly believe that a Muslim would never turn into a Christian. Another group would abandon them because of their influence on the children’s doctrines, following the fiqhī (legal) views of prohibiting Muslims, despite their firm belief, to be involved in venerating other places of worship. For Riḍā, this view could only be applicable to Catholic and Orthodox schools (especially of the Jesuits), which also compelled Muslim children to follow their religious practices, including the veneration of images and saints. He argued that when Muslim students of the American Protestant College in Beirut refused to attend religious sermons in the Church, the administration insisted that they should either join them or be dismissed. According to Riḍā, the Ministry of Interior interfered to solve the problem by asking the American Consul in Beirut to appeal to the school, either to abandon the idea and build a mosque inside the school where students could easily practice their religion, or to refuse to enrol Muslim students.70

69 Al-Manār, vol. 12/1, p. 17.
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Riḍā maintained that a teacher at the American Protestant College (probably ḍumiṭ) had once asked him about his religious views concerning the attendance of Muslim students in Christian classes. He argued that these classes contained ethical and religious admonitions which are also embodied in Islam. The College neither taught Muslim students Christian traditions, nor did it attack other beliefs. Riḍā encouraged these students to reject the call to boycott these classes on the basis of the view of the majority of Muslim jurists, who prohibited students from entering the places of worship of other religions. Although there is no legal Islamic basis of prohibition with regard to entering these places, Riḍā stressed that the choice of the students should be respected. Having respect for schools and houses is one of the pivotal corners of upbringing, but respecting one’s belief and consciousness was higher than showing respect to the school regulations only.71

To conclude, Riḍā requested the College’s administration to gain the respect of those students by dealing with them justly in a way comparable to their Jewish and Christian classmates, who were given permission to establish their own societies. They should also avoid all kinds of assaults against Islam in their lectures. If the objective of these lectures was to create harmony among the College’s members, away from any political and religious doctrines, they should have attempted to gain the loyalty of the Muslim students by allowing them to have their own activities. He also stressed that the College had only two choices, either to be tolerant in accepting the demands of the Muslim students, or to send them away. In Riḍā’s own terms:

If they made the first choice, Muslims and ‘humanity’ would appreciate their deed; and they would draw closer to the ‘real core’ of any religion by establishing harmony among people: something shared by Islam and Christianity. But if they decided upon the second alternative, they would teach Muslims another new lesson that might cause harm to them [as Christians] and [to Muslims] among whom they lived by causing discord and strengthening fanaticism. However, it would be stimulating for Muslims to be more self-sufficient and competitive in establishing their own religious societies, which would found similar schools.72

Although Western education, in Riḍā’s view, contained plenty of social benefits, it still had its impact upon the feelings of the Muslim umma. Muslims should hasten to have good command of the sciences
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taught in these schools. He advised Muslim students at the American Protestant College to get more scientific ability in new educational methods and to translate all the knowledge they acquired into Arabic in order to achieve progress in the whole umma. They should also endure any kind of ill-treatment or inequality practised by the College, and to be flexible and wise enough by obeying the rules of their College.

Nonetheless, Riḍā gave preference to the view of allowing Muslim children to remain in such schools as long as they did not have similar Muslim ones. But they should avoid any disadvantages resulting from instructions which are incompatible with Islam. Besides, Riḍā advised Muslim students to strengthen their religious identity by: 1) studying Muslim books explaining the truth of Islam and the differences between Islam and Christianity; 2) reading Muslim works refuting the Bible and its doctrines; 3) observing all Islamic acts of worship at these schools, such as the five daily prayers, and to fast on the days they were required to attend the Christian religious classes; and 4) keeping their concern for competition with those people, trying to combine both religion and science, and to establish similar schools.73 Although he presented such solutions for the students, Riḍā at the same time earnestly called upon the Muslims of Beirut to get their children out of the American Protestant College and the other missionary schools, and hasten in raising funds for establishing their own Islamic college to replace such institutions.74

A further change in Riḍā’s attitude towards the American Protestant College took place after he had received a letter from a certain ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Ghandūr from Beirut at the end of the academic year 1909. In his letter, al-Ghandūr informed Riḍā that the president invited Muslim and Jewish students in his office and asked them to sign an oath that they should carry out certain religious duties in the following year including attending the church service and studying the Bible. The student who would be absent from prayers a number of times was to be suspended.75 In response, Riḍā no longer showed any courtesy or respect to the College, and totally prohibited Muslims from looking into or listening to books belonging to any other religion. Imitating the behaviour of such people in their religious acts is unquestionably forbidden in Islam. He moreover accused ‘foreigners
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[...] of spreading their prejudice and partisanship in the East, [while] continuing to claim that the East was the birthplace of fanaticism."76

On the relation between missionary schools and colonialism, Riḍā stressed that powerful colonial nations always attempted to reshape the social, national and religious identity of their colonised people by promoting educational systems according to their political agenda.77 The idea was further developed in his answers to the afore-mentioned Danish missionary Alfred Nielsen (see, chapter 7). Riḍā made it clear that the most obnoxious thing done by missionary schools, even the American ones (which he still considered to be the most honest), was that they would make the students doubt their own religion, without convincing them of the soundness of Christianity. Thus many of the students would become hypocrites and atheists. The same held true for Christian students and followers of other religions. Such institutions, however, brought benefits by disseminating pure and applied sciences in the Muslim countries, particularly agriculture, commerce and medicine. Although such advantages were appreciated, they were not attributed to the missions themselves in any way. The specialists in these fields at missionary schools were far remote from the instructions and rulings of the Bible.78

Apart from the services offered by these schools and hospitals, Riḍā went on, they were mainly established to help the ‘colonial covetousness,’ as was clearly expressed by Lord Salisbury who said: ‘Missionary schools are the first step of colonialism.’ Riḍā thus insisted that there was an espousal between colonialism and mission:

Missionary schools, first of all, cause division among the populations of the land where they are established. The people, as a result, fall into intellectual disagreement and dogmatic doubts. The ‘foreigners,’ in that way, would succeed in hitting the people of the country by one another. This will in the end give the colonial powers the opportunity to get them completely under control, humiliate and deprive them of their independence and wealth.79
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Riḍā maintained that missionary activities had proved to be tragic and catastrophic for many countries by causing hostility and division among the peoples they were sent to. In Syria, for example, dissidence and religious strife were mostly caused by the activities of missionary schools in the country. Deplorable religious fanaticism was weaker in the area before the coming of those missions. But thanks to them religious knowledge among Christian groups had increased.

An anonymous Tunisian Muslim also asked Riḍā for a fatwā on enrolling Muslim students at secular (lā dīniyya) and Christian schools, where emphasis was laid upon foreign languages, while Islamic and Arabic subjects were inappropriately lacking. A further advantage of attending these schools was that they would have the privilege of exemption from a three-year military service after their graduation. 80

Riḍā not only opposed these secular schools, but also severely criticised missionary ones, labeling them as much more dangerous for Muslims than the secular ones. He further noted that teaching Arabic and Islamic doctrine and rules to children is the duty of every Muslim parent. Unless these schools enabled them to teach their small children Islamic values, there would be no excuse for them to put their children there. For Riḍā, it was no convincing justification to send their children to secular schools only for escaping military service. Muslim parents, however, are obliged to teach their children discipline as well. These schools, in his view, were less dangerous than the schools of ‘the preachers of Christianity.’ It has been attested, he argued, that such religious schools were solely established by missionary organisations to propagate their religion; and pupils attending their lessons were requested to practice Christian doctrines, worship and ethics. Missionaries also follow many ‘satanic’ methods to keep Muslims away from Islam, which vary according the state of knowledge or ignorance of the Muslim. Secular schools were established by secular organisations also ‘not only to propagate atheism, but also rejecting all Prophets and their message of guidance.’ 81

Atheism, Riḍā lamented, was in different degrees clearly widespread among those who studied at secular and missionary schools. The outcome of attending these schools could be seen in various ways. Among their graduates were the al-Muʿāṭṭila, who do not believe in
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God, His angels, Books, Prophets, and the Day of Resurrection. Some of them were only religiously committed to the political and social affairs of Islam, such as marriage, inheritance, feasts, funeral ceremonies, but did not perform prayer, pay zakāt (almsgiving), nor go on pilgrimage. Some of them acknowledged the sacredness of Ramadan, and sometimes fasted, but they did not abandon what Allah prohibits, such as wine-drinking, gambling, zinā (adultery and fornication) and usury. Finally, there were some of them who prayed and fasted regularly, but they did not know the minimum amount of what the real Muslim should know about the Islamic creed, values and rulings.\textsuperscript{82}

Most of the children learning at such schools would be ignorant of \textit{al-ma lūm min al-dīn bi al-ḍarūra} (the necessary minimum amount of knowledge that every Muslim should know). They would also give precedence to foreign languages over Arabic, and ignore that Islam stipulates Arabic as the language of Islam in order to unify Muslims under one banner in terms of worship, morals and law. The education of Muslims at such missionary and secular schools caused Muslims many ‘evils’ in their religion, life and politics. The reason why Muslims let their children study in such schools was the lack of similar well-financed Muslim organisations, and the fact that there was no real Muslim government taking the responsibility for establishing such institutions. If Muslims established their own schools, there would be no need for the educational institutions of the ‘enemies’ of their religion, which they deemed very necessary for their life. For him, establishing similar schools was \textit{Fard Kifāya}, a duty that must be fulfilled at least by a sufficient number of Muslims.\textsuperscript{83}

Finally, he contended that Muslim parents, even those well acquainted with Islam and capable of raising their children in a real Islamic way, would be only rarely able to preserve the faith of their children who joined these missionary schools. As an example to support his ideas he recounted that his brother al-Sayyid Śāliḥ (d. 1922) once sent his own daughter to the American School for girls in Tripoli-Syria. Despite his deep knowledge of Islam and ability to debate with missionaries, he failed to convince her of the inaccuracy of hymns praising the divinity of Jesus and the salvation he offers to human beings, which she had memorised there. As a result, he took her out of this school even before she finished her studies.\textsuperscript{84}
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3.5. Encounters with Missions in al-Manār

By the end of the nineteenth century, the behaviour of some Christian missionaries in Cairo was strongly criticised in the Egyptian press. Reports on some Protestant missionary institutions that tried to entice Muslims by giving them money were spread over the city. Members of the English Missionary School (situated in Muḥammad ʿAli Street, Cairo) rejected such rumours.85 Riḍā quoted at length the views of the Christian paper al-Falāḥ (Success) and the writings of the Syrian journalist Salīm Pasha al-Ḥamawī as an example of ‘enthusiastic’ Christian writers, who dared to censure Western missions for their ‘transgression.’ The paper suggested that Muslims should constitute their own missionary associations in order to challenge Western missions. Riḍā, as a result, dwelled upon the idea of initiating a classroom in the Ottoman School of the Syrian nationalist Raḥīq al-ʿAẓm (mentioned above, chapter 2) in Cairo, where students would receive religious lessons.86

In the same period, Riḍā took a prominent place in two Muslim associations: Shams al-ʾIslām (Sun of Islam) and Makārim al-ʾAkhlāq (Good Manners). The two organisations aimed at combating Christian missions, and the revitalisation of religious consciousness among Muslims. Riḍā became a member of the Sun of Islam on July 20, 1899.87 He also toured Egypt in order to help found new branches for the association in various provinces. He consistently praised the benevolent activities supported by the association, especially religious propagation and the establishment of new educational institutions.88

In these early years, Riḍā, however, criticised the ‘overzealous and fanatic’ reaction of both Muslims and Christians. He attributed the origin of fanaticism and disharmony among the followers of the two religions to the behaviour of some religious and secular leaders, who worked only for their own interests. As for his own rejoinders against Protestant missionary writings, he stressed that they were purely defensive against their attacks on Islam. At the same time, he criticised some newspapers, which vehemently attacked missionaries with the
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purpose of satisfying the desire of ‘fanatic’ Muslims. By doing so, they intended to inflame the tension between both groups and to cause harm for the society.\textsuperscript{89}

Some of Riḍā’s Muslim readers used to send him missionary publications on Islam so that he might refute them in his journal. In many cases, he would ‘soothe their anger’ by confirming that missionary writings were ‘futile and that their attack on Islam had its advantage in renovating the spirit of research and reasoning and refurbishing the sense of religious zealousness and national consciousness among Muslims.’\textsuperscript{90}

A prominent example of Riḍā’s polemics against missionary writings was his answer to the publication of the Arabic translation of the missionary book \textit{The Sources of Islam} by Rev. W.St. Clair-Tisdall (1859–1928) of the Church Missionary Society (CMS) in 1904. Riḍā’s answer was part of an intense controversy in the Egyptian press over the book.\textsuperscript{91} It was originally published as a Persian treatise in which Tisdall attempted to show that the Qur’an was partly derived from ancient Arabian traditions, and that there was also Judeo-Christian influence on its narratives. In his foreword to the book, Sir William Muir concluded that ‘if it be shown that much of this grand book [the Qur’an] can be traced in human sources existing daily around the Prophet, then Islam falls to the ground. And this is what the author proves with marvelous power and erudition.’\textsuperscript{92} Compare this praise with the recent judgment of Tisdall’s work made by Western scholars, who described it as ‘a shoddy piece of missionary propaganda,’\textsuperscript{93} and ‘not particularly scholarly essay or even a polemi-
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Riḍā ridiculed the book as ‘false camouflage’ that would only affect weakly-minded Muslims. The author applied similar methods used by European scholars to ‘demolish’ Judaism and Christianity by investigating the origin of their sources and proving them to be of an inaccurate and unholy nature. However, Muslims, in Riḍā’s eyes, continue to believe in the invulnerability of their Holy Book. Imbued by his missionary zeal, Tisdall was enormously puzzled by the methods of the Higher Biblical Criticism on his religion. Thus, he attempted to attack Islam with ‘the very weapon Christianity had been fought with.’ Riḍā was also very skeptical about Tisdall’s knowledge of Islam: his method was no less spurious than that of other missionary writings in their attack on Islam. In constructing the sources of Islam, Riḍā believed, the author depended on the Isrāʾiliyyāt (Israelite Lore) and legendary narratives attributed to insignificant authors. Riḍā’s general view of this Lore was in line with that of his teacher Muḥammad ʿAbduh, viz. that such stories had been fabricated by the Jews with the purpose of undermining Islam.

In 1911, the French orientalist Alfred Le Chatelier (1855-1929) published his history of Protestant missions in the Muslim world under the title ‘La conquête du monde Musulman’ in La Revue du Monde Musulman of the Scientific Mission of Morocco. Riḍā immediately requested his fellow citizen Mūsā ʿid al-Yāfī (1886-1943) to make an Arabic translation of the whole French text. Soon his translation, prepared in cooperation with the Salafī writer Muḥḥib al-Dīn al-Khatīb (1886-1969), was published in many Egyptian newspapers,
such as al-Mu’ayyad, al-Fath and al-’Ittiḥād al-’Uthmānī. 98 During Riḍā’s visit to India in that year, al-Manār also started publishing the entire translation in order to inform its readers about the ‘future plans’ of missionaries in the Muslim world. 99 Riḍā’s above-mentioned brother al-Sayyid Sālih criticised the French magazine for having taken another direction by writing on that subject in order to gain political and religious ends. 100

In its comment on the purpose of the translation in Arab newspapers, La Revue criticised these Muslim journals:

Nous en venons par là à ce qui séparera probablement notre point de vue et celui de nos confrères arabes. Leurs vœux se bornent à affirmer, à acclamer l’indépendance de l’Islam, avec la certitude de ne pas la réaliser, mais d’achever au contraire de la perdre. Nous voudrions, nous, les voir assurer cette indépendance, par les voies de prospérité encore ouvertes à son avenir. […] Ce n’est pas en se réislamisant que le Musulman d’Égypte échappera à la main-mise britannique : c’est en opposant le gentleman musulman au gentleman chrétien. Si le Moayyad, le Manar et l’Ittihad al Othmani veulent se mettre pratiquement en travers de l’« assaut donné au monde musulman » la méthode est simple. Qu’ils disent à leurs lecteurs : « Sortons de nos petits coins, pour aborder, de face, le réalités qui sont. 101

Al-Manār also followed the news circulated on missionary activities in Muslim journals worldwide. In 1910, for instance, it published a translation of an article published in the above-mentioned Russian journal Shūrā in Orenburg on missionary associations in Russia. The article described missions as ‘uninvited guests.’ 102 It belittled their success in converting or attracting local Muslims, although their numbers were on the increase and their finances were flourishing. Nevertheless, the revival of religious zealosity among the Tatar Muslims was due to missionary movements in Russian provinces. In that sense, missions had their positive impact by consolidating the feeling of broth-

99 See, vol. 15 the issues 3-9.
100 Al-Manār, vol. 15/4, p. 259.
erhood and unity among Muslim Russians. Any case of conversion was also, according to the article, insignificant, since it was in the favour of Islam to ‘root out those [converts as] corrupt members of the Muslim community.’  

It is also noteworthy that the Shi‘i Muslim scholar Hibat al-Dīn al-Shahrastānī al-Najafī (1884-1967), the founder and proprietor of al-ʿIlm Magazine in Najaf, took part in countering Christian missions in Rīdā’s journal. As a Shi‘i reformist, al-Shahrastānī was keen to have relations with Muslim contemporary reformists in Egypt and Syria. In his journal he also published biographies of famous Sunnī and Shi‘i reformists. The ideas of both al-Shahrastānī and Rīdā ran parallel. Al-Shahrastānī intended to connect al-Manār with his magazine, as they had common interests of reform.

In 1911 al-Shahrastānī wrote an article in al-Manār on Christian missions about one of his debates with Christian missionaries in Iraq. Rīdā published the article under the title: ‘A Debate of a Muslim Scholar with Protestant Missionaries in Baghdad.’ In his preface to the article, Rīdā mentioned that although the debate was also published in al-ʿIlm, al-Shahrastānī had asked him to republish it in al-Manār for the sake of circulation among Muslims everywhere. Rīdā’s intention of publishing the debate was directed to the common method among Protestant missionaries of using imaginary characters and themes in their articles on Islam. In the Anglo-Arabic magazine al-Sharq wā al-Gharb, Gairdner used to illustrate imaginary debates with extracts from the Bible as a medium in presenting his Christian texts and his apologetic discussions on Islam.

In February 1911 in Baghdad, while he was touring around Iraqi and Indian cities, al-Shahrastānī attended two meetings of Protestant missionaries, including the members of the Persia and Turkish Arabia
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Missions, Rev. P. Boyes, Dr. F. Johnson and Dr. G. W. Stanley. He described them as people of ‘good manners and [claiming] to have knowledge of practical and spiritual ‘divine’ medicine.’ Both Johnson and Stanley were physicians of the medical missionary team at that time. Among the attendants in the debate were other indigenous Iraqi Muslims and Christians, such as Dawūd Fitto (1865-1921), an Iraqi Christian pharmacist.

The discussion took the form of a munāẓarah (‘debate’) around ‘philosophical’ and ‘theological’ issues, such as 1) the sacred character of the Bible; 2) the sonship of Jesus; 3) medical subjects; 4) Jesus as saviour; 5) evil and human sin; 6) and the concept Mahdism and the return of the Messiah. Despite their theological differences, al-Shahrastānī was impressed by the studiousness of missionary physicians, who fulfilled their job with no expectation of any financial return from their patients. Their concern for propagating their faith was immense to the extent that they wrote on the walls of their hospital: ‘Believe in Jesus Christ, He will save you and your family from all evil.’ In conclusion, al-Shahrastānī ended his article saying: ‘The Lord may make all difficulties easy for the seekers of the good, and to reward the people of beneficence with gratitude; He is the One Who guides to the right path.’

In his comment, Riḍā appreciated the praise of al-Shahrastānī of their medical work (even though he knew perfectly well that their only mission was to convert Muslims to Christianity), and saw it as a clear-cut indication of Muslim tolerance with missions. But he blamed him for giving them this credit, while giving no attention to their anti-Islamic campaigns. Two months later al-Shahrastānī
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explained to Riḍā that he neither intended to praise the missionary medical work, nor wished them any success. He only desired to ‘awaken Muslims and motivate their thinking.’

His supplications at the end of his article were ‘relative,’ and were meant to be only a concluding statement. On the other hand, he totally agreed with what Riḍā repeatedly articulated in his writings about ‘their [missionary] activities as harming for Muslims in their religion and politics.’

One of the common ideas between Riḍā and al-Shahrastānī was obvious in their fight against missions and the endeavour to promote the Da’wa in the face of the Christian propaganda against Islam. Among Riḍā’s personal papers I have come across an unpublished manuscript of a treatise by al-Shahrastānī submitted to al-Manār for publication (see, appendix XI). The aim of this work was to inform Riḍā and the readers of al-Manār about the author’s efforts to strengthen the Islamic Da’wa against Christian missionary work during his stay in India in 1913. From there he tried to ‘promote preaching, writing, and the advance of an Islamic social power through establishing Muslim schools and societies and distributing publications.’ The reason why Riḍā did not publish this work in his journal is not known. Al-Shahrastānī related to Riḍā one of his anecdotes about what he labeled as ‘a missionary trick,’ which happened to him in India. He passed by a group of people surrounding a Christian priest preaching his religion in a park in Bombay. A man dressed as a European came, and started to recount that he traveled around the world in his search for the true religion, but did not find a better religion than Christianity. He took an oath before the priest and sat beside him. The same thing happened with another man, who was dressed as an Arab claiming to be a Hanafī Muslim from Mecca. He was followed by a man acting as a Shīʿī from Karbala, then by a heathen from India with the same story. Al-Shahrastānī maintained that they were four Indians, who converted to Christianity a time ago. Their performance was only a ‘trick’ in order to deceive the
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common people. Had he known the Indian language and the Indian mentality, he would have debated with them all!\textsuperscript{117} When Riḍā published the above-mentioned Arabic translation of Chatelier’s ‘La conquête,’ a Muslim ‘traveler’ sent al-Manār his observations about the influence of Protestant missionary organisations in the Gulf region during his visit as early as 1913.\textsuperscript{118} The Arabian Mission had been one of the organisations founded by Samuel Zwemer. During his early stay in Arabia, Zwemer adopted the name ‘Ḍayf Allāh’ (the guest of Allah) in order to make a distinction for himself among the Bedouins. The Arabs, however, called him ‘Ḍayf al-Shayṭān’ (the guest of the Devil).\textsuperscript{119} Another report asserts that local citizens named him: ‘Fāṭih al-Baḥrain’ (the Conqueror of Bahrain).\textsuperscript{120} One of the servants of this Muslim traveler went to probe information about their work, and made some pictures of their centers in Bahrain, Muscat, Kuwait and Basra. In spite of the effect of their efforts on Islam and Muslims, he indicated to al-Manār that they exaggerated their success among Muslims in order to gain more funding from their native institutions. He counted the number of male and female workers as less than twenty persons, who neither had good command of Arabic, nor good acquaintance with the local population. He himself once visited their society in Bahrain and discussed many theological issues related to Biblical and Qur’ānic narratives of the Creation. He also noted that they established a small school consisting of two rooms, where they used to teach children downstairs, and to gather adults for religious services upstairs.\textsuperscript{121} As for the status of Zwemer in Bahrain, he added that the local inhabitants treated him very roughly in his early stay. On the market
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he established his own bookshop, where he first sold publications on various topics, but later he gradually put up only Christian books for sale. When he decided to purchase a piece of land, the local governor stipulated that he should not put any Christian symbol on the building. Zwemer appealed to the British Consul, who interfered in the matter and he purchased a spacious piece of land for about four thousand Rubies where they founded their school and their missionary hospital. He ascribed Zwemer’s success in the last years to four reasons: 1) his high salary that exceeded 150 Rubies beside other donations from the United States; 2) the increase of the number of male and female missionaries in the region; 3) their exploitation of poor and needy Muslims in taking pictures for them as new converts in order to propagate their ‘forged’ success; and 4) their distribution of copies of Gospels for free among Muslims.

The traveler also noted that young Arab natives ridiculed their religious work, and developed many criticisms of the Bible. Many times he prevented them from burning the distributed Gospel copies or throwing them in the sea. Common Muslims also used to sell their hard covers and use the paper leaves for making carton boxes for their daily use. He concluded that they handed out thousands of copies for free, which overloaded their societies with financial loss with no real result. Their circulation, on the contrary, would revive the Muslim awareness of the ‘vulnerability’ of their holy scriptures to criticism.

In his comment, Riḍā maintained that the reason behind missionary publications was primarily to ‘scorn’ Islam, and to cast doubts on the Muslim faith as the first step towards ‘Western peaceful conquest.’ He demanded that Muslims should boycott their publications as a sign of defending their religion, and that all the books distributed by missionaries had to be destroyed. He encouraged them to replace these missionary writings with Muslim pamphlets and treatises in which a distinction was made between what he called the ‘accurate’ faith of Jesus and that ‘doctrine of Paul.’

When al-Manār published an anti-missionary article by al-Tannīr, an unnamed Syrian friend of Riḍā criticised al-Manār for hurting the
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feelings of Christian compatriots by publishing such severe anti-Christian statements in its anti-missionary campaign.\textsuperscript{126} It was al-Tannīr’s phrase \textit{al-Thālūth al-Zināʾi al-Muqaddas} (the holy trinity of fornication), which disappointed Riḍā’s friend. Riḍā maintained that he received the first draft of Tannīr’s article under this title, which he immediately amended in order not to hurt the feelings of Christian fellow citizens. The same word was also repeated throughout the whole text. Riḍā maintained that he had deleted all of them because it was \textit{imtihān} (an offense) for \textit{iṣtilāḥāt muḥtaramah} (respected terms). Riḍā justified himself, saying that this phrase must have been forgotten by mistake during the printing process of this issue of \textit{al-Manār}.\textsuperscript{127} He also tried to validate his writings as it was his duty to stand against missionary attacks on Islam. He claimed that he never attempted to propagate his critiques of the Christian scriptures and beliefs in public. On the contrary, he was always preaching the significance of harmony among followers of religions in society.\textsuperscript{128} Another critical point was that it was not Christian fellow citizens who attacked Islam, but American and British missionaries. Riḍā confirmed that missionary activity was ‘more harmful in the Muslim world than brothels and gambling clubs.’ Owners of such places would probably entice the Muslim to commit sins, but missionaries were trying to make him put down their religion entirely and to stir up animosity between Islam and Christianity.\textsuperscript{129}

Elsewhere Riḍā firmly maintained that he would never stop defending his religion, so long as anti-Islamic writings on Islam continued. However, he did not mind if they preached their religion by demonstrating its merits, while not attacking other beliefs.\textsuperscript{130} Riḍā argued that since most foreign missionaries had no good command of Arabic they hired Arab Christians for assisting them in publishing anti-Islamic literature in Arabic. He also added that ‘Muslims should not stop defending their religion against attacks on the Qur’ān and the Prophet just for satisfying the feelings of Christian citizens.’\textsuperscript{131}

In 1916, Riḍā published two articles as a refutation of an Arabic article written by Temple Gairdner in his periodical, \textit{al-Sharq wā

\begin{enumerate}
\item[126] \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 17/3, p. 188.
\item[127] Ibid., p. 187.
\item[128] Ibid., p. 189.
\item[129] Ibid., p. 190.
\item[131] Ibid.
\end{enumerate}
In this article, published in April 1916, the legal authority of Ḥadīth was broached. This article was one of the routes through which the work of the Hungarian orientalist Ignaz Goldziher on Ḥadīth became known in Egypt. Some months after his contribution to the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference (13-23 June, 1910) Gairdner decided to take a Wanderjahr in Europe. The trip began in Germany in September, 1910, where he spent ‘three months […] for the purpose of learning enough German to give [him] access to the incomparable German literature on Islamic subjects.’ In his correspondence with Duncan Black Macdonald of the Hartford Theological Seminary, Gairdner stated that ‘it would have been worth learning German only for the sake of […] Goldziher’s […] perfect gold-mine.’ Gairdner voiced his skepticism of the authenticity of almost all Traditions ascribed to the Prophet. He maintained that the considerations he followed would give ample ground for suspecting the stability of the foundations of Islamic tradition, and consequently of the enormous superstructure which has been erected thereupon. In his view, if the unreliability of traditions is established, the Islamic system ought logically to be discarded.

Many Muslims were disturbed by Gairdner’s ideas, and urgently demanded Riḍā to publish his views on the issue. As usual Riḍā looked down on missionary methods of investigating Muslim sources. Missionaries, unlike philosophers, dealt with such questions not to reach the truth as such; but to cast doubts on other beliefs. He added that if Gairdner’s only reason was to convert Muslims, let him
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134 Padwick, op. cit., p. 198 ff.

135 Ibid., p. 201.

136 Ibid., p. 204. For more details about his contact with Macdonald, see for example, J. Jermain Bodine, ‘Magic Carpet to Islam: Duncan Black Macdonald and the Arabian Nights,’ The Muslim World LXVII, 1977, pp. 1-11.


rest assured that most of the Muslims who abandoned Islam would never become real Christians, but rather turn into ‘atheists’ or ‘antagonists.’ They mostly converted to Christianity due to their poverty and need for missionary financial support, unlike Western converts to Islam, who were in most cases the elite in Europe like the English Baron Lord Headley (to be discussed below).139

In 1921, an Arabic translation of one of Zwemer’s articles in the Anglican magazine Church Missionary Intelligencer appeared in al-Manār. In that article, he maintained that Muslims had already started to ‘welcome the Gospel’.140 Zwemer argued that ‘political troubles in the Near East were not due to economic factors or any political aspiration for autonomy, but rather to religious discontent among the people.’141 Due to the change of their ‘missiological’ approaches, he was rather optimistic about the accessibility of Christianity in Egyptian villages and towns for missionary work. Although Islam did not recognise the Crucifixion of Jesus, there were reports about a responsive spirit among Muslims including teachers and students of Al-Azhar University. The missionary regional conference, held in Helwan at the outskirts of Cairo in the same year, agreed that there was ‘a great and remarkable change [...] during the past few years in the attitude of Muslims.’142 They also recommended ‘establish[ing] contact with Al-Azhar students; one or more homes or settlements should be located in Al-Azhar neighbourhood with several resident workers, who would show hospitality, make friendships, and encourage free intercourse.’143

It is noteworthy to mention that Zwemer, later in 1926 and 1927, entered Al-Azhar and distributed missionary tracts among students, an incident that provoked the Egyptian public opinion.144 Riḍā saw Zwemer’s hope as a merely ‘missionary wishful thinking.’ The mis-
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139 Ibid.
140 As quoted by Riḍā, al-Manār, ‘Amānī al-Mubashshīrin aw Mukhada’tuhum lil-Mūsirīn (Missionaries’ Wishful Thinking or their Deception of Rich [Christians],’ vol. 22/4 (Rajab 1339/March 1921), pp. 313-314; cf. al-Manār, vol. 28/2, pp. 140-149.
141 Ibid., p. 314.
143 Ibid., p. 80.
sionary writer by disseminating such reports intended to encourage zealous Christians in the West to raise more funds for their missionary plans.\textsuperscript{145}

In 1923 a certain Muhammad al-Rashidi al-Ḥijāzī, a former member of the military in Berlin, published an article on the activity of the German Orient Mission (Deutsche-Orient Mission), which was founded by Pastor Johannes Lepsius (1858–1926), an eyewitness to the Armenian genocide.\textsuperscript{146} While collecting information about Lepsius, Hijāzī came across the periodical of the mission, \textit{Der christliche Orient} (1900), which he translated into Arabic for \textit{al-Manār}'s readers under the title: ‘Cunning Programmes of Mission among the Muḥammadans.’\textsuperscript{147} He accused Lepsius of ‘fanaticism’ by having given a ‘false testimony and fabrication’ with regard to the genocide. Hijāzī laid emphasis on the contribution and biography of the Evangelical Armenian preacher Abraham Amirchanjanz, who was a born Muslim. Another convert named Johannes Awetaranian was also mentioned in the report of the issue.\textsuperscript{148} Hijāzī summarised an item by Amirchanjanz in that issue on: ‘Die Aufgabe der Mohammeder-Mission.’\textsuperscript{149} In his article, Amirchanjanz launched a severe attack on Islam:

‘Islam is one of the most disastrous phenomena in human history. It is a mixture of truth and falsehood, and therefore more dangerous than the heathendom. This religion, taking over 200 million people, cannot be overcome easily. A carefully thought-out plan, like a military tactic, should be designed and performed well in attacking it.’\textsuperscript{150}

\textsuperscript{145} \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 22/4, p. 314.
\textsuperscript{146} See, for example, \textit{Deutschland und Armenien 1914-1918: Samlung diplomatischer Aktenstucke}, Postdam (1919). His archives are to be found at the Martin Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg.
\textsuperscript{147} \textit{Der christliche Orient: Monatsschrift der deutschen Orient-Mission}, Berlin, 1900. Ḥijāzī, ‘Ba’that Tanṣīr al-Maḥamaddiyyīn wā Barnāmaj Kaydihā lil-‘Islām wā al-Muslimīn (Christian Missions [among] Mohammedans, and their cunning programmes for Islam and Muslims),’ vol. 24/10 (Rabīʿ al-ʿAwwal 1342/November 1923), pp. 785-795. Among Ridal’s papers I have found a booklet of \textit{Kunstblätter} from Berlin signed as a gift to Ridal on 4 August 1923, a couple of months before the publication of his article in \textit{al-Manār}. As is indicated in a letter sent to Ridal (12 September 1923), Hijāzī was probably an Egyptian former military stationed in North Africa during the Great War. He tried to publish many articles in \textit{al-Manār}, but his contributions were not suitable for the journal’s interests. He also had contact with other Egyptian journals, and managed to publish a few contributions.

\textsuperscript{149} \textit{Der christliche Orient}, op. cit., pp. 84-88.
\textsuperscript{150} As quoted in, Hijāzī, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 788. Compare the German text: ‘Der Islam ist eine der verhängnisvollsten Erscheinungen in der Menschengeschichte. Er ist ein
In his conclusion, Ḥijāzī expressed his frustration in the negligence of Muslim governments to such ‘complots,’ which were espoused with colonial plans. He again asked Muslim scholars to learn European languages in order to refute the views of missionaries on Islam. By doing so, they would also have the chance to be the ‘delegates’ of Islam in the West.  

Riḍā confirmed the author’s words by stating that he himself had been frustrated by the failure of Muslim political and religious leaders to support him in his struggle against missions for more than thirty years.

3.6. A Muslim Missionary Seminary

As reaction to missionary work, Riḍā formed his short-lived project Jamʿiyyat (or Dār) al-Daʿwa wa al-ʾIrshād, which has been mentioned in many places above. It was founded in Cairo in 1912 as a well-structured private Muslim seminary. The idea of such a society first occurred to him when he was a student in Syria, where he used to frequent and read the literature provided by the American missionaries in that city, and he wished that Muslims could have similar societies and schools.

Conversion of Muslims in Cyprus, for example, greatly saddened him as well. He attributed that to their being ill-informed about their religion due to the lack of Muslim propaganda. Christian missions were more successful in propagating their faith into the native languages, and in a way suiting the mentality of the indigenous inhabitants. As was his habit, Riḍā strongly stressed the obligation of Muslims to raise funds to start missionary centres in order to train young propagators of Islam.

During his visit to Turkey in 1909, Riḍā managed to raise funds for his seminary from the Supreme Porte. The Egyptian Ministry of Religious Endowments was also prepared to participate in funding
the school with a contribution of four thousand Egyptian pounds a year. The project was dependent too on gifts and donations from rich Muslims. During his visit in Egypt in 1911, Sheikh Qāsim Ibn ʿAl ʾIbrāhīm, a wealthy Arab merchant in Bombay and a senior honorary member of the board of the Daʾwa school, made a contribution of two thousand pounds, and a yearly donation of a hundred pounds. In March 1911, Prince Muḥammad ʿAlī Pashā, the brother of the Egyptian Khedive, was selected as its honorary president. ʿAbbās Hilmī, the Khedive of Egypt, also supported Riḍā’s missionary plan by paying an official visit to the school, and meeting with the staff and students in May 1914.

Riḍā’s society took the shape of a boarding school, which was primarily an endeavour to train two groups of people: the murshids (guides), who would function within the Muslim community by combating religious deviation, and the duʿāh (propagators) who would convey the Islamic mission to non-Muslims and defend Islam against missionary attacks. Riḍā included in the educational program modern subjects such as international law, psychology, sociology, biology, introductory mathematics, geography and economics. He also introduced the study of the Bible and the history of the Church. In the curriculum he proposed for the category of murshids to choose a well-circulated missionary treatise on Islam for study in order to enable them to defend Islam against missionary allegations, especially in the minds of common Muslims. Such allegations were to be collected, well studied, and debated among the future murshids. We have already mentioned that Ṣidqī was appointed as a teacher at the school, where he taught the students scientific and medical subjects as well as his views on Christianity which he already crystallised in his polemics in al-Manār.

It was also intended to recruit qualified Muslim students from all over the world, especially from poor regions such as China or Indonesia. The school provided students with accommodation, books and costs of living. Students were supposed to live strictly according to Islamic values. Those who would ‘commit sins’ had to be sent
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155 Draft of letter from Riḍā to the Prime Minister Ḥusayn Rushdī, 13 January 1918, Riḍā’s private archive in Cairo.
156 Al-Manār, vol. 14/3, pp. 191-196; archival documents relevant to the organisation of the school; about other contributors, see, al-Manār, vol. 14/6, p. 480.
away.\textsuperscript{159} Although the school had to close down after the First World War, it had counted amongst its graduates well-known leaders, such as Amin al-Husayni, the prominent Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Sheikh Yusuf Yasin, the prominent Saudi official and private secretary of the Saudi Royal Family, and other leaders of thought in India, Malaysia and Egypt.\textsuperscript{160}

In order to update the students about the developments of missionary work, one of Ridā’s friends in the Sudan sent \textit{al-Manār} a detailed report. In his account, he confirmed that schooling was the most significant way of disseminating Christian religious ideas. Missionary schools provided families of their students with needed materials, such as corn, clothes, jewellery, and medication. Social work was also one of their priorities. For example, students were trained in a variety of professions, such as manufacturing, commerce and agriculture. They also established beehives in the European style in order to benefit the local population.\textsuperscript{161}

Ridā’s missionary effort was hotly contested. Members of the Egyptian Nationalist Party opposed his establishing of the Da’wa School. They considered it as a ‘futile and far-fetched’ missionary project with no prospect. English or Dutch colonial authorities in such lands as Indonesia and the Sudan would never give the graduates of his school the opportunity to propagate Islam there. However, Ridā was confident that his missionary graduates would be given a good chance in these colonies. If not, they would be capable of propagating Islam in other countries, such as China and Japan.\textsuperscript{162}

Sheikh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Jāwīsh (1876-1929), the editor-in-chief of the National Party mouthpiece, accused Ridā’s school of being an underground organisation working on demolishing the Ottoman State and separating the Arabs from the Turks by appointing an Arab Caliph. Ridā vigorously denied such charges.\textsuperscript{163} He moreover sent the prospectus of his school to the editors of Gairdner’s \textit{al-Sharq wā al-Gharb},

\footnotesize
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  \item Al-Manār, vol. 14/1, p. 52.
  \item Zaki Badawi, \textit{The Reformers of Egypt}, London: Croom Helm, pp. 116-117.
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which he considered then as 'the most decent among missionary papers.' Riḍā considered their feedback more reasonable than that of these Muslim nationalists, such as Jāwīsh. In their comment, the missionary periodical was positive about the school because of its non-interference in politics.

Riḍā, however, had no more funds from Turkey, and his project was consequently suspended. The reason was possibly Riḍā’s sympathy and activism for Syrian Arab nationalism. According to Riḍā, ‘plots’ of British authorities and Bahāʾī groups in Egypt were behind closing down his seminary. He attempted to revive his project by appealing to the Egyptian Ministry of Religious Endowments to resume its funding to the school, but he failed.

In 1931, Riḍā himself was requested by Al-Azhar to give advice about the establishment of its new department of al-Wâʾz wā al-ʾIrshād (Preaching and Guidance). In the same year, he made a similar attempt during the General Islamic Congress in Jerusalem, when he was nominated as a chairman of its (sub)Committee of Guidance and Preaching. In that congress, a report on missionary work in the Muslim world was read before the attendants. Through this committee he tried to revive his seminary project by presenting his suggestions to constitute a society under the same name in Jerusalem. The society could have its own college as committed to train Muslim preachers. He also suggested that the congress should take speedy measures against Christian missionary activities by promoting Islamic education, encouraging the publication of works in different languages countering missionary doctrines, and circulating them for free in all Muslim countries. Among the works he suggested were of the
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168 Draft letter to Rushdī, op. cit.
late Ṣidqī on Christianity. The congress should also entrust a group of qualified scholars to write treatises refuting ‘atheism,’ and promoting Muslim brotherhood. These works should also contain responses to missionary ‘allegations’ on Islam. 171

3.7. Conversion to Islam versus Evangelisation

Riḍā’s ambitions of establishing Islamic missionary institutions were also expressed in his support for the conversion of non-Muslims to Islam. After its victory in the war against Russia (1904), Japan, for instance, was held in the Muslim world as an example to be followed and was seen as a prospective place for Islamic propagation. 172 Even before its victory, the Egyptian nationalist Muṣṭafā Kāmil wrote a monograph in which he catalogued the history of Japan and predicted the defeat of Russia. His treatise proved to be popular, and attracted so much attention that it was translated into Malay by a group of Muslim reformers in Singapore who had strong educational connections with Cairo. Due to its political success,
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171 Ibid., pp. 203-209. When Riḍā read his proposals before the Congress (Sha’bān 1350/December 1931), Sheikh Sa’īd Darwīsh, an anti-Wahhābī participant from Aleppo, openly opposed Riḍā’s proposals, and described him as ‘tyrannical’ president who did not give others their chance to utter their views. Other participants tried to calm the intense situation down by delivering speeches on the significance of Muslim unity and brotherhood. Cf. Uri M. Kupferschmidt, The Supreme Muslim Council: Islam under the British Mandate for Palestine, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987, p. 213.

172 The idea of preaching Islam in Japan started as early as 1889, when the Turkish naval frigate Ertugrul sailed for Japan on the orders of Sultan Abdülhamid II, see, al-Manār, ‘Da’wat al-Yāpān ilā al-ʾIslām (Inviting Japan to Islam),’ vol. 8/18 (Ramadān 1323/13 November 1905), pp. 705. The Egyptian ʿAlī Aḥmad al-Jirjāwī, the founder of al-ʾIrshād paper, was one of the early Muslims, who resolved to travel to Japan propagate Islam during the Second World Congress of Religions in Tokyo (1907). See his travelogue to Japan (1908), al-Riḥla al-Yābāniyya (The Japanese Journey); Michael F. Laffan, ‘Making Meiji Muslims: The Travelogue of ʿAlī Aḥmad al-Jarjāwī,’ East Asian History 22, 2001, pp. 145-170.

Tokyo was also seen as ‘the qibla of Muslims in the Far East just as the Sublime Porte was to the Muslims in the Near East.’

In face of the Christian expansion in the Orient, Riḍā hailed the need for sending Muslim missions to Japan as well. He criticised Muslims for rushing to advocate the idea without taking into consideration the lack of financial resources and qualified candidates to carry out such a mission. Politics, in his view, were the reason behind the hope of Muslims for converting Japan to Islam. He believed that the Japanese people were only ready to accept a religion which is compatible with science and civilisation. The lack of capable Muslim scholars would be an obstacle in the face of propagating Islam in a developed country like Japan. A group of rich Muslims approached Riḍā to sponsor a missionary association for taking up this task. But the committee was very short-lived and unsuccessfully stopped all its work for no specific reason. When the Japan Congress of Religions was announced (1907), Riḍā suggested to the Supreme Porte to delegate Muslim representatives, who had a vast knowledge of Islamic history and philosophy and a good knowledge of other world religions, such as Buddhism, Judaism and Christianity.

Riḍā repeatedly used the conversion of European Christians to Islam as an argument for the expansion of Islam, despite the fact that Muslims, unlike Christians, had no organised missionary enterprise. In December 1913, he published at length the story of the conversion of the well-known Muslim fifth Baron Lord Headley (1855-1935), which drew the attention of the British public to Islam as a faith.
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176 Al-Manār, ‘Al-Dawla wā Mu’tamar al-’Adyān fī al-’Yabān’ (The State and the Congress of Religions in Japan), vol. 9/6 (Jumadā al-Thāniya 1324/23 July 1906), p. 480. A photo in Riḍā’s archive of showing the gathering of the Islamic Society with Japanese notables in the Council of the Qur’ān and Dissimination of the Religion Islam in Tokyo (dates to July 1934) would indicate his aspiration in the spread of Islam in Japan, even shortly before his death (see, appendix M).
Riḍā hailed the conversion of Headley, even though he knew that he was a convert to Islam through the Lahore Ahmadiyya sect.\footnote{178}

*Al-Manār* quoted some interviews which Headley gave to British weeklies after he embraced Islam in November 1913.\footnote{179} Headley later developed some of his ideas of these interviews in his book, *A Western Awakening to Islam*.\footnote{180} In this book, he criticised ‘zealous Protestants who have thought it their duty to visit Roman Catholic homes in order to make ‘converts’ of the inmates. Such irritating and unneighborly conduct is of course, very obnoxious, and has invariably led to much ill-feeling—stirring up strife and tending to bring religion into contempt. I am sorry to think that Christian missionaries have also tried these methods with their Muslim brethren, though why they should try to convert those who are already better Christians than they are themselves […] Charity, tolerance and broadmindedness in the Muslim faith comes nearer to what Christ himself taught.’\footnote{181} Riḍā proudly confirmed Headley’s statements and added that political and sectarian conflicts and superstitions among Muslims on the one hand, and the ill-information presented in the West on Islam on the other, represent a big obstacle for Europeans to embrace Islam.\footnote{182}

Followed by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, the founder of the Woking Muslim Mission in London,\footnote{183} Headley went on Hajj in 1923. On their way, reception committees were formed in Port Said, Alexandria and Cairo, and Headley became the object of marked attention of the press in the country. Riḍā himself was not able to meet Headley personally during his stop in Egypt, but he again quoted his conversion

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{179}{Riḍā quoted *The Daily Mail* (17 November 1913) and the weekly *The Observer* (23 November 1913).}
\footnote{180}{Lord Headley, *A Western Awakening to Islam*, London: J.S. Philips, 1915. A softcopy of the work is available at: www.aaill.org, which Riḍā reviewed in 1925 in his journal as a challenge to atheists and missionaries, vol. 26/1 (Ramaḍān 1343/April 1925), pp. 60-64.}
\footnote{181}{Ibid., p. 13.}
\footnote{182}{*Al-Manār*, vol. 17/1, pp. 39-40.}
\footnote{183}{About Riḍā’s views of Kamal-ud-Dīn, see, *al-Manār*, vol. 33/2 (Dhū al-Ḥijja 1351/April 1933), pp. 138-141.}
\end{footnotes}
story in an interview with the Egyptian newspaper *al-Siyāsa* (Politics). In his comment, Riḍā again expressed his wish that ‘if a group of knowledgeable Muslim missionaries would arise in England and the United States in order to uncover the swindle of politicians and [...] missionaries, who have caused enmity and animosity between Islam and Europe, the people of the two countries would embrace Islam in droves.’

3.8. *Al-Azhar Criticised*

Riḍā always took pride in his journal as one of the few Muslim journals of his time that concerned themselves with defending Islam against missionary work. His statements always carried the tone of criticism to religious official bodies, such as Al-Azhar scholars, for their leniency. In 1913, he made an observation on the intensification of missionary work even among the students of Al-Azhar. He also criticised those students for their feeble knowledge of Islam, confirming that the curricula they were learning during their long schooling were not helpful enough to assist them to defend Islam. He expressed his worries that without establishing solid knowledge of Islam through renewing the teachings of Al-Azhar, some of those students would probably convert to Christianity and abandon their religion. Missionaries would therefore use that as a pretext to prove that the greatest religious institution had failed to refute the ‘allegations’ of Christianity. In order to enable them to achieve this task, Riḍā suggested two things: 1) the whole curriculum of *ʿIlm al-Kalām* (Sciences of Islamic Theology) should be changed, and 2) to appoint a leader to each group of students who would investigate their conditions. The board should prohibit them from attending missionary meetings, and any student who contacted them without permission should be dismissed. An exception could be made for
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184 *Al-Manār*, vol. 24/7, pp. 555-559.
186 *Al-Manār*, ‘ʿAḍāʾ al-ʿIslām al-Muhāribūn lahū ʾfi Hādhā al-ʿAhd (The Combating Enemies of Islam in this Age),’ vol. 29/2, pp. 115-117
brilliant students, who would visit their meetings with the purpose of informing their colleagues about their activities.\textsuperscript{188}

After the appearance of the first issue of the mouthpiece of Al-Azhar, Majallat Nūr al-ʾIslām (The Light of Islam, 1930), Riḍā commended it in his journal, wishing that the magazine would take the place of his Manār in propagating the Islamic values and fighting against the increase of missionary attempts among Muslims.\textsuperscript{189} But Riḍā soon expressed his disappointment with the lax position taken by Al-Azhar and the Corps of its High ʿUlamā in that regard. His critique coincided with the anti-missionary press campaign against the observable increase of missionary work in Egypt that culminated during the period 1931-1933 with the coming of the unpopular and undemocratic regime of Ṣidqī Pasha. The Egyptian government and official religious leaders (represented by Al-Azhar scholars) were heavily criticised for their weak reactions against missionary activities in the country.\textsuperscript{190}

In his criticism, Riḍā claimed that although the Egyptian press was immensely preoccupied by the news of missionary events in the country, the Al-Azhar scholars, who were supposed to be the religious leaders of the community, had not taken a proper stance against missionary attacks on Islam. He strongly accused the institution and its then rector, the conservative Sheikh al-Aḥmadi al-Ẓawāhirī (1878-1944), of ‘making a poor defense against unbelief and the attacks of the Christian West.’\textsuperscript{191} Al-Ẓawāhirī had a conflict at that time with the reform-minded Azhari scholar Sheikh Muṣṭafā al-Marāghī (1881-1945),\textsuperscript{192} who was a good friend of Riḍā and a disciple of Muḥammad ʿAbduh as well. The newspaper al-Siyāsa, the voice of the Liberal Constituitionalist Party, accused Al-Azhar scholars of immersing

\textsuperscript{188} Ibid., p. 878.


\textsuperscript{190} Carter, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

\textsuperscript{191} Crecelius, op. cit., p. 314.

themselves in ritual matters, and turning their back against the Christian proselytisation of Muslims.\textsuperscript{193}

In 1931 the above-mentioned Sheikh Yūsuf al-Dijwī (see chapter 1),\textsuperscript{194} became Riḍā’s greatest opponent in his polemic with Al-Azhar. The debate between both Riḍā and Dijwī around many religious issues became very intense and serious, and later developed into hostility and serious friction between the two men. They exchanged insults, and Dijwī accused Riḍā of unbelief.\textsuperscript{195} Al-Dijwī now recalled Riḍā’s *fatwā* for the students of the American Protestant College in Beirut (mentioned above), which he interpreted as allegedly allowing Muslim students to attend Christian prayers.\textsuperscript{196} According to him, Riḍā forgot that his permission ‘would implant Christian rituals in the pure hearts [of Muslim students], and engrave what they would hear from missionaries and priests in their naïve minds.’\textsuperscript{197}

By 1933 the anti-missionary press campaign reached its climax. Missionaries were charged with using methods, such as hypnotism, torture, bribery and jobs, enticing children by sweets, kidnapping, adoption of babies, abusing the prophet Muḥammad, burning the Qur’ān and using it as toilet paper.\textsuperscript{198} As a result of the pressing need of public opinion, Al-Azhar High Corps of ‘Ulamā convened two consequent meetings (26 June, and 17 July, 1933) to discuss the matter.\textsuperscript{199} In one of their manifestos Al-Azhar ‘Ulamā requested the


\textsuperscript{196} Dijwī also gave a number of *fatwās* attacking the Wahhābī Kingdom in Saudi Arabia. Skovgaard-Petersen, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-53.

\textsuperscript{197} Dijwī, ‘Ṣāḥib,’ p. 337. Some other Azharīs had earlier pleaded that a committee from Al-Azhar should be established to study Riḍā’s views and give the government its advice to close down *al-Manār*. See, *al-Manār*, vol. 20/1, pp. 6-7

\textsuperscript{198} ‘Current Events: The anti-missionary Campaign in Egypt,’ *The Moslim World* 24, 1934, pp. 84-86; ‘Contro l’attiviá dei Missionari protestanti in Egitto,’ *Oriente Moderno* 13/7, 1933, pp. 373-375.

\textsuperscript{199} See, Umar Ryad, ‘Muslim Response to Missionary Activities in Egypt: With a Special Reference to the Al-Azhar High Corps of ‘Ulamā (1925-1935),’ in Heleen Murre-van Den Berg, ed., *New Faith in Ancient Lands: Western Missions in the Mid-*
government to prescribe strict laws in order to root missionaries out of Egypt. Riḍā believed that this demand was ‘peculiar and unreasonable.’ The government would never accept it. He also wondered how the committee could ‘entrust the Sheikh of Al-Azhar to carry out the suggestion, while he was following the government in its shade.’

Riḍā, on the other hand, joined Jamʿiyyat al-Difāʿ an al-ʾIslām (the Committee of the Defense of Islam), held in Jamʿiyyat al-Shubbān al-Muslimūn (Young Men’s Muslim Association) in Cairo and attended by more than 400 scholars. The Committee was headed by al-Ẓawāhirī’s opponent al-Marāghī, and gained a wider popularity than Al-Azhar. It included many influential figures, such as Muḥammad Ḥusayn Haykal, the editor of al-Siyāsa and Ḥasan al-Bannā. In one of its reports, the British Residency noted that al-Ẓawāhirī and many other scholars felt that their role as the ‘public defenders’ of Islam was being undermined by al-Marāghī. The British Residency also intimidated the King by stating that the British had the right to protect foreigners in Egypt and could well be pressed by other foreign governments to take action. As a result, the government forbade anti-missionary gatherings including the meetings of the Committee for the Defense of Islam. The High Corps of Ṭalāmā was the only organisation which could safely continue the work of collecting donations.

In the propositions of the meetings, the members passed some recommendations to be carried out by Marāghī’s Committee: 1) to submit a petition to King Fuʿād about missionary activities, stressing the importance of diminishing the missionary attacks against Islam and the Muslim community; 2) to send another similar petition to the Egyptian government, asking them to take strict decisions towards the ‘illegal’ missionary work; 3) to send messages to the ministers plenipotentiary, to attract their attention to the danger and consequences of missionary activities and asking them to use their influence to stop the missionary arguments against Islam and Muslims; 4) to publish a public announcement to the whole Muslim community, warning people against the enrolment of their children in missionary
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schools, as well as against entering their hospitals and orphanages; 5) to appeal for public subscription in order to establish Muslim institutions instead of that of missionary institutions; 6) to establish a committee, consisting of Muslim scholars and writers for Islamic propaganda and publications; 7) to write messages to the Christian Patriarchs, stating that the resistance is only directed against missionary attacks on Islam, and that the Committee is keen on maintaining a good relationship between Muslims and other religious groups living in the same country on the basis of the national mutual understanding. Riḍā believed that the resolutions of the Committee came as a ‘thunderbolt on the heads of the [Western] governments which protected these missionary organisations.’

3.9. Conclusion

We have studied al-Manār’s anti-missionary responses on different levels. Al-Manār placed particular emphasis upon the necessity of counteracting their activities through establishing similar schools that could provide instruction in the doctrines of Islam. Its anti-Christian polemics were also ‘an apologetic directed towards Muslim doubters.’

Riḍā remained firm in his conviction of the espousal between Christian mission and colonialism. In the beginning, however, he was ready to criticise any ‘overzealous and fanatic’ reactions against missionaries, while considering his own writings as purely defensive. The political and religious changes of the Muslim world had a major impact on the change of this calm tone. He became frustrated by the protection given to missionaries under the Capitulatory System. He regularly contrasted their freedom with the restrictions imposed upon him not to write against them. He was also convinced that there was a missionary attempt to intervene in order to close down his journal by approaching Lord Kitchener. He felt that this ‘collaboration’ endangered his career and diminished his role as a Muslim scholar in defending Islam.

The diversity of missionary movements and their different religious and political backgrounds sometimes caused Riḍā’s response to be undecided. However, he clearly differentiated between what he called
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‘paid preachers’ and ‘wise and virtuous Christians.’ The first category always depended on their salaries from missionary societies, seeking discord, attacking Islam and many times falsifying the facts about the number of converts among Muslims in order to gain more funds from their mother institutions in the West. The second group were those who had real zealotry for their faith, and were working for the good of all, such as the Danish missionary Alfred Nielsen (discussed below).

Regarding the influence of missionary schools, his views were not decisive either. He neither fully allowed Muslims to enter such schools, nor wanted them to abandon them entirely. In fact, he was inclined to recommend Muslims by way of selective borrowing from the West to make use of the scientific advances of such schools, while keeping the strength of Islamic traditions. Apparently, he was anxious as to the ramifications of their establishment in the Muslim society, and feared that they would produce an antagonistic generation among Muslims. When Riḍā tried to make a balance by permitting enthusiastic Muslims to enroll their children in such schools for a better future, while firmly observing their articles of faith, some of Al-Azhar scholars led by al-Dijwī exploited his views in enflaming their polemics against him.
CHAPTER FOUR

FALSE ALLEGATIONS OR PROOFS? RIḌĀ’S FORMATIVE POLEMICS ON CHRISTIANITY

In his annotated translation of Riḍā’s above-mentioned monograph, Shubuhāt, Simon Wood argues that Riḍā’s specific wording of the title of his earliest work on Christianity as Shubuhāt al-Naṣārā wā Ḥujaj al-ʾIslām (Allegations of Christians and Proofs of Islam) was carefully chosen. It was no accident, Wood says, that the book was not entitled Shubuhāt al-Naṣārā wā Ḥujaj al-Muslimīn (The Criticisms of the Christians and the arguments of Muslims) or Shubuhāt al-Naṣrāniyya wā Ḥujaj al-ʾIslām (the Obscurities of Christianity and the Clear Proof of Islam). Wood does not give any reason why he has given three different English translations for the two keywords, Shubuhāt and Ḥujaj as appearing in Riḍā’s title. He further thinks that Riḍā’s ‘title reflected his understanding of an ideal or ultimate Christianity that was not opposed to Islam. Ideal Christianity, however, was not that represented by European missionaries or their local allies. In that sense, Riḍā felt that the majority of his contemporary Muslims had become an argument against their own religion.’¹

Wood’s argument is true when looking at how Riḍā understood the Christian Scriptures as a whole and their relation to Islam. But his analysis of Riḍā’s wording of the title is far-fetched and not convincing. Wood has only depended on Riḍā’s monograph bearing this title, but nowhere mentioned that it was a collection of sixteen articles that had appeared earlier as a special section in a number of issues that Riḍā had compiled a few years later in a small volume. As a matter of fact, and in contradiction to Wood’s argument, Riḍā headed eleven of these articles in al-Manār with the phrase, Shubuhāt al-Masīḥiyyīn (sometimes al-Naṣārā) wā Ḥujaj al-Muslimīn (The Allegations of the Christians and the Proofs of Muslims).²

¹ Wood, op. cit., p. 40.
As it was his initial work on the subject, Riḍā’s *Shubuhāt* only represents, as I shall show in the coming chapters, a formative phase of its author’s views on Christian belief. Drawing a final conclusion on the basis of Riḍā’s whole understanding of Christianity and his polemics with his Christian counterparts as a result of studying only this book would be misleading. The work itself should be evaluated in the light of Riḍā’s subsequent writings in the historical context mentioned above. Besides, Riḍā published these articles from time to time as a response to a variety of Christian Arab missionaries, roughly between 1901-1904. In that period Western missionary literature in Arabic was not very widespread among Muslims. As we shall see, this treatise was a rather unsystematic book, sometimes of an inconsistent and rhetorical style.

In the present chapter, we will discuss Riḍā’s responses as he selected them in the monograph, but we supplement them with other background ideas that appeared in the journal. Discussing the details of all articles under this section would, however, fall outside the scope of the present chapter. Riḍā composed six of his articles in *al-Manār* (which were excluded in his monograph) under the same title as answers to the Egyptian Protestant Magazine. Some of these articles also did not directly deal with his views on Christianity, but were mostly devoted to refute Christian ‘allegations’ against the Qurʾān.3 In a similar manner, Riḍā published four lengthy reactions to some other articles written in the above-mentioned Brazilian Arabic journal *al-Munāẓir* (see, chapter 2) by a Christian Syrian emigrant under the name of Rafūl Saʿādeh. These articles were not included in the monograph either. They mainly contain refutations of Rafūl Saʿādeh’s arguments that Islam had no success, except because of the Christian principles it bore; and that Muslims were not as wise as other conquerors of Syria (such as the Seleucids and Romans), who had never attacked the habits and feelings of the Syrians.4 But the reason why Riḍā did not include these articles in the monograph is not known.

It is also worth noting that the last two articles of Riḍā’s monograph were written as a reply to Faraḥ Anṭūn’s critique of Islam during his
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4 For more details, see *al-Manār*, vol. 7/1 (Muḥarram 1322/March 1904), pp. 17-27; vol. 7/2 (Ṣafar 1322/April 1904), pp. 94-100; vol. 7/6, pp. 225-231.
above-mentioned debate with ‘Abduh (see, chapter 2). In these articles, Riḍā clearly put Anṭūn on an equal footing with missionaries by arguing that when the editor of al-Jāmiʿa saw the failure of evangelists in converting Muslims through purely religious methods, he embarked upon planting doubts in their minds through what he claimed to be scientific methods. He therefore exerted his effort to convince them: 1) that their religion, like other religions, is the enemy of reason and knowledge, 2) that their scholastic theologians denied causes; and 3) that the combining of religious and civil political authority in the office of the Caliph harms Muslims, causing their social retardation.\footnote{As translated by Wood, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 198.}

4.1. \textit{A Muslim Doubting the Authenticity of the Qur’ān}

It might be interesting to know that in 1903 a certain ‘Abdullāh Naṣūḥī, one of al-Manār’s readers from Alexandria, asked Riḍā to discontinue publishing the section of the \textit{Shubuhāt}, which, in his view, had become a platform for the publicity of missionary allegations. According to Naṣūḥī, no Muslim would have ever known about their publications, had al-Manār not published regular sections rebutting their ideas. The reader also believed that missionary treatises and magazines were only read by the Christians themselves.\footnote{\textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 6/11 (Jumādā al-Thānya 1321 /August 1903), pp. 425-427. The same reader had criticised \textit{al-Manār} for giving a special tribute for Pope Leo XIII after his death; see, pp. 434-440.} Riḍā replied that the editors of these publications frequently sent their magazine to the Grand Sheikh of Al-Azhar and other Muslim scholars, who took no initiative to respond to their contentions. He found it incumbent upon Muslims to counter their writings, otherwise they would be held sinful.\footnote{Ibid., p. 426.} Another Egyptian subscriber informed \textit{al-Manār} that one of his friends converted to Christianity only as a result of reading these missionary critiques of Islam.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 426-27.} When Riḍā decided to cease publishing the section of the \textit{Shubuhāt} in 1904, the judge of Bahrain encouraged him to resume his refutations, describing \textit{al-Manār} as a ‘shooting star burning the devils, and tearing down their allegations.’\footnote{\textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 6/23 (Dhū al-Ḥijja 1321/18 February 1904), p. 919.}
Riḍā embarked upon writing the section of the *Shubuhāt* after he had read an article in an Islamic newspaper by a Muslim journalist, who was affected by missionary writings and became doubtful about some Islamic teachings. Riḍā made it clear that he felt obliged to become directly involved in discussing these issues, although he was always keen on a peaceful attitude in his journal towards other religions, including Christianity. He stressed that *al-Manār*’s policy was neither to inflame the animosity between different religious groups, nor to invite people to defame each other’s belief, but missionaries were constantly attacking Islam.\(^{10}\)

Riḍā was surprised that the Muslim writer had read missionary works, but had not tried to study any Muslim works in response to them, such as *Iẓhār al-Ḥaqq* or *al-Sayf al-Ṣaqīl*.\(^{11}\) The doubts, which had emerged in his mind, were: 1) the divergence of some Islamic texts from the Jewish and Christian Scriptures; 2) the silence of these Scriptures about many points which had been later mentioned in the Qur’ān; and 3) the fact that many things mentioned in the Ḥadīth and the Qur’ān contradict actual reality or the truths already established by modern sciences.

Riḍā argued that silence about something is not the same as its denial. It is not reasonable that one would believe in the divine message of Islam on the basis of what the authors of Jewish and Christian Scriptures (whom Riḍā named *mu’arrikhūn* ‘historians’) had mentioned or neglected. The Muslim writer used the frequent missionary argument, which attempted to prove the genuineness of the Old and New Testament on the basis of the Qur’ān. In this sense, he
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\(^{10}\) First article, ‘Shubuhāt al-Masīḥīyyīn ‘alā al-ʾIslam,’ *al-Manār*, vol. 4/5 (Muharram 1319 /May 1901), pp. 179-183.

further argued that the Qurʾān made a declaration of truth of the revelation of the Bible; but if the revelation of the Bible were proved to be false in some points, would the testimony of the Qurʾān for false Scriptures bring the authenticity of the Qurʾān itself also into suspicion?!12

In his reply, Riḍā maintained that the Qurʾān has testified to the Torah as a book of laws and precepts, not as a book of history borrowed from Assyrian and Chaldean mythologies. These mythologies were proved to contradict the sciences of geology and archaeology. For example, it had been proved that serpents do not eat earth in contradiction of God’s command in the Torah for the serpent: ‘and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life’ (Genesis 3:14).13 The Qurʾān therefore bore witness to the authenticity of the Torah, as a book of legislation (al-Māʾīda 5:44),14 but did not give any testimony for other historical books, such as those of unknown authors and those that had been written centuries after Moses. In Riḍā’s view, any historical analogy between the Qurʾān and other Biblical books, such as Isaiah, Ezekiel or Daniel was baseless, since the Qurʾān had never witnessed to them. He asked the writer not to be dazzled by the claims of the Christians that all the books mentioned in the Old Testament were parts of the original Torah. As for the New Testament, Muslims should believe that it was a revelation which included religious exhortations, rulings and wisdom about Jesus. All other books of the New Testament were nothing but a part of history, and in the same way as the Torah, they had been written down many years after Jesus’ death with no asānīd (chains of transmission). The Qurʾān had testified that the Christians did not preserve all parts of the revelation about Jesus (Al-Māʾīda 5:14).16

Riḍā added that the Qurʾān also rebuked the Christians and the Jews for having mixed the original Bible with other historical stories. Thus, Riḍā argued, Muslims have no definitive criteria to distinguish parts originally revealed from other parts. However, Muslims hold
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13 Ibid., p. 181
14 ‘It is we who revealed the Law (to Moses): therein was guidance and light. By its standard have been judged the Jews, by Prophets who bowed (as in Islam) to God’s will, by the Rabbis and the Doctors of Law.’
15 Wood, op. cit., p. 95
16 ‘Lo! We are Christians. We made a covenant, but they forgot a part of that whereof they were admonished.’
the books of Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy and Leviticus as parts of the original Torah. Riḍā also favoured the Sermon of Jesus on the Mount, and other sermons according to the Gospel of Matthew (chapters 5, 6 and 7), as parts of the original Gospel. Nevertheless, he made it clear that any report that might contradict the Qurʾān in these books must be totally rejected, since ‘God speaks truthfully, whereas historians lie.’

At the end, Riḍā requested the writer to visit him in his office, if his written answers were not sufficient. One month later, Riḍā stated that he decided to stop publishing on the subject, after the writer visited him in his office and was convinced by his answers.

4.2. Researches of the Diligent

Very soon Riḍā started to publish his replies against Christian writings once again. As we have mentioned (see introduction), his early replies were directed to the missionary treatise written by the Egyptian Niqūlā Yaʿqūb Ghabriyāl. Riḍā held Christian writers responsible for attacking Islam. He felt compelled to react, even though he was still seeking harmony among different religious groups in society. It was Ghabriyāl’s ‘unfavourable judgment’ of Islam that made him return to polemics. The author tried to prove the authenticity of the Bible as based on Qurʾānic passages. It was also a direct message to Muslims to ‘share with the Christians their salvation and the eternal life, which they have acquired through Jesus.’

Riḍā evaluated the method of Ghabriyāl’s Researches as ‘decent,’ as it did not contain any ‘profanity’ against Islam as compared to other missionary works. Ghabriyāl personally gave a copy of his book to Riḍā, and requested him to give feedback in al-Manār. The above-

18 Wood, op. cit., p. 96.
19 Al-Manār, vol. 4/7 (Ṣafar 1319/June 1901), p. 280
21 Ghabriyāl, op. cit., p. 3.
mentioned Salīm Pasha al-Ḥamawī, a Syrian Greek Orthodox and a friend of Riḍā, reviewed the book in his newspaper al-Falāḥ, and asked Riḍā to respond to it as well. Other missionary friends of Ghabriyāl made the same request to Riḍā. In the beginning, Riḍā expressed his hesitation, stating that ‘the mujādāla (debate or polemics) is the job of those who live by it: ‘as the seller seeks a buyer, the debater seeks another debater.’ Riḍā was worried that he would not be able to respond to the issues mentioned by Ghabriyāl without exceeding his boundaries and attacking Christianity. As a result, the authors of such works would charge him with religious fanaticism. For him, the lucidity of Islam would need no defender.

4.2.1. Three Prophets: Historical Doubts about Judaism and Christianity

Riḍā argued with Ghabriyāl that anyone who studied the Scriptures of the three religions and the biographies of their narrators would definitely reach the conclusion that Islam was the most ‘obvious’ and ‘soundest’ one. Once he had a conversation with a Christian historian, whom he described as ‘not fanatically disposed towards one religion over another.’ They imposed upon themselves the hypothetical condition that they did not believe in any religion in order to define who the greatest man in history was. Riḍā nominated Muḥammad, while the historian’s choice went to Moses and Jesus. They agreed that the three of them were the greatest and most influential in history, but did not agree on the criteria that made them greatest in terms of status and historical influence.
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22 Al-Manār, vol. 4/10, p. 380. Other contemporary Muslim scholars also refuted Ghabriyāl’s treatise. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Saʿīd al-Baghdādī (d. 1911), the Iraqi head of the Commercial Court in Baghdad, systematically responded to its nine chapters. Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Saʿīd Baghdadī, (Bajah Ji Zadah), al-Fāriq bayna al-Makhlūq wā al-Khāliq, Cairo, 1904, pp. 31-83. The book was published in Cairo three years after the appearance of Riḍā’s articles in al-Manār. Ghabriyāl’s work was, in his view, nothing but a ‘camouflage,’ which would swindle the fair-minded Christians and convince them with the authenticity of their Scriptures. In order to discover the deception of its author, Baghdadī advised his readers, Christians or not, to purchase a copy of Ghabriyāl’s work, and put it beside him while reading his refutation. On the margin of Baghdadī’s work, the author included al-Qarāfī’s al-Ajwiba al-Fākhira and Ibn al-Qayyim’s Hidāyat al-Ḥayārā.

23 Ibid.

As for Moses, Riḍā maintained that he was brought up under the custody of the ‘greatest king’ of his time. In the court of the Pharaoh, Moses grew up in the ‘cradle’ of royalty and power, and therefore became imbued with love of rule and authority. He witnessed the civilised world of Egypt, the universal sciences, *Funūn al-Ṣināʿa* (arts of industry) and magic. He grew up in the shadow of the Egyptian laws. The pride of the monarchy made him valiant. He turned against the Pharaoh, as he was conscious of the weakness and humiliation of the Children of Israel as a disgraced nation under the Pharaoh. He sought the partisan support (ʿAṣabiyya) of his people, and attempted to establish a kingdom like the one under which he grew up. He rebelled against the Pharaoh by using this ʿAṣabiyya. Riḍā did not consider Moses’ miracle of the passing of the sea to have been a matter of magic or supernatural power. Some historians stated that the Children of Israel had crossed the sea at a shallow point at the end of the tide’s ebb. When the Pharaoh and his people tried to cross, they drowned due to the incoming tide. Riḍā did not mention any historian by name. Here he alluded to theories like those of the Hellenistic Jewish historian Artapanus who pointed to the ebb as a possible explanation. Riḍā compared the story to what, according to him, happened to the French political leader Napoleon Bonaparte (d. 1821) and his soldiers on their way back to the Egyptian shore, when they tried to cross the Red Sea at the time of the tide’s ebb; and the water began to rise. This made their return very difficult. Bonaparte commanded his soldiers to get hold of each other till they were overpowered by the strength of the rising water. All other miracles attributed to Moses were, in Riḍā’s view, dubious in regard to their transmission, and of doubtful understanding.

As for Jesus, Riḍā described him as a Jewish man who was brought up under the Mosaic laws, who was judging according to the Roman
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25 Artapanus explained the crossing of the sea by Moses and the Israelites as a consequence of Moses’ familiarity with the natural phenomena of the area. See, for instance, Stanislav Segert, ‘Crossing the Waters: Moses and Hamilcar,’ *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 53/3, 1994, pp. 195-203.

26 Riḍā did not give this rationalist interpretation in his commentary on the Qur’ānic passages related to this story. He rendered stretching the sea for Moses to be a miraculous act caused by the divine providence. He gave his interpretation in light of Biblical narratives. He only quoted the story as mentioned in Exodus 13 and 14, which he considered to be a proper exegesis for the Qur’ānic story. See, *Tafsīr Al-Manār*, Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1999, vol. 9, pp. 91-92.

27 *Al-Manār*, vol. 4/10, p. 381.
code, and who had read Greek philosophy. Therefore, he was well acquainted with the three great civilisations and their sciences; and was not keen on establishing a new law or nation. Riḍā also suggested that Jesus, as an eloquent preacher, had some knowledge of Greek philosophy of life, such as asceticism, which had been clearly expressed in the renunciation of worldly pleasures and the humiliation of the body for the sake of the soul and the entering of the Kingdom of the Heavens.28 Some of the zealous poor followed him, as they found in his mission consolation and comfort. Riḍā argued that these followers embarked on reporting miraculous stories, just as common Muslims attribute miraculous acts to Muslim Ṣūfīs. In his interpretation of the clash of his arguments with the Qur’ānic reports of the miraculous acts attributed to Jesus, such as his fatherless birth, Riḍā maintained that it was a claim that could never be proven, except after establishing the rational evidence of the authenticity of Islam.29

As compared to Moses, Riḍā saw that Jesus in many aspects did not accomplish noteworthy achievements regarding science, social reform or civilisation. His sermons and exhortations, however, led to the demolition of civilisations, the ruining of prosperity, and the decline of humankind from its highest degrees to the lowest depth of animal existence. The sermons of Jesus would lift up human souls in humiliation and humbleness, encouraging people to discard any flourishing or progressive development in the world. Riḍā mentioned in that regard examples, such as: ‘It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God’ (Matthew, 19:24). He added that the doctrine of Crucifixion also allowed ‘permissiveness,’ since it taught the believers that any sin was forgiven through it. Riḍā concluded that the teachings of Christianity were derived from paganism and that it ‘relinquished any light [produced by reflection].’ He attempted to refute the claim that Western civilisation was based on Christianity. A civilisation based on materialism, love of money and authority, arrogance and the enjoyment of worldly pleasures, does not match with the spirit of Christian asceticism. He strongly believed that the West reached its civilisation only after it had entirely abandoned Christian teachings.30

28 Ibid., p. 382.
29 Ibid., pp. 382-83.
30 Ibid., p. 383.
After having mentioned all these points, Ridā reached his conclusion of the preference of the Prophet of Islam in human history. The Prophet Muhammad was born as an orphan, and was raised up in a nation of paganism, illiteracy and ignorance; one lacking laws, civilisation, national unity, knowledge or craft. The highest degree of development attained in his time was that a group of people, who, due to their dealings with other tribes, had learnt to read and write. Neither he nor any of his followers was included in this group. However, he was capable of founding a nation, religion, law, kingdom and civilisation in an unprecedented short period of time.  

Ridā’s counterpart in the discussion conceded that it was true that Muhammad was the greatest man in history, but the sad status of Muslims nowadays was not compatible with the teachings of his religion. Ridā answered that the Islamic civilisation declined when Muslims abandoned their religion. The so-called Western civilisation, on the other hand, began to exist after having come into contact with Muslims in Spain. The more the West puts Christianity aside, the more it advances. Ridā’s Christian counterpart considered this answer to be an exaggerated statement.  

At the end, Ridā returned to the Qur’ānic narration of the miracles of prophets. For him, the Qur’ānic narrative should be given preponderance as divine revelation above all historical probabilities. He argued that the authenticity of any religion should be proven through supernatural acts, which are reported on the authority of its lawgiver. Ridā favoured the Muslim reports as the most reliable for many reasons. First of all, knowledge and oral transmissions were known since the first century of Islam. It is not historically established that Muslims were conquered by an enemy, who burnt their books or demolished their entire religion and history. They were never persecuted nor obliged to conceal their belief and in the course of secrecy invent stories. Unlike other religions, Muslims initiated the science of Tārīkh al-Rijāl (Biography of Men) with which they examined the authenticity of narratives by means of studying their narrators.

31 Ibid.  
32 Ibid., p. 384.
4.2.2. Islam & Christianity: Three Goals of Religion

In a following article, Riḍā rebuked missionaries for their insistence on inviting Muslims to deny the divine message of one of the three prophets, notwithstanding that his mission was established on the strongest rational proofs. He proposed a comparison between Christianity and Islam in the light of three general objectives that every religion should have: 1) soundness of doctrines, leading to the perfection of the human mind; 2) cultivation of morality leading to the perfection of the soul; and 3) the goodness of acts facilitating welfare and interests of human beings, therefore leading to the perfection of the body. This composition would demonstrate which one of the two religions really realised these goals, and deserved to be followed.33

With regard to the first aspect, Riḍā argued that Muslims agreed that beliefs should be derived from clear-cut proofs. Any sensible person would definitely judge the doctrines of Islam as sound. He did not agree with the author of the Researches that ‘no one would grasp the essence of the divine entity except God Himself, as Muslims and others agree.’ Riḍā made a distinction between what the reason would prove on the basis of evidence without knowing its deepest entity, and what it would declare as impossible to know. Reason however did not attain knowledge of the true nature of any of the created things, but it comprehended external appearances and attributes. The Torah, in Riḍā’s perspective, ascribed to God irrational attributes. Depending on early Islamic polemics, Riḍā maintained that telling about God in the Torah that God ‘repented,’ ‘grieved,’ or ‘plotted to destroy man’ (Genesis, 6:6-7) indicates that He was ignorant and incapable.34

As for the second objective, Riḍā maintained that the Islamic teachings were the most adequate and perfect, as they were standing upon the foundations of justice and moderation. He wrote that the Christian teachings, on other hand, were based on ‘excess’ and ‘exaggeration.’ He referred to verses such as, ‘Love your enemies, bless them that

curse you’ (Mathew, 5:44); ‘But those mine enemies, [...] that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me’ (Luke, 19:27). These verses convinced him that its core message was a kind of excess in love, which human nature cannot stand.

In terms of the third objective, Riḍā argued that good deeds promote the human being spiritually and bodily, and in that sense all acts of worship in Islam are connected to a value. Prayer, for example, is obligated to prevent *Fahshā* (lewdness) and *Munkar* (reprehensible acts). He contended that it is hard to find these meanings of worship in other scriptures. Worship in the Torah is substantiated only for the sake of ‘worldly fortunes.’ For instance, feasts in the Bible were only justified as a season of gathering, harvest, and agriculture (Exodus, 23: 14-16). The same holds true for his understanding of the Islamic precepts of transactions, which ‘treat Muslims and non-Muslims equally.’ Riḍā attempted to compare some of these Islamic precepts with their Biblical counterparts. He quoted that the Torah stipulates ‘thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour’ (Exodus, 20: 16), while the Qur’ānic concept of giving one’s testimony demands believers to ‘stand firmly for justice and not be biased even against oneself, parents, kin, rich or poor’ (al-Mā’ida, 4:135). Riḍā further alleged that, unlike the Bible, the Qur’ān combines both faith and good deeds. Riḍā selected many Biblical examples to prove his point. In his Epistle to the Romans, Paul, for example, made it clear: ‘Now to one who works is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that works not, but believeth in him that justifies the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness’ (4:4-5).

4.2.3. Judaism & Christianity Derived from Paganism?

In this part, Riḍā harshly criticised the Judeo-Christian Scriptures as being rehashed from pagan ideas. In his view, the only means to avoid what he considered as the ‘objections’ of Western scholars and historians against the authenticity of the Scriptures was to adhere to Muslim belief by admitting the ‘corruption’ of many parts of them. Here he quoted the famous fictional work ‘ʿAlam al-Dīn (The Banner of Religion) by ʿAlī Pasha Mubārak (1823-1893), an Egyptian former
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The four-volume book described a journey to France by an Azharite Sheikh (named ‘Alam al-Dīn) and a British orientalist, who hired him for Arabic lessons. When the Sheikh traveled with his English student to France, his view of the East and West drastically changed. As it was written for educative reasons, the novel contained accounts of the discussions between both men on various fields, such as geography, physics, zoology, religion, and intellectual schools. Riḍā was impressed by such works.

In the *Shubuhāt*, Riḍā quoted from Mubārak’s work an imaginary conversation between Sheikh ‘Alam al-Dīn and a French philosopher, who visited Egypt during Napoleon’s campaign, on the relation between Islam and Christianity, and on other issues related to the Bible. The orientalist was the interpreter, and introduced the French philosopher as one of the well-versed scholars in the field of theology. The philosopher was said to believe that ‘the Old Testament is composed, and not one of the heavenly-divine books.’ Mubārak mentioned that the philosopher relied on the statements of a person to whom he referred as ‘Mary Augustus’ and ‘Origen.’ He was probably referring to the church father St. Aurelius Augustine (AD 353-430) and to Origenes Adamantius (probably AD 185-254). Mubārak maintained that Augustine would argue that it was not possible that the first three chapters [of Genesis] would have remained in the same form. In his work, Mubārak maintained:

Origen also believed that what is mentioned in the Torah pertaining to the creation of the world was legendary […] the word Hebrew word *Barrāh*—fatḥa on the b, doubling of the *r* and sukūn on the h—would actually mean ‘arrange’ and ‘order.’ It was not possible for anyone to ‘arrange’ or ‘order’ something that did not really exist. Thus the application of this word to the creation of the world required that the material substance of the world was pre-existent and eternal; and the time

---
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and place are coeternal. Insofar as the substance was living, the soul was eternal as well, since it was the cause of life. As the substance is light, heat, power, motion, gravity and balance, both life and the substance were one thing, which is contradictory to the Torah

There is no evidence that Mubārak had a good command of the Hebrew language. He did not mention any source on which he depended in the argument. Reading the general lines of the two ancient Christian writers on the creation narrative in the Book of Genesis, we find their theories more sophisticated than the way they are introduced by Mubārak. Augustine, born of a Christian mother and a pagan father, firstly attempted to expound the creation narrative in his commentary: *De Genesi contra Manichaeos libri duo* (388). He tried to discover the literal meaning of every statement in the text of Genesis; but when he found that impossible, he resorted to an allegorical interpretation. The first three chapters of Genesis contained a narrative of another sort as compared to those from the fourth chapter onwards which obviously contained a historical narrative. The first chapters were unfamiliar because they were unique. But that, according to Augustine, did not justify one in concluding that the events did not happen. Origen’s approach to cosmology was philosophical rather than theological. He believed that the Bible was divinely revealed, which was established both by the fulfilment of prophecy, and by the direct impression which the Scriptures made on him who read them.

Returning to Riḍā’s quotation from ‘ʿAlam al-Dīn, the author compared some Biblical notions and events with similar ones in ancient traditions. For example, the Biblical story of creation in six days resembles that of the six ages of the Hindus, as well as the six
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44 Ibid., p. 10.
Gahambars (holy festivals) of Zarathustra. The philosopher, moreover, criticised the Old Testament as containing ‘inappropriate’ things attributed to the Prophets, such as fratricide, adultery, and theft. In the same manner, the author turned to draw analogies between Christian doctrines and ancient Pagan cultures. Examples of these were the incarnation of God into a human body and the virginal birth, which had occurred according to Indian, Chinese and Egyptian ancient cults. The ancient Egyptians, for instance, believed that Osiris was virgin-born. The Christian doctrine that Jesus died, was buried, resurrected and elevated to heaven resembled the statements of ancient Egyptians about Osiris and the Greeks about the cult figure Adonis. Also it was said that the Germanic God Odin had sacrificed himself, killing himself of his own choice by throwing himself in a terrible fire until he burnt for the salvation of his worshippers. 46

Riḍā argued that because Western people (especially scholars and philosophers) became skeptical about Christianity, some governments (such as in France) started to declare that their states had no official religion. 47 Those philosophers and scholars, he went on, were still convinced that religion was necessary for humankind. Riḍā believed that the ‘truth’ of Islam, as the religion of the Fiṭra (the innate disposition), was concealed away from those scholars. Therefore some of them produced a poor translation of the Qurʾān which did not enable people to understand the truth of Islam. 48 In Riḍā’s view, the Russian and Spanish people persisted to be the strongest advocates of Christianity. However, the Spaniards recently suppressed their clergy. The Orthodox Church of Russia excommunicated its philosopher Tolstoy for his rejection of their doctrines. Riḍā was aware of the ‘westernised’ group of Muslims, who followed the path of these
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48 Riḍā mentioned as an example an English translation of Surat al-ʿAṣr: ‘Verily, by three hours after noon a man becomes bad or despicable.’ He did identify the translator by name, but Wood argued that Riḍā’s paraphrasing looked like the translation of J.M. Rodwell (1862-1876), who translated it as: ‘Verily, man’s lot is cast amid destruction.’ Ibid., p. 123.
Europeans in their attitudes towards Islam. In a generalisation he stated that these individuals never studied Islam properly, either before their studying of European thought or after.  

4.2.4. Qurʾānic Proofs for the Genuineness of the Bible

As we have already mentioned, it was typical of the missionary writings to prove the authenticity of the Bible on the basis of the Qurʾānic testimony to it as a divinely-revealed book. In his Researches, Ghabriyāl cited seven Qurʾānic verses discussing the character of the Bible. Riḍā ridiculed this method, and ironically named the whole book Abḥāth al-Jadaliyyīn ‘the Researches of the Disputants’ instead of the Diligent. He also accused the author of trying to ‘twist the meanings [of the Qurʾān] in the same way as his ancestors did with the Old and New Testament.’ It was, in his view, Paul who rendered the laws of the Old and New Testament worthless, and made Christianity permissive attaching no good values to any good act by requesting people to believe in the salvation of Jesus only. By this Riḍā thought along a similar line with many Muslim polemicists who saw Paul as a ‘cunning and roguish Jew […] who emancipated himself from the religious practices of Jesus and accepted those of the Romans.’ Riḍā called down ‘shame’ and ‘denigration’ on Christian missionaries because they preached that ‘this Jewish man [Paul]’ could invalidate both the laws of Moses and Jesus, whereas they refused the message of Muhammad, which came as confirmation of the divine message of both prophets.

In Riḍā’s understanding, the missionary argument of proving the authenticity of the Bible from the Qurʾān was a ‘quotation out of context’ in order to distort the Qurʾān’s real meaning. The Old and New Testament were earlier ‘guidance for humanity,’ but after their followers deviated from its ‘true’ message and went astray, the texts had undergone alteration. Riḍā’s premise did not go further than his pure conviction that Islam had later brought ‘the greatest guidance’ and ‘glorious evidence.’ If the People of the Book believed in it, they

49 Ibid., p. 125.
51 See, S. M. Stern, ‘ʿAbd-al-Jabbār’s account of how Christ’s religion was falsified by the adoption of Roman customs,’ Journal of Theological Studies 19, 1968, pp. 128-185.
52 Al-Manār, vol. 4/14, p. 538.
would gain ‘prosperity’ and become ‘masters’ of others.\textsuperscript{53} Again, Riḍā was cynical in reproaching missionaries to concern themselves with non-religious Christians, who did not live according to the precepts of the Bible: ‘why would they have sympathy and give their sincere advice to Muslims to follow the Bible, whereas they themselves are in need of advice and sympathy.’\textsuperscript{54}

The same held true for the verse quoted by Ghabriyāl: ‘Let the People of the Gospel judge by what Allah hath revealed therein’ (al-Mā‘ida, 5:47), which he understood as a commandment to the Prophet of Islam to follow the Gospel. Riḍā maintained that the verse did not indicate any command that the Prophet Muḥammad should submit to the precepts of the Bible. The author, in Riḍā’s words, sought to furnish any corroborating evidence by misconstruing the verse in a way that would support his desire, and would also corrupt the Qur’ān as they did with their own Scriptures. The verse pertained to the statement in the preceding verse: ‘We sent him [Jesus] the Gospel; therein was guidance and light’ (5:46). This means that God gave him the Gospel and ordered his people (the Israelites) to act accordingly. Riḍā understood the verse as a proof and objection against the Christians themselves that they did not act according to the Gospel. He concluded that ‘if it is possible for the Christian evangelists today to argue against Muslims that the Qur’ān commands them to believe and act according to the Old and New Testament and not see that this argument mandates their faith in the Qur’ān, then how can they assert that Muḥammad’s request to them to judge by the Gospel would mandate that he submitted to its ordinances?’\textsuperscript{55}

Ghabriyāl argued that the Qur’ān confirmed that it would be an error for a Muslim not to believe in the Old and New Testament. He cited the verse admonishing the Muslims to believe in the preceding Scriptures (al-Nisā, 4: 136).\textsuperscript{56} Riḍā immediately replied that the Muslim is required to believe in the previous Scriptures, but is never obligated to act according to their laws. According to Muslim exegetes, he argued, the verse was addressing the hypocrites (\textit{munāfiqūn}),
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who outwardly manifested their faith only, with no real conviction. Riḍā paraphrased the verse: ‘O you who profess faith in God, His Book and his Messengers’—with their tongues and outwardly—‘it is incumbent upon you to believe in them with your hearts and bring your outward profession to congruity with what you hold inwardly.’

In Ghabriyāl’s view, the people of Mecca knew the Old and New Testament in the same manner they knew the Qurʾān. He cited the verse ‘And those who disbelieve say: We believe not in this Qurʾān nor in that which was before it’ (Sabaʾ, 34:31). He interpreted the Arabic phrase, bayna yadayhi (lit. between his hands), as ‘before it.’ This means that the verse directly refers to ‘the Old and New Testament.’ Riḍā rejected this interpretation by arguing that it pointed to the rejection by the people of Mecca of the Qurʾān and its prophet. Riḍā again paraphrased the verse that the premise of the people of Mecca was to say: ‘we do neither believe in you Muḥammad and the book you claim from God, nor in the Scriptures you claim to have been revealed before you.’ He argued that the verse neither indicated that the ‘illiterate’ inhabitants of Mecca during the time of the revelation knew the Old and New Testament, nor did it give any connotation that they specifically studied them. Only a few people among them were able to read and write well (Riḍā counted them as six individuals). However, Riḍā gave his preference to another exegetical interpretation: the phrase ‘bayna yadayhi’ referred to the Day of Judgment, not to the preceding Scriptures.

Ghabriyāl’s following argument was that the Prophet himself verified the authenticity of the Scriptures and put them on an equal footing with the Qurʾān, as has been stated by the Qurʾān itself: ‘Say (to them Muḥammad): ‘then bring a Book, which gives a clearer guidance than these two, that I may follow.’ The pronoun in minhumā (than these two), according to Ghabriyāl, refers to the Qurʾān and the Gospel. For Riḍā, this quotation was mentioned by Ghabriyāl out of his ‘dishonesty’ and an ‘alteration’ of the real meaning of the verse by not giving any reference to its previous passages. In his exegetical view, Riḍā considered the mention of Moses in the preceding verses as an indication that the verse referred to the Qurʾān and the Torah,

57 Wood, op. cit., p. 133.
59 Al-Qaṣaṣ (28: 49).
but not to the Gospel. But this interpretation, in Riḍā’s view, does not indicate any approval that the Qur’ān recognised the Torah as equal in all aspects, nor the revelation to Muḥammad as equivalent to that to Moses. The verse pointed to the inability of the people of Mecca to produce a book similar to the Scriptures brought by Moses and Muḥammad, but it did not necessarily imply that the former was equivalent to the latter. As an example, Riḍā compared the case of the Qur’ān and the Torah with two works on the science of logic: ‘Were it said to an individual, ignorant of the science of logic […], ‘Write me a book that is better than the book Isagoge [of Porphyry], and al-Baṣāʾir al-Nuṣayriyya’, would we say that this statement demonstrates that the two books are equal in every aspect?’

Lastly, Ghabriyāl cited the verse indicating that the Torah contained God’s ordinance or command (al-Mā’ida, 5:43). The verse was therefore a clear substantiation that the Torah was not twisted and that there was no need to follow any other law. Riḍā pointed out that the reason for the revelation of that verse was that a group of Jews intended to escape the punishment of stoning by asking the Prophet to be an arbitrator in a case of adultery committed by a highborn person among them, hoping that he would decide to flog the adulterer. Riḍā argued that the verse elucidated astonishment about the lack of confidence of the Jews in their religion by rejecting its judgement and yielding to another legislator. It was also amazing that they rejected the Prophet’s judgement, which was in agreement with their own law. Their lack of confidence was also extended to the message of Islam
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60 Riḍā supported his argument by referring to the preceding verses: ‘If (we had) not (sent thee to the Quraysh)—in case a calamity should seize them for (the deeds) that their hands have sent forth, they might say: ‘O Lord! Why didst Thou not send us a messenger? We should then have followed the signs and been amongst Those who believe’! But (now), when the Truth has come to them from Ourselves, they say, ‘Why are not (signs) sent to him, like those which were sent to Moses? Do they not then reject (the signs) which were formerly sent to Moses? They say: ‘Two kinds of sorcery, each assisting the other and they say: ‘For us, we reject all (such things).’ (Al-Qaṣaṣ, 28: 47-48).


62 Wood, op. cit., p. 137.
and all other religions. Riḍā’s very assertion of the corruption and the human features of the Bible permitted him to allege that although they contained ‘the Command of God,’ the Scriptures were not purely divine in their entirety. He argued that the book of al-Sīra al-Ḥalabiyya, for instance, might contain the ‘Command of God,’ but this did not mean that it was secure from corruption. It had also included the personal views of the author.

4.2.5. Books of the Old and New Testament

Ghabriyāl devoted the second chapter of his book to discuss what he believed to be a rational proof of the authenticity of the Bible. For him, God was omnipotent and wise to stipulate a constitution and to prescribe a law for human beings in order that they should comply with specific duties towards their Maker. The law regulated relationship among them, otherwise life would be in chaos with no deterrent or restrain. The people would also annihilate each other, and the good would be on equal footing with the evil, something God would never accept. Ghabriyāl challenged Muslims: ‘if that constitution and law were not the Old and New Testament, would you tell me what are they? Is there any other ancient holy book that accomplishes the same objective, as do the two Testaments?’

Riḍā had a low opinion of the logic behind the argument of his opponent. He wondered why God had left humanity without a law for thousands of years before the Torah, and why this wisdom of His had not appeared except recently in the case of the Israelites. These question marks were enough for Riḍā to refute Ghabriyāl’s arguments. Muslims, on the other hand, believed that God sent down innumerable messengers and prophets to all nations. He also contended that the people of China were not like ‘cattle’ trampling each other, or like ‘fish,’ the big eating the small with no restrain. They had a civilization and values of their own; either before or after the existence of
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the Israelites. They were even more advanced than the Israelites in science, culture and order. Riḍā added that they were more advanced than the Christians themselves whose religion advanced them in nothing but animosity, hatred, disagreement, discord, war and murder during the so-called ‘Dark Ages,’ while the Chinese lived in peace and harmony. The same was true for the Hindus. He argued that there is no harm for Muslims to believe that the Chinese religion and Hinduism were of divine origin, just as Judaism, Christianity and Islam. It is not forbidden to believe that God had sent down messengers for those people in order to guide them to ‘eternal happiness.’ But they intermingled their religions with inherited pagan tendencies, the same as the Christians did with their originally divine and monotheistic religion.\textsuperscript{70}

Riḍā believed that when the Europeans replaced the law of the Old Testament with positive laws, and the customs of the Old and New Testament with philosophy, they discarded ‘asceticism’ and ‘shook the dust of humiliation off their heads.’\textsuperscript{71} By this the Europeans achieved more progress than during the time when they firmly followed the Bible. Riḍā believed at this time that in their good manners the Europeans were the closest people to Islam. These morals included their attachment to ‘pride, high motivation, seriousness in work, honesty, trustworthiness, and seeking knowledge according to the universal laws and abiding by rationality.’\textsuperscript{72} Riḍā was persuaded that Ghabriyāl’s statement about the effect of the cultivation of the divine laws on human beings was only evident in the case of Muslims, rather than that of the Jews and the Christians. Historically, when Muslims faithfully fulfilled their duties towards God and the people, they became refined, their morals became cultivated and their civilisation advanced.\textsuperscript{73} Riḍā ironically wondered if the needs of people were really to be fulfilled solely by the revelation of the Torah, why God would send down the Gospel on Jesus? However, this problem was not pertinent to Muslims, as they believed in the genuineness of the origin of the Bible.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., p. 656.
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\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., pp. 656-657. Riḍā concluded his arguments with the stanzas of the \textit{lāmiyyah} by al-Būṣīrī on the character of Old Testament and its people. See the translation of Wood, pp. 156-157.
Ghabriyāl argued that it was impossible that both the Old and the New Testament were distorted, as both Judaism and Christianity became widespread throughout the East and the West. In his words, ‘the Scriptures, especially the New Testament, was translated from the original Greek and Hebrew languages into the languages of the peoples among whom they were spread, including Arabic, Aramaic, Abyssinian, Coptic, and Latin.’ It was not logical, therefore, that these thousands of Christians had collaborated on altering the Scriptures. Ghabriyāl repudiated the Muslim view that the Scriptures were corrupted. Muslims, in his view, definitely failed to pinpoint the altered passages, or to mention the real reasons behind this alleged corruption.

In Riḍā’s opinion, the Qurʾān, unlike the Bible, was proven to be in a clear way transmitted orally and in writing. Thus, preference should be given to it above the Bible, as many ‘Christian scholars’ had admitted. Riḍā quoted a piece of work by the Coptic convert to Islam, Muḥammad Effendi Ḥabīb, a teacher of Hebrew and English in Cairo, which he wrote against the above-mentioned Gibāra (see, the introduction). Ḥabīb quoted J.W.H. Stobart, the principal of La Martiniere College in Lucknow. In Stobart’s view, ‘we have ample proofs to believe that the existing Qurʾān consists of genuine words, and is the original composition of the Prophet Muhammad, as learnt or transcribed under his observation and instruction.’ Stobart’s view was a quotation from Muir’s work, The Life of Mahomet, whom Ḥabīb described as the ‘forceful enemy of Islam.’

As for the alteration of the Bible, Riḍā argued that Muslims do not acknowledge that all these Scriptures were accurately transmitted from the prophets. They believe that the Jews and Christians subse-
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quently altered them after dispersing throughout the East and the West, and each people embracing Judaism and Christianity had translated them into their own languages. For him, investigating the origin, scribes and transmitters of these books before the great expansion would embarrass the People of the Book, as it might expose many shortcomings in their history. Riḍā repeated an often-cited example by Muslim polemicists that it was not possible to believe that it was Moses who had written the five books of the Torah because they speak about him in the third person, and mentioned his death and burial in one of the chapters.

Riḍā cited a passage from the Book of Deuteronomy in that Moses was reported to say: ‘Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord’ (31:26). For him, this phrase was enough evidence to argue that Moses wrote a particular book, which must have been lost. The next passages also conclude the alteration of the Torah. Moses said: ‘For I know that after my death ye will utterly corrupt yourselves, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you’ (31:29). Riḍā defined the word ‘Torah,’ as sharīʿa or law, whereas the existing five books are historical, even though they contain some rulings. He compared it with the example of the Qurʾānic verses of rulings, which Muslim historiographers included in the works of the Sīra (the Prophet’s Biography), as containing sound and unsound narratives. Muslims do not consider the books of Sīra as Qurʾān or as part of the revelation. The same holds true for the stories on Moses and other Israelite prophets. Riḍā pointed out that the authors of these books did not examine their narratives as Muslim scholars did in their investigation of biographical works on the prophet.

Riḍā attempted to invalidate the claim of Ghabriyāl that the Scriptures were preserved among thousands of people in various languages. As vindication for his conviction, Riḍā quoted an anonymous Christian Arabic work which acknowledged that the original copy of Moses’ book disappeared at some time when paganism prevailed among the Israelites till it was rediscovered in the Kingdom of Hosea the Pious. The Christian author maintained that it is impossible that the original version of Moses had survived until the present time. It
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was also plausible that it was lost along with the arc when Nebuchadnezar the Great had destroyed the temple in Jerusalem. This was therefore the reason why it was reported among the Jews that the priestly scribe Ezra was the one who had found it again by collecting the fragmented copies of the holy books and correcting their mistakes.85

Riḍā severely reproved the ‘People of the Book’ for their belief that Ezra had corrected and edited the Torah, while discarding the belief that the Prophet Muḥammad had the ability to restore the whole divine message. He moreover did not accept the idea that Ezra re-wrote the Scriptures as they originally had been. He even went further to argue that it was not true that Ezra wrote the Torah on the basis of divine revelation to him. Riḍā held a view in this regard similar to many of early Muslim exegetes (such as Ibn Kathīr, al-Qurṭūbī, al-Ṭabarī) and polemicists. In his al-ʿAjwiba al-Fākhira (The Unique Replies), the Egyptian jurist Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qarāfī (d. 684 AH/1285 AD), for instance, maintained that Nebuchadnezar murdered the Jews and burnt the Torah. Ezra had collected it many years later. One could not be sure about its authenticity, since it might have contained lots of najasāt (impurities).86 In that regard Riḍā cited chapter seven of the Book of Ezra in which it was stated that Ezra had ‘set his heart to study the law of the Lord’ as a result of a letter given to him (Ezra 7:10-12). Riḍā interpreted this Biblical passage as meaning that Ezra was merely one of the scribes of the revealed law, just as any scribe of the revelation during the early age of Islam: ‘If we [Muslims] assume that the Qurʾān was lost, and was never preserved by heart, and then say that Muʿāwiya was inspired to write it only because he was one of the scribes—would the People of the Book accept this argument from us?’87
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4.3. The Glad Tidings of Peace

4.3.1. Muḥammad’s Superiority above all Prophets?

When the Egyptian missionary magazine Bashāʾir al-Salām (The Glad Tidings of Peace) praised the Israelites as ‘the blessed family tree,’ Riḍā portrayed its editor as someone ‘swimming in the sea of illusions.’⁸⁸ In its own words, the Glad Tidings said that: ‘is it not amazing that the Creator of the heavens and the earth was alone with the Children of Israel in the wilderness, where He addressed them and they addressed him [...]. Moses amongst them was in deep conversation with Him, addressing various topics, just as two intimate companions or close friends.’⁸⁹ The writer addressed his Muslim readers saying that the Prophet of Islam did not deserve to talk to God directly, listen to His voice, nor witness His majesty the same as the general folk of the Israelites did, let alone the elite among them. Neither had Muḥammad had the privilege of speaking to Gabriel. He was rather overcome with the feeling of fainting and trance, and by sweat appearing on his forehead on a day of severe cold.⁹⁰

Riḍā considered this argument as a severe sacrilege against the divine. For him, Muslims reported that their Prophet ascended to the Heaven and witnessed some of ‘the greatest miracles of God’ during his journey by night (al-Miʿrāj). He also saw God and talked to Him without intermediary. Riḍā rejected the writer’s view concerning Moses. According to the Book of Exodus, Moses and those among the Children of Israel saw lightning and heard thundering, the noise of a trumpet, and the mountain smoking (Ex. 20:18). The Israelites ‘said unto Moses, speak thou with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we would die’ (20:19). These passages, in Riḍā’s opinion, disproved the author’s statement that the laymen of the Children of Israel were talking to God directly and heard His voice. In his comparison between the two cases of ruʿyah (vision), Riḍā relied on the Qurʾānic narratives. In the case of Moses, he ‘fell down senseless’ (al-ʿAʿrāf, 7:143), while Muḥammad ‘saw one of the greatest signs of his Lord.’ (al-Najm, 53: 18).⁹¹ Riḍā stressed that the Israelites, who were honoured and dignified by God, became rebellious.
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and ungrateful to Him later. They also deserved ‘aversion’ and ‘loathing,’ and were deprived of God’s favour and mercy. The Arabs were given a ‘blessing’ through the removal of paganism. Riḍā found it strange that the writer quoted Qur’ānic verses to prove God’s blessing on the Israelites, while ignoring the verses manifesting their rebellion and disbelief.92

On another level, Riḍā went on to discuss his theological attitude towards anthropomorphism as contrasted with Biblical concepts. For Muslims, he argued, their fundamental basis of belief was the absolute dissociation from any resemblance between God and the created beings. Any Qur’ānic passage that might indicate anthropomorphism should be subjected to metaphorical interpretation. In comparison to the ‘anthropomorphism’ and ‘paganism’ of other religions, Riḍā maintained that Muslims believed that God is far above having [a] voice, place or direction, and that all of His attributes in the Qur’ān are merely a form of divine proclamation. Riḍā reproached the writer of the *Glad Tidings* for saying that God was in deep conversation with Moses as an intimate friend: ‘It is no surprise that those who say that Jesus is a god would say that God met alone with Moses, addressing various topics in His conversation with him.’93

Like contemporary Muslim periodicals, missionary papers had a separate section in which they used to answer the questions of their readers. These queries dealt mostly with theological issues, and were sometimes raised by Muslim readers. A Muslim ‘friend’ and reader of his journal, for instance, once raised the question to the *Glad Tidings*: Can we consider Peter, Paul, John and other New Testament authors as messengers of God? Is there any prophecy on their message in the Old Testament, just as that on the coming of Jesus?94 Riḍā was certain that the question was invented, and could not be asked by a faithful Muslim. Muslims believed that messengers were those who received the revelation of an independent religion, and were commanded to preach it. Muslims never used the word ‘prophecy’ to mean ‘glad tidings.’ Riḍā was thus convinced that such a question was fabricated by the magazine in order to give a false impression and to delude their readers, or it was sent in by a ‘cultural’ Muslim who had nothing to do with Islam, except his name [...], nationality

92 Ibid.
94 Ibid., pp. 623-624.
Another query was raised by another ‘friend’: Why is it only Christians who are constantly involved in sending out missionaries from the first appearance of Christianity until the present day? The editor of the Glad Tidings answered: ‘because Christianity is verily the guidance, and so far as guidance is in one’s heart, he cannot restrain himself and conceal it from his fellow human beings.’ In his reaction, Riḍā repeated his aforementioned point of view that no religion was established without mission (see, chapter 3). However, he added that ‘the true Da’wa was that of the disciples of Jesus, which was based on their strong faith; nevertheless, few joined them whereas the Islamic Da’wa continued to gain millions: as soon as a Muslim trader entered an Asian or African city, it would convert to Islam immediately.’ It was only the European supremacy, Riḍā went on, that made missionaries ‘loudly speak and write.’ The true answer, which the Christian writer should have given, was that ‘the Christians preached their religion because politics motivated them, while they were [always] followed by money and protected by weapons.’

4.3.2. Fear and Hope

In another article, the Glad Tidings asserted that ‘many Muslims die on the carpet of hope to enter Paradise and enjoy its pleasures as based on the magnificent promises in their Qurʾān […] The only reason for that is nothing but their ignorance of the reality of themselves and the perfections of the Almighty.’ It further argued that Muslims of knowledge and mental faculties seek relief from the burden of their sins through extravagant asceticism, devotion, supplication, and prayers to God. The magazine reckoned among these the fearfulness expressed by the Companions of the Prophet, such as Abū Bakr and ʿAlī. The Glad Tidings suggested that ‘if these Companions had known and believed in the doctrine of Salvation, they would have lived safe from God’s stratagem and punishment.’

Riḍā harshly criticised the writer’s knowledge of Islam. According to him, the missionary writer incorrectly included the Ḥadīth scholar Sufyān al-Thawrī as one of the Companions. He was infuriated by
what he considered as ‘offenses’ against the Companions and rightly-guided Muslim Imams. He furthermore asserted that Muslims have a higher esteem of the prophets than the Jews and the Christians who portrayed them as cruel, unjust, drunk, and committing adultery or murder. Riḍā was convinced that if a Muslim were required to believe in the collection of the books of the Old Testament, and his religion permitted him to elevate anyone above prophets, he would give his preference to those rightly-guided Imams above the prophets as described by the Torah.100

Concerning the concepts of ‘fear’ and ‘hope,’ Riḍā believed that they represent the basis of the true religion. In his view, the author disparaged the Islamic perception with regard to these two concepts only in order to attract people to his religion. He indirectly tried to promote the doctrine that salvation and the eternal life in the Kingdom would be solely obtainable through the belief that God would save people through becoming incarnate in a human body.101 Riḍā extended his above-mentioned argument by stipulating that the Christian message encourages people to be more libertine through murder, committing adultery, getting drunk, and be a source of ruin to creation while being convinced that they would be saved by means of this doctrine. He also criticised the writer for ignoring the fact that his own Scriptures were not devoid of passages referring to Biblical prophets and saints, who were also fearful to God and hopeful for His blessings.102 Riḍā made it clear, however, that many ‘fair-minded’ Christians held the same view as Muslims in their belief that all prophets and upright believers adhered to absolute monotheism. Their fear of God was to keep them apart from sins and evil, while their hope was to stimulate them to do right.103 In conclusion, Riḍā reminded his missionary opponent of the various examples of fear mentioned by al-Ghazālī, such as fear of revoking repentance, and the incapacity to fulfil obligation.104

100 Ibid., p. 99.
101 Ibid., pp. 99-100.
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103 Ibid., pp. 100-101.
4.3.3. Faith and Acts of Muslims

Under the title, ‘ʾImān al-Muslimīn wā Aʿmāluhum (Faith and Acts of Muslims), the Glad Tidings wrote that ‘it is possible according the school of Ahl al-Sunna that one could truly believe in Islam, while persisting in evil action.’ 105 Citing various Biblical verses, the writer raised two points of objection to Islam: 1) Islam was a false and valueless faith, as it did not impress the sense of repentance and good endeavour upon the mind of the believer, while abandoning him when his sins outweigh his good acts. It also denigrated the majesty of the Creator and amplified the misery of the created. 2) The Muhammadan religion was also incapable of bringing complete salvation for humankind. 106

In his reply, Riḍā maintained that his ‘disputant’ did not perceive that his own argument could turn against him. He reiterated that the New Testament is the only way of redemption and that inheriting the Kingdom could be only achieved by the belief in Jesus, even when the believer was an evildoer or libertine. He also pointed out that faith was closely associated with good deeds in 75 Qurʾānic verses.107 Riḍā argued that Islam stipulated that faith should produce sound deeds, while acts had no value in Christianity. But it was the missionary ‘net’ with which the magazine attempted to ‘catch’ ignorant Muslims into accepting Christianity through his allegations against Islam. At the same time, however, he completely forgot that preaching that salvation was confined to the doctrines of Trinity and Crucifixion only would never motivate its followers to do good and avoid evil. The ‘ignorant’ would therefore be deluded by the missionary argument, and be more inclined to choose the faith which does not burden him with additional religious duties.108

Riḍā agreed with the statement of the Glad Tidings that any faith that does not aim at perfection and piety is false. Its writer, however, criticised the concept of punishment according to some Muslim traditions that sinful Muslims will be ‘imprisoned in the Hellfire for a period not less than seven hundred years and not more than seven thousand years.’ 109 Riḍā rejected his opponent’s assertion that such

106 Ibid.
107 Riḍā cited Qurʾānic verses such as, 4:123-124, 8: 2-4, and 103:1-3.
109 As quoted in ibid.
reports are neither mentioned in the Qurʾān nor in sound Ḥadīths. They were only related in some unsound and unacceptable Ḥadīths of no binding proofs. Riḍā followed ‘Abduh’s view that the affairs related to the Day of Judgement should be taken directly from the Qurʾān and the mutawātīr Ḥadīths. To make the point clear, the Glad Tidings quoted the Qurʾānic verse: ‘There is not one of you but shall approach [hell] (Maryam, 19:71).’ Riḍā interpreted the verse as not addressing Muslims. According to one exegetical view, the verse, in connection with the whole context of previous passages, was meant to address the unbelievers. Another view indicated that it generally referred to all people (believers and unbelievers). But believers will quickly pass alongside the Hellfire in order to appreciate God’s blessing when they finally enter the Paradise.  

4.3.4. Absurd Treatment

The Glad Tidings also attacked Islamic doctrines and practices as inferior to the Jāhiliyya Arab pagan society. It saw that Islam added six new elements of paganism to its pagan characteristics, which Riḍā considered as an absurd treatment.  

First of all, Muslims hold Muḥammad in the second place after God in the formula of shahāda, which they claim to be written on the Throne of God even before the Creation. Riḍā explained the general Muslim point of view that the Muslim must believe in the prophethood of Moses and Jesus, just as his belief in the prophethood of Muḥammad. As for the connection of the two names of Allah and Muḥammad in the shahāda, it had been narrated in some Traditions to the Muslim requesting utter the word ‘ʿabduhu (his servant) in the formula. The shahāda’s being written on the Throne, in Riḍā’s mind, was not one of the essential doctrines of Islam. ‘And if the formula was really written down there, this would imply no form of paganism, since ‘the servant remains servant, and the lord remains lord.’  

The Glad Tidings alleged that Muslims raise the status of the Ḥadīth to the Qurʾān, and for this reason the Sunnīs became angered by the Shiʿī rejection of Ḥadīth. Riḍā considered both claims as false. The
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Qurʾān was the fundamental basis of religion, while the Sunna was giving additional clarity. The Muslim is fully requested to believe in the Qurʾān and recite it in his worship. But disbelief in any one of the Ḥadiths will not harm his faith as a Muslim. Riḍā further explained that the Muslim is not obliged to follow the Ḥadiths related to worldly affairs (dunya), such as the one on cultivating the palm-tree. Muslims, he went on, can distinguish between the Qurʾān, as a direct revelation, and the indirect revelation, which the Prophet was reported to have uttered in his own words.

The missionary magazine, on the other hand, pointed out that the name of Muḥammad was connected with the name of Allah in many places in the Qurʾān as an associate in matters such as command and prohibition, and the obligation of obedience and love. It also maintained that Muslims take him as their master and intercessor. Taking a created being as an intercessor was identical to pre-Islamic Arab polytheism. The writer defended himself as a non-polytheist. Christians believe in Jesus as the eternal word of God, and as the creator, not the created. Muslims, on the other hand, are polytheists, since they know perfectly well the status of their prophet as a human being, while insisting on having him as an intercessor.113 In the Qurʾān it is also stated that God and the angels perform ṣalāḥ (prayer) over the Prophet (33:56). But Muslims exaggerate in their perception of his pre-existence to the degree that they state that he was eternal light and pre-existing to humanity. Riḍā replied that the Prophet of Islam was nowhere in the Qurʾān or in the Sunna described as master. Riḍā criticised the writer for his misunderstanding of the verse. Muslim scholars interpreted the ṣalāḥ as ‘mercy and compassion.’ For Riḍā, the magazine’s assumption was not logical: ‘were every individual from whom we ask mercy and anybody or whom we call ‘master’ would be like a god of ours? Then we and the writer would have uncountable deities.’114 Riḍā expressed a puritan view by stating that the exaggeration in honouring the Prophet in that way ensued from the books and narratives of mawālid, and the faith of the common folk. In his reply, Riḍā added that the concept of intercession (shafāʿa) in Islam merely meant ‘supplication.’ In that sense, every Muslim was an intercessor, and similarly every believer summoning upon God for himself and others. The comparison between Jesus and Muḥammad

113 Ibid., p. 520.
114 Ibid., p. 519.
in this manner was, in Riḍā’s view, absurd. He said cynically: ‘it means that polytheism is the Muslim belief in their prophet as God’s servant and his intercession as supplication to God, while the pure monotheism is the Christian belief that their prophet, who was born 1902 years ago, is God, the Pre-existent, the Eternal, the Creator of all things before and after him.’

4.3.5. Exceeding the Borders of Politeness

We have mentioned that Riḍā did not include all articles under the section of *Shubuhāt in al-Manār* in his later compiled treatise, which Wood has translated. In this part, two of these articles were written as replies to the *Glad Tidings*, which clearly display his increasing frustration with what he called ‘exceeding the borders of politeness’ within these missionary circles. Riḍā was shocked by what he saw as anti-Islamic views uttered by its newly-appointed editor-in-chief, Niqūlā effendi Rafāʾil (or Raphael), whom he formerly knew as a ‘decent’ person.

In the *Glad Tidings*, Rafāʾil published one of his debates with a Muslim at the Protestant library in the city of Suez. The Muslim objected to the doctrine of the Crucifixion of Jesus using Qurʾānic verses. But Rafāʾil asked his Muslim adversary whether he would believe in the Crucifixion if he were a contemporary to Jesus, and personally witnessed it. The Muslim replied in the affirmative that he would have definitely believed in it just as other observers did. Then Rafāʾil argued that it was more reasonable to believe in an incident as an eye-witness than to have faith in the story as had been told by an illiterate man in Mecca nearly seven hundred years later. The Muslim’s reply was challenging, saying that he would definitely believe in the illiterate man, who was proven to be a messenger of God, while rejecting his eyesight and that of other people as well. Rafāʾil re-contended that Muḥammad’s words might have been the teachings of the Satan, but not of God. The great miracles achieved by
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Muḥammad were again enough evidence for the Muslim to believe in the divine origin of his prophet’s message. Rafāʾil, however, contested that while the Qurʾān rejected the reality of Crucifixion, the Holy Scriptures and their historical narratives, the majority of the people still believed in it. According to Rafāʾil, the Muslim, unable to reply, was defeated by this argument and left the place. Rafāʾil added that the Qurʾānic view on the Crucifixion was quoted from the belief of al-Dustiyūn (Docetics) that the physical body of Jesus was an illusion, as was his Crucifixion. Jesus was in reality incorporeal, and he only seemed to have a physical body and could not physically die. Rafāʾil argued that Muḥammad had copied their belief in the Qurʾān (4:156) that the Jews: ‘did not kill him, and they did not crucify him, but a similitude was made for them.’

Riḍā had not expected that Rafāʾil would attack Islam in this manner. In Riḍā’s evaluation, Rafāʾil’s Muslim counterpart was definitely a common person who lacked deep religious knowledge; and the missionary must also have exaggerated his story by adding or deliberately perverting the words of his partner in the dialogue. Riḍā even doubted the Muslim’s replies as real. He did not imagine that the faithful Muslim, who was confused by this argument, would leave such a debate without giving any convincing explanation of the Qurʾānic report concerning Crucifixion. Riḍā was convinced that the story of Crucifixion had become a controversial issue among the Christians themselves. For the first time, Riḍā’s mentioned the Gospel of Barnabas, which he described as one of the Gospels in which there was no mention of the story, even though the Christians tried to destroy it.

Regarding the miracles achieved by the Prophet Muḥammad, Riḍā held the classical point of view that the Qurʾān was his most significant miracle. He drew an analogy between the prophet and the author of many valuable medical books, who also proved to be a clever physician after many successful and useful treatments. The performance of miracles was never his evidence to be a good doctor. Muslims similarly believed that the prophet was enabled to perform many miraculous acts, but because they were less important than his mission he never made them the cornerstone of his mission. The prophet,

\[117\] Ibid., pp. 63-64. It was the argument of many Western scholars that the Docetic views of Jesus looked like the Qurʾānic concept of non-Crucifixion. See, for instance, H. Gregoire, Mahomet et le monophysisme, in Mêlanges Charles Diehl, Paris 1930, pp. 107-119.

\[118\] Ibid., p. 65.
on the other hand, ‘came to address minds, to support science, to explain reasoning, and to abolish witchcraft [...] and swindling by encouraging man to promote himself through knowledge and work.’

Rafâ’il’s assertion that Islam was copied from Docetism was, in Riḍâ’s opinion, baseless. He argued that when missionaries objected to a Qur’ânic story related to a prophet or a nation known to them, they would immediately claim that Muḥammad plagiarised it from such-and-such false or heretical sects. But if their Scriptures gave no mention to a story mentioned in the Qur’ân, they would draw the conclusion that it had not been revealed. In plain words, Riḍâ confirmed that the Prophet of Islam never learnt thoughts of other nations, and had no knowledge of languages other than Arabic.

In conclusion, Riḍâ asked his Christian compatriots to understand that he never intended to start attacking Christianity. But it was his duty as a scholar to defend his religion against any attacks and offenses. Missionaries, according to him, were not seeking the truth. He also demanded fair-minded Christians not to blame him. They should help him to bring the missionary attacks to an end.

According to al-Manâr, the editor(s) of the Glad Tidings soon dismissed Rafâ’il. He also failed to find any other job as a journalist. Therefore he started to publish his own missionary publications, and toured Egyptian towns and villages to preach Christianity among Muslims. He sent Riḍâ a letter with copies of his publications. In his letter, he wrote: ‘Because I noticed that your magnificent journal is zealous in defending Islam, I am sending this letter to you in order that you would reply to it according to your knowledge, and publish the reply in your journal. And if you were not able to give reply due to its solid evidences, I would earnestly request you to pay it some of your attention.’ Riḍâ refused to give any answer, as it was logical for him that he only aimed at using al-Manâr as a channel for making publicity for his writings. Riḍâ furthermore disqualified Rafâ’il’s ‘evidences’ as ‘childish fantasies.’
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4.4. The Standard of Zion

4.4.1. Sinlessness of Prophets and Salvation

Ridā received the missionary periodical *Rāyat Ṣuhyūn* (The Standard of Zion) with the editor’s request: ‘I request a reading of the article on the sinning of prophets and a reply to it.’ The article maintained that ‘Muslims say that God sent many prophets to the world. The greatest among them were six: Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad. Many [Muslims] say that all of these prophets were sinless, and therefore were competent to grant salvation to their followers. If they had been sinners, it would have never been easy for them to do that, since the sinner can not grant his salvation from the sin to others.’ On the basis of stories from the Old Testament, the *Standard* argued that all these prophets, except Jesus, were sinners. Examples of these were Adam’s disobedience to God and Noah’s getting drunk. As for Abraham, it was reported that he ‘lied twice because of his fear of the people.’ Moses was commanded by God to go to the Pharaoh, but he showed great fear and increasing timidity, which would make God angry with him. When the Children of Israel were in the wilderness after their exodus from Egypt, Moses uttered incoherent words. God, due to this sin, forbade him to return to the land Canaan, and ordained him to die in the desert. In the Qurʾān, the *Standard* went on, it was also stated that all of them asked God’s forgiveness, except Jesus. This was exactly the same line of argument in the missionary writings of the late nineteenth century. The American missionary E.M. Wherry (1843-1927), for example, addressed the moral excellence of the Old Testament major prophets and Muḥammad. He further concluded that ‘we nowhere find a single sentence or word, or even a shadow of a hint that Jesus was a sinner.’

In his answer, Ridā firstly explained that the author was incorrect in counting Adam among the five prophets of resolve (*ʿulū al-ʿAzm*)
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from an Islamic point of view. Muslims do not believe that due to their infallibility prophets would be their saviors; they were only sent as preachers. It is only one’s faith and good deeds that can save a person. Riḍā ridiculed the writer by stating that he did not understand the notion of infallibility (ʿiṣma) attributed to prophets according to Islam. Their infallibility merely means that they never committed any kabīra (grave sin), and does not signify that they were different from all human beings, or that they never experienced pain and fear. As for the author’s statement that wine-drinking was the only sin Noah committed, Riḍā stressed that in the New Testament it is related that Jesus drank wine as well. As Jesus committed the same ‘sin,’ he would not have had the ability to save the people either. Riḍā interpreted the tale of Abraham’s sinning by lying in an allegorical way. He intended to protect his wife by saying: ‘she is my sister,’ which meant ‘in religion.’ He hid the truth only out of necessity in order to get rid of evil and injustice by protecting his wife against slavery or capture. Neither did Riḍā accept the idea that the fear expressed by Moses should be a sin or violation of the law. It was his human feeling of fearfulness and of the sublimity of his divine mission. It was also not appropriate, according to Riḍā, to consider the prophets seeking forgiveness as a mark of rebellion or violation of God’s religion. It was only their perception of glorifying Him.

4.5. Conclusion

In the above-mentioned articles, we have shown that Riḍā discussed both Judeo-Christian and Muslim Scriptures on the basis of classical and modern interpretations. Riḍā’s usage of Western sources in this
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128 The messengers of ‘ulā-al-ʿAzm in Islam were five: Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad. The prophet Muḥammad was asked to ‘bear up [hardships] as did the apostles endowed with resolve bear up with patience’ (Al-Aḥqāf: 35). They were called as such because they were resolve and arduous in facing the immense trial of their people.

129 In his polemics with Samuel Ibn Nagrela, Ibn Hazm made it clear that the text of Genesis 20:12 on the tale specifically defined ‘sister’ in words attributed to Abraham himself, as ‘daughter of my father.’ The only way in which Abraham’s marriage to his sister could be defended, Ibn Hazm said, would be by appeal to the Islamic principle of abrogation. See, Theodore Pulcini, Exegesis as Polemical Discourse: Ibn Hazm on Jewish and Christian Scriptures, Atlanta: Scholars Press 1998, p. 60.

specific period was not entirely absent. It is interesting to see that he quoted the Western critical study of the Bible from a work of fiction, such as ʿAlam al-Dīn, and quoted the statements of a Christian convert to Islam.

Riḍā found the Egyptian magazine, Glad Tidings of Peace, the most outspoken among the Christian missionary publications in its enmity towards Islam. All of these missionary publications reflected the general thesis that Islam was at many levels inherently inferior and irrational as compared to Christianity. Specific criticisms included the following: the Qurʾān was inconsistent and inharmonious; and Muḥammad was inferior to Moses and Jesus and therefore not a real prophet. Therefore, Muslims did not properly adhere to their Scriptures, which strongly commanded them to believe in the Bible. In his answer, Riḍā’s supposedly abstract comparison of Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad was not entirely based on Islamic sources. He went beyond these sources by restricting his arguments to some descriptive analysis of the characters of the two prophets in comparison to Muḥammad. In the case of Moses, it was his upbringing under the custody of the Pharaoh, which made him a diligent and proud person. Jesus was portrayed as a Jewish man, who was much influenced by the Roman and the Greek way of life.

In his answer, Riḍā was in the ‘defensive arena,’ and his main objective was to refute the ‘allegations’ of the missionaries as much as he could. He was anxious that they would definitely affect the common Muslims who had no solid knowledge. Besides his critique of the textual authenticity of the Bible, Riḍā cynically attacked its content and the current interpretation of its message. The teachings of the canonical gospels were, for example, excessive in love and power in contrast to the Qurʾānic concept of moderation. He frequently attacked his Christian counterparts for their implicit propagation of ‘evildoing’ and of libertine behaviour among their followers through their confirmation that the only way of redemption was to believe in Jesus, whatever sins they might commit in their life. In comparison to that, he further argued, Islam required of the believers that faith should produce sound deeds.

Ridā’s Arabic edition of the Gospel of Barnabas should be seen as a continuation of a long-enduring Islamic search for a Biblical witness congruent with Islamic tenets of belief. Throughout history it has been a common phenomenon that Muslims maintained that the apostleship of Muḥammad had been foretold in Bible. On the basis of al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya of Ibn Ishāq and his citation from the Gospels (Anājīl), Alfred Guillaume tried to make a first reconstruction of the text of the Gospels, which was known in Medina in the early 8th century.¹ In a pioneering work, Tarif Khalidi collected the Arabic Islamic lore on the figure of Jesus.²

Muslim polemicists sometimes used apocryphal books, which fitted well with their arguments on the main trends of the Islamic tradition regarding Christianity. O. Krarup and L. Cheikho published fragments of Islamicised Davidic Psalters.³ In order to prove that not Jesus, but another man was crucified, the Muʿtazilī theologian and chief Judge ʿAbd al-Jabbar (935-1025), for example, quoted a few passages from an unknown apocryphal Gospel containing the story of the passion, alongside the canonical Gospels. Another unidentified apocryphal Gospel is quoted in the Refutation of the Christians by ʿAlī b. Rabbān al-Ṭabarī, a medieval Nestorian physician who converted to Islam.⁴

² Khalidi, op. cit.
Much has been written about the controversial apocryphal Gospel attributed to Barnabas, whose Italian manuscript was discovered in the eighteenth century in Amsterdam. A number of these studies have argued that this anonymous Gospel was the work of Moriscos in Spain. G.A. Wiegers has recently made a link between the Gospel and the so-called Lead Books by arguing that it was an Islamically inspired work and a pseudo-epigraphic piece of anti-Christian polemics in the form of a gospel. He argued that the authorship of the Gospel would fit in the profile of a Morisco scholar and physician under the name of Alonso de Luna, who knew Latin, Arabic, Spanish and Italian, the languages used in the oldest manuscripts of the gospel.

The Gospel of Barnabas reached the Muslim world for the first time through al-Qairanawi’s polemical work Iẓhār al-Ḥaqq. He had derived his information from George Sale’s Introduction to the Qurʾān (1734), who had known of a version of the Gospel in Spanish. But the Gospel gained much more diffusion among Muslims after Ridā’s publication of the Arabic text. As soon as he had received a complimentary copy of the Raggs’ bilingual Italian-English edition from the Clarendon Press in Oxford, Ridā spoke with Khalil Sa’deh, who immediately approached the editors for permission to translate their work into Arabic.
In her study of this Gospel, Christine Schirrmacher is not precise when she remarked: ‘Auf dem Deckblatt der arabischen Edition hat der Herausgeber zwei Seiten des italienischen Manuskripts in Faksimile reproduziert und die arabische Edition mit dem Titel ‘al-ingil as-sahih’ versehen, woraus Rashīd Riḍā’s Anspruch, hiermit das ‘wahre Evangelium’ vorzulegen, bereits deutlich wird.’9 Although Riḍā’s main interest in the Gospel emanated from the fact that it echoed the Qur’ānic image of Jesus and his servanthood to God, he did not mention the word ‘ṣaḥīḥ’ on the cover of his Arabic edition. He presented it merely as a literal Arabic translation of the English (and original Italian) text as appearing on the cover: ‘True Gospel of Jesus, called Christ, a new prophet sent by God to the world: according to the description of Barnabas his apostle.’10

The present chapter does not argue that Riḍā was convinced that the Gospel of Barnabas was a forgery. Neither does it claim that Riḍā was not in search for any newly discovered materials that would support his conviction of the corruption of the Scriptures, especially in his anti-missionary writings. It only tries to study what kind of change might have occurred in Riḍā’s thoughts by looking at his introduction and the later use by al-Manār of the Gospel. Firstly an attempt is made to study Riḍā’s earlier initiative of using the Gospel of the Russian philosopher Tolstoy. Secondly, I will discuss Sa‘ādeh’s participation in freemasonry, linking that to his translation of the Gospel. Then we shall move to study his perception of the Gospel as a historical piece of work through a critical reconsideration of his introduction. Finally and most relevant to the whole study we shall reconsider what motivated Riḍā to publish the Gospel on the basis of his introduction, and his later use of the Gospel in his journal and Tafsīr work.

5.1. Championing Tolstoy’s Gospel

According to al-Manār itself, Riḍā was apparently in search of a ‘true gospel of Christ’ that would confirm the message of Islam. As has been noted earlier, before knowing of the Raggs’ edition, Riḍā referred to the Gospel for the first time in 1903 in his reply to the Glad Tidings in the work of the Shubuhāt. There he wrote: ‘The Christians
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themselves do not deny that a dispute took place about the Crucifixion; and that there were some Gospels excluded by the synods centuries after Jesus, which denied the Crucifixion, such as the Gospel of Barnabas, which still exists despite the attempts of Christians to ‘obliterate’ it, just as other Gospels which they had already obliterated.' It is clear from this quoted passage that Riḍā at that moment knew about the existence of the Gospel of Barnabas (probably from al-Qairanāwī’s Izhār al-Ḥaqq). A few pages later in the same issue of al-Manār, Riḍā, in one of his fatwās, referred to a certain Gospel ‘in the Ḥimyarī script’ which was said to be in the Papal Library in the Vatican (discussed below).12

In the same year, Riḍā published parts of an Arabic text of the Gospels according to the Russian writer and philosopher Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910), which had been published in 1879.13 We have already said that Riḍā was aware of the excommunication of Tolstoy from the Russian Orthodox Church because of his religious ideas (see, chapter 4). One of Tolstoy’s contributions was his composition of what he saw as a ‘corrected’ version of the four Gospels. In his collection, he unified them into one account, excluding the reports on Christ’s birth and genealogy, his miracles (such as his walking on the lake, and the healing of the sick), his mother’s flight with him to Egypt, and the references to prophecies fulfilled by his life. He also left out most of the material about the birth of John the Baptist, his imprisonment and death. For Tolstoy, ‘to believe in Christ as God is to reject God.’14 It is interesting to know that many of Tolstoy’s works were available in Arabic for readers in Egypt. ‘Abduh was fascinated by his ideas, believing that he ‘cast a glance on religion which has

11 Al-Manār, vol. 6/2, p. 64
12 Ibid., p. 67
14 As quoted in Patterson, op. cit., p. xvii.
dispelled the illusions of distorted traditions, and by this glance he has arrived at the fundamental truth of divine Unity."\textsuperscript{15}

Following ʿAbduh’s steps, Riḍā championed Tolstoy, and frequently praised his thoughts and writings in \textit{al-Manār}.\textsuperscript{16} In three successive articles, he published Tolstoy’s own introduction to his Gospels in Arabic under the caption “The True Gospel: Introduction of the Russian philosopher Tolstoy known as “the Gospels,””\textsuperscript{17} which was prepared for \textit{al-Manār} in a translation from French. Riḍā praised this ‘true Gospel’ as the result of freedom in religious research, which the Protestant thinking revived in Europe. Riḍā reckoned Tolstoy as one of the Western scholars, who sifted out the teachings of the Bible, and liberated his thoughts from the dogmas prescribed by the Church. Typical of Riḍā’s views was that the conclusions reached by those free-minded scholars in that regard came closer to the Qur’ānic perceptions regarding the corruption of the Gospels. Riḍā moreover deemed their views to be a substantial proof of the truth of Islam.\textsuperscript{18}

Riḍā agreed with Tolstoy in his distrust of the four canonical Gospels. He further argued that these Gospels clearly indicated that Jesus’ followers in his age were ‘\textit{Awāmm Jāhilūn} (ignorant laymen). After his death they became dispersed and persecuted by the Jews and Romans until Constantine had adopted Christianity. When the Christian religion had acquired its authority, there emerged synods to collect all written religious material. A multitude of Gospels was collected from which these four were authorised, and which only contained some of Christ’s historical records and transmitted sermons.\textsuperscript{19} But Riḍā did not take all of Tolstoy’s arguments for granted as they contained many things contrary to the Islamic narratives on the life of Jesus, especially his denial of Jesus’ miracles. However, he

\textsuperscript{15} Letter ʿAbduh to Tolstoy, 8 April 1904; as quoted in the English translation in the diaries of Abdūh’s friend Blunt, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 455-456.

\textsuperscript{16} His works were translated by Salīm effendi Qabīn. These translations were also available for sale at Riḍā’s bookshop. See, for example, \textit{al-Manār}’s reviews of some of these works, vol. 5/24 (March 1903), p. 952; vol. 6/11 (August 1903), p. 427; vol. 7/23 (February 1905), p. 915; vol. 9/12 (January 1907), p. 946; vol. 10/4 (June 1907), p. 292; vol. 13/2 (March 1910), p. 131, vol. 16/1 (January 1913), p. 66.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Al-Manār}, ‘Al-Injīl al-Ṣahīh: Muqaddimat Kitāb al-Faylasūf al-Rūsī Tolstoy al-Ladhī Sammāhu al-Anājīl,’ vol. 6/4 (16 Ṣafar 1321/14 May 1903), pp. 131-137. See also other following parts in, vol. 6/6, pp. 226-232; vol. 6/7, pp. 259-265.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 131.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 131.
saw the work of Tolstoy as a very useful tool in contesting the missionary allegation that the Qurʾān bore testimony to the canonical Gospels as the real word of God, a point that he had also challenged in his Shubuhāt earlier.20

5.2. Announcing another ‘True’ Gospel?

In July 1907, al-Manār started to announce its publication of the Gospel of Barnabas by printing some Arabic samples of Saʿādeh’s translation.21 Riḍā also reminded his readers of his earlier publication of Tolstoy’s Gospel, and once again quoted a lengthy passage from Tolstoy’s introduction: ‘The reader should remember that these Gospels in their present form do not entirely contain the testimonies of the disciples of Jesus directly […], and the oldest copy that has come down to us from the fourth century was written in continuous script without punctuation, so that even after the fourth and fifth centuries they have been subject to very diverse interpretations, and there are not less than fifty thousand such variations of the Gospels.’22 In line with the Tolstoy Gospel, Riḍā announced the publication of the whole Arabic edition of the Gospel of Barnabas by his publishing house in 1908. On the cover of the al-Manār issue in which he announced this, Riḍā wrote clearly: ‘This Gospel is the narrative of Barnabas […] which he [himself] called the ‘true Gospel,’ and whose privilege over other circulated Gospels is that it confirms monotheism, denies Crucifixion, and gives elaborate prediction of our Prophet Muḥammad.’23 Riḍā’s insistence on publishing the Gospel in Arabic was due to its conformity with the form and structure of famous canonical Gospels on the one hand, and its agreement with many Islamic concepts on the other. A second objective was his intention to make this work available to Arab readers, just as the Westerners did in some of their languages.24 To promote the publication he quoted the passages from the Gospel, which agree with Islamic con-

---

20 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid., p. 386
cepts, among others that it was not Jesus who died on the Cross, but Judas instead.25

5.3. A Freemason

Saʿādeh’s relation with Riḍā and his journal has been described above (see chapter 2). Based on Saʿādeh’s testimony in his preface to the Arabic translation of the Gospel, it is obvious that he did not want to commit himself to the religious meaning of the text: ‘I feel obliged to stress that I have been committed in my introduction to follow my research from a historical and scientific point of view only. […] My translation is just to serve history. Therefore, I have avoided any religious discussions, which I leave for those who are more competent than I.’26

Saʿādeh was born a Christian, but held secularist beliefs. Previous studies on Saʿādeh’s role in the Arabic edition of the Gospel of Barnabas did not pay attention to his participation in Masonic activities, which can be considered as a justifiable interpretation for his cooperation with Riḍā in the translation work. His affiliation with the freemasons dates back to 1885, when he was a member of the lodge of Sulymān al-Mulūki during his four-year service as a medical advisor, and director of the English Hospital in Jerusalem. In this period, he became the secretary of the lodge, and later its president. According to Saʿādeh, the meetings of the freemasons took place at this time in a cave, which was discovered by the American consul in Jerusalem.27

Later in 1915, Saʿādeh described the discovery of the consul of this cave, and what he named their ‘historic meeting’ in it. While he was hunting rabbits, the consul discovered a small hole covered with trees. The cave (which they thought to be the Temple of Solomon) was very wide, and had big pillars and huge rocks. Saʿādeh wrote:

In this dark cave our impressive meeting was held. It was attended by many British and American MP’s. Police agents, who were freemasons

25 Al-Manār, vol. 10/12, pp. 947-948. On the cover of the Arabic edition it is mentioned that the Gospel was available at al-Manār Bookshop for the price of 15-20 piasters exclusive posting costs (2 piasters); and the introduction was to be sold for 10 piasters.
26 Khalīl Saʿādeh’s introduction to the Arabic translation, ‘Muqaddimat al-Mutarjim (the Translator’s introduction),’ p. 16.
27 Hamie, al-ʿAllāma, p. 54.
as well, guarded the entrance. The number of attendants was not less than 200 people, most of whom were of high status. […] In that dark cave, where nothing would spoil the spreading calmness, except the sound of water moving in the canal nearby, we had heard fascinating speeches. Some of them were the most beautiful I had ever heard in my life. The attendants sent a telegram of loyalty to King Edward VII, Prince de Galles and the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of England; and in whose name we shouted three times. […] We then went out, and took a picture in the front of the entrance of the cave beside our freemasonry logo. In this particular meeting, I was thinking of building a freemason lodge in Jerusalem, which I wished to be the Grand Lodge of the whole freemason world.28

Unlike Afghānī and ʿAbduh, there is no proof so far that Riḍā took part in freemason activities in Egypt or elsewhere.29 During his stay in Egypt, Saʿādeh must have been a member of its Grand Lodge. In 1905 he dedicated one of his translated novels to Idrīs Rāghib, the grand master of the lodge in Egypt.30 After his migration to Brazil, he remained active, and became the president of the freemason lodge Najmat Sūriyya (the Star of Syria) in Sao Paulo.31 Saʿādeh quitted in May 1926, when he became convinced that masonic teachings relating to liberty and the elimination of tyranny and despotism had no tangible results, and that the teachings of its rites were futile.32

One might consider Saʿādeh’s commitment to freemasonry as a clarification for his embarking on translating the Gospel, as part of his attitude towards the Holy Scriptures and religion in general. It would also suggest that he might have embraced the belief of the majority of freemasons that every scripture of faith or every religion is to be respected equally. The Baptist minister and Masonic author

---

28 As quoted in ibid., p. 55.
31 Schumann, op. cit., p. 606. The official language of al-Mulūkī lodge was English
Joseph Fort Newton (1880-1950) put it clearly: 'Whether it be the Gospel of the Christian, the Book of Law of the Hebrew, the Koran of the Mussulman, or the Vedas of the Hindu, it everywhere masonically symbolises the Will of God revealed to man.' In the same vein, one would venture to argue that Saʿādeh had no strong commitment to one religious scripture above another; and this would accordingly make sense that somebody like him would accept the task of making the translation of that Gospel.

5.3.1. Critical Analysis of Saʿādeh’s Preface

Saʿādeh was aware that scholars fundamentally differed around the historicity of the Gospel of Barnabas without reaching any satisfactory answer about its origin. Following the Raggs, he gave a detailed description of the Italian manuscript of the Gospel, which was first discovered in Amsterdam by J. F. Cramer, a Counselor of the King of Prussia. He also referred to the Spanish manuscript referred to by Sale that had been in the possession of Dr. Thomas Monkhouse of Oxford (d. 1793).

Saʿādeh was convinced that the Italian manuscript had been stolen from the Papal Library by the monk Fra Marino, who had by accident come across the Gospel of Barnabas in the library of Pope Sixtus V (1585-1590) among other scriptures, when the latter was asleep. The monk, who had managed to gain the Pope’s confidence, discovered the manuscript and hid it in his sleeves. Saʿādeh accepted the possibility that the existing Italian manuscript was the very manuscript found by Marino in the Pope’s library, arguing that by examining its water-mark researchers discovered that it was dated to the second half of the 16th century during Sixtus’ Papal office. He also added that its water-mark proved that it had been written on paper of clear Italian character on which there appears a picture of an ‘anchor in a circle.’ In this regard, Saʿādeh was selective, and did not elaborate on the point carefully. He actually accepted the description of M. Briquet, who had argued that its paper was ‘distinctively Italian.’

---

36 Ibid., p. 4.
which was also mentioned by the Raggs. But he left out other arguments which other scholars referred to, such as J. Toland, who described the paper as Turkish. 37 It should be added that L. Cirillo dated the water-mark of its paper to the second half of the sixteenth century. The binding of the manuscript was made of Turkish leather, decorated in the Ottoman style with a double gilt-edged frame and a central floral medallion on both covers. Although the main text was Italian, its lay-out showed that this manuscript was executed according to the Ottoman tradition. 38

Saʿādeh criticised the eighteenth-century European scholars who examined the Italian manuscript for their speculations in answering the question about the originality of the text, and whether it was the copy found by Marino or a later one. These scholars, in his view, had not paid attention to the Arabic sentences and phrases on the margin of the text, which could be the clue to answer the question. He also blamed the orientalist David Samuel Margoliouth (1858–1940) for not having dealt with the question in more details. Margoliouth maintained that ‘the Arabic glosses […] cannot have been composed by anyone whose native language was a form of Arabic.’ 39 He also pointed out that this fact had escaped the notice of Toland, as also of La Monnoye who had described the ‘citations arabes’ as ‘fort bien écrites.’ Denis, on the other hand, had not failed to observe its mistakes and archaic style. 40 In Saʿādeh’s mind, although some of the Arabic expressions on the margin had been composed correctly and were well-structured, they apparently had been modified by the scribe of the manuscript. Some other phrases were difficult to understand, while others were very archaic. This would mean that the scribe tried to translate them literally and in the ‘narrowest’ and ‘silliest’ sense. For example, he incorrectly structured the genitive case by putting the muḍāf ʾilayh (the second noun) in the place of the muḍāf (construct state) by saying: ‘there is no such an Arab [writer] who would make such a mistake under the sun.’ 41

Saʿādeh paraded some of these mistakes and reached the conclusion that these Arabic glosses had been written by more than one scribe. He concluded that the language of the original composer had been

37 Raggs, op. cit., p. xiv.  
39 Raggs, op. cit., p. xlix.  
41 Ibid., p. 5.
correct, but then a following copyist had tampered with it. His lack of command of Arabic had resulted in many changes, and he corrupted much of what the first scribe had already written down. The scribe added to them many "silly expressions, archaic styles and foreign elements producing no meaning [...] Therefore, the Italian copy found in [...] Vienna is not the original one and is undoubtedly taken from another copy."42

Regarding to the author of the Gospel, Saʿādeh literally quoted the Raggs’ views that the copying process had taken place in 1575 possibly by Fra Marino. He translated their words as follows: ‘Anyhow, we can surely say that the Italian book of Barnabas is original. It was done by somebody, whether a priest, secular, monk or layman, who had an amazing knowledge of the Latin Bible [...] And like Dante, he was particularly familiar with the Psalter. It was the work of somebody whose knowledge of the Christian Scriptures was exceeding his familiarity with the Islamic religious Scriptures. It was more probable; therefore, that he was a convert from Christianity.’43

There were congruent features between the Gospel and the famous ‘Divina Comedia’ by Dante in his description of hell, purgatory and paradise. These coincidences and quasi-coincidences in both accounts regarding the infernal torment were a good reason for some historians to relate the Gospel to the fourteenth century and to believe that its author was probably a contemporary with Dante. Saʿādeh, however, maintained that the descriptions of hell in the Gospel of Barnabas were reminiscent of those of Dante only in its numbering of its seven circles. He argued that it was more plausible to believe that both authors did not live in the same age. It was just a matter of Tawārud al-Khawāṭir (telepathy). It was also possible that both of them, in different ages, had quoted from an earlier work depending on Greek mythology.44

Saʿādeh’s hypothesis did not depend on any further historical elaboration or linguistic analysis of both works. The Raggs were more

42 Ibid., p. 6.
43 Ibid., p. 7. Compare the Raggs: ‘Thus much we may say with confidence. The Italian Barnabas is, to all intents and purposes, an original work. It is the work of one who, whether priest or layman, monk or secular, has remarkable knowledge of the Latin Bible—as remarkable, perhaps, as Dante’s—and like Dante, a special familiarity with the Psalter. It is the work of one whose knowledge of the Christian Scriptures is considerably in advance of his familiarity with the Scriptures of Islam: presumably, therefore, of a renegade from Christianity.’ Raggs, op. cit., pp. xliii-xliv.
44 Saʿādeh, op. cit., pp. 7-8.
systematic in their comparison between the Gospel of Barnabas and Dante. Although they pursued many examples of reminiscences and studied the ‘common atmosphere’ of both, they considered it a ‘superficially attractive theory.’ All those who studied the similitude between the Gospel and Dante at this time did not pay attention to another probability that Dante himself might have depended on Islamic sources. It was not until 1919 that the Spanish orientalist and Catholic priest Miguel Asín Palacios (1871-1944) compared the Muslim religious literature on the Prophet Muhammad’s Mi’rāj (ascension to Heaven) with Dante’s story describing a spiritual journey among the various inhabitants of the afterlife.

According to the Raggs, Western scholars in the eighteenth century were of the view that there ‘lurked an Arabic original.’ They also argued that this suggestion was made by Dr. White in 1784, who wrote that ‘the Arabic original still existed in the East.’ His statement was based on Sale’s statement that ‘the Muhammedans have also a Gospel in Arabic, attributed to St. Barnabas, wherein the history of Jesus Christ is related in a manner very different from what we find in the true Gospels, and correspondent to those traditions which Mohammed has followed in the Qurʾān.’ Sale had not seen the Gospel, but had based his statement on the information of La Monnoye, who had never seen an Arabic original either.

Sa’ādeh’s view in this respect is paradoxical. Having discussed the Arabic glosses, he at first concluded that it would be quite unfeasible that the original text was Arabic for many reasons. First of all, it was not possible that a translator with the ability to translate the Gospel from Arabic would have committed linguistic mistakes. Most of the
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48 As quoted in ibid., pp. xv-xvi.
49 Ibid.
expressions used in the text would suggest that the original was Latin or Italian. It is more probable therefore that the scribe was from Venice and that he had copied the manuscript from another Tuscan text or from a Venetian text mingled with Tuscan expressions.\(^{50}\) After having discussed the above-mentioned Western views on an Arabic original, Saʿādeh reached another conclusion:

Nevertheless [...] it should be declared that I am more inclined to believe in an Arabic original rather than any other [language]. [The fact] that it has never been found should not be taken as an argument that it has never existed. If not, it should be believed that the Italian was the original version because no other copy has been found except the aforementioned Spanish one, which was said to have been translated from an Italian version. The oriental reader would at first glance recognise that the writer of the Gospel of Barnabas had a wide knowledge of the Qurʾān to the degree that most of his phrases were almost literally or figuratively translated from Qurʾānic verses. I am saying this while being aware that I am opposing the majority of Western writers who immersed themselves in the matter.\(^{51}\)

Saʿādeh did not agree with the Raggs that the writer of the Gospel had little knowledge of Islam. For him, many stories mentioned in the Gospel corresponded with the Qurʾānic narratives.\(^{52}\) The Gospel of Barnabas also contained many statements, which could be traced in the Hadith-literature and ‘scientific mythologies’ which were only known to the Arabs. Saʿādeh digressed from his main subject with the sweeping statement that ‘although there are a large number of orientalists preoccupied by Arabic and the history of Islam, we do not find nowadays among Westerners those who are considered to be real scholars of Ḥadīth.’\(^{53}\)

Another proof for Saʿādeh’s assumption of an Arabic original was the style of binding of the Italian manuscript, which was, in his opinion, undoubtedly Arab. He furthermore disagreed with the view that it was the work of the Parisian binders brought by Prince Eugene of Savoy, as merely a presupposition.\(^{54}\) It was again the conclusion of the Raggs, who closely studied the manuscript: ‘the binding is, to all

\(^{50}\) Saʿādeh, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., p. 9.

\(^{52}\) He mentioned examples, such as the story of Abraham and his father (The Gospel of Barnabas, pp. 55-63) that resembles the Qurʾānic narratives (al-Anbiyā 21: 48-73 & al-Ṣaffāt 37: 83-101). Ibid., p. 9.

\(^{53}\) Ibid.

\(^{54}\) Ibid., pp. 9-10.
appearance, oriental. If it be the work of the Prince’s Parisian binders (as no doubt the outer case is), then it is an astonishingly faithful copy of an oriental model. They compared the style of binding of the manuscript of the Gospel to another document, of 1575, in the Archive of Venice; and also based their argument on that of Lady Mary Wortley-Montagué’s (1689-1762) remarks of 1717, that ‘the books were profusely bound in Turkey leather, and two of the most famous bookbinders of Paris were expressly sent to do this work.’

In Sa’ādeh’s mind, it was indifferent whether the writer of the Gospel was of Jewish or Christian origin. He was convinced in either case that he was a convert to Islam. Sa’ādeh bemoaned the loss of the Spanish manuscript and the fact that the scholars who had witnessed it had not studied it meticulously. He also stated that to speak of an Arabic original does not mean that the writer was of Arab origin. The most plausible argument, in his view, was that the writer of the Gospel was an Andalusian Jew who had converted to Islam, after he had been forced to adopt Christianity and had become very familiar with the Christian Scriptures. The writer’s remarkable knowledge of the Bible was hardly to be found among the Christians of this time, except among a small group of specialists. Sa’ādeh corroborated his premise with the fact that many Jews in Andalusia had an excellent command of Arabic to the extent that some had belonged to the class of poets and literati. The passage of the Gospel of Barnabas concerning the obligation of circumcision and the ‘hurting’ report that Jesus had said ‘a dog is better than an uncircumcised man’ (Chapter 22, p. 45) was, in Sa’ādeh’s eyes, another evidence that it had not been written by somebody of Christian origin. He again digressed from his subject by arguing that the Arabs had never tried to persecute people of other religious denominations in the beginning of their conquest of Andalusia. The fact that the Jews of Andalusia had converted to Islam in droves, and had sustained Muslims in conquering Spain and their

55 Raggs, op. cit., p. xiii.
56 Ibid., p. xiii (footnote).
57 Sa’ādeh, op. cit., p. 11. An eighteenth-century copy of the Spanish manuscript was discovered in the 1970s in the Fisher Library of the University of Sydney among the books of Sir Charles Nicholson, which was marked in English as ‘Transcribed from ms. in possession of the Rev. Mr. Edm. Callamy who bought it at the decease of Mr. George Sale and now gave me at the decease of Mr. John Nickolls, 1745.’ See, J.E. Fletcher, ‘The Spanish Gospel of Barnabas,’ Novum Testamentum 18/4, 1976, pp. 314-320. The manuscript has been published in L.F. Bernabe Pons, El Evangelio de San Bernabe; Un evangelio islamico espanol, Universidad de Alicante, 1995.
long-term establishment could also indicate, according to Saʿādeh, that the author of the Gospel was one of these converts.58

On another level, he wrote: 'This was one of the incentives, which spurred the people of Andalusia to yield to the Muslim authority [...], except in one thing, namely circumcision. At a certain point in time, however, they [Muslims] compelled the people to do it and issued a decree obligating the Christians to follow the tradition of circumcision, like Muslims and Jews. This was therefore one of reasons which made the Christians 'pounce' on them.'59

Saʿādeh changed to confirm that the writer of the Gospel was an Arab. Another reason for this was his treatment of the philosophy of Aristotle, which was widespread in Europe in the early Middle Ages. As this philosophy had reached Europe through the Arabs in Spain, it would confirm that its writer was an Arab, but not a Westerner.60

Saʿādeh did not accept the view that the milieu of the Gospel of Barnabas was Italian. This was the historical conclusion made by the Raggs maintaining that the style of the book and the atmosphere it breathed were occidental, more specifically medieval Italian. They mentioned many suggestive parallels between passages in the Gospel and the manners and customs of people in Italy. For example, its picturesque eulogy of the ‘bellezza’ of the summer season of fruits voiced an experience that was almost worldwide; and had familiar parallels in the Old Testament.61 The Raggs were of the view that vendemmia (Vintage in Tuscany) in the Gospel would give a ‘realistic description’ of the historical background in which the Gospel had been written. Its reference to the expert stone-quarriers62 and the solid stone buildings63 were also ‘more suggestive of a nation of born mura-

58 Ibid.
59 Ibid., p. 10.
60 Ibid., p. 15.
61 Raggs, *op. cit.*, chapter 185, pp. 391-400. ‘Behold, then, how beautiful is the world in summer-time, when all things bear fruit! The very peasant, intoxicated with gladness by reason of the harvest that is come, makes the valleys and mountains resound with his singing, for that he loves his labours supremely. Now lift up even so your heart to paradise, where all things are fruitful with fruits proportionate to him who has cultivated it.’
62 Ibid., chapter 116, p. 251. ‘But tell me, have you seen them that work quarried stones, how by their constant practice they have so learned to strike that they speak with others and all the time are striking the iron tool that works the stone without looking at the iron, and yet they do not strike their hands? Now do you likewise.’
63 Chapter 153, p. 327. ‘Have you seen them that build [and] how they lay every stone with the foundation in view, measuring if it is straight [so] that the wall will not
turi than of tent-loving Arabs.\textsuperscript{64} Saʿādeh saw these examples as merely an indication of an oriental rather than an occidental environment. These manners and customs during the harvest time and stone-quar-rying had been known in the remote past among the peoples of Palestine and Syria as well.\textsuperscript{65}

The Raggs corroborated their above-mentioned theory on the relation between Dante and the Gospel of Barnabas by the incidental reference to the Jubilee as giving a definite date for the origin of the Gospel. The Jubilee year was a Jewish celebration occurring every fifty years (Leviticus 25:10-11). The first recorded Jubilee was that of Pope Boniface VIII in 1300. The Pope issued a decree that the Jubilee should be observed once every hundred years.\textsuperscript{66} After his death, however, Pope Clemens VI decreed in 1343 that the jubilee year should be held once every fifty years as the Jews had observed it. Pope Urban VI later proposed the celebration of a Jubilee every thirty-three years as representing the period of the sojourn of Christ upon earth, while Pope Paul II had decreed that the Jubilee should be celebrated every twenty-five years. In the Gospel it was mentioned: ‘the year of jubilee, which now cometh every hundred years, shall by the Messiah be reduced to every year in every place.’ (chap. 82, p. 193). This was a convincing reason for some historians to conclude that the author of the Gospel knew of the decree of Boniface. It would be reasonable therefore to suggest that it had not been written earlier than the second half of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{67} Saʿādeh argued that it was difficult to understand how somebody, who had such a wide knowledge of the Bible, would make such a naïve error which he excused as a spelling mistake by the copyist. He gave the far-fetched argument that the writing of the word ‘fifty’ in Italian is almost identical to the word ‘one hundred.’ \textsuperscript{68}

In one sub-section, the Raggs dealt with the Gospel of Barnabas as part of the question of the lost Gnostic Gospels, and whether the Italian Barnabas enshrined within its covers the lost Gnostic Gospel

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., p. xxxviii.
\textsuperscript{65} Saʿādeh, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{66} Raggs, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. xli-xlii.
\textsuperscript{67} Saʿādeh, \textit{op. cit.}, pp 12-13.
\textsuperscript{68} The word 50 in Italian is ‘cinquanta,’ while 100 is ‘cento.’ The two words are not almost identical as Saʿādeh argued.
which bore that name. The so-called ‘Gelasian Decree’ mentioned an Evangelium Barnabe as a heretical book. The decree was an apocryphal text, which was generally to be dated in the century after Pope Gelasius; and this was a reason for some people to suggest that such an apocryphal Gospel survived during the time of the Prophet Muḥammad. The Raggs further argued:

It is quite conceivable, then, that some of the apocryphal stories of the Qurʾān may be indirectly borrowed from this Gospel. If this be so, then a Christian student of the Qurʾān would at once be attracted by the Gnostic Gospel of Barnabas if it chanced to fall into his hands. Assuming, then, for the sake of argument, that an original Gnostic Barnabas, or a Latin version of the same, fell into the hands of a Christian renegade of the fourteenth or fifteenth century—just as the Spanish translation(?) fell into Fra Marino’s hands in the last quarter of the sixteenth century—it would give him at once a title for his great missionary pamphlet, and a vast amount of material to work upon.69

On the basis of these arguments, Saʿādeh concluded that to say that the Gospel of Barnabas was entirely invented by a medieval writer was still debatable. The half or third of it would correspond with sources other than the Bible and the Qurʾān. If the Gelasian Decree were true, Saʿādeh added, it would be possible that the Gospel of Barnabas was existent long before the Prophet of Islam, albeit this would mean that it was different from its present form. The Gelasian Decree would also imply that it was well-known among the elite of scholars in this age. ‘Therefore,’ Saʿādeh wrote, ‘it was probable that any information about it must have reached the prophet of Islam (even by hearing), including the repeated and lucid statements and explicit chapters in which his name was clearly mentioned.’70

Saʿādeh did not understand the Raggs’ standpoint entirely. He mistakenly interpreted their sub-section on the Gospel of Barnabas as one of the Gnostic Gospels by thinking that a gospel had existed under the name of the ‘Gnostic Gospel,’ which was completely lost. He totally misapprehended the argument of the Raggs, who only intended to put the Gospel of Barnabas in the context of other apocryphal Gospels and its deviance from the canonical ones, especially in its account of the ‘valedictory denunciation of St. Paul’ and the ‘painless birth of Jesus.’71 Saʿādeh was erroneous in his argument that

69 Raggs, op. cit., pp. xlv-xivi.
70 Saʿādeh, op. cit., p. 12.
71 Ibid., p. 13; See Raggs, op. cit., p. xlvi.
‘this Gnostic Gospel was probably a father of the Gospel of Barnabas.’

In the end, he left aside the earlier-mentioned argument about an Arabic original copy of the Gospel. He reformulated the Raggs’ views that a Jewish or Christian convert to Islam might have found a Latin or Greek version of this Gospel in the fourteenth or fifteenth century and made it up in its form, and therefore its origin had disappeared.

5.4. Riḍā’s Introduction

Following Saʿādeh’s introduction Riḍā wrote a few pages in which he described his personal attitude towards the Gospel and its significance as an apocryphal book. At the start, he reiterated Tolstoy’s statement that Christian historians were unanimous that there had been a great number of Gospels in the early centuries after the coming of Jesus, but clergymen had selected four only. But he did not attribute the statement to Tolstoy this time. In his conviction, the Christian muqallidūn (imitators) followed the selection of their clergymen without any further investigation, while those who valued science and avoided taqlīd (imitation) were eager to study the origin and history of Christianity even by means of such rejected Gospels. He also maintained that the reason for the existence of multiple versions of Gospels was the interest of each follower of Jesus to write a sīra (biography) and name it a ‘gospel,’ which contained his sermons and history. Therefore, apocryphal books could be useful after comparing them with the other canonical books. Riḍā argued that their significance would lie in their giving information about other religious conceptions, which had not been officially stipulated by clergymen:

Had these gospels survived, they would have been in their content the most affluent historical sources […]. You would have also watched the scholars of this age judging and deducing from them [conclusions] through the methods of modern sciences, as they have become safeguarded by the ‘fence’ of freedom and independence of thought and will: a thing which clergymen had never produced when they selected these four gospels only.
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Riḍā stressed that Barnabas accompanied Paul for a long time. After his conversion to Christianity, Paul had been introduced to the apostles on his return to Jerusalem by Barnabas (Acts 9:27). Before making any attempt to review the arguments of Saʿādeh, Riḍā stated that because the belief of Paul became more dominant and became the pillar of Christianity, it was no wonder that the Church considered the Gospel of Barnabas as non-canonical or incorrect. But he was pleased that the Gospel had not been discovered in Europe during medieval times: 'Had anybody found it in the medieval centuries—the centuries of the darkness of fanaticism and ignorance—it would never have appeared […]. Its copy, however, appeared in the vivid light of freedom in these [Western] countries.' In Riḍā’s evaluation, the views of Western scholars concerning the paper of its manuscript, binding and language had been a result of painstaking and scholarly research, but their conclusions about its earliest writer and the time of its composition were merely reached by way of conjecture. Like any researcher basing his propositions on incorrect assumptions, while considering it as a valid postulate, those who studied the Gospel had assumed that the author was a Muslim, but became puzzled later and did not manage to define his origin.

After this statement, and without further elaboration, Riḍā started to rephrase some of Saʿādeh’s findings that its author was an Andalusian Jew, who had converted to Islam. He also mentioned an argument by an anonymous ‘priest in a religious magazine,’ who had argued that most of the chapters of this Gospel were not known to any Muslim before. Riḍā was probably referring to Temple Gairdner, who had alluded to the ‘strange’ fact that none of the earlier Muslim writers had ever referred to this Arabic ‘Gospel of Barnabas.’ Riḍā was initially persuaded that its reference to the year of Jubilee was the ‘strongest’ assertion that its composer had been a medieval writer, but Saʿādeh’s argument and his illustration on the ‘weakness’ of this theory made him change his view. Saʿādeh’s examination was, for Riḍā, meticulous enough, and there was no other evidence to depend on in this regard. The same held true for Saʿādeh’s argument concern-
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ing Dante.\footnote{78 ‘Muqaddimatuna,’ p. 116.} In line with Sa’ādeh, Riḍā supported the viewpoint that Fra Marino probably was the writer of the Arabic glosses on the Gospel. He argued that conversion to Islam must have stimulated him to learn Arabic, but he had not been able to write in correct phrases. As he learnt a language in his old age, it was normal that he had made several mistakes. Most of his correct expressions, however, were literally quoted from the Qur’ān or other Arabic sources, which he might have read.\footnote{79 Ibid., p. 117.} According to Riḍā, there was another possibility that a clergyman had found the Gospel, and started learning Arabic in order to determine any Arabic reference to which he might ascribe this Gospel. Neither native nor non-native (a’jami) speaker would say in Arabic, for example, ‘Allah Subḥān’ instead of ‘Subḥāna Allah.’\footnote{80 Ibid., p. 118.}

Researchers rejected the Gospel’s affirmation of the coming of Muhammad by name. One of their arguments was that it was not logical that it had been written before Islam, as foretelling should come usually in a metonymical way. Riḍā maintained that it was probable that the translator of the Gospel into Italian had rendered the name Muhammad from the word ‘Paraclete.’ However, deeply-religious people, in his opinion, would not see such things as contradictory with divine revelation. He quoted the Tunisian Muslim reformist Muḥammad Bayram al-Khāmis (1840-1889) who reported on the authority of ‘an English traveler’ that he had seen in the Papal Library in the Vatican a copy of a gospel written in the Ḥimyarī script, which was dated before the coming of the Prophet Muhammad. Bayram al-Khāmis did not define the gospel by name, but this ‘ reliable’ gospel, according to him, literally corresponded with the Qur’ānic verse: ‘And giving the good tidings of an Apostle who will come after me, his name being Aḥmad’ (61: 6). Riḍā gave no reference for his information, but tracing Bayram’s Šafwat al-Ṯibār I have found that the author did not describe the Englishman as ‘traveler.’ Bayram also did not hear this report personally from him. It was an account which Bayram mentioned in the context of his description of the Vatican and its library, which he portrayed as containing thousands of books, including this gospel in ‘Arabic Ḥimyarī script, which had been written two hundred years before the [Islamic] message.’\footnote{81 Muhammad Bayram al-Khāmis, Šafwat al-Ṯibār bi Mustawda’ al-Aṃṣār wā al-Aqtār, edited by Ma‘mūn Ibn Muḥī al-Dīn al-Jannān, Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmyya (2 vols.), 1997, vol. 2, p. 14.}
Riḍā, however, admitted that it was never reported that any Muslim had seen a gospel with such an evident prediction of the coming of Muḥammad. In his view, it seemed that the remains of such gospels were still existent in the Papal Library in the Vatican with other banned books dated to the early centuries of Christianity. The appearance of such works, he believed, would remove all assertions around the Gospel of Barnabas and other gospels. In the end, Riḍā urged his Muslim readers not to think that Western scholars and Eastern Christian writers (such as Saʿādeh and the above-mentioned founders of al-Muqtaṭaf and al-Hilāl) doubted the authenticity of this gospel out of their fanaticism as Christians by concluding:

The age when fanaticism used to incite people to obliterate historical facts has elapsed […] Aside from its historical advantage and its judgment in our [Muslims] favour in the three issues of dispute; namely monotheism, non-Crucifixion and the prophethood of Muḥammad, it suffices us to publish it because of its sermons, wisdom, ethics and best teachings.

5.4.1. Later use by al-Manār

Riḍā scarcely mentioned the Gospel of Barnabas in his religious arguments against Christian missions. Four years later al-Manār for the first time mentioned the Gospel in its comment on an article published in the Russian journal Shūrā, which compared Ibn Taymiyya and Luther in sciences related to Christianity. (see, chapter 2). In 1929, al-Manār published a critique written by a certain al-Yazīdī from Rabat on Émile Dermenghem’s biography of the Prophet Muḥammad. Al-Yazīdī, among others, attacked the Church for failing to have established clearly the divine revelation, and for the fact that its clergymen had not only corrupted their religion, but rejected
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the message of Muḥammad. As a comment on this article, Riḍā rebuked Dermenghem and requested him to call Christians to convert to Islam, as this religion was the *muṣliḥ* (reformer) of Christianity. In a footnote, he confirmed that Christians had lost the real Gospel. As Islam, in his view, came to abrogate all preceding laws, Christianity should return back to it, and not vice versa. Riḍā was now more outspoken: ‘The Gospel of Barnabas is the truest in our point of view above all these canonical Gospels, as it utterly speaks of monotheism and its proofs, and the prophethood of Muḥammad.’

Riḍā cited the Gospel of Barnabas again in the context of his exegesis of the verse: ‘Those who follow the Messenger; the unlettered Prophet, whom they find mentioned in their own (Scriptures)—in their Torah and the Gospel’ (Al-ʿAʿrāf, 7: 157). In his discussion on the *bishāra* (foretelling or glad tiding) of previous Judeo-Christian Scriptures of the coming of the Prophet Muḥammad, Riḍā quoted lengthy passages (about 60 pages) of *ʾIẓhār al-Ḥaqq.* After discussing what he deduced as *bishārāt* from the authorised Biblical books, al-Qairanāwī preferred to avoid quoting other prophecies mentioned in non-canonical books, except the Gospel of Barnabas. Al-Qairanāwī pointed out that despite its exclusion by clergymen this Gospel included ‘the greatest *bishāra* about the Prophet of Islam.’ He also believed that it was one of the most ancient Gospels, and even existed before the coming of Islam. Regarding the historicity of this Gospel, al-Qairanāwī noted that it had been mentioned in books dated back to the second and third centuries A.D. This would mean that it had been written ‘two centuries before Islam.’ Al-Qairanāwī did not accept the argument that it was a Muslim who had corrupted this Gospel either, since it had nowhere been reported that Muslims had ever attempted to make any change in the widely accepted scriptures, let alone the Gospel of Barnabas.

In Riḍā’s view, there was ‘a clear mistake’ made by al-Qairanāwī in calculating the years, since the Prophet had received his message in the beginning of the seventh century. This meant that Barnabas had written his Gospel five centuries before Islam, and not two. Riḍā, however, supposed that Jesus ordered Barnabas to write it down in
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the first century, although there was no earlier mention of it. The oldest version discovered in Europe, nevertheless, was dated to the 15th or the 16th century.\(^{90}\) Riḍā in details quoted the *bishārāt* from the Gospel of Barnabas annexing to them some passages of his above-mentioned introduction.\(^{91}\) He added another *bishāra* from the book of Haggai (2:7-8): ‘For thus saith the Lord of hosts: Yet one little while, and I will move the heaven and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land. And I will move all nations: and the desired of all nations shall come and I will fill this house with glory: saith the Lord of hosts.’ Riḍā stated that the ‘desired of all nations’ was in its original Hebrew ‘ḥemdat (*חֶמְדַּת*),’ which directly means ‘praised,’ and would consequently refer to the Arabic ‘Muḥammad.’\(^{92}\)

By the end, Riḍā restated: ‘We believe that the Gospel of Barnabas is superior to these four Gospels in its divine knowledge, glorification of the Creator, and knowledge of ethics, manners and values.’\(^{93}\) He agreed with Saʿādeh that some of its ethical and cognitive notions had been derived from the philosophy of Aristotle. Riḍā argued that similar arguments had also been raised by ‘independent’ Western scholars concerning the Mosaic laws as derived from Hammurabi (which he had endorsed earlier), and concerning the ethics of the Gospels as emanated from Greek and Roman philosophy. Riḍā was straightforward in declaring his pragmatic approach in polemics by saying: ‘We might have agreed with the People of the Book and have accepted these *shubuhāt* (allegations) as well, but we establish proofs against them by exploiting them in [defending Islam] in this situation [of polemics].’\(^{94}\)

5.5. Short-lived Like an Apricot: A Missionary Response

The appearance of the Gospel must have been a shock to many Christian believers.\(^{95}\) Strangely, Riḍā never alluded to any Christian response to his undertaking. He only told us one anecdote that hap-
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\(^{95}\) Some available studies have examined a few evaluations made by Muslims and Christians afterwards, as well as some recent debates on the Gospel and their impact on Muslim-Christian relations later. See, Oddbjørn Leirvik, ‘History as a Literary
pened a few months after its publication, when he was visiting his village in Lebanon. In one of his meetings with Muslims and Christians, one of the Muslim attendants shouted: ‘Without you [Riḍā] the status of Islam would never be elevated!’ A Christian fellow replied: ‘Not only yours, he also published the Gospel for us’—meaning the Gospel of Barnabas. Riḍā and other people laughed. He ironically wrote: ‘Ḥabbadhā hadhihī al-Sadhāja maʿa hadhā al-ʾItifāq bayna al-Muslimīn wā al-Naṣārā (how wonderful this naiveté is, when accompanied by harmony among Christians and Muslims).’96 ʿAbd al-Masiḥ al-Antākī (1874-1922), the Greek Orthodox proprietor of al-ʿOmrān journal in Cairo and a friend of Riḍā, expressed his interest in the Gospel as well.97

Then working in Cairo, Temple Gairdner and his Egyptian fellow-worker Selim ʿAbdul-Wāhid wrote a refutation of the Gospel. The authors did not make a straight reference to Riḍā, but their treatise should be seen as a contemporary Christian description of the whole debate. In their own words, they contended:

‘The name (though not the contents) of this strange book had long been known in India, and was not unknown in Egypt. Though it was only by name, it has been freely cited in these countries by inserted parties, who cited a book they had never seen or read, and almost certainly never would have heard of, except for a chance mention of it in Sale’s Introduction of the Qur’ān […] Moreover it has been triumphantly cited by the opponents of the Christian religion as the book which most of all confuted the New Testament and demonstrated all that our Muslim friends have alleged against the Christian Book and against Christianity in general. It would seem that such men, therefore, have been guilty of using as one of their valued weapons a book about which they knew nothing other than the name.’98

As an active member in missionary circles in Egypt, the Muslim convert to Christianity ʿAbd al-Masiḥ al-Bajūrī sharply reacted to Riḍā’s

---

98 Ahad and Gairdner, p. 1.
publication of the Gospel in a hitherto unnoticed polemical piece of work under the title *Khūdhat al-Khalāṣ* (see, introduction). According to Bājūrī himself, he was taught Christian theology by Gairdner, and became keeper at the English missionary Library in Giza. His polemical treatise against the Gospel of Barnabas was primarily a collection of articles, some of which he earlier published in the Egyptian Christian journals *al-Ḥaqq* (‘The Truth’) and *Bashāʾir al-Salām* (see, chapter 4). After the publication of the Gospel in Arabic, he immediately approached a certain Maʿzūz Effendi Jād Mikhāʾīl, a notable Copt from the town Dir Muwās (the province of Minia, southern Egypt), who showed his enthusiasm by financing the printing of a treatise against the Arabic edition of Riḍā on the condition that the profit should be used to publish another Christian rejoinder to Muslim attacks.

Throughout his whole treatise, Bājūrī did not refer to Riḍā directly by name, except at the end of his work. Like many other Christian Egyptians, Bajūrī often called him the ‘intruder Sheikh,’ whose objective was to enflame the animosity between Islam and Christianity. Besides his attack on the Gospel, he reported many interesting stories about his conversion and the conversion of other contemporary Muslims in Egypt. He maintained that he abandoned Islam after a long-term investigation of the Bible. As he committed himself to the ‘service of Jesus,’ his treatise was a message to the Muslim umma. His intention was to give those ‘arrogant’ people a lesson if they dared to assault his new religion. In his view, Muslims turned their efforts to attack the essence of Christianity in their magazines instead of reacting to Cromer’s writings on Islam.

Bājūrī incorrectly thought that the publisher and translator of the Gospel in English was George Sale. As he had no anxiety that the Gospel would have an impact on the English people, the translator published this ‘mythical’ work in order to teach his Christian fellow-citizens the superiority of their Gospel over such ‘invented and futile’ books. Unlike the English people, he went on, Muslims of Egypt believed that the authority of religion was above everything, including
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the freedom of individuals. They became excited when they saw the Gospel in Arabic; and it was, Bājūrī believed, part of the anti-Christian propaganda in the country. He scornfully attacked the ‘intruder’ by saying that his claim of publishing the Gospel because of its historical significance was only to escape the ‘arrows of blameworthiness,’ as he did that due to the ‘hidden fanatic hostility […] boiling in his head’ against Christianity and Paul.101

Bājūrī considered it his task to defend the Scriptures, like a ‘soldier’ in the Kingdom of Christ,102 just like the Egyptian soldier who had sacrificed himself and saved the Khedive from an assassination attempt in Alexandria. In his view, four reasons must have been behind the ‘horrifying evil’ which Riḍā brought about by publishing the Gospel: 1) his conviction that Egyptian Muslims had a tendency to purchase any anti-Christian literature; he therefore wanted to gain money without paying attention to the problems which this ‘Juhanammi (devilish)’ work was to cause; 2) as reaction to his feeling of exclusion by Al-Azhar scholars, so he attempted to gain their affection by having published the Gospel, and in order to persuade them that he was serving Islam; 3) his pretence that he was an honest servant of Islam so that the sultan would allow him to return back to his homeland; 4) or his desire to support anti-Christian nationalist papers in Egypt (such as al-Liwā’ of Muṣṭafā Kāmil), and to enhance them in their fanaticism and agitation.103 Bājūrī mockingly described Riḍā as ‘the hero of [propagating] discord among the two Egyptian races, Christians and Muslims,’ and his Manār was ‘the theater of offenses against Christianity.’104

Bājūrī’s first chapter first appeared in the fifth issue of al-Haqq (7 December 1907), which he signed as Ḥāmīl ʿĀr al-Masīḥ wā Ṣalībuh (or the bearer of Christ’s Disgrace and Cross). He believed that his treatise was an ‘amputating sword and protective shield’ for Christians against the Gospel of Barnabas. Under the title, ‘Nazareth and Jesus,’ Bājūrī mentioned that he had many discussions with some ‘dissident [Muslims]’ in Giza, who were enthusiastic about the appearance of the Gospel. In his dispute, he used the arguments developed by Gairdner’s magazine al-Sharq wā al-Gharb that its writer must have
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been a Westerner, since he was entirely ignorant of the geographical site of Syria and Palestine. The Gospel’s notion of Nazareth was, for example, incorrect. In the Gospel, it had been stated that ‘Jesus went to the Sea of Galilee, and having embarked in a ship sailed to his city of Nazareth (chapter 20). This picture would represent the city as a harbour on the lake of Galilee, whereas it was a town miles away from the Lake, surrounded by mountains. A Muslim once disputed with Bājūrī and rejected such arguments, and accepted the portrayal of Barnabas asserting that the ‘cursed Christians had changed the name of Nazareth and labeled it on this town surrounded by the mountains in order to contend the Gospel of Barnabas.’

A few months later, Bājūrī published another article (his second chapter) in the above mentioned Bashāʾir al-Salām. For him, due to its ‘fallacies,’ the publication of the Gospel was also harmful to Islam, and its circulation could be a reason behind the conversion of many Muslims to Christianity. He praised Saʿādeh for his scientific introduction, especially his doubts about the Gospel and its foretelling of Muḥammad by name. As for Riḍā’s introduction, he found it ‘immature’ in ‘philosophical’ terms claiming that it contained nothing but all kinds of provocation against Christianity. Interestingly, Bājūrī charged Riḍā with seeing no understanding for the significance of Taqālīd (customs) in Christianity, just as with his resistance against Islamic concepts, such as Ijmāʿ (consensus), Taqlīd and Tawātur. It was no surprise therefore that he, in a similar sense, rejoiced in the ‘baseless’ Gospel attributed to Barnabas, while ‘closing his eyes’ away from the fact that the Bible had been transmitted from one generation to another. Bājūrī consequently compared Riḍā’s denial of the Bible to the rejection of the Tawātur in Ḥadīth, the Qurʾān, and prophets. He moreover described Riḍā’s introduction as religiously ‘fanatic,’ who based himself on ‘the illusions of a lunatic Indian who superficially knew […] the Holy Book […], and whose fatal poison was the cause of discord among Christians and Muslims.’
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In Bājūrī’s opinion, the Gospel of Barnabas contained many contradictions with the Bible and Qur’ān. In the last part of his treatise, Bājūrī traced a hundred chapters (out of 222) from the Gospel and criticised them in the light of his own understanding of Christian and Islamic notions. He complained that his constant shortage of financial resources was the reason why he was not able to publish the remaining chapters in his small book. He therefore requested zealous rich Christians to contact him for the funding of another treatise, if they were interested in seeing his criticisms of the rest.

Bājūrī concluded that Riḍā was not aware of his ‘childish’ act and the grief it caused. According to him, the Gospel became a weapon in the hands of many Muslim teachers of Arabic, who spent most of their lessons in mocking at Coptic children in state schools. He saw the publication of the Gospel as an integral part of what he considered as anti-Coptic sentiments in Egypt. In his view, by reviewing the Coptic mouthpiece al-Waṭan for the last three years (1905-1908) one could count more than 3000 incidents offending the Copts. Bājūrī warned Egyptian Muslims not to continue their assault on the Christians, as he believed that the British would persist in occupying Egypt and protecting its Coptic minority against any aggression. He also expressed his unwillingness to offer any concession by pleading for independence, and by leaving more space for these nationalist voices to play with the Copts after the British departure. He was therefore seeking for some kind of European protection by writing: ‘we the Copts are in need of the English or any other European state more than during the Fitna (strife) of ʿUrābī.’

Bājūrī argued that the writer of the Gospel had inserted the idea that the ‘uncircumcised is worse than dogs’ after his conversion to Islam in order to satisfy Muslims: ‘why the disciples would be disappointed when hearing that [from Jesus], while they were circumcised Jews, and Jesus himself was circumcised!’ Another example was the story of Adam according to Barnabas: ‘as the food was going down, he remembered the words of God, and, wishing to stop the food, he
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put his hand into his throat’ (chapter 40). Bājūrī maintained that such a story had its Islamic origin. He had heard the same account from his teacher of the Qurʾān, when he was still a young Muslim, twenty-nine years before the publication of the Gospel in Arabic. This was for him enough evidence that the author of the Gospel was ‘hunting’ for common Islamic notions. Bājūrī also compared verses from the Gospel of Barnabas with their Qurʾānic equivalents. Here Bājūrī was trying to find these equivalents by using Saʿādeh’s Arabic text. For example, he compared the verse of the Gospel of Barnabas which stated that ‘the flesh […] alone desireth sin’ (chapter, 23), with a Qurʾānic passage maintaining that ‘certainly the soul is indeed prone to evil’ (Yūsuf, 55).

Bājūrī concluded his treatise by making an interesting parallel that ‘each lie [embodied] in the Gospel of Barnabas was a weapon against the simple-minded Christians, but we thank God that it was published out of agitation in the month of May: […] a month in which flies are very short-lived; and the age of this Gospel will be shorter than flies. Also in May apricot grows up, which is the most short-lived fruit, and this ‘deceitful’ Gospel will be likewise!’

5.6. Conclusion

The Gospel of Barnabas has been examined as part of a continuing Islamic literary tradition in looking for an ‘Islamic Gospel’ that supported the principal tenets of the Islamic faith. Four stages have been detected in al-Manār’s search for this gospel: 1) Riḍā’s explicit reference to the existence of the Gospel of Barnabas (May 1903), 2) his simultaneous allusion to a copy of a Gospel confirming the coming of the Prophet Muḥammad, which had been written in the Himyarī script to be found in the Papal Library in the Vatican, 3) his declaration in the same month of the Gospel of Tolstoy as the true one, 4) finally his publication of the Arabic edition of the Gospel of Barnabas, after he had received the English translation from the publishers.

It remains an interesting aspect of the Arabic edition of the Barnabas Gospel that it was the product of co-operation between a Christian
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(albeit with a secular spirit) and a Muslim scholar. We have seen that Saʿādeh probably did not study any relevant materials related to the historicity of the Gospel, except the conclusions of the Raggs, whose views were deeper and historically more detailed. Riḍā rephrased Saʿādeh’s ideas most of the time without giving any elaborate explanation.
The present chapter will shed light on the contributions of the above-mentioned Egyptian physician Muḥammad Tawfīq Ṣidqī, who is considered to be the most prolific polemicist in *al-Manār*. In a general sense, the thrust of the approach of Ṣidqī in his polemics was not innovative in the subjects he dealt with. It did not differ much from the earlier Muslim tradition that considered the Holy Scriptures as falsified, but containing many parts which could be used as a source for apologetics in verifying Islamic tenets. Like all Muslim authors in the field, one of his major concerns was to find proofs of Muḥammad’s prophethood in the Bible. He selected Biblical passages extensively, which he depicted as inappropriate, and raised many questions about them. From the bulk of these quotations we will select some salient features that are typical of his approach. His treatment sometimes stood apart from the tradition of earlier Muslim writers. The new dimension of his methods, as we shall note, was that he made wide use of the writings of the Rationalist Press Association.¹ In his analysis of Biblical Criticism, he also used his own medical expertise and scientific interpretations, especially on the Christian set of narratives of Crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus.

We have already mentioned that Ṣidqī’s stridently articulated views against Christianity and missions brought him into conflict with the colonial authorities, and consequently endangered the existence of *al-Manār*. Ṣidqī’s works did not please the contemporary missionary quarterly, *The Moslem World* as well. In reviewing Ṣidqī’s *A View on the Scriptures*, Rev. R.F. McNeile of Cairo wrote that he was not in the least surprised, nor did he intend to complain that an educated Muslim used the methods and results of Biblical Criticism, which to him were wholly incompatible with the belief in an inspired book. He complained about Ṣidqī’s method, describing it as ‘wholly out of
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date.’ In his view, Ṣidqī was ignorant of living scholars, and not a single one of his long list of authorities was a highly recognised scholar of the New Testament. He was only fond of quoting agnostics […] In his evaluation, the first part of the book was ‘disingenuous,’ the last part was ‘far worse.’ He concluded:

We are ashamed to defile a printed page by repeating his statements […] we are willing to grant originality to Dr. Ṣidqī in such points, and are tempted to ask whether they are not reflections of a society, or at least the state of mind, to which the uplifting of women, the casting out of devils, is unthinkable. […] Dr. Ṣidqī is in government employ. What would be the result of a Copt in a similar position, who published articles one-tenth so revolting to the Moslem as these are to the Christian!

Riḍā, nevertheless, was proud of Ṣidqī’s polemical contributions. He always saw his replies to missionaries as unprecedented. No previous scholars, according to him, had ever dealt with similar subjects, especially the concept of Qarābīn (sacrifices) in previous religions, as his friend did. He constantly recommended Muslims, who used to read works of missionaries or to attend their gatherings, to study Ṣidqī’s works very carefully. In a letter, he enthusiastically told Shakīb Arslān that one of the Chinese Muslim scholars had already translated the work of ‘Aqidat al-Ṣalb wā al-Fidā,’ which he wrote together with Ṣidqī, into Chinese. Without mentioning the Chinese Muslim by name, he added that the translation had been published in his Muslim journal as a response to missionary propaganda in their town. The clue which allows us to identify this Chinese Muslim is Riḍā’s reference to him as one of his mustaftīs, who regularly sent al-Manār letters concerning the ‘shameful’ situation of Muslims in China. In al-Manār, we find a certain ʿUthmān Ibn al-Ḥāj Nūr al-Ḥaqq al-Ṣīnī al-Ḥanafī, who regularly lamented to Riḍā about the situation of Sino-Muslims and their lack of religious knowledge and piety. He was the director of an Islamic journal in the Chinese province Guangdong. His journal was much influenced by Riḍā’s thoughts, and sometimes published full chapters from al-Manār translated into Chinese.
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is clear that this al-Hanafi is the one who was committed to translate ‘Aqīdat al-Ṣalb wā al-Fidā’.

6.1. Al-Matbūlī of Cairo and the Resurrection of Jesus

When Šidqī started publishing his anti-Christian polemics in al-Manār, an interesting anecdote spread all over the Cairo of 1912. Both Riḍā and Šidqī used this anecdote on a regular basis as a point of departure in their writings, and compared it with the story of Crucifixion. The Cairiene story also appeared as an appendix on the back page of one of Šidqī’s works.

According to the Egyptian daily al-Muqaṭṭam (31 October 1912), a big number of men and women had crowded in the front of the recently built Greek Church downtown in Cairo. The crowds were shouting: ‘O, Matbūlī,’ and some of them were severely wounded. The police was immediately called, and ambulances were carrying people to hospital. The Governor of Cairo, ʾIbrāhīm Pasha Najīb, came soon to the place. A rumor circulated among the people that Sheikh al-Matbūlī, a holy man buried in the center of Cairo, had been seen standing on the dome of his grave. He then had flown through the air and descended on the building of this Greek Church. A seventy-year old lunatic from Upper Egypt, whose name was Fāris Ismāʿīl, had been seen running on the street, wearing green clothes and a turban, shouting: ‘I am al-Matbūlī.’ Seeking his blessing, the people paraded behind him, and started kissing his hands and clothes. The police immediately arrested him, and dispersed the gathering. Al-Manār compared this anecdote with the story of the resurrection of Jesus. It drew the attention of its readers to the influence of illusions and false rumors on the minds of laymen and narrow-minded people, especially the women among them. Illusion could also affect the minds of people to the degree that they would see imaginary things.⁶

---

⁶ Appendix, Šidqī, Dīn Allah fī Kutub Anbyāʾih, Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Manār, 1330/1912 (Quoted below, Dīn).
6.2. The Religion of God in His Prophets’ Books

6.2.1. Jesus as Offering

According to Şidqī, the Christians used concepts and events taken from earlier religions in their narratives about Jesus, even though they lacked a historical basis. They tried to show that the ‘former’ was a proof to the ‘later.’ Şidqī reiterated the words of al-Afghānī that ‘the authors of the New Testament tailored a dress from the Old Testament and put it on their Christ.’ An example of these was that the exodus of the Children of Israel was a sign of the return of Jesus: ‘that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, out of Egypt have I called my son’ (Mathew 2:15).

In his understanding, Şidqī stated that some Christians used the practice of offerings and sacrifices in previous religions as a token for the Crucifixion. He made a critical observation that sacrifices also existed in ancient pagan religions, which had neither known Jesus nor his religion. And since the Mosaic Covenant also included among sacrifices burnt offerings, he argued, did that also refer to the burning of Jesus? And would an animal sacrifice directly refer to the Crucifixion? In John (19:32-33) the Crucifixion had been described as follows: ‘the soldiers […] brake not his legs: But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water.’ Medically speaking, Şidqī contended, it was impossible that human beings bleed water. The symbolic resemblance between Jesus’ death and offerings in previous religions was in that sense absent. Şidqī maintained that there was also no logic behind his hanging on the cross for six hours, and leaving him in pain and hunger. The same held true for having been pierced, something which is totally different from the way of slaughtering animals as an offering. In pagan religions, people often brought offerings to please their gods. But ‘true religions,’ according to Şidqī, never ordered offerings in order to please or to profit God. Their objectives have been stipulated, for instance, to feed the poor and needy or to expiate one’s illegal acts.

---

7 Ibid., p. 4. Şidqī opened his book with some passages from the Bible, such as, ‘Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life (John, 5: 39).
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6.2.2. The Crucifixion and Divinity of Jesus in the Old Testament

We have seen that Ṣidqī renounced any claim or clarification of the Crucifixion as having been foretold in the Old Testament. For example, the book of Daniel indicated the restoration and building of ‘Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince’ (Daniel, 9:24-27). According to Christian interpretation, the prophecy stated the primary mission of Jesus by giving several particulars. According to this passage, Daniel was told that ‘seventy weeks’ were required to fulfill his petition concerning the restoration of Israel. The seventy weeks, according to many Christian scholars, were seventy ‘weeks’ of years, which resulted in a period of 490 years, and these referred to the coming of Jesus.  

Ṣidqī found this interpretation unconvincing, and placed the prophecy of Daniel in an Islamic context. He argued that as the Israelites had lost authority over Jerusalem in 132 AD, adding to it 490 years it would mean that the period should have ended in 622, the year of the prophet’s migration to Medina. Or it would refer to the year 636, when Muslims conquered Jerusalem. The period of 14 years according to this calculation was left out as an interval period during which the Jews were recovering from the ‘injustice’ of the Christians.  

On the basis of the same calculation, Ṣidqī explained that the revelation to Daniel in the same book ‘to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy and to anoint the Most Holy’ (9:24) was again a reference to the Prophet Muḥammad as the seal of prophets. ‘It was his Caliph Omar, who took authority upon Jerusalem, restored it to God’s worship, and lifted up the injustice inflicted upon the Jews.’

---


12 Ṣidqī, Dīn, pp. 15-16.

Another example was that many Christians argued that there were other prophecies of the Crucifixion in the book of Isaiah (chapter 53). Ṣidqī interpreted the chapter in the same manner: they had no relation to Jesus whatsoever. He attempted to show the ‘errors’ of the Christians by citing many passages from this chapter, and compared them with other previous ones in the Bible. He concluded that the whole chapter clearly referred to the conquest of Jerusalem. It was Jewish converts to Christianity, such as Paul, who had inserted such notions into their new religion by thoroughly applying them to the figure of Jesus.\textsuperscript{14}

In the course of his observations, Ṣidqī turned to refute what he saw as Christian arguments of proving the divinity of Jesus from within the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{15} Ṣidqī saw that the Jews had an inherent inclination towards paganism. For instance, they worshipped the golden calf. Their ‘affection of paganism’ originated from their long-term residence among the pagans of Ancient Egypt and Babylon. This was the reason why they always held their expected Messiah to be a king, who would grant them victory over all nations. Ṣidqī moreover added that when Jesus declared his divine mission, such ‘pagan doctrines were grown in their hearts.’ They tried to worship him in a similar manner, but Jesus constantly opposed them by saying, for example: ‘depart from me, ye that work iniquity (Mathew 7:23)’ and ‘O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord’ (Mark, 12:29). Jewish converts and the Romans, therefore, carried their pagan precepts into Christianity, and took up an extreme position by holding the divinity of Jesus as integral part of their new faith. In this context, Ṣidqī understood the ‘exaggeration’ in the account of the Jewish historian and apologist Flavius Josephus, who wrote about him: ‘Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles’ (\textit{Antiquities of the Jews}, Book 18, chapter 3/3. Ṣidqī translated ‘Gentiles’ as ‘Greek’ in Arabic).\textsuperscript{16} Another account of such exaggeration was of the ‘greatest’ Jewish convert Paul: ‘Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they’ (Hebrews 1:4). Ṣidqī

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid, pp. 31-32.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., pp. 39-61.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 41.
believed that at this precise moment the idea of divinity had not been completely developed in Paul’s mind, but he later made it much clearer by putting it bluntly that God had ‘raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places […] and has put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church’ (Ephesians 1: 17-22).  

Ṣidqī followed his usual procedure by selecting some examples from the Old Testament, which were alleged to implicitly support the belief of the divinity of Jesus. He totally discredited the Christian argument that Isaiah had predicted the divinity of Jesus as the one whose ‘name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace,’ and that the same prophet had predicted that Christ was to order and establish his judgement upon ‘the throne of David, and upon his kingdom’ (Isaiah, 9: 6-7). Ṣidqī concluded that Isaiah’s prophecy and the attributes he mentioned were only applicable to the Prophet Muḥammad as the seal of the prophets whose followers had ruled over the Holy Land. Supposing that the passage really referred to Jesus, and that people had called him already a ‘mighty god,’ it was still not enough evidence for Ṣidqī on his divinity. It was rather the other way around that it had been a real prediction and warning by Isaiah that the people would contradict the notions of the genuine monotheism, and would turn to worshipping Jesus other than the One God. Ṣidqī forgot, however, to give more clarification of the phrase ‘mighty god’ in the context of his Islamic interpretation, and how one could understand its application to the Prophet Muḥammad from an Islamic viewpoint.

Ṣidqī argued that all these implicit passages used by the Christians could easily be explained as referring to the message of Islam. Prophecies in the Old Testament were not specific in defining persons by name. Take for example the passage, ‘Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek’ (Psalm 110: 4). This was, according to Ṣidqī, an allusion to the Prophet Muḥammad. Ṣidqī compared the blessing by Melchizedek of Abraham to the way the Qurʾān respected him. Muslims remember the name of Abraham during their daily prayers. As for the word ‘priest,’ Ṣidqī interpreted it within an Islamic viewpoint.

17 Ibid., pp. 42-43.
18 Ibid., pp. 45-46.
19 Ibid., pp. 50-53.
scope. It directly refers to the prophecy of Muhammad, since he was the ‘leader of Muslims and their greatest imam, who taught them the religion, judged among them, looked into all of their affairs, led them in their [...] prayers, pilgrimage [...] gatherings and feasts. They [Muslims] imitated him in their sacrifices and in everything [...] He was therefore their greatest ‘priest’ [...] forever.’ In Ṣidqī’s mind, Muhammad deserved the prophecy, as Jesus had less status than he in regard to all these ‘priestly’ functions. He added ironically that Jesus never practised any priestly job, but was only portrayed as ‘offering’ in the Book of Revelation: ‘the Lamb that was slain to receive power’ (Revelation 5:12). He added that in the same chapter we find testimony to the Prophet Muhammad. ‘The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion’ (110:2) showed that the real kingdom and prophethood should be given to Muhammad after the Jews and Christians. Jesus himself said it clearly that: ‘the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof’ (Matthew 21:43).

In his polemics, Ṣidqī was not always consistent. As we have noted, he made use of Josephus’ remark about Jesus as ‘a wise man’ and the conversion of many Jews and Romans to his religion. Now he fell back on accusing the Christians of interpolating many passages in Josephus’ Antiquities in order to serve their desires. He followed the arguments of many seventeenth-century critics, who had doubted the authenticity of certain proofs of the Antiquities of Josephus (especially book 18) and its reference to Jesus by arguing that it had been added by a later Christian copyist. There was no indication throughout that whole voluminous work, except this one passage. None of the early Christian Church Fathers, such as Origen, mentioned Josephus as having written about Jesus. According to Ṣidqī, the situation of the Jews at that time was so fragile and they became ‘humiliated’ to the degree that the Christians were able to manipulate and change their scriptures.
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Ṣidqī maintained that the authors of the Gospels did not write everything about Jesus and his life. Jesus only spoke about previous prophecies and legislations, and never mentioned anything about history. Ṣidqī also wondered why Jesus did not rebuke the Jews for their additions in the version of Septuaginta, but reproached them for nullifying the Mosaic Law through their traditions: ‘you nullify the word of God by your tradition that you have handed down’ (Mark 7:13). Ṣidqī labelled their legislations as temporary, and to be replaced by Islam. Jesus had already alluded to Muḥammad’s coming by saying: ‘I have much more to say to you, more than you can now bear. But when he, the Spirit of truth, comes, he will guide you into all truth. He will not speak on his own; he will speak only what he hears, and he will tell you what is yet to come’ (John 16:12-13).26

Ṣidqī intended to prove that the corruption of the Scriptures had been dominant since the earliest history of Christianity. Peter, for example, confessed that ‘in them there are some things hard to understand that the ignorant and unstable distort to their own destruction, just as they do the other scriptures’ (Peter 2, 3: 16). Paul said the same in Galatians, viz. that ‘evidently some people are throwing you into confusion and are trying to pervert the gospel of Christ’ (1:7). Ṣidqī again wondered which ‘one was among all these numerous gospels the favourite of Paul to the degree that he called it gospel of Christ: it might have been one of the apocryphal gospels.’27

Ṣidqī made an attempt to reconcile his rejection of the divinity of Jesus with his miraculous birth without a father, which the Christians used as a proof for his supernatural power. In his view, his birth in this way was one of God’s countless miracles in His creation. The divine omnipotence was meant to remove the ‘illusions’ of Greek philosophy, and to show human beings their weakness and to warn them that they should not boast their power. Ṣidqī argued that people always believed in the impossibility of creating animals without a father, but God made the matter different by the creation of Jesus. Modern scholars, he went on, investigated many creatures and found that there are tiny animals, such as aphides (plant lice), which are often found to be partheno-genetic in many generations. It is theoretically possible that the process of parthenogenesis in the same way

26 Ibid., p. 81.
27 Ibid., p. 84.
could produce human beings and mammals. ‘It would be crazy,’ Ṣidqī wrote, ‘to hold such odd examples of creatures as deity. It is just as considering a lady with more than two breasts as a goddess, and worshipping her only because one did never see or hear about someone alike. Or like worshipping a virgin woman who delivered without any intercourse.’

Elsewhere Ṣidqī gave another medical interpretation of the fatherless birth of Jesus. There was no naqlī (traditional) or ʿaqlī (rational) objection against making a comparison between the pregnancy of Mary and the exceptional case of somebody like Catherine Hohmann, a masculine hermaphrodite who in her life was said to have a sort of menstruation. However, Ṣidqī did not mean that Mary was not a feminine: ‘it was probable that she had male and female genitals, but her female structure was exceeding [the other]. She bore Jesus, delivered and fed him, if we believe in what the New Testament claimed that she got married after his birth and had children (Matthew 1: 25 & 13: 55). It is interesting to note that the thirteenth-century Qurʾānic exegete Abū Bakr al-Qurṭubī made a similar portrayal of Mary, which J.I. Smith & Y.Y. Haddad interpreted as that of a kind of hermaphrodite. According to Qurṭubī:

The truth is that when God created Adam and took the covenant with his progeny, He made some of the liquid in the back of fathers and some in the uterus of mothers. When the waters join, a child is formed. God made both waters in Mary, part in her uterus and part in her back. Gabriel blew in order to arouse her desire. A woman cannot conceive unless her desire is aroused. When her desire was roused with the blowing of Gabriel, the water in her back descended to the uterus, and became mixed and then became fertilized.

Ṣidqī offered a separate presentation of the Qurʾānic description of Jesus as Kalima (Word of God) and its relation to the Christian concept of logos. He understood the term as metaphorically pointing to all God’s creatures, including Adam and Jesus, as God’s Kalimāt.
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Islam portrayed Jesus in particular, but not Adam, as God’s *Kalima* in order to show the way of his creation, and to rebuff the Christian ‘allegation’ concerning his divinity and the Jewish ‘accusation’ of him as an illegitimate child. Another reason, according to Ṣidqī, was that he, unlike Adam, did other miracles, such as talking in his infancy, and curing the sick. In that sense, Ṣidqī blamed the Christians that they incorrectly grasped the figurative meaning of the word *logos*. They exaggerated the concept of Jesus by understanding his place as God’s *logos* and therefore the creator of all things (John 1:3). Ṣidqī agreed with the common argument that the Christian tenet of identifying Jesus with the *logos* was derived from Stoic ideas as incorporated in Judaic and Christian thought in the first and second century.  

Ṣidqī compared the Islamic rejection of the Crucifixion with that by earlier Christian sects, such as the Cerinthians, Carpocratians, Basilidians, and Arians. He did not define his source at this point, but made it clear in the book ‘*Aqīdat al-Ṣalb wā al-Fidā’*, discussed below. He directly quoted the Qur’ān translation by George Sale, who elaborated on this point. Ṣidqī, however, quoted an anonymous book under the title, *Riḥlat al-Rusul* (Journey of the Apostles), which included the acts of Paul, Peter, John, Andrew, and Thomas. He asserted that the account of Patriarch Photius of Constantinople that Jesus was not crucified, but another person instead, was based on that book. It is difficult to trace this source. But it is interesting to know that it was Photius who preserved a fragment from a lost work by the Jewish historian Justus of Tiberius, a native of Galilee, who made no reference to the appearance of Jesus.

6.3. The Doctrine of Crucifixion and Salvation

Ṣidqī mentioned his main arguments about the Crucifixion and salvation in Christianity in the book of ‘*Aqīdat al-Ṣalb wā al-Fidā’*, which he co-published with Riḍā. In that work, he expressed his presupposi-
tion that some narratives in the Gospels related to the story of the Crucifixion were correct. But he tried to make his own reconstruction of the story as an attempt to remove the ‘blur’ from the eyes of his missionary opponents. In instead of propagating Christianity outside Europe, he advised them to go and save their religion from the critique of the rationalistic attacks of their fellow-citizens. If they did not save their religion there, he cynically said, Europe would one day entirely leave Christianity aside.

Throughout his statements, Šidqi championed the controversial anonymously published work *Supernatural Religion*, which was later attributed to the above-mentioned English literary figure Walter Richard Cassels. This work attracted wide attention after its publication in 1874. Many scholars began to speculate about the identity of its author. Others responded strongly to its criticism of Christianity. The two Victorian scholar-critics J.B. Lightfoot and Matthew Arnold were among its strongest opponents. Its ‘author managed to maintain his anonymity through more than a decade of wild conjectures, until, finally, in 1895, the *Manchester City News* announced that a Manchester poet, Walter R. Cassels, has now avowed himself the author. Being a lay theologian, Cassels drew much from British and continental Biblical scholars past and present, including the works of such German scholars as Eichhorn and Baur.

Most of the classical Muslim commentators understood the Qur’anic clause *wa lākin shubbiha lahum* (4:157) that the person who was killed was made to resemble Jesus in their eyes. Putting the likeness of Jesus on another person happened according to these interpretations in a miraculous way. They depended mostly on the Prophetic Traditions claiming that it was a loyal disciple of Jesus who volunteered to die in his place. Other Traditions suggested that God
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caused Judas Iscariot or one of those who were sent to arrest Jesus to appear like Jesus as a punishment for their betrayal.\textsuperscript{40}

Ṣidqī did not follow the lines of the classical \textit{Tafsīr}, and proposed that Judas looked very much like Jesus. He accepted most of the details of the story of the Gospels, but filled in some other parts according to his own logic, and to Islamic traditions. Ṣidqī broached it as a historical matter that the Jewish chief priests became ‘jealous’ of Jesus, when his message began to attract the people of Jerusalem. They made a deal with Judas to lead the soldiers to arrest him, during his last visit to the city (Mark, 14:43-48). All the disciples of Jesus fled away, except Peter, who later denied his relation with Jesus (Mark, 14:50).

Pilate, who presided at the trial of Jesus, hesitated to condemn him, but he failed to withdraw. After his arrest, Jesus was able to escape, possibly in a miraculous way. (Acts 12:6-10 & 16:25). He probably went to the Mount of Olives (John 8:1, 59; 10:39) in order to hide. As Judas regretted his act, he decided to go and hang himself (Mathew, 27:3-10). Due to their similar physical appearance, the soldiers arrested Judas and led him to prison. They thought that he was Jesus. As they were afraid of punishment, they completely concealed his escape. During his last minutes before committing suicide, Judas had become very hysterical. He yielded to death, and decided not to tell the truth about his identity wishing that by saving his master this time his sin would be forgiven. As he was awake the whole night, Judas became very pale and tired, and was not able to carry his cross. For this reason, they ordered Simon to carry it. None of Jesus’ disciples was present during the time of the Crucifixion, ‘except some women beholding afar off’ (Mathew, 27:55). Ṣidqī preferred the explanation that these women failed to recognise the real Jesus because it is always the habit of women to become emotional and tender-hearted in such situations. He rejected the narrative of the fourth Gospel that Mary and John were standing there (John 19:26). Ṣidqī quoted Renan’s critique that it is difficult to ‘understand how the Synoptics, who name the other women, should have omitted her [Mary], whose presence was so striking a feature.’\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{40} See, for example, K. Cragg, \textit{Jesus and the Muslim. An exploration}, London 1985; M. Ayoub, ‘Towards an Islamic Christology II: The death of Jesus, reality or delusion,’ \textit{The Muslim World} 70, 1980, pp. 91-121; E.E. Elder, ‘The Crucifixion in the Qurān,’ \textit{The Muslim World} 13, 1923, pp. 242-58.

\textsuperscript{41} Riḍā-Ṣidqī, \textit{ʿAqīda}, pp. 104-105. See Chapter XXV: ‘Death of Jesus.’ Renan’s work is also available at: http://www.infidels.org/library/historical/ernest_renan/
Besides, Ṣidqī went on with his reconstruction of the story that the standing people were also not well-acquainted with Jesus, as he was not a native inhabitant of the city. Even those who were close to the scene could not grasp Judas’ dissimilarity with him. They must have thought that it was his exhaustion and distress that might have changed his face. According to his medical knowledge, Ṣidqī argued that many comparable examples occurred, and people became confused when identifying their dead relatives. Such cases could be explained by forensic medicine.42

In the evening Joseph of Arimathaea, a disciple of Jesus, secretly asked Pilate for permission to bury the body of Jesus after the Crucifixion (John 19:38). In Ṣidqī’s view, Joseph did not know Jesus before in person. He could not recognise the identity of the crucified man. Even Nicodemus, who helped Joseph during the burial, had seen Jesus only once at night (John 19:39), three years before the Crucifixion (John 3: 1-10). In order to remove the humiliation attached to them and render the Jews saddened, Ṣidqī continued, one or two of the disciples decided to get the corpse of the dead body out of the grave and hid it in another place. In the same way, they also alleged that their Saviour was taken to the heaven.43 It was not until Sunday that Mary Magdalene told Peter and John that Jesus’ dead body was not in his grave. People consequently started to believe that the body had been raised to the heaven. Ṣidqī stressed that Mary Magdalene was the only woman who had seen him and spoken to him. Ṣidqī was certain that the story of the ‘seven devils’ cast upon her after having witnessed Jesus’ rising meant that she became very hysterically nervous (Mark 16:9). She only imagined that there had been two angels talking to her. Such ‘illusive imaginations’ would sometimes occur in the minds of women, who become emotional and hysterical; especially at the graveyard in the darkness (John 20:1). Ṣidqī argued that she was not able to determine the right place of his grave. He compared these ‘illusions’ to the above-mentioned Matbûlî incident. The two angels were, in his view, probably the two disciples, dressed in white, who were trying to take the dead body away. This was in agreement with the other report that ‘two men stood by them
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in shining garments’ (Luke 24:4). The differences between the reports of the writers of the Gospels, he went on, lay in their entire dependence on the ‘circulated unorganised rumours’ after the death of Jesus. The disciples became haunted by ‘illusions’ and ‘obsessions’ to the extent that they thought that everybody whom they had met or with whom they had eaten was Jesus (Mark 16:12, Luke 24:16 and John 21:4-7).

To support his arguments, Ṣidqī quoted similar examples of illusions mentioned by European psychologists. William Benjamin Carpenter (d. 1885), an English psychologist, reported about the Scottish historical novelist Sir Walter Scott (d. 1832) that, while having been deeply engaged in reading, he had seen his friend Lord Byron, after the latter’s death. When he stepped onwards towards the figure, there had been merely a screen occupied by great-coats, shawls, plaids and such other articles. A similar incident also occurred after a fire had broken out in 1866 in the Crystal Palace in London. People fancied an ape trying to escape, but finally they realised that there was nothing.

Returning to his hypothesis on the crucified person, Ṣidqī maintained that people must have wondered where Judas Iscariot had been. But as they had already known that he was planning to hang himself, it was probable that they had found a dead body whose ‘bowels were gushed out (Acts 1:18)’ outside Jerusalem. Ṣidqī believed that it was also possible that this dead body was of Jesus himself, if it were true that he died a natural death after his escape. In that case, God must have raised him up only in the spiritual sense. Ṣidqī stressed that his disciples, due to their extreme love to him, never thought of his death, just as the companions of the Prophet Muḥammad had done after his death. He moreover argued that it was impossible that people would recognise the one to be crucified, as they ‘arrayed him in a gorgeous robe’ (Luke 23:10) and Jesus ‘came out wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe’ (John 19:2). When they crucified him, they divided his garments (Mark 15:24 & Matthew 27:35-36). The fact that he was unclothed at the moment of the
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Crucifixion must have made it more difficult for the attendants to recognise him.\textsuperscript{48} 

Ṣidqī suggested yet another scenario of the burial moments of Jesus. It was also probable that Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus became anxious that the Jews would abuse the dead body or leave it to wild animals. After having pretended that they had buried his body, they returned back to the graveyard in order to relocate the body in another grave after having become sure that everybody had already departed. They had made a pledge that they should keep it highly confidential.\textsuperscript{49}

The story of his rising up to heaven in the beginning was only confined to his disciples in Jerusalem (Luke 24:33). They only assembled for a period of eight days while the doors were shut for fear of the Jews (John 20:19 and 26). It was only 50 days later when they were able to publicly gather when the Day of Pentecost had come (Acts 2:1). Ṣidqī concluded that if they had really found a dead body, it would have been impossible to identify it after it had decayed.\textsuperscript{50} Ṣidqī rejected the Biblical claim that there were 3,000 souls who ‘gladly received his word and baptised’ (Acts 2:41). The house where the disciples were gathering could only include 120 persons (Acts 1:15). Peculiar to him was the quick reporting to the public from various communities about the Holy Ghost, which began to speak with other tongues. He wondered why the disciples had not written the Gospels in these world languages that were familiar to them so that they would have made it easy for the people to accept the message without translation. It would have also been an eternal miracle to them.\textsuperscript{51} Ṣidqī doubted the reports on the locality of Jesus after his rising. He raised the question that if Jesus had really told his disciples that he would go before them into Galilee after his rising (Matthew 26:32 & 28:10), how was it that they had met him in Jerusalem (Luke, 24:36-37)? What was the wisdom behind sending them to Galilee?\textsuperscript{52}

Ṣidqī knew of the Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus (AD 55-120) and his discussion on the Crucifixion. For him, Tacitus’ report had been based on the already circulated rumours without any investiga-
He was also aware of the ideas of the English humanist F.J. Gould (1855-1938) who denied the story of Tacitus as a forgery. Most of the Roman historians, in Ṣidqī’s view, had poor knowledge of the history of Jesus. The Romans had never heard of him, except after the spread of Christianity in Italy. Some of them had looked down upon Christianity. For a long time, they had not been able to distinguish between the Jews and Christians, and had been convinced that the god of the Jews was a donkey, or donkey-headed. Ṣidqī compared the value of such ‘pagan’ works on Christianity with Western writings on Islam in the Middle Ages. He concluded that Muslims should not take these histories into account, as ‘they were valueless and should not be taken as a correct history. They were all based on rumours, inventions, illusions and lies without taking the least trouble in investigating [Christian] history.’

6.4. Ṣidqī’s View on the Scriptures of the New Testament and Christian Doctrines

Ṣidqī published his last polemical work in 1913. Under the title A View on the Scriptures, he repeated the testimony made by some early Christian writers, such as Papias, Irenaeus and Eusebius on the history of the four Gospels. Irenaeus of Lyons, for example, mentioned that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew or Aramaic. According to him, an anonymous translator took this version and arranged the Greek version. The circulation of these Gospels, in Ṣidqī’s view, did not deter the Christians from attempting to twist many parts of them. Although the concern of many of these translators was to prove ancient prophecies about Jesus, they were not aware that their insertion of such elements would make them ‘blind’ about other problematic issues. For example, they had inserted the statement of Jesus ‘saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’ (Matthew, 27:46), only in order to apply to what they saw as a prophecy in the Psalms: ‘My God, my God,
why hast thou forsaken me?’ (22:1). They did not take into account that this would be a sign of weakness, inability and despair. Ṣidqī developed his ideas on the basis of a study of the Protestant writer W.T. Turton, who, in his eyes, was a defender of the truth of Christianity.\(^{58}\)

In his work, Turton wrote: ‘it would have weakened the force of Prophecy enormously, since, in the absence of ancient manuscripts, the assertion that the old Jewish prophecies had been tampered with, to make them suit their Christian interpretation, would be difficult to disprove.’\(^{59}\) Ṣidqī added that the reason why the Christians did not reform these mistakes was the dominant ignorance in ancient times, and the belief that without these matters one’s belief would have been invalid. In his words, it was ‘only because of their fear of disgrace and shame that they did not dare to change all these mistakes in their scriptures nowadays. This would also have saved them al-Qīl wā al-Qāl (prattle).’\(^{60}\)

Ṣidqī’s writing rendered the vast majority of the material in the New Testament as inauthentic. He maintained that the Twelve Apostles did not write important things on the history of Jesus. Eight of them had never reported anything on his life. He belittled the contribution made by the other four. For instance, Peter was, in his view, a man of weak personality, and because of many negative incidents he could not be trusted. Jesus, for instance, rebuked him ‘saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men’ (Mark 8:33). Above all, during the Last Supper, Jesus foretold that Peter would deny association with him three times in the course of the night.\(^{61}\)

Like all other Muslim polemicists, Ṣidqī held the common view that the prophecy of the Paraclete had a direct relation to the Prophet Muhammad. In addition, he quoted the theory of the Pagan Christs of the British rationalist journalist John M. Robertson (d. 1933), who had pointed to the emergence of the concept of Paraclete in Christian circles in Asia Minor. The figure of Mani was declared to have called himself the Paraclete promised in the Christian Gospel.\(^{62}\) Another,
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\(^{58}\) Ibid., p. 45.

\(^{59}\) Turton, *op. cit.*, p. 386.

\(^{60}\) Ṣidqī, *Naẓra*, p. 51.

\(^{61}\) Ibid., pp. 52-54.

\(^{62}\) John M. Robertson, *Pagan Christs: Studies in Comparative Hierology*, London, 1903, p. 268. Cf. for more critical study on the concept of Paraclete according to these
Montanus, in Asia Minor had claimed to be inspired by the Paraclete.63 The critique of Robertson and others, in Ṣidqī’s view, supports the argument of al-Qairanāwī that the Christians during the time of the Prophet were expecting the coming of another prophet who was to confirm the message of Jesus.64 Ṣidqī detected that the Gospels sometimes exaggerated the limits of power of the disciples. They ascribed to them a certain divine capacity or supernatural powers. Jesus was reported, for example, to have addressed them ‘Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained’ (John 20: 23). Ṣidqī repeated Riḍā’s above-mentioned stance that such instructions in the Gospel could be an indirect call to the believers to commit sins lavishly, while resting assured that they would be forgiven. It was also impossible that those human disciples would have the power to know the intentions of a person in order to assess the sincerity of his repentance. This promise given to them by Jesus, in Ṣidqī’s polemics, indicated that the will of the disciples took precedence over that of anybody else, including God himself. He went further by attacking these notions to be the raison d’être why ‘clergy-men’ in the European Middle Ages had systematically murdered people during the period of Inquisition. The sacralisation of such doctrines was the cause of their corruption and tyranny. Ṣidqī recapitulated his astonishment that these notions contradict the other verses in which Jesus himself made it clear that he had no capacity to forgive, except ‘for whom it is prepared of his Father’ (Matthew 20: 23). Likewise absurd to Ṣidqī were the accounts of Jesus’ promise to the disciples that they ‘shall say unto this mountain, remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you’ (Matthew 17: 20). This meant that they left nothing for God to carry out in the universe. According to him, the spread of such concepts among people was the direct motive behind the urgency of sending the Prophet Muḥammad with his message in order to bring people back to the real concept of monotheism.65 Ṣidqī challenged his opponents by saying that the divine wisdom behind the difference of opinions among the Christians and the vari-


63 Ibid., p. 274.
64 Ṣidqī, Naẓra, pp. 77-78. Cf., al-Qairanāwī, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 149-150.
65 Ibid., pp. 108-110.
ous sects before Muhammad was to satisfy human minds with reasonable investigation and thinking, which would promote their readiness to accept the Islamic doctrine after a long period of longing for the truth. As it was the final message, the Muslim umma was never to go astray from the truth. If it were misled, he contended, a new revelation would be needed. But it was the divine will to send Muhammad as the seal of prophets in the climax of progress of the human mind.66 Had God willed that their Scriptures would continue to be the criterion, he went on, He would have preserved them unimpaired as in the case of the Qur’an. However, God had ordained that some parts should remain in them, which contained true doctrine, sermons and high values.67

Medieval Muslim polemicists developed some linguistic analysis in understanding the Christian concept of the Sonship of Jesus. They repeatedly attempted to explain to their Christian counterparts that Jesus’ Sonship was a metaphor.68 In the same manner, Ṣidqī ascribed the Jewish and Christian usage of the words ‘Father’ and ‘Children of God’ to the fact that people in the historical context of revelation had been feeble-minded. They would have never understood the logic behind the divine message except by means of allegories and similes. Their Scriptures used such terms in order to describe God as merciful and forgiving. Soon after the death of Jesus, Ṣidqī went on, people had begun to believe in the Sonship in the literal sense. He referred to the early Christian and apologist Justin Martyr, who justified the worship of Christ on the basis of certain passages from the Old Testament.69 This ‘erroneous’ understanding of the metaphoric meaning of the word ‘Son’ was, in Ṣidqī’s mind, substantiated by the fact

66 Ibid., pp. 113-115.
67 Ibid., pp. 116-117.
that early Christian theologians had mixed their doctrines with ancient foreign philosophies.

Ṣidqī added a new Islamic concept to the discussion by stressing that God did not metaphorically use such words as father and son in the Qurʾān because it became well-known among people that they were harmful from a doctrinal point of view. It became therefore useless to use them again, as it might have taken ‘silly-minded’ people back to the doctrine of paganism once again. God, therefore, replaced the word ‘Father’ in the Qurʾān with many other words and phrases that closely portray the reality of His entity, such as Raʿūf (compassionate) and Raḥīm (merciful). The Prophet put it more clearly in one of his Ḥadīths by saying metaphorically that all created human beings are God’s ʿIyāl (children), and that God is more compassionate to his creatures than the mother to her children. Ṣidqī was convinced that people in the time of the Prophet were more advanced than earlier generations, and could easily grasp the meaning of God’s mercy without the instrument of allegory.

Ṣidqī maintained that when the Church seized power in the Middle Ages, it saw that any rational investigation would endanger its position and lead people to discard specific Christian doctrines. For this reason, it tried to dishearten the human Fiṭra (nature) by forbidding the reading of some religious texts. In his view, people were able to read these banned books only thanks to Protestantism. He believed that those Western scholars, who studied the Bible critically, were a product of Protestantism. He expected that although remained some defenders of Christianity in Europe, the critical scholars of the Bible would one day reject the authenticity of the Scriptures altogether.

6.5. Ridā’s Reflections

Ridā published his reflections on the same subjects together with Ṣidqī in the above-mentioned ‘Aqidat al-Ṣalb wā al-Fidā’. According to him, the Qurʾānic reference to the Crucifixion was meant to be a severe censure of the claims of the Jews. Their offence and rudeness
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70 Ṣidqī, Naẓra, pp. 137-146.
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with regard to Jesus had originated from the fact that he declared himself a new prophet. For Riḍā, the Gospels explicitly mentioned that Jesus repeatedly confirmed his prophecy and the oneness of God: ‘Now this is eternal life: that they may know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent’ (John 17: 3).73

In his interpretation of the passage wā mā qatalūh yaqīnan (for sure they killed him not), Riḍā argued that the Gospel of Barnabas made it clear that it was Judas Iscariot upon whom God put the likeness with Jesus. Riḍā used Ṣidqī’s argument that there was no dispute that the soldiers did not know Jesus in person either, but he gave another metaphoric interpretation to the word qatala. It did not mean ‘kill’ or ‘slay,’ but should be seen as comparable to the Arabic usage of the word in the phrase, qataltu al-sha’ya baḥthan (I have studied something thoroughly). The verse could therefore denote that they followed their uncertainty without trying to reach any kind of sure knowledge. Riḍā did not entirely reject the Muslim interpretation that it had been Judas or another person who shared the likeness with Jesus. In collecting their arguments, Muslim exegetes depended mostly on the narratives of Jewish and Christian converts to Islam, but did not pay any attention to the premises of the story as have been told in the Christian Scriptures themselves.74

Regarding the Qur’ānic reference to the ‘raising’ of Jesus, Riḍā drew upon ‘Abduh’s exegesis of the verse, ‘When God said, ‘O Jesus, I am the One who will take you and raise you to me and cleanse you from those who disbelieve’ (Al-‘Imrān, 3:55). ‘Abduh’s interpretation of the Arabic phrases innī mutawāffika wā rāfiʿuka differed much from most of the early Muslim commentators. Al-Ṭabarī, for example, explained that Jesus was taken by God in his sleep. It hinged on the Ḥadīth in which the Prophet was reported to have said: ‘Jesus did not die and he will not return to you before the Day of Judgement.’ The whole passage would thus mean: ‘I am the One who collected you from the earth and raised you from among the idolaters and those who disbelieved in you.’75

In her Qur’ānic Christians, J.D. McAuliffe studied the interpretation of ‘Abduh (which Riḍā followed) on that Qur’ānic verse. Her analysis can be accepted in a general sense, but she has sometimes

74 Ibid., pp. 7-8.
75 McAuliffe, op. cit., p. 131. For more interpretations, see, pp. 132-141.
failed to understand the technical language of *Tafsīr al-Manār*. \(^{76}\)

ʿAbduh maintained that some commentators interpreted *mutawaffīka* as ‘causing you to sleep,’ others explained the phrase that Jesus was collected from the earth to heaven alive in body and spirit; but the majority of the commentators paraphrased it as ‘I rescued you from those aggressors so that they could not kill you. Rather I caused you to die a natural death (*umītuka ḥatfa anfik*) and then raised you to Me.’ \(^{77}\) The key to a more proper interpretation, according to ʿAbduh, lies in the conjunctive *wā*, which does not point to the order of the actual event (*al-Tartīb fī al-Wujūd*). Both ʿAbduh and Riḍā tended to accept the alternative interpretation that *al-Tawaffī* overtly meant causing to die in the usual sense of death. The *raf* (raising) afterwards denoted a ‘raising’ of the soul: ‘it is not odd to speak of an individual, meaning only his soul. Because the soul (*al-Rūḥ*) is the true essence of a man, while the body is like a borrowed garment. It increases and decreases and changes. But the human being is human because his soul persists.’ \(^{78}\) ʿAbduh explained the Ḥadīth referring to the bodily raising of Jesus and his eventual return before the Last Day to preach the message of Islam and judge among people with Islamic law into two ways. First of all, all Prophetic traditions with regard to this had been transmitted in an *ahād* (narrated by a small number people) way; and *al-ʾUmūr al-Iʿtiqādiyya* (the doctrinal matters) should not be deduced on the basis of such traditions. As a doctrinal issue, the raising or the return of Jesus should only be taken from the *mutawātir* Ḥadīth. \(^{79}\) Secondly, the verse could be understood as referring to the spiritual triumph (*al-Ghalaba al-Rūḥiyya*) of Jesus:

The Messiah did not bring a new law to the Jews: he brought them something which would prize them from their inflexibility over the external signification of the words of the Mosaic Law and set them to understanding it clearly in its real meaning. He instructed them to observe this true essence and to do whatever would draw them to the
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\(^{76}\) Ibid., p. 142. Take for example her translation of the Arabic term *nuktah balāghiyya* as ‘joke.’ Although the word *nuktah* means in another context ‘joke,’ it refers here to a technical term in the science of Balāghah (Arabic rhetoric). It is any word specifying the hidden meaning of the phrase or the sentence.
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Riḍā shifted to give an interpretation of the verse: ‘And there is none of the People of the Book but must believe in him before his death; and on the Day of Judgment he will be a witness against them’ (al-Nisāʾ, 159). Some exegetes defined the pronoun his in the verse as referring to Jesus. This meant therefore that all of them believed in Jesus before his death because he is still alive in heaven. In Riḍā’s view, the pronoun referred to the person who would believe in Jesus, but not to Jesus himself. In other words, everybody among the People of the Book, before his own death, would witness the truth about Jesus. Riḍā’s understanding of the verse in this manner was closely related to the Muslim eschatological point of view that everybody will witness his final destination of al-Thawāb (reward) or al-ʿIqāb (punishment) during the last moments before his death. Riḍā quoted the Prophetic Traditions that clearly pointed out that the believer will receive the good tidings about God’s contentment before his death, on the other hand the unbeliever will be told about God’s torture and punishment. The angels consequently will address those who are about to die about the truth of Jesus. Riḍā attempted to prove his interpretation in the light of the Qurʾānic verse indicating that when the Pharaoh was overwhelmed with the flood, he confessed his belief (Yūnus, 90).81

Riḍā made it clear that the belief in the murder and the Crucifixion of Jesus at the outset is not needed for Muslims. Disbelief in it does not decrease Muslim knowledge of Christian ethics or history. It was the Christians who took it as the basis of their faith. Riḍā only criticized it because the Christians made it a point of departure in their attacks against Islam, especially when they found the Qurʾān abhorrently condemning it.82

6.5.1. Riḍā Discussing Crucifixion in a Missionary School

In his commentary on these verses, Riḍā recalled his early contact with missionaries, when he arrived in Cairo. Once he passed by the above-mentioned English Missionary School (situated at Muḥammed
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80 As translated by McAuliffe, p. 143.
ʿAlī Pasha Street). A missionary was standing at the entrance of the school asking people to come in and listen to the Word of God. When Riḍā was invited in, he saw many people sitting on wooden benches. A missionary preacher stood up and started to address his audience by dwelling on the question of Crucifixion and the Original Sin.83 Riḍā related the words of the preacher without giving any elaboration on the Christian theological interpretations of the concept of the Original Sin as such. In the missionary’s words, human beings were born sinful and deserve punishment because of the Adamic guilt. It was a ‘dilemma’ for God, Who was supposed to be characterised by justice and mercy. If He were to punish Adam and his offspring, it would contradict His mercy. If not, it would not correspond with His justice. Since the creation of Adam, God had been ‘thinking’ of solving the problem by finding a way to combine mercy with justice. It was only 1912 years ago (from the year Riḍā wrote his treatise), when He found this solution by incarnating His only son in the womb of a woman from Adam’s offspring. This son was destined to live and bear the pain of Crucifixion in order to salvage human beings.84 As soon as the missionary finished his sermon, Riḍā stood up and asked: ‘If you have gathered us in this place in order to convey to us this message out of mercy and compassion, would you allow me to clarify the effect of your sermon on me?’ The preacher allowed him. Riḍā took the position of the preacher and started to refute the contents of the sermon by raising six points for discussion. According to Riḍā, his missionary counterpart was not able to give any answer, but made it clear that their school was not a place for debating. Those who were interested in debating were asked to go to their library. Riḍā proudly relates that the audience was shouting: ‘There is no God, but Allah and Muḥammad is His messenger!’85

During this discussion, Riḍā identified some theological problems surrounding the man’s sermon. He recapitulated his amazement at how it was possible that the Maker of the world would fail to find a solution to this predicament for thousands of years. Those who believe in this doctrine, he went on, do not seek the least of rationality behind their faith.86 Riḍā was dismayed that the Maker of the universe would

83 Ibid., pp. 18-19.
84 Ibid., pp. 17-18.
85 Ibid., p. 19.
86 Ibid., p. 20.
became incarnated in the womb of a woman, who had the tiniest place in His Kingdom. The outcome was a human being, who was eating, drinking and being tired to the extent that he was slain in humiliation with thieves. Likewise scandalous to Riḍā was the suggestion that God had to leave Jesus to his enemies who tortured him and stabbed him, even though he was guiltless. The divine toleration of their acts significantly contradicts the concept of mercy and justice, which the Christians sought behind the doctrine. For Riḍā, the concept of forgiveness never contradicted the divine justice and perfection. Riḍā related a parable that any master who forgives his guilty slave is never described as unjust. Forgiveness is, on the other hand, one of the most excellent virtues.

6.5.2. Reward and Salvation in Islam

After having recalled this discussion in the missionary school, Riḍā continued by discussing the infallibility of prophets, which he had already discussed in the *Shubuhāt*. It was again a reaction to the missionary claim that the Prophet Muḥammad took the place of Jesus in Islam as redeemer for Muslims. Riḍā was frustrated by their propaganda among the simple-minded Muslims that Jesus had never committed a sin. As in the case of Muḥammad, we are left with some reports that he did make mistakes. According to him, the sinful was never capable of saving his followers from any sin.

Riḍā argued that Islamic instructions in this regard were superior to the Christian doctrine of Crucifixion. In his words, as it never encouraged its followers to exert efforts towards good deeds in order to be saved, this doctrine made people lax in blindly relying on something that had ‘corrupted their minds and ethics. He stressed that the light of knowledge and independence, which was originally taken from Islam, liberated the whole of Europe from it. Despite Riḍā’s deep belief in the sinlessness of all prophets (including Jesus and Muḥammad), he was convinced that his Christian addressees were not able to produce any ʿAqli (rational) or Naqli (traditional) proofs from within their religion. Very suspicious about their way of trans-
mission, Riḍā maintained that the Christian scriptures had no explicit texts telling us that a large number of the followers of Jesus had accompanied him in every minute of his life so that they could have given their testimony that he never lapsed in sin in his whole life. In accordance with Islamic theology, Riḍā differentiated between the Arabic usage of Khatīʾah (guilt or fault) and Dhanb (sin). As for the former, it never happened on the part of prophets, since it included all acts of divergence by committing what God prohibits. The latter concept was derived from Dhanab al-Ḥayawān (the tail of animal) because it refers to any act that entails unpleasant and opposing results. All prophets had probably made this kind of mistake. An example of these was the Prophet Muḥammad’s permission to the Hypocrites not to join him in the Expedition of Tabūk (or the Expedition of Distress, circa 630 AD), when they decided to stay behind in Medina. In Riḍā’s view, such acts—even though a dhanb in the literal sense—could not be considered as a khatīʾah, which might prevent human beings from deserving the Kingdom of God and His eternal reward.92 However, he pointed out that such issues did not represent the core of the Islamic doctrine; and their rejection brings no harm. For Riḍā, the Muslim criterion of salvation and eternal pleasure in the Hereafter was only accomplished by means of purifying one’s soul from all ‘false’ pagan dogmas and performing good and virtuous acts in this world.93 This kind of purification does not mean that the believer should be fully infallible from committing any mistake; but he should always wipe off these mistakes by showing remorse: ‘It is like one’s house which one regularly sweeps and wipes by using all cleaning methods. Whenever any dust or filthiness touches it, one would immediately remove it away […] Clean houses have sometimes little dust and filthiness, which could be easily removed.’94

6.5.3. A Pagan Nature of the doctrines of Crucifixion and Salvation?

Riḍā remarked that many Christians had personally confessed to him that such doctrines as the Crucifixion, Salvation and Trinity could never rationally be proved. Their mere support for such beliefs originated from the Holy Scriptures with which they must comply regardless of their rationality or irrationality. In Islam, he further argued,

93 Ibid., p. 27.
94 Ibid., p. 28.
there was no fundamental doctrine that did not conform to rationality, except some reports on the ‘unseen world,’ which cannot be proven by means of human reason independently. But their occurrence cannot be denied, as they are considered as Mumkināt (possibilities).  

Riḍā reiterated the arguments of the above-mentioned Ṭāhir al-Tannīr verbatim. As we have mentioned, Tannīr drew parallels between various Christian doctrines and other doctrines held in antique religions. As for the Crucifixion, he also quoted other sources, such as a piece of work by the nineteenth-century rationalist Thomas William Doane who argued that ‘the idea of salvation through the offering of a God as a sacrifice is very ancient among the pagan Hindus and others.’

6.5.4. An Illusive Crucifixion?

As continuation to his reflection on the Crucifixion, Riḍā occasionally drew from the arguments of Šidqi, sometimes with no differentiation between Šidqi’s and his own. Riḍā doubted the soundness of the Christian narratives on the Crucifixion as lacking the quality of tawātur. Riḍā took pride in the status of the tawātur in Islam. For him, historical reports acquire this specific attribute, when they are related after the agreement of a large group of narrators, whose collusion to lie over the narration is impossible. In order to avoid any doubt, the absence of collusion and error should be also testified from the side of this multitude of informers. The fact that Mary Magdalene and other women, for example, had been in doubt about the crucified person violated the conditions of tawātur.

Riḍā challenged the Christians to prove the tawātur of their Scriptures in that sense. He also distrusted the reliability and the holiness, which the Christians ascribed to their Scriptures. He found no evidence whatsoever on their internal infallibility or the infallibility

95 Ibid., p. 31.
96 Ibid., p. 32. ‘The idea of expiation by the sacrifice of a god was to be found among the Hindoos even in Vedic times. The sacrificer was mystically identified with the victim, which was regarded as the ransom for sin, and the instrument of its annulment. The Rig—Veda represents the gods as sacrificing Purusha, the primeval male, supposed to be coeval with the Creator.’ T. W. Doane, Bible myths and their parallels in other religions, New York: Commonwealth Co, circa 1882, p. 181.
97 Ibid., pp. 35-36
98 Ibid., p. 36.
of their writers. The same held true for the synods which had been established to authorise them. The fact that the Qurʾān has been narrated by the way of tawātūr was a more reliable foundation for faith than their non-mutawātir books. Riḍā warned Muslims not to believe in the missionary propaganda that their Scriptures had been transmitted without interruption since the time of Jesus, and that all Christian sects had accepted them with no disagreement. Riḍā drew the attention of common Muslims to the fact that Islam, unlike Christianity, was born in the ‘cradle’ of power, civilisation and culture. In that milieu the Qurʾān was preserved.

Riḍā retold Ṣidqī’s arguments regarding the alleged prediction in the Old Testament of the Crucifixion. He also repeated his ideas concerning the confusion of the soldiers, who had led Jesus to his prison. Riḍā used his own experience as an argument. Often, he would greet strange people confusing them with his friends. But after having talked to them, he would recognise that they were not his friends. Riḍā quoted from the same medical work used by Ṣidqī. Besides, he cited another incident mentioned in the afore-mentioned educational French work, *L’Émile du dix-neuvième siècle*, that it has been attested that people would sometimes be confused in recognising others who have similar appearance. Unlike Ṣidqī, who mainly interpreted the confusion about the Crucifixion from a medical and scientific point of view, Riḍā repeated the classical Muslim view that it was primarily caused by a divine supernatural act, when God put the likeness of Jesus upon another man and changed his appearance. For this reason, he was able to escape unseen. Riḍā tried to substantiate this Islamic viewpoint on the basis of passages from the New Testament. He alluded, for example, to Jesus’ words to his followers that ‘a time is coming, and has come, when you will be scattered, each to his own home. You will leave me all alone. Yet I am not alone, for my Father is with me. I have told you these things, so that in me you may have peace. In this world you will have trouble. But take
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heart! I have overcome the world’ (John 16:32-33). This was a prediction of what Matthew stated when he said that ‘all the disciples forsook him, and fled’ (Matthew 26:55) (See also, Mark 14:50). 103

The preferable alternative, in Riḍā’s eyes, was the narrative of the Crucifixion as told in the Gospel of Barnabas. He added that if it were true that Judas Iscariot had plans to commit suicide and had later completely disappeared, Riḍā argued, it could mean that it was he who had been crucified. Giving up himself to the soldiers must have been much less demanding than committing suicide. In Riḍā’s mind, it was also reasonable that when Judas witnessed the divine Providence having saved his master, he must have instantly perceived how grave his infidelity was. He therefore submitted himself to death in order to have his sins wiped off. Riḍā compared the escape of Jesus with that of the Prophet Muḥammad before his migration to Medina, when the Meccans fell asleep in front of his house and did not perceive him passing by. 104

Riḍā held the same view as Ṣidqī that the whole event of the Crucifixion was based on illusions and rumours. It was only the ‘hysterical’ Mary Magdalene, who was touched by the ‘seven devils,’ who had witnessed the Resurrection and claimed to have talked to Jesus. After having heard the story, the disciples circulated it among the common people. Riḍā clarified all that happened as something that normally occurs to people in the situation of ‘nervous excitement,’ such as fear, sorrow or thirst. In these circumstances people sometimes imagine that other persons are talking to them. This could also be compared to things happening in dreams and visions. 105

Similarly to Ṣidqī, Riḍā made the interesting remark that all reports related to the Crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus looked much like the supposed imaginary visions that occasionally appear to Ṣūfī figures. An example of these was the occurrence, which took place in the Moroccan city Fez, and was narrated by the writer of the well-known eighteenth-century influential Ṣūfī work al-Dhahab al-ʾIbrīz. 106

103 Ibid., pp. 48-49.
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106 Riḍā did not define the writer by name. But it is obvious that he referred to al-Ibrīz min Kalām Sayyīdī al-Ghawth ʾAbd al-ʾAzīz al-Dabbāgh, which was written by the Mālikite jurist Ahmad Ibn al-Mubārak al-Sijilmāsī (d. 1742). In his unpublished work, ‘al-Ḥikmā al-Sharʿiyyā,’ Riḍā criticised many points of this work. See, al-Ibrīz, edited by Muhammad ʾAdnān al-Shammā, 2 vols, Damascus, 1st edition, 1986. See also the French translation of Zakia Zouanat, Paroles d’or Kitāb al-Ibrīz,
The author related a story on the authority of his master that a butcher lost one of his most beloved children, and remained overwhelmed by the presence of that child in his thoughts day and night. He once went to Bāb al-Futūḥ (a famous gate in Fez) in order to purchase sheep. While he was thinking about his dead son, he saw all of a sudden the boy standing beside him. The man claimed that he was really asking his son to seize the sheep till he would buy another one. When the surrounding people asked him whom he was speaking to, the butcher retrieved his consciousness once again. The son disappeared. ‘None knew exactly,’ the author concluded, ‘what occurred inside him out of longing to [see] his child, except God the Almighty.’

Riḍā mentioned another example about an elderly lady from his hometown al-Qalamūn who often saw the dead and talked to them. A brother of hers, who had drowned, was her most habitual companion in conversation. Riḍā and others were almost sure that the lady was not lying or deceiving with her story, for she was overwhelmed by that experience. Adding to these examples, Riḍā now glossed long citations from the Arabic translation of Gustave Le Bon’s work *Psychologie des foules*, especially on the author’s ideas concerning ‘the suggestibility and credulity of crowds.’ In his works, Le Bon put more emphasis on mass movements in general, and appealed more directly to the sensibilities of the middle class. Riḍā quoted his particular ideas on how the community thinks in images, and the image itself instantaneously calls up a series of other images of no connection with the former. The ways in which a community distorts any event which it witnesses must be manifold, since the temperaments of individuals composing the gathering are very different. The first perversion of the truth affected by one of the individuals of the gathering is the starting-point of the contagious suggestion. The miraculous appearance of St. George on the walls of Jerusalem to all the Crusaders was certainly perceived in the first instance by one of
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\[108\] Ibid., p. 66.


those present, and was immediately accepted by all. Another example of these ‘collective hallucinations’ had been related by Julian Felix, a naval lieutenant, and was cited by the *Revue Scientifique*. The French frigate, the Belle Poule, was cruising in search for the cruiser Le Berceau, from which she had been separated as a result of violent storm. It was daylight and in full sunshine. Everybody on board signaled a disabled vessel with many officers and sailors, who were exhibiting signals of distress. But it was nothing but a collective hallucination. When Admiral Desfosses had lowered a boat to rescue the wrecked sailors, they saw masses of men in motion, stretching out their hands and screaming. Finally, they discovered that it was only a few branches of trees covered with leaves, which had been carried from the neighboring coast. Le Bon mentioned another example, which he read in the newspapers about the story of two little girls, who had been found dead in the Seine. Half a dozen witnesses recognised both of them. On the basis of these affirmations, the *juge d’instruction* had the certificate of death drawn up. During the procession of their burial, people discovered that the supposed victims were alive. They also had but a remote resemblance to the drowned girls.

Riḍā argued that if it were possible in the opinion of those psychologists (which he called philosophers) that people can be affected by their imagination to this extent, it should be accepted that those who witnessed the Crucifixion and resurrection (such as Mary Magdalene and others) were also affected by these kinds of illusions. Some Ṣūfīs, whom Riḍā personally knew, claimed many times to him that they saw the spirits of many prophets in their visions. One of these acquaintances was an *a’jamī* (non-Arab Western) Ṣūfī, who confessed to Riḍā the same thing, and that these prophets who came to him used to read religious sciences in Arabic. Parallel to the appearance of St. George on the walls of Jerusalem, Riḍā again mentioned the story of Sheikh al-Matbūlī of Cairo and another analogous account reported about a certain Rāghib from Syria. This Rāghib was training himself in mystical disciplines to the degree that he was overpowered by numerous imaginations. It was said that he memorised many parts of the Gospels after having lived among Christians in

112 Ibid., p. 30.
113 Ibid., pp. 31-32.
114 Riḍā-Ṣidqī, *ʿAqīda*, pp. 73-74.
115 Ibid., p. 76.
Damascus. As a result, he started to imagine the story of the Crucifixion. Once he claimed that he envisioned Jesus as nailed in accordance with the image mentioned in the Gospels. After having told his Christian fellows about that, they believed him and declared him a saint. The famous Syrian reformer Ṭāhir al-Jazāʾīrī (d. 1920)\(^{116}\) visited him and began to discuss with him the story from an Islamic point of view without any direct reproach about his mistake until he established another vision in his mind. Rāghib consequently stated that he envisioned Jesus once again standing in front of him, but without any trace of the Crucifixion whatsoever. In his vision, Rāghib began to ask Jesus about the reality of his Crucifixion. Jesus informed him that his image was placed upon Judas; and they therefore had crucified him. When he told them about his new vision, his Christian fellows declared him to be a lunatic.\(^{117}\)

6.6. Conclusion

We have provided a detailed synopsis of the contents of Ṣidqi’s polemical treatises. Like his missionary counterparts polemicising against Islam, Ṣidqi was not very charitable in his criticism of the Bible. His approach was typical of the Muslim response to missionary work in its spirit of combativeness. We have seen that he attached great value to the European rationalistic attacks on the credibility of the miracles of the Bible and its supernatural ethical authority. On the other hand, he paid little attention to the classical Islamic sources. It was clear that he agreed with earlier Muslim polemicists that the Jewish and Christian sacred texts cannot boast any prophetic authorship even though they were supposedly based on the life stories of their prophets. At almost every point, Ṣidqi established the principal lines of his inquiry by sorting out various ideas already accepted in some Western circles in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. We have also noticed that his choice of words and tone was bolder and more startling than that of Riḍā. Though not a specialist, he tried to enter

---


\(^{117}\) Riḍā-Ṣidqi, *‘Aqīda*, pp. 74-75.
upon the province of Biblical criticism giving it an Islamic flavour. His zealotry in defending Islam against missionary attacks made his arguments an impoverished imitation of these Western writings. His medical knowledge was one of the most salient features of his polemics.

In his joint contribution to ‘Aqīdat al-Ṣalb wā al-Fidā’, Riḍā generally set forth his ideas on the basis of his religious knowledge. Riḍā’s attitude towards the Crucifixion was, to say the least, surprising. He was clearly not concerned with analysing the wide range of narratives developed by early Muslims. In the course of his arguments, he stepped sometimes outside the established Muslim interpretations, mentioning many stories related in Ṣūfī traditions of visionary occurrences, and comparing them to the Christian narratives. The story of the Egyptian old man playing the role of al-Matbūlī, who was envisioned by people in the sky above the Greek Church, was one of the favourite stories quoted by Riḍā and Ṣidqī. As Riḍā was known for his heavy critique of the extreme forms of Sufism, we can plausibly conclude that his comparison of these stories with the Crucifixion was an indication of his belittling of their miraculous aspects as ‘illusive.’ These interpretations took a new turn in the force with which they insisted on the understanding of the Crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus as illusive events, which had nothing to do with the reality of his last moments on earth. Riḍā replicated many of his arguments from the same Western rationalist sources, which had been mentioned by Ṣidqī. Besides, he tallied many examples of comparable ‘illusions’ in some of the available Western works on ‘Crowd Psychology,’ such as the ideas of his favourite French physician, Gustave Le Bon.
CHAPTER SEVEN

RECAPITULATION OF IDEAS: CHRISTIANITY AS REFLECTED IN RIḌĀ’S FATWĀS

We have already discussed the polemics of al-Manār on Christianity on different levels. In chapter three we have seen that Riḍā had opened the pages of his journal to some of his readers by publishing their reactions to missionary activities. As early as 1903, al-Manār published a poem by an anonymous reader under the title of Suʿālun fī al-Tathlīth (A Question on the Trinity). Signing his poem sin nūn, the poet challenged the Christians to prove that this doctrine was qadīm (primordial). The fact that it had never been explicitly mentioned in the teachings of previous prophets (especially Moses) proves that it was hādith (newly innovated).¹ We have also pointed out that missionary activity in Egypt reached its peak in the beginning of the 1930s. In June 1933, another reader under the name Ḥasan al-Dars, a police officer and a journalist in Cairo, wrote a poem which he entitled, Muhārabat al-Mubashshirīn lil-ʾIslām fī Miṣr (Missionaries fighting Islam in Egypt), which Riḍā never published in his journal. In his long poem, al-Dars accused missionaries of being ‘charlatans,’ who used all means, such as hypnosis, to convert people. He was grieved by the ‘laxity’ of the government in combating their work.²

Riḍā’s interaction with his readers is best exemplified in his fatwā section.³ In this section, he illustrated many of his views on many a great deal of theological, scholarly, religious, and social issues. Beginning in 1903, firstly under the title ‘Questions and Answers’ (Suʿāl wā Jawāb), and later ‘Fatāwā al-Manār,’ he responded to a wide variety of queries from all over the world. This collection indicates that al-Manār was a remarkable record of interests and preoccupations of the Muslim world.⁴

² Letter to Riḍā, ʿHasan al-Dars, 15 June 1933, Cairo, Riḍā’s private archive.
³ The whole collection of his fatwās has been collected in six volumes in 1970-1971 by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid and Yūsuf al-Khūrī, 6 vols., Beirut, 1976-77.
It should be stressed that most of these petitions were submitted by Muslim readers; but there were also questions raised by Christians and missionaries. As we shall discuss, Riḍā’s answers to the Danish missionary Alfred Nielsen represented his only reaction to queries directly sent by an active missionary in the Middle East. We also encounter the name of the above-mentioned Coptic lawyer Akhnūkh Fanūs (see, chapter 2), who sent Riḍā a long message in which he discussed the differences between some Qur’ānic narratives and their equivalents in the Old Testament. We should remember that Fānūs was one of the pivotal figures behind the Coptic Congress, which Riḍā had strongly resisted in 1911. Riḍā published his brief reaction to his message as a *fatwā* in 1913.5 He reacted sharply, stressing that the Qur’ān was the Word of God and more trustworthy than the Biblical narratives written by Jewish historians. He divided Jewish narratives into two types: 1) divine as they contained the history of prophets, and 2) non-divine, such as the historical account of the Jewish historiographer Josephus. Riḍā stated that the Christian views of the narratives of the Old Testament were not always coherent, especially those on the stories of prophets. Muslims were therefore required not to trust their Scriptures, neither in the ‘literal,’ nor in the ‘figurative’ sense. They should be merely seen as historical records.6

7.1. Early Encounters

The first pertinent question was raised as early as 1902. In the minds of one of Riḍā’s readers there were some theological problems as to the narratives on the *nuzūl* (descending) of Jesus before the end of
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6 *Al-Manār,* vol. 16/7, (Rajab 1331/July 1913), p. 520.
Christianity as Reflected in Rîdâ’s Fatwâs

the world. And would his return as a prophet contradict the concept of the Prophet Muḥammad as the seal of prophecy? 7

Rîdâ confirmed that Muslims were not required to believe in the return of Jesus because there was no related qatī (definite) Qur’ānic text. All Ḥadīths related to this issue, mostly from Abū Hurairah, were ahâd (narrated by a small number people) or ghârib (odd). In matters of ‘Aqīda (doctrine), one should depend on definite and mutawâtir traditions. Rîdâ furthermore disagreed with those who quoted the Qur’ān in order to support this element of doctrine. He gave different interpretations to the two verses related to this issue. The verse: ‘And there is none of the People of the Book but must believe in him before his death’ (al-Nisâ’, 4:159) was actually mentioned in the context of the claims of Christians about Jesus as the Son of God. In the fatwâ, Rîdâ employed the same arguments he used in the Taṣfîr which we have already discussed in the previous chapter. The verse refers to a group of the People of the Book who revert to the true belief in Jesus as God’s prophet immediately before their death. To take the verse as proving the descending of Jesus, and that people will believe in him before his natural death before the Day of Resurrection, was, in his view, inaccurate. The narratives concerning the coming of Jesus only became known after the circulation of the manuals of the two Shaykhs (Al-Bukhārī and Muslim). 8

Despite his refusal to accept the return of Jesus on the basis of the Qur’ān, Rîdâ insisted on making his own comparison between the concept of the Messiah in Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The Jews, in his view, expected their messiah who will renew the kingdom of Israel. Rîdâ alluded that as they are desirous for wealth, the Jews predicted somebody who would consolidate their ‘materialistic’ aspirations on earth. The Christians expected the return of theirs in order to re-establish his Kingdom and the Cross. But Muslims believed that Jesus will return and ‘break the cross, kill the swine, put an end to the payment of the jizya (the poll tax on the People of the Book), establish the Islamic Shari’a, and observe the Muslim prayer in order
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8 Ibid., 137.
to make it clear that Islam is the true religion.’ 9 Riḍā however argued that some Christians believed in the return of Jesus not in the physical sense. They interpreted his ‘return’ as referring to his ‘good attributes and sermons of love, peace and brotherhood.’ In the same sense, Riḍā metaphorically elucidated the word *nuzūl* in the Ḥadīth as that the descending of Jesus would be exemplified in the propagation and loftiness of Islam as the true religion of God. The Christians will also comprehend the nature of Jesus to be a man, in the same way as the Muslims believe in Muḥammad. 10 Concerning the second point of the question, Riḍā confirmed that the notion of the Prophet Muḥammad as the seal of prophecy was confirmed by means of *mutawātir* and definite traditions; and there was no need to interpret it in the light of other *aḥād* narratives such as that about the return of Jesus. 11

In 1903, a habitual *mustaftī* (petitioner) of al-Manār under the name Ahmād Muḥammad al-ʾAlfī, a regional scholar in the town of Ĺūkh nearby Cairo, wondered why many Christians, despite being highly qualified and having significantly contributed to the Arabic language, still insist on disbelieving in the Qurʾān as the final and true revelation. Some of them, he went on, already admitted its miraculous nature, but rejected its divine origin out of ‘stubbornness’: Why did eloquent Christian men of letters adhere to Christianity, and ignore the ‘contradictions, the broken chain of transmission, and the opposition to logic in the Christian Scriptures? Why did they leave the Qurʾān with its ‘wise’ message and ‘beautiful’ style aside? 12

Riḍā answered that those Christians insisted on adopting their religion only as a matter of ‘nationality’ and a socio-political bond. They preserved its religious symbols of doctrines, traditions in order to keep their national and religious unity intact. In Riḍā’s thinking, they did not study Islam with due fairness in order to understand its origins. However, the ‘vices’ widespread among Muslims made the ‘merits’ of Islam invisible to the fair-minded among them. Riḍā
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10 Ibid., pp. 138-139.
11 Ibid.
moreover spelled out that most of the well-versed Christian Arab linguists hardly looked at the Qurʾān in an objective way. Their ‘ethnic enmity’ against Islam, he further argued, frequently prevented them from saying the truth about the Qurʾān’s miraculous (muʿjiz) nature. However, he excluded the group of those who reached another conclusion, viz. that the language of the Qurʾān is miraculous, such as the above-mentioned Christian Lebanese linguist Jabr effendi Ḍumiṭ in his book al-Khawātir al-Ḥisān. Riḍā assured his petitioner that most of the educated and rational Christians did not believe in the Trinity, and a group of them had frequently informed him that they were entirely sceptical about their religion.

In 1904, an unnamed Tunisian questioner asked Riḍā whether a Muslim was allowed to read non-Muslim scriptures, such as the Torah, only for the sake of acquiring knowledge about their contents. He suggested that should Muslims be prohibited from reading other scriptures, non-Muslims would be more knowledgeable and stronger than Muslims, since they were not discouraged by their religion to study the Qurʾān. For Riḍā, reading other scriptures for the purpose of supporting the truth of Islam and refuting the allegations of others was highly recommended. He even considered this act as a matter of ‘Ībāda (worship); and in many cases this should become a duty. As early Muslim scholars had been reading other scriptures in order to deduce proofs from them, Riḍā deemed it an obligation upon himself and other contemporary scholars to combat missionary writings on Islam by reading Christian scriptures and disproving them. In order to avoid disturbance in their beliefs, Riḍā discouraged common Muslims and young students to read the books of other religions. He compared the state of those Muslims with a ‘crow’ who tried to learn the way of walking of a ‘peacock.’ As soon as the crow acquired the peacock’s way of walking, it would totally forget its former nature.
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15 Ibid., p. 263.
Muḥammad Effendi Ḥilmī, a secretary at the Prisons of Ḥalfa (Sudan), put a question to Riḍā concerning the eternal abide of unbelievers and Christians in the Fire. Riḍā expounded that the Qurʾān is clear-cut in stating that the 
Kāfirūn (unbelievers) and 
Munāfiqūn (hypocrites) abide eternally in the Fire, except whom the Lord wills to be saved. The scholars interpreted the concept of Khulūd (eternity) in this case as Mukth (eternal residence) in a similar way as in the other verse: 'If a man kills a Believer intentionally, his recompense is Hell, to abide therein for ever' (al-Nisāʾ 4:93). Muslim theologians were also of the opinion that anyone who knew about Islam on a sound basis stimulating his contemplation, while he did not believe out of stubbornness and rigidity, was eternally destined to the Fire. However, they excluded those who had not received the message properly or those who studiously and seriously investigated Islam, but did not manage to discover the truth before their death.

Another petitioner had some doubts about the authenticity of the Ḥadīth of the Fitra (God’s way of creating or His plan): ‘Every infant is born according to the Fitra, then his parents make him a Jew or a Christian or a Magian.’ Riḍā explained that every infant is born ready to ‘promote’ himself by accepting Islam as agreeable with God’s original nature of creation. The infant later will be taught other psychological and physical behaviours which might influence his nature. When parents (or anybody playing their role) bring up their children according to beliefs other than Islam, they will be creating in the character of their children other traditions opposing the Fitra. Riḍā concluded that Christian parents, for example, raise their children to believe that all human beings have been created by nature with ‘evil’ and ‘sin.’ They also teach them that salvation and happiness could be reached if they believe in the Crucifixion, which Riḍā defined as a change in their Fitra.

In another fatwā on the belief of the People of the Book, Riḍā made his points clearer. He gave the example that their belief was like a

16 ‘Khulūd al-Kāfir fī al-Nār,’ vol. 7/7, pp. 258-259; questions by the same person, see, vol. 6/13 (Rajab 1321/September 1903), p. 510; vol. 6/17, p. 672, vol. 7/4, p. 141
17 Al-Manār, vol. 8/1 (Muḥarram 1323/March 1905), pp. 18-20; a certain ‘Abdullāh Sulaymān sent the question from Suez. In his comment, based on the question, Riḍā found him a ‘strange man.’
18 Ibid.
group of slaves whose master left them his farm in order to reconstruct it and avail themselves from its crops. Later he sent them a more educated and well-informed slave with a manual of other instructions and duties. They followed that manual, but soon abandoned it after the death of the slave. They were ‘tempted’ to discard their work according to his manual, replacing it by extravagant veneration of the slave instead of exerting efforts to keep the farm cultivated. Riḍā followed the line of Abū Ḥāmid Al-Ghazālī (d. 1111) who maintained that those who died after having conducted deep investigation, but did not reach the truth of Islam before their death, would be forgiven in the Hereafter. Such people are excused until they have a real opportunity to learn about the ‘truth’ of Islam. 19

7.3. A Kuwaiti Petitioner on Slavery in the Bible

In the Gulf region, there were slave-holding areas even until the 1950s, despite official outlawing of the slave trade. In their writings, missionaries in Kuwait and Bahrain were critical of the institution of slavery.20 In response to many questions, Riḍā published opinions on slavery. Sulaymān al-ʿAdasānī (d. 1957), al-Manār’s agent and Riḍā’s informant in Kuwait, requested Riḍā to dwell upon the concept of captivity and slavery in the Bible. The reason for the query was to respond to the objections to Islam as an ‘anti-humane’ and ‘barbaric’ religion.21 Al-ʿAdasānī had several debates with Christian missions in his homeland. In a letter to Riḍā, he mentioned a well-circulated missionary pamphlet in Kuwait entitled: Ḥusn al-ʿIjāz fī Ibṭāl al-ʾIjāz (The Best Refutation of the Unapproachable Eloquence) by a certain


Nuṣayr al-Dīn al-Zāfīrī, whose aim was to disapprove the Qur’ān’s claim of eloquence.\(^{22}\)

In his answer, Riḍā did not cite any specific sources. His reply was based on lengthy quotations from the Bible which he saw as encouraging slavery. He continued to elucidate that there was ample evidence that captivity and slavery were permitted in ancient legislations. He pointed for instance to the Biblical narrative that Abraham’s brother had been taken captive (Genesis 14:14). The Mosaic Law had also allowed the Israelites to take ‘the children of the strangers’ as their ‘bondmen forever’ (Leviticus 25:46). Riḍā argued that these Biblical passages stated that it had not been permitted to free any foreign slave. The Israelites, on the other hand, were requested to free their Hebrew slaves during the year of Jubilee, except those who showed a desire to remain in eternal slavery. Riḍā went further and applied his analysis of these Biblical passages to the Zionist movement. He expected that once they had completely seized Palestine and established their laws, they will ‘root out’ all native inhabitants and keep them in slavery forever. In his view, the Israelites were likewise asked not to set a king over themselves who was ‘a stranger’ and not a ‘brother’ (Deuteronomy 17:15). Riḍā referred to another passage as responsible for the subjugation of female captives. According to Deuteronomy, when an Israelite saw among the captives a beautiful woman, and had a desire to have her as his wife, he should bring her home. She had to shave her head, and pare her nails (21:11-14). As for the Gospels, Riḍā pointed out that they endorsed slavery in the same manner as the Romans. It neither demanded masters to free their slaves nor to be lenient with them. In many places it was stressed that servants should be submissive to their masters ‘with all fear’ and ‘according to the flesh, with fear and trembling’ (Ephesians 6:5-8; Colossians 3:22-25; I Peter 2:18-20).

In this fatwā, Riḍā did not exemplify the Islamic rules of slavery in details, but referred the questioner to other articles in al-Manār
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In Riḍā’s archive, I found about 30 letters sent by the petitioner. The treatise was published by the American Press in Cairo (Bulaq, 1912, 24pp). The title is to be listed in the *Summer 1914 Edition, op. cit.*, p. 13.
on the subject.\textsuperscript{23} In this way he rebuked those who criticised Islam as an unjust religion towards slaves. Unlike Judaism and Christianity, he argued, Islam never made slavery an obligation, but allowed it for specific reasons. Riḍā looked at the role of slaves in that sense in a positive way. In the case of war and the murder of most of the male members of the clan, slaves had always been of great benefit in taking care of children and women. Islam always demanded masters to treat their slaves on an equal footing, even in giving them the same food and clothes; and never to humiliate or afflict them with heavy work.\textsuperscript{24}

7.4. An Aḥmādī Petitioner

In 1915, Shir ʿAlī, the director of the Aḥmādī quarterly Review of Religions (firstly published in 1902) in Punjab, made a statement that al-Manār’s interpretation of the phrase muṣaddiqan limā bayna yadayhi (lit. confirming which is between his hands) was an eye-opener for him. This phrase is often mentioned in the Qurʾān as a testimony to other holy books. Al-Manār made a distinction between ‘saddaqa lahu’ (a non-transitional verb with the preposition lām) and ‘ṣaddaqa bihi’ (a non-transitional verb with the preposition bā). The former refers to ‘verification and confirmation,’ whereas the latter means ‘completion, or implementation of the purport of something.’ The usage of the concept by the Qurʾān referred to the former meaning of verification, only. According to Shir ʿAlī, this interpretation might remove the misunderstanding between Muslims and Christians concerning the testimony of the Qurʾān to their scriptures. Shir ʿAlī had heard about this interpretation, but did not read al-Manār himself. The significance of it lay in the fact that he, as a Muslim missionary in India, was indebted to Riḍā whose arguments regularly endorsed his debates with Christian missionaries.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{23} Riḍā dealt with the issue of slavery in al-Manār in many other places. In 1910, for example, he received a group of questions on the issue from a certain Muḥammad Mukhtār from Paris, see vol. 13/10 (Shawwāl 1328/November 1910), pp. 741-744.

\textsuperscript{24} Al-Manār, vol. 17/9. Later in 1922, Riḍā clung to the notion that Muslims were obliged to retain slavery if their enemies did so, to improve their bargaining position. Towards the end of his life, he even opined that servitude could be a refuge for the poor and weak, notably, women, and could give all women a chance to bear children. See, William Gervase Clarence-Smith, Islam and the Abolition of Slavery, London: Hurst & Oxford University Press, 2006, pp. 205-206.

\textsuperscript{25} Al-Manār, vol. 18/3 (Jumāda al-ʿŪlā 1333/14 April 1915). pp. 178-180.
Riḍā explained to Shir ‘Alī that the interpretation was not his own, but had been formulated earlier by Tawfīq Ṣidqī in one of his polemical treatises. Riḍā added to the interpretation more linguistic analyses of some theological connotations. The verb ṣaddqa could be used in the Qurʾān as muta’addī bī nafsihī (transitional form in itself) and has two meanings: 1) the Prophet verbally conveyed the truth of the Jewish and Christian messages, or 2) his mission, supported by his ‘merits and deeds,’ confirmed his prophecy on the coming of other scriptures. Riḍā agreed that the non-transitional verb muṣaddiqan limā was only used for confirmation, but the other way around, viz. the other scriptures contained clear prophecies, which confirmed the coming of the prophet Muḥammad and the message of Islam.

7.5. A Lutheran Danish Missionary in Riḍā’s Fatwās

Riḍā was never reluctant to publish his own debates with missionaries in his Manār, and opened its pages for their questions. He thought that this was the best way to raise the Muslims’ awareness of the missionary movements of his time. He published three fatwās on Christian missions, whose questions had been raised by the Danish missionary Pastor Alfred Julius Nielsen (1884-1963), a Lutheran missionary in Syria and Palestine.26

It is worth noting that Nielsen had worked for some time in Riḍā’s village, and was a subscriber to al-Manār.27 He was also keen on having correspondences with other Muslim scholars in Palestine, in which he discussed many theological aspects of the Bible and the Qurʾān. He was much interested in promoting tolerance and the free


27 Letter, anonymous to ‘Abd al-Rāziq Ḥamzah, Damascus, 15 Rabī’ al-Thānī 1343, Riḍā’s archive in Cairo.
exchange of opinions relative to Christianity and Islam. As a liberal theologian, Nielsen argued that ‘the Christians of the Near East were to lose nothing, if they would abandon Christianity and become Muslims.’ It was not important for him that Christians and Muslims might reach an ultimate conclusion with each other as regard to the concept of Salvation; but they should live as ‘brothers.’ In its review of one of his Arabic treatises, the Jesuit magazine *al-Machreq* severely criticised Nielsen for his overzealous goals by ‘treading a wicked road.’ It also considered his views ‘a slap in the face of Christians.’

Riḍā’s three fatwās for Nielsen contained interesting arguments, which were rarely found in the Muslim-Christian controversy of that time. They were unique in the sense of being a face-to-face debate between a Muslim theologian and a Christian missionary. Riḍā’s answers did not only dealt with his conception of the missionary work, but contained some reflections on a few theological issues as well.

The first fatwā (1924) dealt with Nielsen’s questions on several points, such as the Muslim perception of the upright missionary work which does not attack Islam, and learning the Bible as it is the basis of Western civilisation. In his answer, Riḍā amply vindicated that the Muslim, with the knowledge and reason given to him, can distinguish between good missions whose work was fair and included no defamation or obscenity of other religions. The Muslim, according to him, could differentiate between zealous Christians and most missionaries who exploited it in politics and retained religious fanaticism. Riḍā evaluated all missions working among Muslims as corrupting and indecent due to their ‘bad’ behaviour, which had been attested. A decent missionary approach, however, was acceptable. His own experience convinced him that there were some individuals who preached their religion on the basis of manifesting its values, standing up for their convictions on the basis of solid knowledge, and keeping abreast of honesty and blamelessness. He lived among such Christians
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30 Ibid.

31 Ibid., pp. 470–471.
in his hometown. He had many debates with them, and they used to respect each other.\textsuperscript{32}

As for the point of learning the Bible, Riḍā stated it was not true that it was the duty of every enlightened person to know the Bible. It was only the duty of the scholars who specialised in religious sciences. He also rejected Nielsen’s statement that Western civilisation is based on the Holy Book. This allegation, according to him, was absurdly formulated by the missionaires in order to win over those who were dazzled by the European civilisation. The association between Western civilisation and the Bible was not plausible. In his mind, Western laws had no connection whatsoever with the legislation of the Torah. Nor did the morals of Western people have any relation whatsoever with the body of ethics included in the Gospel. The civilisation of the West, he believed, was lustful and materialistic, and mainly based on arrogance, conceit and the adoration of money, covetousness, and extravagance in embellishment and lusts. On the contrary, the principles of the Gospel were founded on modesty, altruism, asceticism, truthfulness, the renunciation of embellishment, and the abandonment of lusts. The dissemination of sciences and arts in the West was not due to the spread of missionary groups there. Riḍā stressed that the impact of religion on nations was at its strongest and most complete in the early stages of guidance. Once a nation reaches its full blossoming, religion gradually becomes weaker. For many centuries, even after the spread of Christianity, the West remained without the application of any principle of the sciences and arts. All these concepts were originally transferred from the Arabs and Muslims to Europe. ‘It should be borne in mind that,’ he wrote, ‘the propagators of these concepts in Europe were tyrannised and ill-treated by “the Holy Group” and its defenders in the courts of Inquisition. Had the West acquired the religion of the Arabs from the East, just as it had acquired their knowledge and wisdom, it would have been perfect in both religious and worldly matters, and it would not have been entirely materialistic as it is today.’\textsuperscript{33}

Riḍā was persuaded that the Bible was not a ‘virtue’ which everybody should appreciate. Appreciation should be only given to things of real benefit. Missionary activities had proved to be tragic and catastrophic wherever they worked. He challenged Nielsen to bring him

\textsuperscript{32} Ryad, ‘Nielsen,’ pp. 96-99.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
any justification necessitating the gratitude of Muslims to Christian missions. The high esteem that Riḍā gave to the Qurʾān stimulated him to maintain that ‘if any Muslim, who is aware of the true nature of Islam, studies the Bible, he will be more convinced that the Qurʾān is given priority over all books, superior to them, and has the soundest judgement among them all.’ Furthermore, Riḍā predicted a total fiasco for missionary work among Muslims. The real Muslim believing in his religion on the basis of true knowledge and firm belief should not fear any ‘call’ for any other religion. Riḍā quoted al-Afghānī who said that the Muslim could never become a Christian because Islam is Christianity with additions. Having decided on something perfect, Riḍā added, one would never accept a subordinate alternative.

He attempted, for instance, to hit straight at the doctrine of Trinity: one of the most vulnerable spots, which Muslims always took into account in the opposition with Christian dogma. His very premise started from the argument that Muslim theologians are of the agreement that there is no logical impossibility in Islam (muḥāl ʿaqlan). This means: a Muslim is never required to believe in anything that is logically impossible. If he once encounters anything which seems to be in rational or practical conflict with a definitive proof, it should be interpreted as an attempt of reconciliation between the rationale and the text on the basis of the Qurʾānic passage: ‘On no soul doth Allah place a burden greater that it can bear. It gets every good that it earns, and suffers every ill that it earns’ (al-Baqara, 2: 286). Riḍā argued that religions other than Islam required people to believe in what is rationally impossible, i.e., the reconciliation between the two antitheses or opposites, such as the real Unity and the real Trinity. In other terms, that God is truly one, and truly more than one at the same time. Putting in mind that he was in debate with a Christian missionary, Riḍā argued that unlike the life of the Prophet Muḥammad, there was little historical information about previous Prophets, including the record of the life of Jesus in the four Gospels.

Riḍā’s due respect for Nielsen was explicitly noted in the fatwās. One rarely met in missionary circles, he commented, someone who

---

34 Ibid.
35 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
37 Ibid.
would write in such a confident way like this Danish missionary. Riḍā had no respect for Christians with extravagant evangelistic ideas. Those who preached their religion with firm conviction and submission, such as Nielsen, were to be respected by any sensible person.  

Only one year later (1925), Riḍā published an answer to another question sent by Nielsen, who bluntly challenged Riḍā by asking why he repudiated the ‘call of Christianity,’ despite being quite aware of Christian sources. In his reply, Riḍā gave a brief outline of the reasons why he firmly upheld Islam as the true religion. He maintained that it had been proved to him that the Prophet Muḥammad was ummī (illiterate). He was never a disciple of any scholar of theology, history, law, philosophy, or literature. Neither was he an orator, nor a poet. Thereupon Riḍā proceeded to speak about the qualities of the Prophet Muḥammad:

Unlike the people of his age at Mecca, the prophet Muḥammad was not keen on leadership, fame, pride or eloquence. He was very renowned for his good disposition, truthfulness, honesty, decency, austerity, and all other kinds of good morals to the degree that they used to call him al-ʾAmin [the honest]. At his maturity of age he maintained to be a prophet sent by Allah for all people. His message was to preach the same message of other prophets before him.

In view of these reasons, Riḍā underlined that he was firmly convinced of the message of Islam. The Qurʾān foretold many things, which had been unknown among the people of Mecca during that time. The most important among these things, he argued, was the corruption and alterations made by the Christians and the Jews in their Books. It had been revealed in the Qurʾān that the Jews and the Christians had twisted the truth by corrupting their Scriptures, a fact which was verified by modern Western scholars.

The controversy around the book of the Egyptian Ṭaha Ḥusayn on Pre-Islamic Poetry (1926) and his understanding of the place of the prophet Abraham in Islamic history was a turning point in the Riḍā-Nielsen discussion. Nielsen’s inquiries centred upon the Muslim-Christian critique of each other’s scriptures as understood in the term Ṭaʾn (defamation). Nielsen aggressively blamed Riḍā for his rooted
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hostile attitudes to missionaries when he stated that it was always their duty to defame Islam. He raised the important question whether it was possible to declare the Muslim, who would still be committed to Islam in both religious and moral aspects, as unbeliever, if he (such as in the case of Ḥusayn) reached a conclusion that might contradict the Qurʾān and the Islamic creed through his scientific methods and research.

Nielsen raised his questions to Riḍā because he did not want to put any other argument against Islam than what Muslims themselves would agree upon. At the same time, he believed that enlightened Muslims were expected very soon to change their attitudes towards the Qurʾān by distinguishing between religious and moral matters, on the one hand, and scientific and historical ones on the other. Imbued by his Lutheran background, Nielsen insinuated that this would lead to the same conclusions reached by the Christians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The belief of those scholars of the infallibility in the Bible was different from those of the eighteenth century, despite the fact that both Christian generations shared the same belief in Jesus as the only Saviour mediator between God and mankind. In addition, Nielsen predicted some changes in the Muslim world. He saw, for instance, the coming of modernist movements and magazines in Turkey and elsewhere in the Muslim world as a signal for a new and similar trend within Islam in the near future.41

Riḍā clearly pointed out that the Christian Scriptures were not binding for Muslims. He lexically defined the word Ṭāʾn as originally used to mean, ‘to thrust or stab a spear or a lance,’ which was also designated to mean ‘to rebuke, insult, deny, and orally disregard.’ The parallel between both definitions was that the latter spiritually hurt the person, just like the former did in a material sense. What Ṭāḥa Ḥusayn (a Muslim himself) wrote in his book ‘painfully hurt’ Muslims, so it was valid to say that he rebuked Islam. But Riḍā made it clear that it would be no Ṭāʾn if any Muslim, Christian, or Jew attempted to deal with the Book(s) of the others. The same holds true, according to him, for the things in which they did not believe and what they might see as contradictory to their own religion, so long as they did not go beyond ‘moral obligations’ in their critique. For example, he

deemed neither what Nielsen wrote about Islam in formulating his questions, nor his reply to them as "Ta’n." ⁴²

Referring to Nielsen’s comparison between the changing attitudes of enlightened Christians and Muslims, Riḍā did not accept the concept that enlightened Muslims, like the Christians in the passage of time, might change their belief in the Qur’ān. He strongly disagreed that they would ever make distinction between the religious and moral matters as infallible on the one hand, and the historical ones as vulnerable to criticism, on the other. Such a comparison sprang to Nielsen’s mind, Riḍā believed, because of his interest of drawing an analogy between Islam and Christianity, and the Qur’ān and the Bible.

Regarding the denial of the historical existence of Adam, Ibrāhīm and Ismā‘īl, Riḍā consistently maintained that the existence or the non-existence of anybody, who was said to have lived in long past eras, was not to be proved by scientific methods, in so far as this was not logically impossible. Nobody could deny the existence of someone called ‘Ibrāhīm, as far as it was not logically impossible. At any rate, the very premise of the possibility of his existence, Riḍā contended, was supported by the Revelation according to both the Children of Israel and the Arabs. In support of his argument, Riḍā discussed at considerable length the denial of the existence of some generally recognised men in history. He, furthermore, lamented that suspicions had been expressed against the existence of famous persons, for instance by those who denied the existence of Jesus on the ground of the historical account of the Jewish historiographer Josephus, who was contemporary to Jesus. He did not allude to him in his writings on Jewish history, though he paid much attention to less important events. Riḍā refuted this suspicion by pointing out that Josephus must have concealed this fact in his writings fearing that he would have been considered as a preacher of the Christian message. He deliberately did not want to give his readers any suggestion that he was a believer in the message of Jesus. The other two examples were Homer, the Greek poet, and Īmrul Qays, the Arab poet. Homer was asserted to have been an imaginary mythical character, to whom the Greeks attributed many eloquent poems. As for the second example, it was said that the poetry of Qays was composed during the Umayyad Empire, but that somebody had attributed it to him. Apparently Riḍā

⁴² Ibid., p. 102
intentionally referred to the example of the pre-Islamic poetry of Qays, as it was the core of Ḥusayn’s book.43

In Riḍā’s vocabulary, Muslim scholars were unanimous, the same as the ‘People of the Book,’ on the point that there must be a distinction in religion between the principal theological matters, the rituals and legislations on the one hand, and what was mentioned in the Scripture about the secrets of the Creation on the other. The former were intended to reform and cultivate human beings, and prepare them for the best of their life. In contrast, the latter were mentioned as a manifestation of the divine signs of the Creation, which indicate the divine oneness, mercy and power. The latter category, Riḍā argued, is not used by scientists and historians in their methods of scientific research. Allah, on the contrary, let human beings use their own capabilities to reach specific scientific conclusions through research without depending on the divine revelation. And yet if there were any accurate scholarly conclusion, which might not be agreeable with the literal meaning of the Qurʾān, the subjects in question should be interpreted in the light of the concept of Taʾwil.

In his concluding remarks, Riḍā stressed that one of the characteristics of the Qurʾān was that there is no qaṭʿī (definite) passage which can be violated by definite logical and scientific proofs. The People of the Book, on the contrary, never hold such a claim with regard to their Scripture. Indignantly criticising Muslim doubters, Riḍā expounded that ignorance of the Qurʾān in both spiritual and social matters had dominated some Muslim minds, though the Qurʾān in fact is agreeable to logic and science: ‘unlike many Westerners who were ready to raise funds for the spread of their religion, despite the contradictions their Scriptures contain,’ Riḍā said.44

7.6. An Egyptian Debater in Gairdner’s Magazine

Due to his polemical writings against missionary attacks, a certain ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz Nuṣḥī ʿAbd al-Majīd was known to the readers of al-Manār in the late 1920s. Very little is known about him, but he always signed his contributions to Riḍā’s journal as ‘a warden of the storeroom of the Royal Agricultural Cooperative Society in the city
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of Ashmūn’ (Northern Egypt). In *al-Manār* we read that he wrote a treatise entitled: *al-Qawl al-Ṣaḥīḥ fī Tarjamat Muḥammad wā al-Masīḥ* (The True Statement concerning the Biographies of Muḥammad and Jesus), which was also available for two Egyptian piasters in al-Manār Bookshop in Cairo. The treatise was a brief summary of the histories of both prophets. Riḍā showed his appreciation to Nuṣḥī’s small work, describing it as: ‘nicely written and well-styled in its discussion on the authors of the Gospels.’

During my further research, it appeared that Nuṣḥī had a correspondence with the above-mentioned missionary periodical *al-Sharq wā al-Gharb* of Temple Gairdner. In June 1923, for instance, he asked the editorial board of the magazine to explain the genealogy of Moses and that of Jesus from the side of their mothers. Nuṣḥī’s tone reflected the challenge of a Muslim reader who tried to cast doubts on Biblical narratives. Later in March 1924, he raised two more questions, firstly in relation to the concept of polygamy in the Bible; and secondly whether there was any obvious statement in the Bible prohibiting slavery. It was apparent that Nuṣḥī’s aim was to oblige the missionary magazine to give an implicit refutation of its own allegations on Islam regarding these points, which they also used in their critique of Islam.

Nuṣḥī also turned to Riḍā with a query (1928) on the concept of Original Sin in Christianity. He mentioned that he had had regular gatherings with Christian missionaries in his hometown. Once he had discussed the matters of the Original Sin and the Crucifixion with a missionary, who adamantly challenged him as a Muslim that those who did not believe in Jesus as the saviour would continue to carry this sin. ‘Without shedding blood,’ the missionary went on, ‘one’s sins would never be forgiven. Muslims themselves sacrifice [animals] on behalf of themselves, including the Prophet who himself
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45 *Al-Manār*, vol. 29/5, p. 400.
46 *See, al-Sharq wā al-Gharb*, vol. 19/7 (July 1923), pp. 212-214.
47 Ibid., pp. 212-214 In their answer, the editors of the magazine referred Nuṣḥī to the Biblical passages on the genealogy of Moses in Exodus (6:16-20), and to that of Jesus in Mathew (1:1) and Luke (3:23). The magazine added that, as he was concerned with availing the Jews with his writings, Mathew intended to prove that Jesus had the full right to be called ‘the offspring of David.’ And as he wrote his Gospel for the ‘nations,’ Luke’s intention was to prove the progeny of Jesus from David from the side of his mother.
48 *Al-Sharq wā al-Gharb*, vol. 20/3 (March 1924), p. 86.
offered sacrifice.’ Nuṣḥī asked Riḍā how true the missionary claim was about Adam’s Sin as attached to his offspring.  

In his answer, Riḍā articulated many elements of his anti-missionary polemics mentioned above. He repeated that the ‘missionary enterprise is a part of the Western penetration in Eastern lands.’ He quoted again Lord Salisbury’s statement that ‘missionary schools are the first step towards colonialism […] that they cast strife and animosity among the inhabitants of the one country.’ Riḍā warned people like Nuṣḥī neither to read missionary literature, nor to waste their time in debating with them. He stated that those missionaries—except a few—were ‘soldiers hired to carry out mischief on earth.’ He harshly attacked the Christian concepts of Salvation and Trinity as ‘ancient pagan creeds,’ referring to the work of Tannīr. Again, he praised the ‘independent’ Western Christian intellectuals, who rejected these doctrines. In conclusion, Riḍā totally rejected that offering animals as sacrifice was prescribed in Islam as a ‘pagan practice,’ like in other religions. It was only stipulated in order that a Muslim would show his gratitude to God in his sharing with other poor fellow-Muslims in the society.

7.7. A Muslim Facing Missionaries in Tunisia

On a similar level, a certain ʿUmar Khūja from Tunisia became confused about some theological issues due to his debates with Protestant missionaries in his region. One of the issues they dealt with was the creation of the universe and the explanation of the cosmic structure in light of the Qurʾān, such as in the verse: ‘Allah is He Who created seven Firmaments, and of the Earth similar ones’ (Al-Talāq, 65:12). It was difficult for Khūja to understand that the heavens were spanned out as seven layers in the context of modern scientific discoveries. The second problem in the Tunisian petitioner’s mind was the status and place of Jesus after death. If it were really true that he was still
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living on ‘earth,’ how could he get food or drink? But if he survived in the heaven, where would he descend at the end of time? What about the Muslim who did not believe in his present survival in Heaven?

Riḍā mentioned that there were several Qur’ānic verses speaking about the creation of heavens and earth. The word ard (earth) was always found in the singular form, except in the verse quoted by the petitioner. Riḍā described it as mutashābih (ambiguous). He considered all interpretations of the verse describing the length or breadth of the heavens as unreliable because they were based on the lore of ‘Isrā ’iliyyât. Riḍā referred to the Ḥadīths related by Ibn ‘Abbās, ‘Ā’isha and ‘Abū Hurairah in this regard as indefinite and not marfū’, which means a Ḥadīth effectively elevated to the Prophet. As for the second point, Riḍā contended that there was no qaṭī (definitive) tradition which indicated that Jesus had been lifted to Heaven and was still alive with his soul and body.56 As for the verse: ‘O Jesus! I will take thee and raise thee to Myself (Al-Imrān: 3:55), Riḍā was more inclined to accept the interpretation of Ibn ‘Abbās that God made him really die. He rejected the commentary of Wahb Ibn Munabbih (b. 34 AH/654-5 AD) that ‘God had made him die three hours at the beginning of the day after which he was lifted to Heaven.’ The reason for his rejection was that such interpretations contradicted the apparent meaning (dhāhir) of the verse, along with the role of Ibn Munabbih in disseminating Israelite tales, which Riḍā totally denounced.57

The same held true for the return of Jesus before the Day of Resurrection, which we have already discussed in the first of the fatwās selected in the chapter. This notion was, in Riḍā’s evaluation, the basis on which the Christian belief lies, but it had no foundation in Islam. Riḍā also doubted the Traditions indicating that Jesus’ descent before the end of the world will be on to the white arcade of the Eastern gate at Damascus, or on to a hill in the Holy Land with a spear in his hand to kill the Dajjāl (Antichrist). He highlighted that most of the Traditions on the second return of Jesus were narrated in the context of the ’aḥād traditions on ‘Alamāt al-Sā’ah (Signs of the Hour), on which one should not depend in matters of belief.58 The belief of Jesus’ being alive in Heaven, Riḍā added, was no part of the fundamentals

56 Ibid., pp. 753-54.
57 Ibid, p. 754.
of the Islamic creed. Therefore, if a Muslim rejected it, he would be no apostate. But he was hesitant to leave his statement open, and stipulated that if a Muslim reached the conclusion after his investigation that the Prophetic Traditions in this respect were to be regarded as sound, he must believe in the return of Jesus on the basis of them. His doubt of the Prophet’s sayings in that case, Riḍā asserted, might lead to apostasy. In other words, there was no harm in his refusing or accepting his return on the basis of what he believed to be zannī (subjective) traditions. The Muslim should rather maintain the Prophet’s sayings as trustworthy, and leave all other details to God. At the end, Riḍā summarised:

A Muslim should not cling to such traditions, since they were no article of the Islamic faith. It is also no harm for one’s doctrine to suspect their authenticity […]. What could really harm him is his scepticism or rejection of these traditions after having recognised their authenticity […]. In this case he is discrediting the Prophet […] by thinking of his erroneousness in delivering God’s revelation.59

7.8. Fatherless Birth of Jesus: non-Qur’ānic?

In the early 1930s, a student in Indonesia wrote a long article in which he denied the virgin birth of Jesus. He argued that the matter was totally in contradiction with the Qur’ānic verses which stressed that there would never be tabdil (change) or taḥwīl (turning off) in God’s order or system of the universal laws (al-Aḥzāb, 62 & Fāṭir 43). The editors of the magazine challenged those who believed in the fatherless miraculous birth of Jesus to bring Qur’ānic verses or authentic Prophetic Traditions which would prove the contrary. The above-mentioned Basyūnī ʿImrān of Java (see, chapter 1) brought the issue to al-Manār to say its word, since he was persuaded that its commentary on the relevant verses could put an end to this controversy. Riḍā briefly elaborated on the issue by saying that Muslim scholars on the basis of many Qur’ānic verses have unanimously agreed on the fatherless birth of Jesus. If anyone denied its truth, he harshly concluded, he should be deemed to be an unbeliever.60

59 Ibid., p. 757.
7.9. Missionary Doubts on Qur’ānic Narratives

A certain ‘Alī al-Jundī, a teacher at al-Nāṣiryya School in Cairo, had religious debates with Christian missionaries, who had raised doubts on some Qur’ānic narratives. He eagerly requested Riḍā for his clarifications on such ‘allegations’ in order that he could sustain his arguments with solid arguments. The first point focused on the Hawāriyyūn (disciples) of Jesus, who were constantly praised in various places in the Qurʾān, but were also mentioned in the Christian Scriptures as believing in the Trinity and Crucifixion. Al-Jundī was also confused that some Christians portrayed some figures in the Qur’ānic tales as being Christians. The Qurʾān, for instance, described Ahl Al-Kahf (the People of the Cave) as monotheists, but they had existed 250 years after Jesus. This might suggest that they had believed in a ‘corrupted’ Christianity. Al-Jundī once read that the Jesuit scholar L. Cheikho had argued that the People of the Cave were believers in ‘the Cross.’ The commentators of the Qurʾān explained the story of Ahl al-Qarya (the People of the Village) as a tale about the disciples of Jesus, including Paul. Fourthly, the questioner had many ‘moderate’ Christian friends who believed in Jesus as a prophet and saw Islam as a ‘true’ religion, but still believed in the Crucifixion. They argued that the story had been mentioned by the Jews and witnessed by contemporary people and scribes. What were the differences between the Jewish and Christian Scriptures? Were the Jews closer to Muslims in monotheism than the Christians? If so, what was the reason for their ‘inherited’ hostility to Muslims as related in the Qurʾān? Were there any Christian religious men other than Barnabas who had propagated pure monotheism and rejected the Crucifixion? Did such people also exist after the message of the prophet Muḥammad? Could Muslims rest assured that Islam would win over Christianity, even though Christian missionaries were more vigorous in propagating their religion?

In the beginning, Riḍā explained that there was no mention of the names or genealogy of Jesus’ disciples in the Qurʾān. But the Christian Scriptures narrated that they were twelve. He argued that it was only John who described them as believing in the Trinity. He saw that
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there were discrepancies among the four Gospels concerning the story of the Crucifixion. Riḍā demanded that his questioner should not base his belief entirely in the narratives mentioned in the works of *Tafsīr* regarding the People of the Cave. He also accused Cheikho that as a Jesuit he had either based his story on such ‘invented’ Israelite tales, or had made it up himself. He confirmed that Jesus had been sent to preach monotheism. All Muslim commentators maintained that the People of the Cave were not Christians, except Ibn Kathīr (d. 1373) who attributed to them the religion of Jesus. However, Riḍā believed that they had existed a long time before Christianity. He rejected that they had been Christians, who believed in the Cross. Riḍā’s only proof was that such a claim would have contradicted the Qurʾān, which he deemed impossible. 63

The same held true for the Prophetic Traditions of the story of the People of the Village. They were related by the converted Jews Kaʿb al-ʿĀbār and Wahb Ibn Munabbih, who disseminated most of these ‘mythical’ tales on the authority of Ibn Abbās. Riḍā depended on Ibn Kathīr’s view, who interpreted that the People of the Village as messengers sent by God and not by Jesus. 64

Regarding the Christians who firmly believed in the Crucifixion and accepted Islam as true, Riḍā explicated that the Qurʾānic verse negating Jesus as having been slain (al-Nisāʾ, 3:157) did not indicate the rejection of the story completely, but rebuffed his death in the way explained by Christian Scriptures. Riḍā was less clear in judging those Christians than his above-mentioned *fatwās* on those who searched for the truth. One would also expect Riḍā to repeat his interpretations of the Crucifixion as ‘illusive,’ which he had uttered earlier in his aforementioned treatise in 1913 (see, chapter 6). After twenty years, he now put emphasis in this *fatwā* on his conviction that the story of the Crucifixion was not reliable, and there was no consensus among the early Christians about it. 65

Riḍā admitted that the concept of the Messiah according to the Torah was a complex issue. He only repeated his point mentioned in the first *fatwā* that the Jews believed in the Messiah as a coming king who would revive the kingdom of Solomon, but not as a prophet.
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For him, the Christians considered his coming kingdom as a spiritual one, while the Jews would expect it as a political and financial one. Riḍā explained the verse regarding the animosity of the Jews and the friendship of the Christians as revealed in the case of the Jews of Ḥijāz and the Christians of Abyssinia in particular. It should not be understood as part of the realm of the Islamic belief. He also rejected the view that the animosity between Jews and Muslims was intrinsic. He insisted that it was the Jews who had first shown animosity against Muslims, especially in Palestine. In the same sense, Christians had also founded their hostility with Islam in the form of the Crusades in the past and the continuation of European colonialism and Christian missions in the present. Without colonialism and missionary activities, he went on, Christians would have been much closer to Muslims than Jews. However, he explained that the conflict between Muslims and Western Christians would result in many advantages for Muslims, viz. that all Western nations would one day convert to Islam.66

7.10. Miḥrāb and Altar

In 1932, Riḍā received a question concerning the miḥrāb (niche) in the mosque and its similarity with the altar in the church.67 The questioner cited the Ḥadīth where the Prophet was reported to have said: ‘My nation remains in a good status as far as they do not turn their mosques into altars like the Christians.’

Riḍā maintained that the miḥrāb was embedded in the qibla (direction of prayer) wall for the practical reason that the imam would not occupy a whole row in the mosque. The niche of the Christians and Jews known as altar was a shrine and place for worship. The altar was known in ancient religions as the place where men used to give their offerings to God. He cited the Old Testament ‘And Noah built an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar’ (Genesis, 8:20). Stories about the altar of burnt offering and that of incense are also mentioned in details in the chapter of Exodus. Riḍā issued the fatwā in the period when he had intense conflict with Nūr al-Islām, the mouthpiece of Al-Azhar at that time (see, chapter 3). He suspected the authenticity

---

of the Hadith quoted by the questioner, accusing Al-Azhar scholars of propagating such doubtful narratives in their magazine.\textsuperscript{68}

7.11. \textit{Don't Recite the Qur’ānic Verses on Christians in Public!}

In chapter three, we have seen that Riḍā’s views on allowing Muslim children to attend Christian schools had led to a rigorous dispute with Al-Azhar scholars in the early 1930s. In 1934, he had another dispute with a regional scholar under the name of Sheikh Maḥmūd Maḥmūd, the deputy of \textit{Jam‘īyyat Makārim al-’Akhīlāq} (Society of Best Moralities) and a high school teacher in Cairo. The society was situated in Shubrā, at the outskirts of Cairo. Upon his arrival in Egypt, Riḍā became an active member of the society, where he used to deliver many lectures. One of the main objectives of this society was to combat missionary organisations in the neighbourhood. It had its own primary school and printing house. Besides this it published two magazines, one was named after the society, and the other bore the name \textit{al-Muṣliḥ} (The Reformer).\textsuperscript{69}

According to the Cairine newspaper \textit{al-Waṭaniyya}, Sheikh Maḥmūd maintained that broadcasting Qur’ānic recitations on the radio should be stopped. He argued that the Qur’ān contains certain verses opposing the People of the Book. The reasons for their revelation were not existent anymore. ‘Since the People of the Book have become under our protection (\textit{Dhawī Dhimmatina}),’ Maḥmūd argued, ‘their feelings should not be hurt any longer by letting them listen to such verses.’\textsuperscript{70} He further explained that he himself hated Surat Yūsuf being recited inside Muslim houses because he worried that women would suspect Yūsuf’s chastity, when they regularly listen


\textsuperscript{69} The society was founded by Sheikh Zakī al-Dīn Sanad during the late nineteenth century in Cairo. See, \textit{al-Manār}, vol. 2/27 (Jumāda al-‘Ūlā 1317/16 September 1899), p. 430; vol. 2/45, (Ramāḍān 1317/January 1900), p. 537. The activities of the society waned after the death of Sanad, but it revived again in 1920s-1930s. See Riḍā’s article on the society, vol. 32/8 (Jumada al-‘Ūlā 1351/September 1932), p. 634.

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 34/1, p. 33.
to the story. Also people, according to Mahmūd, should not recite the Qurʾān in public in case they did not grasp its inner meanings.

Ayyūb Ṣabrī, the editor of al-Waṭaniyya, referred the question to Riḍā, requesting him to deal with the issue as soon as possible. Riḍā did not hesitate to express his total rejection of Maḥmūd’s fatwā. In his primary answer, Riḍā preferred in the beginning not to mention the name of the mufti, hoping that he would recant his opinion or would send a clarification to al-Manār. He strongly declared that the Qurʾān as ‘the true word of God’ must be propagated and any concealment of its verses was sin; any acceptance of this sin as lawful would lead to infidelity.

Two years earlier, we read in al-Manār that Riḍā highly commended Maḥmūd because of ‘his religious knowledge and enthusiasm.’ But his religious views in this regard turned this enthusiasm into total frustration. Riḍā attempted to convince his readers that there was no difference between ‘knowledgeable’ or ‘ignorant’ reciters of the Qurʾān in public occasions. All Qurʾānic verses speaking about the People of the Book negatively or positively were suitable to each age and place. Riḍā asserted forcefully that there were many among the People of the Book in the modern age, who were more hostile to Islam than those contemporary with the time of revelation. He saw that Maḥmūd’s attempt of ‘abrogating’ these verses was only to satisfy the Christians and Jews, giving them priority above the Qurʾān.

Five months later, Riḍā mentioned the name of the person, who issued the fatwa. Having read al-Manār, Sheikh Maḥmūd started to defend his point of view. The discussion quickly turned into a hot polemical attack on Riḍā’s character as a scholar. In his commentary on the Qurʾānic verse: ‘Revile not ye those whom they call upon beside Allah, lest they out of spite revile Allah in their ignorance’ (Al-Anʾām, 6:108), Maḥmūd concluded that Muslims were prohibited from insulting the ‘gods of the Christians.’ He intensified his assault upon Riḍā by saying that the Qurʾān was dearer and more beloved to him than the founder of al-Manār. He depicted Riḍā as having grown old and his memory became weak. He had also started to forget what he himself said in his Tafsīr regarding the same verse. He reminded
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Riḍā of what he had already stated years ago in his commentary on the verse that it was forbidden to call the *dhimmīs* ‘unbelievers’ if it would lead to hurting them. He also concluded that any abuse of the gods or saints of the Christians on radio should be forbidden, especially when Muslims were divided, humiliated and weakened while the unbelievers were more strong and unified. Muslims should especially avoid this when it also leads to the disintegration and ruin of the umma.

Riḍā contested the *fatwā* by cynically maintaining that he held higher esteem for the Qurʾān than the mufti of Makārim al-Akhlāq. He was deeply disappointed by Maḥmūd’s remarks on his ‘weak memory’ and ‘old age.’ He counterattacked by saying that due to his ‘young age’ Maḥmūd was not able to understand *al-Manār*’s views. He moreover argued that the Qurʾānic verses on Christians contained no offending passages for their gods, cross or saints. The Qurʾān on the contrary recommended cooperation and concord with them. In the end, Riḍā promised to put an end to the conflict if Maḥmūd would discontinue publishing his ‘absurdity’ on the Qurʾān.

---

7.12. A Muslim Copyist of Missionary Books and Crafting the Cross for Christians

In 1930, Riḍā issued an interesting *fatwā* concerning a Muslim calligrapher, who was hired by Christian missionaries in Algeria to copy their books. Riḍā considered that any assistance to missionaries by reproducing such ‘repulsive’ books would lead to participating in spreading ‘infidelity.’ Those ‘geographical Muslims’ should be called back to repent from earning money through ways of infidelity and enmity of God and the Prophet. To continue working with missionary institutions leads to apostasy. His Muslim fellows should not give their daughters to him in marriage, nor should they bury him according to Muslim rites. Riḍā urged that if there were a Sharʿī court in
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the province, a case of apostasy must be brought against him in order to separate him from his Muslim wife.

Riḍā’s last fatwā (July 1935), a few months before his death, came as an answer to a similar petition by a certain Muḥammad Maṣūr Najāṭī from Damascus, whose craft was probably printing, on the religious ruling concerning printing books of other religions and engraving the cross on copper, zinc and on covers of those books.80 In the same line of his previous fatwā, Riḍā deemed printing or giving any assistance to print or propagate ‘false’ books as totally forbidden. This work might lead to infidelity in the case of the printer’s admitting its contents were accurate. In Riḍā’s view, the cross was a symbol of a non-Muslim religion; and Muslims should not help its followers to spread it. However, nobody should protest against the freedom of the Christians to display it in the Territory of Islam. To engrave it on metals for commercial reasons was not considered sinful as far as there existed no verification for belief in the heart of the Muslim doing so.

7.13. Conclusion

The chapter has proved that Riḍā’s fatwās are a useful reference in tracing his theological and polemical views on Christianity. The questions raised in these fatwās were diverse. This medley of fatwās echoed synopses of some of the major elements of Riḍā’s analysis of Christological doctrines, such as the Trinity and the Original Sin, from an Islamic point of view. The questions show a significant dimension of the Muslim encounter with missionary attacks on Islam in various regions at the micro-level. These questions not only related to the theological challenges to Islam put forward in missionary writings, but were also connected with social problems, such as the question of slavery in Kuwait and to the petitions of Muslim copyists and printers of missionary works in Algeria.

Riḍā’s fatwās for Alfred Nielsen were unique. It has been noted that both sides were ready to come close to each other, each trying their best to show the merits of their own belief. As religious men, both Riḍā and Nielsen were keen on giving their views on several subjects. The discussions not only reflect an Islamic view on missions,

but clearly represent Nielsen’s understanding, as a missionary, of Islam as well. Nielsen’s questions took the form of a missionary challenge to Islam. He attempted to probe the Muslim perception of missions through Riḍā’s views. Nielsen’s questions also reflected a strand of self-critical liberal Christian thought which many conservative Christian thinkers, at that time and still today, would have found objectionable: the idea that doubt—grappling with one’s faith rather than accepting it without thought—is necessary for faith, for a Christian’s faith as well as for a Muslim’s.
CONCLUSION

The study has offered an important example of Muslim-Christian contact in the modern age as highlighted in 1) al-Manār’s views of Christianity, 2) its founder’s relations with his fellow Arab Christians and most significantly 3) his responses to Christian missionary writings on Islam. In his responses, Ridā clearly proclaimed his religious and political doctrines with all the fervour of a Muslim scholar and activist. He was ‘an indefatigable writer […], whose views carried weight with friend and foe alike.’ However, his views were sometimes ambivalent. His early writings on Christianity seem to be rational and calm. But this position underwent a marked change with the passage of time. Ridā was severely provoked by what he deemed the social and political decadency of Muslims of his time. Driven by this spirit of despair and his pan-Islamic outlook, his pen (especially in his later years) started to produce harsher apologetic literature, which expressed his frustration with all forms of Western penetration in Muslim societies. The study has emphasised in many cases Zaki Badawi’s observation that Ridā’s ‘facade of liberalism or tolerance within the umma in the interest of unity did not prevent him for lashing out at any opponent if he felt incensed.’

Apart from these distinct reversals in his thought, there was one area in which he remained unchanged, viz. he did not reject Christianity as such, but attempted to interpret the Holy Scriptures in the light of the Qur’ān by rejecting all passages which indicate any notion contrary to Islamic principles of belief. In consolidation of his interpretations, and in an attempt to demonstrate the ‘irrationality’ of the faith of his Christian adversaries, he eagerly utilised works of historical criticism, first developed by Christian theologians, philosophers and writers. Ridā’s motivation for using such Western studies in his polemics was to vindicate the authenticity of Muslim Scriptures vis-à-vis the Bible and to fulfill his aim of Da’wa.
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Riḍā’s polemical tone against Christianity should be studied against the background of his general understanding of the West. In many places of his journal, he praised the progress of the West, which he ascribed to 1) its independence of thought; 2) the eradication of political oppression; and 3) the foundation of social, political and scientific associations. But his writings exposed also his feelings of parallel vexation, which focused more on those Western Christians, who tried to ridicule Islam and relate the socio-political failure among Muslims to the tenets of Islam.

Throughout our discussions we have seen how complex and diverse Riḍā’s network of associates was. Riḍā’s ignorance of Western languages did not prevent him from proving the authenticity of Islam. He quoted positive findings or remarks made by European writers, whom he always described as ‘fair-minded.’ In that way, the translation movement and Riḍā’s circle of associates always proved to be rich sources for his journal in accumulating knowledge from and on the West. Studying such sources has helped us to understand the value of these contributions in forming the shape of his journal especially regarding his anti-Christian polemics. The contributors to al-Manār were selective in their approach. Nevertheless, an identifying characteristic of their writings was that they did not see a problem in accepting modern thinking when they found it compatible with Islam, and that, consequently, should not pose a problem to the Islamic identity.

Arslān’s contributions in Riḍā’s journal on the Christian theological developments in Europe expressed an integral part of their common belief in pan-Islamism and their broad efforts of anti-imperialism. Those articles indirectly attempted to argue that European politicians were ready to collaborate with clergymen and invoke religious fanaticism against non-Christians. One should also not underestimate the importance of hitherto unknown figures, such as Kirām. From Berlin, he was a useful informant for Riḍā, although he was on the periphery of the ‘first class’ group of Muslim luminaries in al-Manār’s circle. While writing his book al-Waḥī, Riḍā was interested in reading some Western biographies about the Prophet Muḥammad. As an example, he requested Kirām to make an Arabic summary of Tor Andrae’s work, as we have mentioned above.
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It was characteristic of Riḍā to borrow Western positive views in his defence of Islam. But he also tried to use a combination of his religious knowledge and these Western scholarly critiques of the Bible to prove his conviction that their findings about the Bible conformed with the Qur‘ānic reports, especially concerning the ‘corruption’ of Jewish and Christian Scriptures. But he was much upset about the critique Western scholars of established Muslim theories about Biblical figures in the Qur‘ān, as is shown by his response in 1933 to Wensinck’s article on Abraham in the Encyclopedia of Islam. Although he was not directly involved in the affair, Riḍā was provoked by Wensinck’s article to the degree that he discredited the Dutchman’s meticulous undertaking in indexing the Ḥadīth. Elissa-Mondeguer rightly observes that Riḍā’s understanding of the West (especially in the 1930s) should be seen as part of his program of reform in which he tried to envisage that Western civilisation was in need of the guidance of Islam, which he presented as the religion of ‘brotherhood, mercy, and peace.’

Riḍā’s multi-dimensional relations with his contemporary Arab Christians have been studied. Due to his political bent, coupled with his uncompromising religious convictions, his relations with many of them fluctuated. In his discussions with his Arab Christian counterparts, he held specific attitudes that varied according to the intellectual, political or religious background of the counterpart in question. In the course of our discussion it has been observed that the editor of al-Manār, in its process of evolution over more than three decades, tried to integrate many political ideas with his religious aspirations. His Christian fellow-citizens, mostly educated in their homeland at missionary schools, provided a whole generation with many journals. With his heart turned to Syria, Riḍā directed his political activism towards those compatriots, and very rarely had the chance to develop any political ambition in Egypt. While, as a reformer, he had a role in Syrian nationalism, his main role was neither in Syria nor in Egypt but within the world of al-Manār and the ideas it propagated in the Muslim world.

---

These diverse relations with Syrian Christians did not always proceed smoothly. Riḍā’s friction with them should be understood within the context of great controversy about science, politics and religion in the Arab world. In as far as his Arab Christian counterparts carried forward his investigations—either on religion (Islam in particular) or politics—in a way that was in conformity with al-Manār’s world-views, Riḍā had no inclination whatsoever to draw negative conclusions. But Syrian Christians’ criticisms of Islam aroused a wide range of intense replies in his journal. The political and socio-cultural upheaval in the Muslim world also directly affected his exchanges with them to the extent that he became sometimes unpredictable in his responses, especially in his debate with them. A typical confrontation was his dispute with Faraḥ Anṭūn. His critics see him as the ‘assassin’ of Anṭūn’s journal al-Jāmiʿa, but it has also been noted that he was a key figure in organising the ceremony of Anṭūn’s tribute after the latter’s death. Riḍā’s reaction to the type of secularism the Syrian Christians were propagating was temperate compared with his treatment of the views of Muslim secularists, as we have seen in the case of the Iraqi poet al-Zahāwī. He was vexed by the abolition of the Caliphate and its repercussions on Islamic identity, and that might explain his later impassioned rejection of secularism, which he perceived as insidiously creeping into the Arab world.

Al-Manār’s anti-missionary polemics contain indirect responses to the belittling remarks of Europeans about Eastern civilisation and Islam. Just like many previous Muslim thinkers, Riḍā’s vehement refutation of the Christian belief and Scriptures affirmed his conviction of the inherent superiority of Islam over other religions. Characteristic of his style was his bemoaning of the sad state of Muslims which made it possible for the opponents of Islam to depreciate it in its own home. Muslims had become powerless, so that Europeans lorded over them everywhere.7 Riḍā’s anti-Christian polemics involved his critique of their attempts to win over Muslim ‘souls’ as well. He was sometimes emotional and showed bitterness and stern tones towards the missionary work in the Muslim world. However, he was initially positive about the efforts of missionary schools, and admitted their role in achieving some social and technical developments in the Muslim world, especially the American Protestant College in Beirut. But this positive tone was soon muted.

7 Ayoub, ‘Views,’ p. 54.
When he became embroiled in intensive polemics with his Azhari opponents, and the ‘saddened’ news he received from his Muslim readers, Riḍā started to recognise the other side of the coin; namely, that these schools were established to achieve the ‘colonial covetousness.’

As part of his anti-missionary campaign, Ridā tried to develop some ideas on the nature of religious propaganda. Cole described Ridā’s approach as pragmatic and secular. In his early years, he was of the view that successful religious propaganda grew out of his struggle against Christian missionary activity among Muslims. He began by rejecting an explanation of success in mission through governmental support. He continued by suggesting that success in mission could be enhanced by practical techniques adopted by the missionaries, and that these techniques could be used to promulgate any religion, true or false. But looking at the development of his thoughts one finds that he was always convinced of the propaganda of Islam as the only true mission. Giving the Qurʾān a higher esteem than the Bible, he was certain that Islam would expand on its own with no need of any missionary effort. A proof of that was, according to him, the higher social status of Muslim converts (such as Headley) than those Muslims who changed their faith. However, Ridā was aware of the fact that he was lacking official religious institutions to support him in his religious aspirations, like the Church in the Christian case, which was ready to spend a huge amount of money in spreading its religion. Ridā tried to put his ambitions into practice by words and actions. His words had great impact on Muslim thought, but his religious missionary project of Daʾwa was short-lived.

Against this background of Ridā’s network and activities, we have specifically examined al-Manār’s early mode of polemical thoughts as expressed in his series of articles on the Shubuhāt (or allegations) of Christians on Islam, which he later compiled in one small volume. Ridā’s book was of an unsystematic character, due to the fact that it was a compilation of sporadic issues that he raised from time to time in his disputes with certain Christian writings on Islam. Writing these articles in 1903-1904, Ridā imposed a condition upon himself to defend Islam without attacking Christianity and going no further
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than addressing Muslim readers’ questions.\textsuperscript{10} Later, in 1931, and amidst his polemics with al-Azhar scholars (mentioned above), he clarified that after the experience of three decades, it was sometimes unavoidable for him to counterattack missions by using harsh words; and his ‘journal, despite its cautiousness in decency and politeness, could not defend Islam only by responding to missionaries with statements they did not hate.’\textsuperscript{11}

The core of these articles discussed the textual authenticity of both the Torah and the Gospel from an Islamic point of view. He directed his most detailed discussions in that regard against the claims of the Egyptian missionary writer Ghabriyāl (whose book is still widely used on Christian websites nowadays) on the Qur’ānic testimony for Jewish and Christian Scriptures. It has been correctly remarked that Riḍā did not discuss the doctrine of Trinity in details.\textsuperscript{12} Neither did he discuss other key concepts in Christianity, such as the birth, Crucifixion and salvation of Jesus. This was not because he had nothing to say about them. In the \textit{Shubuhāt}, Riḍā rejected these doctrines as ‘irrational,’ but the ideas of al-Manār on these issues were more clearly put forward later, especially after the appearance of Tawfiq Şidqī on al-Manār’s stage.

In his \textit{Shubuhāt}, Riḍā was convinced that it was not harmful for a Muslim to believe in a Chinese religion or in Hinduism as part of God’s revelation. More than twenty years later, he further developed the idea by making it clear that ‘all people of ancient religions, such as Buddhism and Zoroastrianism, belonged also to the category of the People of the Book and were followers of prophets, but paganism and polytheism crept in to the extent that we do not know [the reality] of their scriptures anymore.’\textsuperscript{13}

We have also seen that Riḍā, in order to put his pursuit of a ‘true’ Gospel supporting the Islamic message into practice, first published fragments of the work of Tolstoy on the four Gospels, and in the end published a full Arabic translation of the Gospel of Barnabas. It has been observed that despite his faith in its authenticity, Riḍā in his introduction was somehow cautious in declaring this in an explicit manner. It was only in 1929 that he overtly voiced his opinion that the Gospel of Barnabas was more authentic than the four canonical

\textsuperscript{10} Wood, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 31/6, p. 479.
\textsuperscript{12} Wood, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Al-Manār}, vol. 25/3, p. 227.
Gospels. Bājūrī’s anti-Manār piece of work is a remarkable example of the Coptic reaction to this Gospel. As a Muslim convert to Christianity, considering himself a ‘soldier of Jesus,’ he was not only sarcastic about al-Manār’s printing of the Gospel of Barnabas, but also critical of Riḍā’s views on Islam. He must have felt compelled to express his disdain for this Gospel with vehemence, proving beyond doubt his devotion to his new faith. Bājūrī did not see Riḍā’s publication as part of an Islamic, anti-colonial discourse, but as part of the Muslim polemics against Christian minorities in the Muslim world, especially the Copts. Strangely enough Riḍā did not react to Bajūrī’s treatise, nor to any other polemical work against the Gospel of Barnabas. The treatise should be read as an illustration of the reaction of other Christians of his age; and these reactions deserve to be carefully studied in further research.

Al-Manār changed its strategy in polemics by giving Ṣidqī a principal position. Why Ṣidqī? As part of Riḍā’s network of associates, we have studied Ṣidqī’s place in the world of al-Manār. The very reason why he came into contact with Riḍā was his intense discussions with his classmate and Christian convert to Islam ʿAbduh ʿIbrāhīm. More importantly, Riḍā was also impressed with his knowledge of natural sciences and medicine, as well as his ability to apply this kind of knowledge to Islamic sources. Infuriated by what they saw as ‘unsympathetic’ critique of the West and Westerners on the basis of Biblical passages, some missionaries approached Lord Kitchener, who attempted to convince the Egyptian authorities to ban Riḍā’s journal. Riḍā did not give many details about the affair, but his diaries help us know more about its background. Although the Egyptian authorities did not attempt to ban al-Manār, it seemed that this protest had its effect. It is observable that Riḍā stopped publishing Ṣidqī’s anti-Christian articles directly. But his tone of grief about this incident reflected the ‘underneath’ feeling of an ‘oppressed’ colonised person in face of his ‘colonising oppressors.’

Our analysis of Ṣidqī’s works included a survey of the sources accessible to him. Besides a limited knowledge of some Western rationalistic books on Christianity and Jesus, Ṣidqī’s medical knowledge was more thorough than his knowledge of Islamic sources. However, we indicated that his medical interpretation of the fatherless birth of Jesus that Mary was probably a ‘masculine hermaphrodite’ came close

14 See, Leirvik, Images, p. 139.
to the portrayal of Mary by the thirteenth-century Muslim exegete of the Qur’an al-Qurṭubī. Śidqī and Riḍā shared many ideas, and the most noteworthy of these was their common belief in ‘illusive’ happenings around the event of the Crucifixion. Although their interpretation agreed with the classical Muslim exegesis that Judas (or another person) was killed instead of Jesus, it diverged in its rationalistic argument that the crucified man really looked like Jesus, and that the Roman soldiers arrested him by the way of a mistake. It was interesting to read that Riḍā depended in his analysis of the theory of ‘Crowd Psychology’ according to the medical populariser Le Bon who believed that crowds generate specific emotions. According to this theory, the anonymity of facts and the creation of clichés in the minds of the people is a natural result. Riḍā drew a parallel and argued that those who witnessed the event of the Crucifixion became emotional, and therefore did not recognise any difference between the real Jesus and the one resembling him.

Our discussion came to an end with a recapitulation of al-Manār’s ideas on Christianity through Riḍā’s lively contact with his readers. The presence of missionary work in the Muslim world was a breeding ground for many Muslim readers to ask questions, which Riḍā included under the section of fatwās. Some of these questions focused on christological issues, with which Riḍā had already dealt in many other places in his journal, such as the fatherless birth of Jesus, his natural and physical death, as well as his return before the Last Day. Besides, Riḍā’s Muslim readers were curious to know his views on other issues which resulted from their daily contact with missionaries. The most visible among those was the Egyptian Muslim ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz Nuṣḥī, who was boldly challenging missionaries by sending inquiries to their journals. His participation in al-Manār and the subjects of his inquiries to al-Sharq wā al-Gharb of Gairnder pointed to his critique of the missionary work and the views of missionaries on Islam. An obvious rupture is noted in Riḍā’s answer to the Danish missionary Nielsen. He did not consider Nielsen’s discussions on the case of Ṭāḥa Ḥusayn as ‘defamation’ of Islam. Riḍā’s general views on this case were harsh. But addressing Nielsen, as an ‘outsider,’ he dared to accept discussing such issues with non-Muslims. It can be also concluded that Riḍā’s anti-Christian polemic was ‘an apologetic directed towards Muslim doubters.’

Riḍā’s *fatwā* that Jesus died a natural death after having been saved from the Cross, and that he then was taken up to Heaven, deserves a special concluding observation. Even though he was in line with ʿAbduh in this regard, the view comes close to the interpretations of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement, who denied the belief that Jesus was alive and waiting in the Heaven for an eschatological return to earth. In his view, the idea that Jesus was alive was nothing but a Christian invention, designed to demonstrate that the living Jesus was superior to the deceased Muhammad. In his *fatwā* to the Tunisian Umar Khūja on the rejection of Jesus as having been taken alive into Heaven, Riḍā was more cautious in leaving it open. He boldly stated that a Muslim, who would reject the relevant traditions after having reached the conclusion of their soundness, was an apostate.

It is nowhere mentioned in *al-Manār* that the views of ʿAbduh and Riḍā in this respect caused any Muslim repercussions in their time. But in 1942 the then member of the High Corps of Al-Azhar ʿUlamāʾ and later Sheikh of Al-Azhar Maḥmūd Shaltūt (1893-1963), who was influenced by the spirit of *al-Manār*, issued a similar *fatwā* in which he maintained that Jesus died and was taken in soul and body to God. In support for his arguments, Shaltūt quoted the views of ʿAbduh, Riḍā and al-Marāghī after his analysis of classical interpretations of the relevant Qurʾānic verses. It is interesting to know that Shaltūt specifically cited Riḍā’s *fatwā* for Khūjā. It was ironic that the questioner of Shaltūt was an Indian officer of Ahmadi background, and the *fatwā* remains one of the sublime specimens which the Ahmadiyya publications still use as a sign of triumph for their founder’s pioneering analysis of the subject. However, Shaltūt’s opponents were among his colleagues within Al-Azhar, who accused him of
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issuing the *fatwā* in a ‘Qadiyānī spirit.’ Shaltūt was very upset about the critique, and considered it as an implicit ‘accusation’ of ʿAbduh, Riḍā and al-Marāghī as well. O. Leirvik correctly observed that the christological discussions of the school of *al-Manār* remained mostly within the tradition of apologetics and polemics towards Christianity, but the discussions of the 1940s around Shaltūt’s *fatwā* were an internal Muslim affair.

Without resorting to a neatly tailored or exaggerated hypothesis, Riḍā’s influence over modern-day Muslim reformist polemics is clear that at times his words are reproduced almost verbatim. His views on the Christian faith and its Scriptures have also left their impress upon later Muslim writers, but the impact of the earlier work of *Izhār al-Ḥaqq* by al-Qairanawi seems in my view to play a greater role in Muslim polemics. It is true that the idea that Christianity has been always espoused with Western imperialism to subdue the Muslim faith, which later polemical genre stressed, is not new in the modern polemical and apologetic discourse. According to H. Goddard, this claim ‘goes back to Afghānī and Riḍā, but it has been developed by means of a more systematic examination of Western political and missionary objectives and plans and a more detailed study of Western academic literature.’ Riḍā’s idealisation of Da’wa and the call for the conversion of non-Muslims to Islam in order fight increasing Western dominance in the Muslim world and defeat European colonial rule has been copied in many Muslim circles.

Riḍā’s Arabic edition of the Gospel of Barnabas inspired several translations in several languages, such as Urdu (1916), Persian (1927), and Indonesian (1969). It has made a major impact on a generation of anti-Christian polemical writers, especially in Pakistan, and was found to be a useful weapon in the hands of many Arab and Indian Muslim writers in their resistance to Christian missionary efforts.
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The arguments of the above-mentioned Egyptian Sheikh Muhammad Abū Zahra on the authenticity of the Gospel of Barnabas resemble those of Riḍā. However, he made no allusions whatsoever to Riḍā’s introduction in the context of his discussion but instead made various citations of Saʿādeh’s preface.27

In 1982, Ghulam Murtaza Azad, the director general of the Council of Islamic Ideology in Pakistan, tried to follow Riḍā’s line by writing his own introduction to the Barnabas Gospel from an Islamic point of view.28 Azad also cited Saʿādeh’s introduction at length in Arabic, followed by an English translation of some of his conclusions. He disagreed with Saʿādeh on many points, and concluded: ‘Christians should rest with peace of mind. This Gospel was not contrived by any Muslim, because according to the Holy Qur’ān Jesus predicted the advent of a messenger, Ahmad. The Muslims, therefore, are still in search of that Gospel wherein the name of their prophet is clearly mentioned as ‘Ahmad.’”29

In Indonesia, the translation of this Gospel had a great impact on the Indonesian public and was intended ‘to cease fanaticism in searching [religious] truth; to assure the authenticity of Islam; and to cast-off the notion that all religions are true and same; and the differences among religions are only in their practices.’30 The Gospel of Barnabas reached Muslim circles in East Africa most probably through the Ahmadiyya missionary work or the followers of Riḍā. It is quite possible that the East African Muslim reformers of the 1930s and 1940s, such as Sheikh al-Amin bin ‘Ali al-Mazrui of Mombasa (who died in 1947), were acquainted with the Arabic version of it. The leaflets and journals published by Mazrui in the 1930s and 1940s are in fact a blend of themes derived from both the Gospel of Barnabas and the writings of Riḍā.31 The same Gospel is widely used among Muslim minorities in the West as well. Philip Lewis, the inter-faith advisor to the Anglican Bishop of Bradford, observed that the late 1990s posters advertising a meeting between Muslims and non-Muslims in his

29 Ibid., p. 94.
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city included the words in large bold letters: ‘Banned—The Gospel of Barnabas,’ subtitled ‘The True Teaching of the Prophet Jesus.’ The speaker, the son of the city’s best educated imam, elaborated on the Gospel saying that the Church by rejecting it intended simply to prevent Christians from knowing the truth.32

To analyse the influence of the polemics of Riḍā and his associates on Christianity would need a much more detailed study. It would suffice us here to mention some examples. In his account of the crucifixion, the Egyptian novelist ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Jūḍa al-Saḥḥār held a similar view to that of Ẓidqī that Jesus had been able to escape the crowd. This led to Judas being arrested instead, and explains the silence of the victim before the high priest. He was unsure whether this was a judgment on his doubt or a reward for his betrayal.33 Aḥmad Ḥījāzī al-Saqqā, another Egyptian polemicist, expressed his indebtedness to the writings of many authors before him, including Riḍā’s views on the prophecies of Muḥammad in the Torah and Gospel.34 In his Maʿā al-Masīḥ fī al-Anājīl al-Arbʿa (With the Messiah in the Four Gospels), the Egyptian Islamic writer Fāṭḥī ʿUthmān explained that he was challenged by the existence of Arabic books about Islam and the evident absence of equivalent books by Muslims on Christianity. For him, it was Riḍā who wrote Christian doctrines. ʿUthmān explained his own desire to ‘do better.’ 35 The prominent Indonesian Muslim intellectual Nurcholish Madjid (1939–2005) developed a new understanding of other religions by stressing that the term People of the Book in the Qurʾān should be extended so that it refers not solely to Jews and Christians. He quoted Riḍā, who, as we have seen, was ready to include other religious groups under the same category.36 In his understanding of Christianity, the neo-modernist Egyptian thinker Ḥasan Ḥanafī could be considered as an ‘heir’ of al-Qairānāwī and Riḍā, since he used his knowledge of Western sources to buttress an essentially traditional Muslim view of Christianity.37 In his commentary on the Qurʾān, Fī Ṣīlāl al-Qurʾān,

---

33 Goddard, Perception, pp. 119-120
34 Ibid., p. 71
35 Goddard, p. 122
36 Ropi, op. cit., p. 105
37 Ibid., pp. 148-149
the Muslim ideologue Sayyid Quṭb, for example, extensively quoted Riḍā’s excursus on the Trinity.\textsuperscript{38}

In the digital age, many Salafī websites cite articles from Riḍā’s journal literally. Popular religious websites, such as Multqā Ahl al-Ḥadīth (the Meetingpoint of the People of Hadith), Ṭarīq al-Islām (the Way of Islam) and Shabakat Atbā’ al-Risāla (the Network of the Followers of the Message), made for instance many references to his ideas on what they considered as ‘irrationality’ of the Christian belief. The reactions of the visitors to such websites have high esteem for al-Manār’s efforts, especially the Arabic translation of the Gospel of Barnabas.\textsuperscript{39} The last remark would be an interesting subject for future research.
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APPENDIX I

Zâki Hishmat-Bey Kirâm
A photo from family archive, no date
Ridâ’s diary on his first meeting with Kirâm (13 October 1921)
Kirām to Rīḍā, Berlin (3 June 1926)
Dr. ZEKI KIRAM
Berlin NW6, Karistraße 10
Fernschr. % Bexicx - Nr. 517, 88 Berlin 1088
Telegram - Anmexa: Zekirn Berlin
Code: Rüdiger Mösen
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Berlin, 14 November 1929

[Handwritten text in Turkish]

[Letter to Ridâ, Berlin (14 November 1929)]
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لا يظهر النص بشكل واضح.

Letter to Ridā, Berlin (5 June 1931)
Letter to Ridâ, Berlin (3 Dhû al-Ḥilja 1351/ circa 1933)
سيدي الحاج شكري:

أود أن أتوجه إليكم بخطاب بخصوص جميع الأعمال التي ستفاجأون بها. من الأهمية بمكان أن تكون جميع الأعمال الحالية معلقة في الكتب والمستندات المكتبية. وذلك لضمان أن تتم جميع الأعمال في الوقت المحدد.

في التفاصيل التالية، سأشرح خطوات تطبيق الطلب:

1. استلام جميع الأعمال المطلوبة من المكتب.
2. التأكد من صحتها ودقة البيانات المقدمة.
3. إرسالها إلى الإدارة المكلفة.
4. التأكد من أنها تم العمل بها في الكتب المكتبية.

من فضلك، احرصوا على الالتزام بجميع الخطوات المذكورة أعلاه. يرجى تلقي الملاحظات والتعليقات في الوقت المناسب.

الرجاء أيدي(fmt)

Dr. Zeki H. Kirim

Berlin, Zentralstelle
Mehrsifvelstr. 33a
سيري مختصر عن الإسلام والمسلمين السيد رضي الله عنه

السالم عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته، أما بعد قد كادت طهور القلوب، طه وصالح من أمرهم، ما لم يوفقه بالجرائدة

ال الألمانية التي اتبعتها وإطاراتها وكل دقة وأمان، لا يمكن من الوقوف على الزمان، في تحديدا أرياح السياسة والدفاع عن حقنا بوجوبها وأن يُبَذِّل من الفوائد ما راح بمثابة الرسول hurra والفجر الص ธ.و، ونعتضد أياض الحوادث لتجميع بأسرع ما يمكن ل مقابل الصهيونيين والإعداء اليهود الذين جرتهم المدن لازاعة الاحترام لجميع الجرائدة

لمقالة الراوي العام، ونحن ولأسفل لو لدينا من المال الأشقر أو الآسياني ونلتقي الحريات الشرقي اللذان

يتم شنها بالذين عن محول الغنوة. ها

ارجو من فضلك أن تقطعوا بقبول فائق احترام الحكيم الأصغر، ومعدنا أن عنا الهيبريد القادم

ودم درعا منعاً للإسلام والمسلمين

اختي الذي يحكم

Kirām to Ridā, Berlin (9 October, no year)
First page, Arabic Translation of a piece of work on the Jesuits (probably made by Kirām), no date.
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Letter from ʿAdel Zuʿaytar to Ridā, Paris (24 October 1922)
APPENDIX III

Taqī al-Dīn al-Hilālī
Photo: Family archive, Meknes (Morocco)
MUHAMMAD ABDUL KADIR
EL-HILALY
© Darab.
P. O. FAO, (Iraq).
(Persian Gulf.)

Letter to Ridā, Mecca (10 Rabī‘ al-Awwal 1346/ circa 1928)
الضياء

سجلاً طهوراً أورفة تعليمية
تُمثِّل من الآداب العربية والإسلامية
تصدر في كهنوت (ألهوئي)

Date 1352

A
HIGH CLASS
Arabic Periodical
AL-DHIA:
LUCKNOW (INDIA).

No.____________

حضَّر الإمام الصافي مولانا السيد محمد رضي الله عنده كأишь، والكلام ودوره في مجالات علمية وفكرية، وهمي، والطريقة.

وأفادنا المفكر المسنود إلى مؤرخين، وهمي، والطريقة.

وقد تحدثنا عنله أنتان، أنتان، والكلام ودوره في مجالات علمية وفكرية، وهمي، والطريقة.

وأما الأخلاق في الحُسَّن، فلا تُغَيِّرَ على ما ورد.

Letter to Ridā, Lucknow (Rabi’ al-Awwal 1352/ circa 1934)
الحرة الدائم الإسلام أجمع الصادق رضي الله عنهم
بتوالى المسلمين طوال عهدهم

أما بعد فقد ورد أنه رسم بالرسم في الوعي والانفعال ومن ثم رفع تجربة فلم
القرار الذي جاء من الله باطلة في الرسوم المعروفة، وقتل تجربة بما فيها
وما يفهم من النطق بها ولم يقال هناك كله، فإن بعثنا على الرسوم هذه الصورة
بادرنا لتقديم الرسوم فلم قرأنا بالرسوم باطلة، فلديه الاعتراف إلى أن نبتين هذه
نوع جديد من الحياة والحياة الأخرى، ونبتين وسيلة الفنون والرسوم بيننا ولنا
وأما كله من المواضع من مبادئ النطق المتفرع إلى فلوست التحق بالفناء والفناء.
لكن أيضاً نستطيع أن نرجع أنا في الافتتاح، والذين وقفوا في الاستماع على جمهور ألف
الرسوم، وكونه في صورة كبيرة جداً ولا يمكن أن يكون مقصودة لكي نبتين الواقعية التي
في السؤال، وهذا من النطق المتفرع إلى مبادئ النطق في الرسوم، وقد أن أن
مكشوفfilms مجموع النطق في اللفظ، أن يستوعب في سؤاله ومجموع النطق في اللفظ،
إلى أن كنتا على وحي وسيله، على سبيل، أن نبتين ذلك، وإذا أردنا أن لا
تستوعب، ويكون على نحو فنون، وفيما ينظر، أني في الروتين، وسيلة الفناء.
وكثيرًا على النطق، في نحو فنون، يجب أن نبتين من
أيهم الصدفة، أني، إذا لم يعلم، موضوع وما يعلم، في أي حال، أن نبتين من
المذك، ونستوعب في النطق، وكثيرًا، مثلاً، أننا، في النطق، ونستوعب في النطق،
واعتذرتنا، إذا نظمنا أشياء، نبتين، ونستوعب في النطق.

Letter to Ridā, Fao (Iraq), (28 Jumādā al-Thāniya 1352/ circa 1934)
الحذاء: تعاون الإذاعة الإذاعة (الأنباء) في إرسال الرسائل موجودة في دار الإذاعة الإذاعة.

السلام علىكم وعلى رحمة الله ورحمة وبركاته

فترة قضية المختصر في الشريعة، نبادل طرق توزيع معلومات متمثلة في دار الإذاعة الإذاعة.

المرصد: أثار الدين الإسلامي بصرية في إعلان سرور الله، لالة تفسير، في مبادلة مع م잡ة للإسلام، وعلم وفهمه.

نحو: الجمعية الإسلامية الممثلة بين مبادلة مع
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي من الصورة المقدمة.
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Letter (3 pages) to Ridâ, Fao (Iraq), (18 Jumâdâ al-`Ulâ 1352/ circa 1934)
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي من الصورة. هل يمكنني مساعدتك في شيء آخر؟
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Letter to Ridâ, no place (28 Muḥarram 1353/ circa 1935)
APPENDIX IV

Letter from Rose Anṭūn to Riḍā, Cairo (24 February 1923)
حفلة تأبين

الرحوم فرح انطون

تأقنت حفلة في القاهرة من أصدقاء غفيرة

العلم والادب الراحل فرح انطون صاحب حفلة

الجامعة السعودية بآبائه وشقيقه غاية في الأهمية

حفلة تأبين تذكر فيها آبائه ومنافه وتاريخ

حياته وعماته وهي مؤلفة من حضرة الفاضل

السيد عبد رضوان رئيسي والسيد عبد

الطاهر كاتباً واعضاءها حضارات البادية الآتية

 بإجماع وهي مرتبة بحسب حروف الهجاء

أحد خلف باي عوض والياس أفندى هيساوي

وجب أفندى خومات وجويري أفندى برهم

للمكرم بك مطرات وخليل أفندى

السككية وعبد القادر أفندى جزه ومحمد

لطقي بك جمه وسليمان مكان الحفلة ووعدها

ويربى فيها فريباً كاتب للهيئة

كم على المالك

The members of the committee of Anṭūn’s ceremony of tribute, Riḍā’s archive, Cairo.
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Letter from Shibl Shumayyil to Riḍā, Cairo, n.d.
Ms of the charter of the Ottoman Socialist Party
(first and last pages)
APPENDIX VII

Seyyid 'Alā' al-Dīn 1940

al-Maḥriq
REVUE ORIENTALE MENSUELLE
Imprimerie Catholique — BEYROUTH

المحريج

لا اذاعة العالم الجديد

مَنْ فِى الْعَالَمِ ۡلَمْ يَكُنْ

لا يَكُنَّ عَلَيْهِمْ مِنكَمَا

Egyp
casée

La Casée

Letter al-Machreq to Riḍā, Beirut (2 November 1928)
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Letter, Cheikh & Ladki to Riḍā, Beirut (16 May 1934.)
APPENDIX IX

Muḥammad Tawfīq Ṣīḏqī
His family archive, Cairo

1 My thanks are due to Mr. Ḥishām Ṣīḏqī, his grandson, for sending me this photo. I have been able to trace them through the telephone directory of Egypt. Unfortunately there are no remaining papers of Ṣīḏqī, except some photos and one booknote of his handwriting, which is photocopied above.
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A sample of Sidqi’s handwriting. Probably a scientific glossary
His family archive, Cairo
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Letter from Jabr Ḳumīṭ to Riḍā, Beirut (25 October 1903)
حضرة العلامات الكمالية لمايتس: المصلين لا تاسل سالم، والإسلام، ويومcopied 10 فروردین (20 مارس) ميلادی 1375

بعد انتهاء استمرار وازدياد تجاوز الى تلك المشرقة، ادا مهابد الهيئة وبيت الشوقات الحالية، قائمة
وجوانب سابقة، ولا أن تضلال وراء عソフト مصادر ونفاقوا وواضحة ودشوك والمحتوى. 
وطيب ناظم المعتز ورضا باستعمال مهبط مشترك، فيما لم يتوافق
وبما يتم رفعها لاستخدام بشرة مشترك، بملوك ممتنع بالدولة، في أحد عشر، وفعالة. وان قدرت
نعم ولا سيما، أن مهابد تراء، تزود أمامنا بامكا، والمجموعة، والملجع، كما لو ضعف، تضع
سياسي الأنتان، دامم، أو لا تظل عليه، وبعض في ربان، ومعاليهم، لعشر أرض، ساقري، ورده، والم
مهم، مهابد، والتي انتُهم، هي، وهو، وجلوك، وكلا التجاً، والملابس، دون شكل، بين رمي، تام.
Letter (2 pages), Hibat al-Din al-Shahrastani to Riḍā, Iraq, 16 Rabī’ al-Thānî 1330/4 April 1912, Riḍā’s archive, Cairo
السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

سيدنا الملائمة Active Name، نعم معاً، في الجنة.

لا بد من تدريس الإسلام والجهة الأخرى، وبعث الأفكار التالية، صمماً للجميع.

قد يكون هذا المستنير شرينًا من عهد بعيد رضي عنه الكريم، وهذا يعكس
على الرسل جلالهم، من هنا لنين الصف، وميزة العلماء، عيد كل
لاشك في أن من عجز، ومنه عبادة الإسلام، ولكننا نشير إلى
اهواء البلاد، وميزة الحضارة، لظهور الدين العظيم، ومنها استنار
المذاهب والنصوص، التفصيل الحيوي الدور، على طبيعة الوارغ العام.

الاصطلاحات، وحديد على بعض، إنزوع الإسلام، بعضًا مصدراً
دموا التفاضل، ومنها خريطة لأجيال المسلمين الواردة، على علامة على
استنادً إلى الموارد، الفاسق، عبر عوان (فانان إلا) ولا يرى
بها رؤية في الاقتراب، وميزة جمهور المسلمين الفاسق، أبو عجالة، إلخ،
بجنية دموع المسلمين، وعالم المسلم، المحبة، والملاحم، والمعجم
طبع في المقالات، فكان بمستقبل التذكرة، كثر عوا في زجاجها الآلهة
المبدل، وصولًا، إلهامها، لازالت، فقد دفعتها
مصادرة الإنتقاء، شرائط المقال، فيعيش حسن من النص، والشهداء
والحب الفائق بين من فكر فيه، المهلاج، والملاحم، لهذه الأرمز
إلى المقصود، بجذب حكمة السامير

لا يوجد أي نقل آخر من هذا

Letter, al-Sharistānī to Riḍá, 24 Ramdan 1331/27 August 1913, Riḍá’s arc Cairo
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