IQBAL REVIEW

Journal of the Iqbal Academy, Pakistan

April 1980

Editor

Muhammad Moizuddin

IQBAL ACADEMY PAKISTAN

Title	:	Iqbal Review (April 1980)
Editor	:	Muhammad Moizuddin
Publisher	:	Iqbal Academy Pakistan
City	:	Lahore
Year	:	1980
DDC	:	105
DDC (Iqbal Academy)	:	8U1.66V12
Pages	:	91
Size	:	14.5 x 24.5 cm
ISSN	:	0021-0773
Subjects	:	Iqbal Studies
	:	Philosophy
	:	Research

Table of Contents

Volume: 21 **Iqbal Review: April 1980** **Number: 1**

THE CONSTITUTION OF MADĪNAH

Muhammad Yusuf Guraya

Introduction

Islam lays a great stress on the rights and duties of man. It has explained the obligations of man towards his Creator- Bask and fundamental teachings for controlling the behaviour of the(people were revealed in the very beginning of Islam. The Holy Qur'ān is the Guide. It shows the way in which a government and society are organised. It is the system of fundamental laws and principles of a government, state anal society. The Qur'ānic universal constitutional and legal principles arc fully appreciated when they are compared with the pre-Islamic primitive, tribal and arbitral usages and practices. The greatness and importance of the exemplary conduct and the *Sunnah* of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of God be upon him) with regard to law and constitution become crystal clear when it is explained that a highly constitutional government was formed at a time when the world was not aware of the concept of constitution.

The tribe was the central concept in the political thinking of pre-Islamic Arabia. It was essentially a group based on blood-relationship- Membership of a tribe was the only safeguard for the protection of life and property, and in return the tribe demanded supreme loyalty. Islam abolished the basis of the pre-Islamic socio-political structure and created the Islamic *Ummah* in place of the tribe. *Ummah* was based on universal religious and moral principles and not on kinship. This fact has been given theoretical expression as well as practical demonstration. The Qur'ān has stated in unequivocal terms that the believers in Islam, regardless of their race, region and colour, were one compact community (*Ummah*): "The believers are brethern."[1]

Practically speaking, Muhammad (p.b.u.h.) was accepted as Prophet by

[1] Al-Qur'ān, xlix- to- Surprisingly, Montgomery Watt ignored all this evidence and held: — This idea is nowhere given theoretical expression, but it is everywhere implied or assumed" (Muhammad at Madinah (Oxford, 1966), p. 239).

multi-racial stocks of people and members of different Arab tribes and clans at Makkah- His acceptance by the Ansār of Madīnah was the greatest event for the development and consolidation of the concept of *Ummah*. *Hijrah*, the Emigration of the Holy Prophet and his followers and of different clans and members of various tribes of Arabia from Makkah to Madīnah, was not merely a change of location it was rather a change of relationship, i.e. to leave one's tribe and attach to the *Ummah*. Any deviation from the way of the believers was regarded as transgression and entailed punishment of Hell.[2] For the purposes of retaliation, ransom and blood-wit, the *Ummah* was regarded as a tribe even by its enemies.

The Holy Prophet of Islam was the head of the *Ummah*- Acceptance of Islam by any person included the acceptance of religio-political leadership of the Holy Prophet- It has been explicitly stated in the Holy Qur'ān: "Say: Obey Allah and the Prophet";[3] "Whoever obeys the Prophet, he indeed obeys Allah."[4]

The *Ummah* with its head had come into being but the socio-political environment of Makkah was not conducive to the implementation of its ideals- II required a new socio-political environment.

After about thirteen years of his prophethood the Holy Prophet entered into an agreement with the Muslim leaders of the Aws and Khazraj of Madīnah who invited him to their city, promised to follow Islamic injunctions and undertook to protect him against his enemies, particularly the Qaraish.[5] Consequently, the Holy Prophet left Makkah for Madīnah. Here he got time and opportunity to think over the situation relatively peacefully- He organised his followers, sympathisers and allies and laid down the foundation of a state for which a constitution was framed- Hamidullah has argued that it was the "First Written-Constitution in the World"- Remarking on the previous works on the subject he concludes that they were either in the nature of text-books or advice-books to princes or are histories accounts of the constitutional set-up of certain places: "Non of these enjoys the dignity of an authoritative constitution of stale issued by the sovereign of the

---

[2] AI-Qur'ān, iv. 115.

[3] Ibid.. iii 31.

[4] Ibid., iv 80.

[5] Ibn Hishām, *Sirah* (ed. Egypt, 1955). I, 446.

country. Ours is the first of its kind in the world."[6] Ibn Hishām has preserved the full text of the Constitution.[7] Its English translation is given below:

Constitution of Madīnah

In the name of God, the Most Merciful, the Most Compassionate.

(I) This is a constitution from Muhammad the Prophet be tween the believers and Muslims of the Quraish and Yathrib am those who follow them and join them and fight alongwith them.

(2) They are one community (Ummah) distinct from other people.

(3) The Emigrants from among the Quraish, according to their former condition,[8] shall pay jointly the blood-money, an(they shall ransom their captives in all fairness and equity common among the believers-

(4) Banū 'Awf, according to their former condition, shall pay jointly their blood-wits as heretofore, and each sub-clan shall ransom its captives in

---

[6] M- Hamidullah, *The First Written-Constitution in the World* (Lahore 1975), p. 9.

[7] Ibn Isḥāq, Ihn Hishām, Abū 'Ubaid al-Qāsim b. Sallām, Ibn Abī. Khaithmah, ibn Kathīr, 'Umar b. Muḥammad b. Khiḍr at-Mawṣalī and Ibn Zanjwaih have reported full text of the Constitution. For full refer. once to the text and its extracts see Bibliography of Hamidullah. op. cit. p. 53.

[8] The term '*ale rib'ati-him* means their former or original state or condition, which in law conforms to legal custom or practice. Lane, on the authority of Tāj al-'Arūs, has given other synonyms of this meaning (s.v.) M- Hamidullah's translation "(Responsible) for their ward" does not seem to convey the real sense (Hamidullah, op- cit., p. 35). He has read the word *rib'ah* as *rab'ah* and translated it as "ward". *Rab'ah* in its feminine font does not mean "quarter" or "area" or "ward". It means "a basket for keeping perfumes" or "a middle.statured person". However, in its mascline form tab', it means dwellings. The word used in the Constitution is *rib'ah* and not *rab*'.

In addition, the Emigrants did not settle in one compact colony of Madīnah. The individual Emigrants were attached to the Helpers of the Holy Prophet and were thus scattered all over the city. Hence the translation "The Emigrants from among the Quraish shall he (responsible) for their wards (*rab'ah*)," is far from the real sense of the context.

all fairness and equity common among the believers.

(5) Banū' al-Hārith, according to the former condition, shall pay jointly their blood-wits as heretofore, and each sub-clan shall ransom its captives in all fairness and equity common among the believers-

(6) Banū Sā'idah, according to their former condition, shall pay jointly their blood-wits as heretofore, and each sub-clan shall ransom its captives in all fairness and equity common among the believers.

(7) Banū Jusham, according to their former condition, shall pay jointly their blood-wits as heretofore, and each sub-clan shall ransom its captives in all fairness and equity common among the believers.

(8) Rand al-Najjār, according to their former condition, shall pay jointly their blood-wits as heretofore, and cacti sub-clan shall ransom its captives in all fairness and equity common among the believers-

(9) Banū 'Amr b. 'Awf, according to their former condition, shall pay jointly their blood-wits as heretofore, and each sub-clan shall ransom its captives in all fairness and equity common among the believers-

(10) Banū al-Nabit, according to their former condition, shall pay jointly their blood-wits as heretofore, and each sub-clan shall ransom its captives in all fairness and equity common among the believers-

(11) Banū 'al-Aws, according to their former condition, shall pay jointly their blood-wits as heretofore, and each sub-clan shall ransom its captives in all fairness and equity common among the believers.

(12) The believers shall not forsake anyone among them hard pressed with debts, but shall help him in all fairness with ransom or blood-money.

(13) A believer shall not take as an ally[9] the freedman of another believer against the latter.

(14) The God-fearing believers shall be against whoever o them shall revolt or who shall seek to spread injustice or treachery or aggression or

---

[9] *Yuḥalifu*: Egyptian edition, 1375/1955, has also been read as *yukhalifu* (Wustenfeld edition) and translated as "And no believer shall oppose the client of another believer against him" (i.e. the latter). See M. Hamidullah, op. cit. Reading of *Yuḥalifu* can also be supported by a report of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (iii, 342) on the authority of Jābir, who says: The Messenger of Cud prescribed for each clan its blood-money and then wrote: "Verily it is not permitted that a contract of a freedman of Muslim should be entered into without the permission of his patron (*wali*)".

corruption among the believers; their hand: shall be all together against him, even if he be the son of one o them-

(15) A believer shall not slay a believer for an unbeliever and shall not help an unbeliever against the believer-

(16) The protection of God is one; the least of then ma: grant neighbourly protection on their behalf, the believers an protectors of one another to the exclusion of other people-

(17) Whoever of the Jews follows us shall have the help and have equal status, so long as the Muslims shall not be wronged (by him) nor shall he help (others) against thorn.

(18) The peace of the believers is one; no believer shall malt, peace apart from another believer during war in the Way o G d except on terms of equity and justice between them.

(19) Soldiers of a company participating with us in a battle shall take turns with one another-

(20) (i) The believers shall exact vengeance for one another where blood is shed in the Way of God.

(ii) The God-fearing believers are under the best and most correct guidance.

(21) No polytheist shall give neighbourly protection to the property and life of the Quraish, nor shall intervene in such matters against a believer-

(22) Whoever shall wrongfully kill a believer, the evidence being clear, shall be killed in retaliation, unless the heir of the murdered agrees to blood-money. The entire strength of the believers shall be against the offender; nothing is permissible to them except to enforce law against him-

(23) It shall not be permissible for a believer, who holds b: what is in this document and believes in God and in the Las Day, to help a wrongdoer or to provide him shelter- Whoever shall help him or shelter him, upon him shall be the curse o God and His wrath on the Day of Resurrection, and neither ransom nor compensation shall be accepted from him.

(24) Whenever you have a dispute in some matter its reference shall be made to God and to Muḥammad.

(25) The Jews shall contribute to the expenses of war along-with the believers so long as they fight jointly-

(26) The Jews of Banū ‘Awf shall he a community alongwith the believers- For the Jews shall be their religion and for the Muslims shall be their religion- This includes their allies and themselves except a person who

shall do wrong or act treacherously ; he shall ruin none but his own person and his house-hold.

(27) For the Jews of Banū al-Najjār (the terms) shall be the same as for the Jews of Banū ʻAwf.

(28) For the Jews of Banū al-Hārith (the terms) shall be the same as for the Jews of Banū ʻAwf.

(29) For the Jews of Banū Sā'idah (the terms) shall be the same as for Jews of Banū ʻAwf.

(30) For the Jews of Banū Jusham (the terms) shall be the same as for the Jews of Banū ʻAwf-

(31) For the Jews of Banū ū al-Aws (the terms) shall be the same as for the Jews of Banū ʻAwf,

(32) For the Jews of Banū ʻThaʻlabah (the terms) shall he the same as for the Jews of Banū ʻAwf, except a person who shall do wrong or act treacherously ; he shall ruin none but his own person and his household-

(33) Jafnah, a sub-clan of Thaʻlabah, shall be (in the same position) as they are.

(34) (i) For Banū al-Shuṭaibah shall be the same (terms) as for the Jews of Banū ʻAwl-

(ii) Obedience is distinct from defiance

(35) The allies of Thaʻlabah shall be (in the same position) as they are.

(36) The intimate friends of the Jews shall be (in the same position) as they are

(37) None of them shall go out to war except with the permission of Muhammad ; however, none shall be restrained from taking vengeance for wounds.

(38) (i) He who shall slay a person unawares shall slay him-self and his household except who has been wronged.

(ii) God is the guardian of its (document's) truest contents

(39) (i) The Jews shall bear their expenses and the Muslims shall bear their expenses

(ii) They shall mutually help one another against those who shall wage war against the people of this document.

(iii) There shall be mutual counselling and well-wishing among themselves.

(iv) Obedience is distinct from defiance-

(v) A person shall not be responsible for his ally's treachery

(vi) The oppressed shall be helped.

(40) The Jews shall contribute to the expenses alongwith the believers, so long as they fight jointly.

(41) The valley of Yathrib shall he inviolable for the people of this document.

(42) The protected person shall be as the man himself so long as he shall do no harm and shall not act treacherously.

(43) No woman shall be granted neighbourly protection with-out the consent of her people.

(44) (i) Whenever among the people of this document shall arise any incident or a dispute likely to cause trouble, it shall be referred to God and to Muhammad the Messenger of God.

(ii) God is the guardian of the most scrupulous and the truest of what is in this document.

(45) No neighbourly protection shall be granted to the Quraish nor to those who shall help them.

(46) They shall mutually help one another against whoever shall attack Yathrib.

(47) Whenever they shall be called to participate in a peace treaty and to adhere to it, they shall participate in it and adhere to it. And when they shall call for the same, it shall be binding on the Muslims, excepting one who shall fight for the cause of religion.

(48) Each group shall be responsible for its part from the side which shall be towards them.

(49) (i) The Jews of al-Aws, their allies and themselves shall have the same treatment as the people of this document together with complete obedience to the people of this document-

(ii) Obedience is distinct from defiance.

(iii) The earner of wrongdoing earns it only against himself.

(iv) God is the guardian of what is the most upright and the truest in this document.

(50) (1) This document shall not intervene to protect a wrong-doer or a traitor, lie who shall go out shalt be safe, and he who shall sit still shall be safe in Madīnah, except he who shall dc wrong and shall act treacherously.

(ii) God is the protector of those who obey and behave scrupulously and Muḥammad is the Messenger of God.

Authenticity- The whole document constitutes one complete constitution. Its text, style, diction and archaic Arabic indicate that its authorship was the same- It is an authentic document- Apart from lbn Isḥāq, its full text has been reported by most reliable narrators such as al-Zuhrī and Ibn Khaithmah as quoted by Ibn Zaniwaih and lbn Sayyid al-Nās, respectively. Its important articles have been reported in the "six most authentic" books of Ḥadīth: Ṣaḥīḥ of Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ of Muslim, Jāmi' of Tirmidhī, Sunan of Nisā'ī, Sunan of Abū Dāwud, Sunan of Ibn Mājah, and also in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal, in the Sunan of Dārimī and al-Muṣannuf of 'Abd al-Razzāq. Historians such as lbn Sa'd, al-Ṭabarī, al-Balādhurī, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdad), al-Maqdisī, al-Zurqānī, al Maqrīzī have also reported it- Ibn Manẓūar, the great lexicographer has also mentioned it-

Wellhausen among the Orientalists has made a detailed study of the document and has given reasons for its authenticity.'[10] Montgomery Watt also accepts its genuineness.[11] Ibn Ḥajar, a scrupulous critic, has expressed his reservation on its impeccable authenticity without giving reasons. He could not persuade himself to accept article 26 which declares the Jews to be "a community alongwith the believers". Here "community" meant a political community- Ideologically speaking, the Jews were monotheists and had belief in one God, *vis-a-vis* the polytheists and infidels of Madīnah- The internal and external evidence reveals that the Constitution is an authentic document. It does not contain anything contrary to the fundamentals of Islam. The non-Muslims under Muslim rule on the three old continents of the world were given the same treatment as envisaged in this earliest constitutional document.

Date- The earliest sources of Islam generally state that the Constitution of Madīnah was drawn up in the beginning of the first year of the Hijrah. According to a report of Anas as recorded by Bukhārī, the document was written in the house of his parents, which implies that it was framed before

---

[10] Wellhausen, "Gemeindeordnung von Medina," in his Skizzen und vorarleiton (1899). IV, 74-86. For details of other Orientalists who have worked on the document, see Hamidullah up. cit.. Bibliography.

[11] W. Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Madīnah, p- 225.

the construction of the Mosque of the Holy Prophet at Madīnah.12[12] A number of Orientalists have made a critical study of the Constitution.[13] Wellhausen and Caetani, after having brought enormous evidence and strong arguments, have placed the document before the battle of Badr. Caetani has also met objections of Grimme who argued for a date after Badr.

The Constitution contains fifty articles. The Orientalists, following Welhausen, have counted them forty-seven.[14] Hamidullah has counted fifty-two clauses, but for the sake of conformity with European writers he has divided certain clauses into two by the signs of *a* and *b*. Not satisfied with the above counting the present writer, after making a careful study of the document, has counted fifty articles. Some of them have been divided into paras in accordance with the modern framing of constitutions and legal codes. The reasons for this departure are as follows: "This is a Constitution" has been counted as No. 1, while Watt leaves it without numbering apparently considering it as a part of the Preamble. It does not seem to be so because the constituents of the Constitution are essential parts of the document.

The article "A believer shall not take as an ally the freed-man .. -" is No-13, because it is a self-contained article- Hamidullah counts it as a part of article No. 12 even against the numbering of the Orientalists.

The clause "The God-fearing believers are under the best and most correct guidance" is para (ii) of article No. 20 because its subject is the *mu'minūn* mentioned in para (i) of the same article. Watt has also read it in the same manner, but Hamidullah has made it an independent article including the next independent article as its part (*b*). The article "He who shall slay a person unawares -.." is No. 38. Hamidullah and Watt have read it as part of the previous article, while it seems that it is a self-contained article which concerns a murderer who slays someone unawares. The clause "God is the guardian of its truest contents" is a part of the article. There are some other articles in the Constitution which have been described as such.

Previously all writers have considered *abarr* as an adjective of God while the present writer has considered it as an adjective of the contents of the

---

[12] Bukhārī, al-Ṣaḥīḥ, Chapter 96, Section 19.

[13] Wellhausen, Buhl, Sprenger, Grimme, Mueller, Wensinck, Caetani, Watt and others. See for full reference Hamidullah, op. cit.

[14] Watt, op. cit.,

document, as it appears from its translation in the text. The clause "Each group shall he responsible for its part from the side which shall be towards them" is an independent article, because it is self-contained. It may not be considered as part of the previous one which speaks about participation of all constitutions in a peace treaty.

The Constitution comprises two parts. The first part consists of articles I to 24, and the second of articles 25 to 50. As stated earlier, the whole text of the Constitution was written in the first year of the *Hijrah*, before the battle of Badr. However, the second part of the Constitution has led some scholars to conclude that it was added to the first part after the battle of Badr.[15] Montgomery Watt has gone to the extent that it belonged "to the period after the elimination of Quraish,"[16] i.e after the battle of *Khandaq*. It is not correct. All Jews of Banū Qainuqā, Banū Naḍīr and Ban Quraiẓah had left Madīnah and there was no danger from the Jewish side. Then what was the need for the Jewish inclusion in the Constitution. His view is further based on the linguistic variations and repetition of the same articles at different places.[17] Hamidullah takes the glorious victory of Bach., Holy Prophet's alliances with the neighbourly tribes, Banū Ḍamrah and Juhainah, rivalry of the Jewish tribes, as reasons which obliged the Jews to seek the protective cooperation of the Holy Prophet.[18]

The scholars mentioned above have not substantiated their views with historical evidence. On the contrary, circumstances of the period under reference positively confirm that pre-Badr period was more appropriate for the Jews to participate in the writing of the Constitution and to adhere to its contents than the post-Badr period- It is stated in the Qur'ān that the Jews expected that when the Prophet, spoken of in Deut. I8: 18, came, he would make them victorious over their disbelieving opponents:

> And when there came to them a Book from Allah verifying that which they have, and aforetime they used to pray for victory against those who disbelieved.[19]

Under those expectations the Jews extended their help and co-operation to the Holy Prophet at his arrival in Madīnah. The Holy Prophet was also

---

[15] Hubert Grimme, Muhammad (Munster, 1892), I. 75-81 : M. Hamidullah. op cit., p. 22.
[16] Watt, op. cit., p. 227.
[17] 1bid., p. 226.
[18] Hamidullah, op. cit., p. 22.
[19] The Qur'ān, ii. 89-

closer to the monotheist Jews than pagans and infidels of Madīnah and its surroundings. Practical manifestation of this belief was his adoption of Bait al-Maqdis instead of the Ka'bah as his *qiblah*. Similarly, fasting on the tenth of Muḥarram was also adopted.[20] Out of respect he used to stand up when a bier of a Jew passed by.[21] lie disapproved that his Companions should exaggerate his qualities in comparison with Moses.[22] Bukhārī has recorded a very important statement which says that the Holy Prophet was pleased to adopt manners of the People of the Book in matters not commanded by God.[23]

Muslim-Jewish cordial relations, during the first year of the *Hijrah*, are further confirmed by the attitude adopted by the Quraish in connection with their aggressive policy against the Holy Prophet. Assessing the political situation at Madīnah, the Quraish felt they had better chances of winning over 'Abd Allah b. Ubayy than in the Jews- The Quraish, seeking the support of 'Abd Allah b. Ubayy, addressed him a letter and asked him to kill the Holy Prophet or expell him from Madīnah.[24] Because of these cordial and friendly relations during the pre-Badr period the Jews' co-operation with the Holy Prophet in establishing federal government at Madīnah and in framing an agreed constitution, in which they even did not object to the mention of his Prophethood (articles I, 24, 44, 50).

It seems that the battle of Badr was a turning point in the Muslim-Jewish relationship. One month before this battle in the month of Sha'bān of the second year of the *Hijrah*, under Divine commandment, the Holy Prophet changed his *qiblah* from *Bait al-Maqdis* to the Ka'bah: "Turn then thy face towards the sacred Mosque."[25] This offended the Jews. The Constitution guaranteed them religious freedom. However, their objectionable social practices and harmful conduct were criticised in the Qur'an and their evil intentions were exposed. This was againt their expectations. They had expected that the new prophet would justify their conduct and would preach others to follow it. This enraged the Jews. The glorious victory at Badr further aggravated their frustration.

---

[20] Bukhārī, aI-Ṣaḥīḥ, chapter on the arrival of the Prophet at Madīnah.
[21] Ibid., Kitāb al-Janā'iz.
[22] Ibid., Tafsir Sūrah .A'rāf.
[23] Ibid Kitāb al-Libās.
[24] Abū Dāwaūd. Sunan, Vol- 11, Chapter Banū Naḍīr,
[25] The Qur'ān, ii. 144.

In the changed circumstances after the battle of Badr according to the assessment of the Quraish, they had better chances with the Jews than their previous supporter, 'Abd Allah b. Ubayy. Now they addressed a letter to the Jews mentioning them as owners of weapons and fortresses and incited them to fight against the Holy Prophet.[26]

Banū Qainuqā', the strongest and the bravest of the Jews, were the first to revolt againt the Holy Prophet. Ibn Sa'd reports that "they threw away the Constitution," and "They were the first to betray it and act treacherously: '*Fa kānū awwal man ghadara min al-Yahūd*."[27] Ibn Hishām and al-Ṭabari have also reported to the same effect from lbn Isḥāq: "*Anna Banī Qainuqā' kānū awwal Yahūd naqaḍū mā bainahum wa bain Rasūl Allāh wa ḥarabū fi mā baina Badr wa Uḥud*."[28] The above evidence makes it abundantly clear that the second part of the Constitution relating to the Jews was also written in the first year of the Hijrah, before the battle of Badr. After this battle, instead of co-operating in writing a Constitution, the Jews started violating and acting treacherously against what had already been accomplished.

Banū Naḍīr, after the battle of Uḥud, acted treacherously. Banū Quraiẓah renewed the agreement after the battle of Uḥud and violated both the agreements during the battle of *Khandaq*. It shows that both parts of the Constitution were written prior to the battle of Badr.

Some scholars have argued that the names of the three main Jewish tribes, Banū Qainuqā', Banū Naḍīr and Banū Quraiẓah, have not been mentioned in the Constitution; therefore, they were not included in it. First of all the above historical evidence negates this view. Banū Qainuqā' have explicitly been mentioned by name as the first Jewish tribe that betrayed the Constitution. If they were not included in the Constitution it was meaningless to state their betrayal. Secondly, the Jewish clans were grouped according to the Arab clans in whose districts they lived. Banū Naḍīr and Banū Quraiẓah have been mentioned as the Jews of Banū Aws and Tha'labah, since they lived between Awsallah and Tha'labah b. 'Amr b.'Awf[29]" (articles 31-32). Banū Qainuqā' were the allies of Banū Ḥārith of the

---

[26] Abū Dāwūd, op. cit.

[27] Ibn Sa'd- Ṭabaqāt (ed. Beyrut, 1957), II, 29.

[28] Ibn Hishām, op. cit., 11, 47.

[29] Wellhausen, Skizzen, IV, 80, as quoted by Walt, op. cit., p. 227,

Khazraj[30] and as such they were mentioned under article 28. In view of these circumstances, 'Abd Allah b. Ubayy spoke on behalf of Banū Qainuqā' and Sa'd b. Ma'ādh was an arbiter in the case of Banū Quraiẓah when they acted treacherously.

Ya'qūbī has recorded a statement according to which Banū Naḍīr and Banū Quraiẓah were originally not Jews. They were Arabs from a branch of the Judhām who had adopted Judaism.[31] Al-Mas'ūdī has also mentioned this fact.[32] In this event to group these Jewish clans according to the Arab clans seems more realistic.

Constituents of the Islamic State

The Constitution of Madīnah provided that the believers, the Emigrants from the Quraish, and the Muslims, the Helpers from Madīnah, their followers and political allies were one community (*nmmah wāḥidan*).[33] Other peoples of Madīnah such as Jews, their followers and allies who submitted to the Constitution were given the same treatment and equal rights (*al-naṣr wa al-iswah*).[34] They were declared as *Ummah* alongwith the believers (*ummah ma'a al-Mu'minīn*).[35] The Constitution provided that even the polytheists in or around Madīnah who submitted to the Constitution were also its citizens; and the constitutional provisions were equally binding on them.[36] Hence the whole population of Madīnah, the Emigrants, the Helpers, the Muslims, the non-Muslims, the believers, the non-believers, the Jews and the polytheists became the constituents of the Constitution of Madīnah, and accepted the Holy Prophet as the final court of appeal.

Religious and Social Autonomy. Politically, the whole population of Madīnah constituted the state. Constitutionally, the different constituent religious groups were given religious and internal autonomy. The two major constituents, the Emigrants and the Helpers, were autonomous in following

---

30 Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, II,93.

31 AI-Ya'qūbī, Ta'rīkh, II. 49.

32 Al-Mas'ūdī, Kitāb al-Ashrāf, p. 247.

33 The Constitution of Madīnah, ankle No. 2 thereafter the Constitution referred to in the text and footnotes would mean the Constitution of Madīnah).

34 Ibid , article No. 17.

35 Ibid., article No, 26.

36 Ibid.. article No.21.

their pre-Islamic usages in matters of blood-wit and ransom of their captives.[37] The Jews were guaranteed religious freedom.[38] They were also free in matters of blood-wit and ransom of captives.

Authority of the Holy Prophet

Head of State. Article 44 of the Constitution of Madīnah provided that Muḥammad, the Holy Prophet of Islam, was the head of the state. It was binding on all people of the Constitution to refer all differences, administrative disputes and political issues to the Holy Prophet. Under this constitutional provision, all internal cases of law and order and external issues of war and peace were to he referred to him.

Commander-in-Chief. Article 37 of the Constitution provided that the citizens of the state, individually or collectively, were not allowed to go out to war without the permission of Muḥammad (p.b.u.h.). He was the sole authority in matters of war. Action could be taken against any person who would go out to war without his permission.

Chief Justice. Articles 24 and 44 of the Constitution provided that all legal disputes, judicial matters and litigations were to be referred to Muḥammad, the Holy Prophet (p.b.u.h). The Arabic "*mahmakhtalaf tum fih min shay'in*" (article 24) and "*ishtijār*" (article 44) are very comprehensive legal terms. They are applied to all sorts of legal, judicial, administrative, social and political contentions and disputes. These constitutional provisions made the Holy Prophet the chief justice of the state of Madīnah. The Constitution prescribed prerogatives and obligations of the ruler and the ruled. Its provisions were equally binding on the head of the state. History has recorded some cases which were brought against the Holy Prophet.[39]

---

[37] Ibid., articles Nos. 4. 5. 6, 7. 8. 9. 10. 11.

[38] Ibid., article No. 26.

[39] The Holy Prophet was always ready to redress the grievances of his people. Once one of his Companions complained against his certain action, and appealed to him against them in the name of "al-haqq wa al-'adl". Ile

at once presented his person for compensation. Ibn Ishāq has reported

this cast as follows :

In his capacity as the head of the state, commander-in-chief and chief justice, Muhammad the Holy Prophet wielded power unprecedented among pre-Islamic Arabs. The Arab monarchs of certain regions, the *shuyūkh* of different tribes and the *malā* of the city-state of Makkah had no parallel with the constitutional power of the Holy Prophet. The Muslims, naturally, were the most satisfied constituents at his constitutional position. The Helpers of Madīnah were tired of their pre-Islamic civil wars, fratricidal and internecine fightings and protracted disputes. By accepting his constitutional position they were happy to have an easily available central authority among them for the adjudication of their quarrels and disputes.

It is interesting to note that the Jews and the pagans of Madīnah accepted this constitutional authority of the Holy Prophet without accepting him as the Prophet, and without raising any objection to the mention of his Prophethood. It is important because the Quraish of Makkah did not agree to include his Prophethood in the agreement at Ḥudaibīyyah six years after the framing of the Constitution of Madīnah.[40] After the arrival of the Holy Prophet at Madīnah Arab tribal chiefs alongwith their tribesmen accepted Islam. This event gave a blow to the old social and political organisation based on tribal-ism. With the disorganisation of the tribal system the non-Muslim and pagan relatives of the Muslims found themselves in great difficulty for the adjudication of their disputes. The new Constitution clearly laid down that they could avail themselves of the centralised administration

---

"On the day of Badr the Messenger of Cod straightened the ranks of his Companions, with an arrow in his hand. As he passed by Sawād b. Chāziyah, an ally of Banū b al. Najjār, who was standing out of the line he pricked him in his belly with the arrow, saying : Stand in line, O Sawād. He cried : 'Messenger of Cod! you have hurt me. and God has sent you with right and justice,' and added, 'se let me prick with arrow (in retaliation)' The Messenger of God at once uncovered his belly and said : 'Prick with arrow.' Sawād embraced him and kissed his belly. The Holy Prophet inquired: 'What made you dose, 0 Sawād 1' He replied: 'Messenger of God ' you see what (war) is before us. and as this is my last time with you I want my skin touch yours.' The Messenger of God blessed him" (Ibn Hishām, op. cit., I, 626).

Many examples can be quoted on this subject. It clearly shows that

Islam rejects the theory that "King can do no wrong."

[40] Al, Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, Bāb al-Shuruṭ fi al.Jhād. Suhail, the representative of the Quraish, raised the objection which was acceded to by the Holy Prophet.

of justice, and in the protection of the central government provided in political matters they should not create obstacles in the way of its functioning. They were also required to hale no connection with the Quraish.

The Holy Prophet was unanimously accepted by all sections of the Madīnan society as the head of the community, chief justice and commander-in-chief of the state of Madīnah. With the promulgation of the Constitution the chaos and anarchy of tribalism was brought to an end. It was a revolutionary change. The people were provided with a central public institution for seeking justice. Instead of settling their disputes with individual power or with the support of their family. The centralised constitutional government gave birth to a well-organised and cohesive state which brought three continents of the old world under its rule within a very short period.

Dispensation of Justice

The constitutional government under the Constitution of Madīnah functioned satisfactorily during the first year and a half of its implementation.[41] All its components who willingly submitted to the Constitution worked jointly for its welfare and progress, each group performing its duties and invoking the Constitution in case of departure from any of its provisions. History has recorded many instances which show that the Jews submitted their disputes and complicated legal problems to the Holy Prophet accepting him as the chief justice of the state of Madīnah.

Ibn Isḥāq has reported the details of a case referred to the Holy Prophet by the Jews and has also reported his judicial judgment thereon.

Case History. A married man committed adultery with a married woman. The Jewish Rabbis gathered in Bait al-Midras (a Jewish religious seminary). After discussion and deliberations they decided to refer the case for adjudication to Muḥammad (p.b.u.h.) in accordance with the constitutional provision (articles 24 and 44). The Rabbis also wanted to test the integrity of the Holy Prophet.

"If he prescribes *tajbih* (scourging with a rope of palm fibre smeared with pitch, the blackening of their faces, mounting on two donkeys with their

---

[41] Qadī Muḥammad Sulaimān Salmān Manṣūrpūrī, Raḥmat lil- Ālamin (Lahore ; Shaikh Ghulam Ali & Sons, 1972), I, 130.

faces to the animal's tail), then follow him, for he is a king and believe in him. If he prescribes stoning for them, he is a prophet, so beware lest he deprive you of what you hold." The Jews came to the Prophet and presented the case saying: "O Muḥammad! this married man has committed adultery with a married woman. Give your judgment in

their case. We submit their case to you as judge."[42]

Proceedings of the Case

Meeting with the Rabbis. The Constitution of Madīnah guaranteed religious autonomy to the Jews: "The Jews shall follow their religion" (article 26). Hence the Holy Prophet proceeded to record evidence from their authentic religious text — the Torah. He paid a visit to the Rabbis in Bait al-Midras and asked the Jews to arrange a meeting with their religious authorities. They produced 'Abd Allah b. Ṣūriyā, Abū Yāsir and Wahb. b. Yahūdah and said they were their authorities and 'Abd Allah h. Ṣūriyā was the most learned in Torah among their living authorities.[43]

Cross-Examination and Taking of Oath. After their statement the Holy Prophet put questions to them in cross-examination. Urging upon them the importance of the case he addressed Ibn Ṣūriyā: "In the name of God and in the name of glorious days of Banū Isrā'il, state whether you know that God has prescribed in Torah stoning for married persons who commit adultery." "Yes," was his answer and he added, "they know very well, Abū al-Qāsim, that you are a Prophet sent (by God) but they envy you.[44]

Production of Text. The Holy Prophet asked them to produce the Torah. The most learned of the Rabbis sat there and started reading the text. He put his hand over the verse of stoning. 'Abd Allah b. Salām (a convert from the Jews) struck the Rabbi's hand, saying: "This, Prophet of God, is the verse of stoning which he rufuses to read to you." Thereafter the Jews admitted that such a text existed in the Torah.[45]

Before pronouncing his judgment, the Holy Prophet made further inquiry into the matter.

---

[42] Ibn Hishām, op. cit.. 1, 564, 566: Mālik I). Anas. Muwaṭṭa', Kitāb al-Ḥudūd.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid.

Causes of Suppressing the Law. During the proceeding of the case when the Jews tried to conceal the truth, which of course became manifest, the Holy Prophet asked the reason for sup-pressing the law of the Torah.

"Woe to you Jews," the Holy Prophet asked them: "What induced you to abandon the law of God which you hold in your hands. "They disclosed: "The sentence used to be carried out until a man of royal birth and noble origin committed adultery and the king refused to allow him to be stoned. Later another man committed adultery and the king wanted him to be stoned, but they said: 'No, not until you stone so and so.' And when they said that to him they agreed to arrange the matter by *tajbih* and they did away with all mention of stoning and practising it. "After hearing the background of the suppression of the law of the Torah, the Holy Prophet said: "I am the first to revive the law of God, His book and to practise it."[46]

Judgment. On the basis of the evidence collected during his meeting with the Rabbis, their cross-examination, taking of oath, production of the text of the original law of the Torah and knowledge of the background of the suppression of the law of God, the matter became crystal clear to the Holy Prophet. He, therefore, pronounced his judgment that the adulterers should be stoned. 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar, the reporter of the case, re-ported that they were duly stoned and "I was among those who stoned them."[47]

Discrimination Before Law

Different groups of Jews in Madīnah were not treated equally before the law. The Jews of Banū Naḍīr were considered superior to the Jews of Banū Quraiẓah because of the high social status of the former. In case a man from the Banū Naḍīr was killed full blood-money was paid, but in case of Banū Quraiph only half of the blood-money was paid. The Jews filed a suit in the court of the chief justice of Madīnah, the Holy Prophet of Islam, and requested for his judgment on this very important social and legal issue. The Holy Prophet gave his judgment that Jews were equal before the law and there was no justification for discrimination between the Jews of Banū Naḍīr and Banū Quraiẓah.[48]

---

[46] Ibid.; Wāḥidī, Asbāb al-Nuzūl (Egypt), p. 145 ; Muslim, .Ṣaḥīḥ, Chapter Rajm al-Yahūd.
[47] Ibn Hishām, op. cit.
[48] Ibid., I, 566.

Dispute between A Muslim and A Jew

Once a Jew and a Helper (Muslim) discussed the question of superiority of Prophets inter se. During discussions the Jew presented Moses in such a way as if he was superior to Muhammad (p.b.u.h.). The Helper could not tolerate it and gave him a slap. The Jew lodged a complaint against him in the court of the Holy Prophet. After hearing both the parties the Holy Prophet decided in favour of the Jew and by way of advice he said: "Do not exaggerate my superiority over other Prophets. On the day of Resurrection all people will go into a fit of faint. I shall be the first to wake up and see Moses standing beside the Throne of God the Almighty.[49]

Treason

The Quraish of Makkah did not believe in peaceful co-existence with the Muslims. First, they approached 'Abd Allah b. Ubayy, an expected chief of the Aws and Khazraj before the Emigration, and head of the hyprocrites in Madīnah, and asked him to expel] the Prophet from Madīnah or face its serious con-sequences. "You have provided shelter to our man. By God, either you would kill him or expell him or we would attack you with our full force, and would destroy you and disgrace your women."[50] The sagacity, prudence and wisdom of the Holy Prophet foiled the first attempt of the Quraish directed towards creating dissension among the Companions, and 'Abd Allah b. Ubayy failed to do anything for them in the face of growing influence of the Muslims. This was before the battle of Badr.

After the battle of Badr the Quraish approached other component of the Constitution, the Jews, and asked them to rise against the Holy Prophet or face serious consequences:

> "You are equipped with weapons and have fortresses. You must fight with our man or we would do this and this, and nothing would prevent us from the ornaments of your women."[51]

The Holy Prophet gave the Jews full autonomy provided in the

---

[49] Bukhārī, al-Ṣaḥīḥ, Vol. II, Kitāb al-Tafsir, Sūrat al-A'rāf.

[50] Abū Dāwūd, op. cit., Vol II, Chapter on Banū al-Naḍīr.

[51] Ibid., Chapter on *al-Kharāj wa al-Amārah*; Inn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, Iṣābah, under Talhah b. Barā'.

Constitution, decided legal cases with justice and did not give them any opportunity of complaint. But the Jews by nature were mischief-mongers. They responded positively to the Quraish. According to the Constitution, it was an act of high treason. Even then the Holy Prophet as head of state reminded them of the fate of the Quraish and warned them of the dire consequences that would follow. They reacted violently and said: "O Muhammad! you should not be deluded by the fact that you had a battle with people having no experience of war, and you won it. By God, when we fight, you would know that we were different people."[52] Thus they violated the Constitution and fought against the Muslims.[53]

Banū Qainuqā', the bravest of the Jewish clans,[54] were the first to betray the constitutional trust agreed upon between them and the Holy Prophet. They declared war and fought between the battle of Badr and Uḥud.[55]

Judgment. This act of high treason demanded capital punishment. The Holy Prophet, being the chief justice of the state, gave them an opportunity of defence, to fulfil all the judicial and legal requirements. 'Abd Allah b. Ubayy, an ally of the Qainuqā', appealed for their banishment. As head of the state, the Holy Prophet assented to this punishment and they were banished from Madīnah.[56]

Treachery of Banū Naḍīr

Violating the Constitution of Madīnah, Ka'b b. Ashraf, a leader of the Jews of Banū Naḍīr and a poet of repute, went to Makkah after the battle of Badr. He recited fiery verses and instigated the Quraish against the Muslims.[57] He also plotted against the Holy Prophet and was ultimately killed.

The Constitution provided that every component was allowed to accept blood-wit according to its previous usage. Its enforcement wss the duty of the state. 'Amr b. Umayyat al-Ḍamarī killed two persons of Banū 'Āmir in lieu of the Muslim killed at Bi'r Ma'ūnah. The Holy Prophet, as chief justice,

---

52 Ibn Hishām, op. cit., II, 47.

53 53. Ibn Sa'd, op. cit., II, 29.

54 Ibid.

55 Ibn Hishām, op. cit., II, 47.

56 A1-Ṭabarī, Tā'rīkh (ed. al-Maṭba'at at-Ḥusainīyyah), II, 297.

57 Ibn Hishām, op. cit, II, 48 ; Ibn Sa'd, op. cit., II, 29 ; al- Ṭabarī, op. cit., II, 298.

did not approve the action of 'Amr b. Umayyah and gave his judgment that blood-wits should be paid.[58] Banū 'Āmir were the allies of Banū Nadīr. The Holy Prophet, as head of state, paid a personal visit to Banū Naḍīr for helping them to get blood-money for their allies. Instead of appreciating the judicial and executive efficiency of the state, Banū Naḍīr plotted against the life of the Holy Prophet.[59]

Violation of the Constitution

Banishment of Banū Qainuqā', treachery of Ka'b b. Ashraf and violation of the Constitution by Banū Naḍīr had necessitated the renewal of agreement with the Jews. Band Quraiẓah agreed to renew the agreement but Banū Naḍīr refused to submit to the Constitution and also declined to conclude a new one.[60] This was tantamount to declaration of war. They took positions in their strong fotresses, where they were besieged by the Muslims. Ultimately, they surrendered to the Muslim forces.

Judgment. Breach of the Constitution and violation of the trust demanded capital punishment. But the Holy Prophet of Islam decided to banish them from Madīnah. Banū Naḍīr happily accepted his judgment and agreed to go into exile.[61]

Betrayal of Banū Quraiẓah

Banū Quraiẓah were one of the components of the Constitution of Madīnah. They had also renewed it after the battle of Uḥud. During the battle of *Khandaq* (ditch) Ka'b b. Asad, the leader of the Quraiẓah, declined to help the invaders and reminded them of his pledge with the Muslims. Ḥuyayy b. Akhṭab, a banished leader of Banū Naḍīr, prevailed upon Banū Quraiẓah who decided to violate the Constitution and to support the invaders against the Muslims. The Holy Prophet sent Sa'd b. Mu'ādh and Sa'd b. 'Ubādah to remind them of their agreement.

Since they had decided to betray the agreement and to join the forces of

---

[58] Ibn Hishāmm, op. cit., II, 52.
[59] Ibid., II, 180.
[60] Ibid., II. 190.
[61] Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, Chapter on Banū Naḍīr.

the enemy, they answered: "We don't know who is Muhammad and what is the agreement."[62] They openly participated in the war against the state. After defeat they re-treated to their fortresses and brought alongwith them Ḥuyayy b. Akhṭab, the arch enemy of the Prophet.[63] The Holy Prophet sent 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib as vanguard to Banū Quraiẓah. When he approached their fortresses they abused the Holy Prophet and gave him bad names. 'Alī could not tolerate it and reported it to the Prophet. Thereafter siege was laid which continued for twenty-five days.[64] When they were hard pressed by the siege they decided to surrender. They sent a message to the commander-in-chief of the Muslim forces the Holy Prophet of Islam, and requested him to appoint Sa'db. Mu'ādh, their old ally, as an arbiter.[65] On their request appointment of Sa'd was made and their case was referred to him for decision.

Judgment Announced. Sa'd b. Mu'ādh was the most competent person for arbitration. He took leading part in framing the Constitution of Madīnah and was witness to the fact that Banū Quraiẓah signed it with their free will. He was also witness to the fact that Banū Quraiẓah renewed the agreement without internal or external pressure. He was their dependable ally and was fully conversant with their religious laws and social usages and norms. Keeping in view the above background, their crime and the constitutional provision, Sa'd pronounced his award in the following manner which was in accordance with the law of the Torah: "I pronounce my award about them that their men should be slain, their properties distributed, their children and women be made war captives."[66] The state and the Jews submitted to the judgment which was carried out.

---

[62] Shiblī Nu'māni, *Sirat al-Nabi*, I, 423.

[63] Ibid., I. 434.

[64] Ibn Hishām, op. cit., II, 234-35.

[65] lbn Hishām has reported that the Jews contacted the Awls, the Helpers of the Holy Prophet, and sent their request for appointing Mu'ādh as judge (Ibn Hishām, op. cit., II, 239). According, to a report of al-Ṭabarī, Banū Quraiẓah themselves requested for the appointment of Mu'ādh as judge (op. cit. II, 583 under *Ghazwah Ban Quraiẓah*). The Jews of Banū Qainuqā' were the first to commit high treason and requested the support of Khazraj, their pre-Islamic allies. The Jews of the Quraiẓah were the allies of the Aws and they requested for the appointment of Sa'db. Mu'ādh, the leader of the Aws (Ibn Hishām, op. cit., II, 239).

[66] Ibn Hishām, op. cit., II, 240.

Dispute Over the Converts

On the banishment of Banū Naḍīr, a dispute arose between the Jews and the Anṣār whether the adolescents of the latter who were converted to Judaism should depart with the Jews or stay with their parents. The case was referred to the chief justice of Madīnah, the Holy Prophet. It was not a political or social issue. It was purely a religious matter which necessitated revelation. The famous injunction of the Holy Qur'ān: "There is no compulsion in religious affairs"[67] was revealed. The case was decided accordingly.[68]

Debts of the Jews

The Holy Prophet adhered to the Constitution so strictly that even the defeat of the enemies did not deprive them of their right to recover a debt, accrued in a lawful manner. The following two cases would substantiate this fact.

Treachery of the Jewish tribe of Banū Qainuqā' was established. Consequently, order was passed for their expulsion. On hearing the judgment they filed another suit for the recovery of their debts, where they pleaded: "We have debts to recover whose date of payment has not yet reached." The Holy Prophet tried the case, examined the evidence and made inquiries from the respondents. On the right of the Jews being established, the Holy Prophet announced his judgment: "Capitalise them (debts) at a discount."[69]

On the expulsion of Banū Naḍīr the above situation was repeated. They also requested in the Court of the Holy Prophet: "Different people owe us debts whose date of payment has not yet reached." The Holy Prophet, after examining the evidence, ordered: "Capitalise them (debts) at a discount."[70]

It is clear from the foregoing that the judiciary set up under the Constitution of Madīnah functioned perfectly so long as its components remained loyal to it. When they violated its pro-visions and acted against a

---

[67] The Qur'ān. ii. 256.

[68] Shiblī Nu'māni, op. cit., I, 412. Abū Dāwūd has reported this case in his *Sunnah* under *'Bāb fi al-Asīr yukrahu 'al al-Islām.*

[69] M. Hamidullah. The MuslimConduct of State (Lahore, 1973). p 238 ; he has quoted this case from Sarakhsī, III, 180 and 229.

[70] Ibid.

constitutional government, the offenders were put to trial and cases of high treason and treachery were decided keeping in view all the constitutional, judicial and legal requirements. It is certain that the Jews would have never been expelled had they remained loyal to the Constitution of Madīnah.

Before concluding discussion on the judiciary under the Constitution of Madīnah, it will be illuminating to compare the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 (Act V of 1908) in force in Pakistan with the Code of Civil Procedure adopted by the state of Madīnah in respect of the following matters, namely: (a) summoning and enforcing the attendance of any person and examining him on oath ; (b) requiring the discovery and production of documents ; (c) receiving the evidence on affidavits; and (d) issuing Commissions for the examination of witnesses or documents. It is interesting to note that the, procedure adopted by the Holy Prophet as chief justice has resemblance with the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, as adopted by the State of Pakistan.

The cases quoted above provide ample evidence of the fact that the judicial system set up by the Holy Prophet measured up to the Code of Civil Procedure of the twentieth century. Attention is particularly invited to the details of the first case cited under the heading "Dispensation of Justice".

SAYYID AHMAD KHAN'S CONCEPT OF GOD

Abdul Khaliq

As regards the dominant mood of his philosophy, Sayyid Aḥmad Khān (1817-1898) is a naturalist. He considers every natural phenomenon to be explainable in terms of the laws operating in Nature itself and, correspondingly, has full confidence in the capability of human reason to discover these laws. Reason has, however, its limitations too, so that it entirely fails to comprehend the supersensibles or the *ghaib*.[71] Anyhow, these limitations are not externally imposed but are rather inherent in reason and are recognised by reason itself.[72] Hence the appellation "Rational Supernaturalism"[73] for Sayyid Aḥmad's position.

It is very much with reference to this supernatural component that an element of agnosticism enters into Sayyid Aḥmad's otherwise robustly optimistic and positive approach towards the problems of religion and philosophy. He, no doubt, believes in the existence of God, in Whom existence and essence are identical,[74] the "that" and the "what" are one, as an absolute certainty, but commits at the same time that His attributes (and so, He Himself as well) cannot possibly be known by man. In this connection he records[75] a saying of Ḥaḍrat 'Ali who is reported to have once observed that a person, who is sincere in his love of God, denies away His attributes. Anyway, Ḥaḍrat 'Alī seems to have said this for no ontological reasons, nor does this saying involve a reference, as would be required by Sayyid Aḥmad in this context, to the infirmities of human understanding. What he appears to have actually meant was a sort of recommendation.

If we love God and, at the same time, ascribe to Him certain

---

[71] Sayyid Aḥmad's, *Maqālāt*, I, 128-43.
[72] Ibid , III, 182.
[73] J.M.S. Baljon, *The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad khān*, p 113.
[74] *Sayyid Aḥmad*', op. cit., XIII, 3.
[75] Ibid., , 262. 27

characteristics like kindness, forgiveness, etc., then, psycho-logically speaking, our love would, at least partly, be prompted by our personal needs and desires and would thus be in the danger of being tinctured with selfishness. Hence the necessity of love for, and communion with, the very essence of God. Sayyid Aḥmad, although he recognises the possibility of this interpretation, seeks to conclude here that we are incapable of knowing the attributes of God. He is above our thoughts, speculations and even imagination and above everything people can possibly talk of. There is no passage from human comprehension to the nature of God. Of course, the Qur'ān does qualify the Divine with many attributes, "the Beautiful Names"[76] as it calls them, but in so far as their dictionary meanings are concerned, these attributive words, Sayyid Aḥmad rightly points out, are derivable from our naturalistic observation of man and universe and consequently cannot serve as adequate epithets for the Unique, the Ultimate Real.[77] So God possesses all the attributes ascribed to Him by revelation but not in the sense in which we, with all the limitations and frailties of our comprehension, understand them. Even when we describe Him in most general terms as Infinite, Eternal, Supreme, Absolute and so on, we are not describing Him correctly and sufficiently, because, for one thing, these words are mutually limitative; if they were not so, they would be one word, not four. "No distinctive (human) conception of God can have an exclusive validity and God is greater than the sum of all possible conceptions. . . . If we insist on forming a mental image which we regard as adequate and exclusive, then the object of that image would not be God but merely some figment of our imagination."[78]

Sayyid Aḥmad is an empiricist. He holds that the entire raw material of our knowledge of things is derived through sensations both external, like hearing, seeing, smelling, etc., as well as internal like common sensibility, imagination, memory and so on. Now, it is a fact that through none of these sensations man has been able to know the nature of a Being Who occupies the status of an "Uncaused Cause" because there is nothing like Him in Nature—neither in respect of His existence nor in respect of His attributes.[79]

---

[76] The Qur'an, xvii 110.

[77] *Sayyid Aḥmad*, op. cit., III, 312-13.

[78] Lord Northbourne, *Religion in the Modern World*, pp. 25-26.

[79] *Sayyid Aḥmad*, op. cit., XIII, 3.

Thus the character of this Being cannot be known at all. Consequently, the well-known speculations of the philosophers regarding the dimensions of the knowledge of God (whether He knows particulars or universals) or regarding the problem of creation (whether the universe was created by God or it emanated from Him), etc., are all superfluous and unwarranted.

The sceptic attitude of Sayyid Aḥmad is, however, not absolute and total. Sometimes he appears to hold it in abeyance, though he does it with qualifications. In agreement with the Mu'tazilite thinkers, the unitarians *par excellence*, he particularly believes that the attributes of God, as known to us, arc negations only. Sayyid Aḥmad has, in fact, tried to demonstrate the negative concept of God by desupernaturalising Him in various ways: He cannot answer the prayers of people and do favours to them in response thereto; He cannot intervene in the usual course of Nature and perpetrate miracles; He cannot declare a so-called good thing bad and a so-called bad thing good, so that things are good and bad independently of the will of God; and so on.

Moreover, Sayyid Aḥmad points out, a passage from Nature to God itself involves a process of negation and abstraction. Very much like Aristotle, he argues that whatever exists never really enters into nonentity; only accidents and forms change. It is, allegedly, by virtue of this kind of change only that liquid water, for instance, changes into vapour and vapours change into solid snow. The snow, in its turn, may change into water once again. This is how the process of cosmic evolution goes on. If all the transient forms, that we know, are taken away from the universe, the residue, says Sayyid Aḥmad, will be a permanent something which will be indestructible. The Qur'ān says:

> "Everything will perish but He."[80] Further: "Everyone on it passes away and there endures for ever the person of thy Lord, the Lord of glory and honour."[81] Now, is that permanent, indestructible, enduring "something" one or many? Suppose it is many. The further question would arise whether or not these many have the capability of accepting the attributes which they actually do possess. Sayyid Aḥmad rejects the view that they have this capability inherent in themselves because, in that case, they must be self-subsistent all of them; but this cannot be the

[80] The Qur'ān, xviii. 88.
[81] Ibid., lv. 26-27.

case. The units in an apparent multiplicity must be delimited by, and thus, in a way, be dependent upon, each other. They must have something common among themselves which would explain their mutual co-operation and co-existence. This, in its turn, establishes their being the products of a common cause. This one and supreme cause which holds together the abundant diversity is God. This is the theistic point of view.

The other possibility is that, after abstracting all the attributes and accidents, the substance that remains is one. Again, the question further arises whether that one substance has itself the capability of accepting various attributes or that capability is given to it by another being. The former is the standpoint of the upholders of the doctrine of Unity of Being (*waḥdat alwujud*) ; the latter, of the upholders of the doctrine of Unity of Manifestation (*waḥdat-al-shuhūd*). Say Aḥmad does not go deep into a discussion regarding the relative significance and importance of these points of view. He simply ends up with the assertion:

آن برتـــر از خیـــال و قیـــاس و گمـــان و وہم

وز ہرچـــه گفتـــه انـــد و شـــنیدیم و خوانـــده

ایـــم[82]

[He is above thought, measure, fantasy and speculation,
And above everything people talk of, everthing we hear and read.]

Anyhow, agnosticism of Sayyid Aḥmad and his negativism, in whatever way it may be expressed and qualified, is not entirely justified. He, for one thing, does not recognise the possibility that there may be other sources of knowledge than the operation of reason on sense-experience. There is, we believe, an intuitive faculty, mystic or religious consciousness or the so-called sixth sense which is a matter of quite a common experience, although, like the aesthetic sense, for instance, there is more or less of it in people. In great

[82] *Sayyid Aḥmad*, op. cit., I. 8-10.

mystics it is particularly and exceptionally developed. "There seems to be no reason, then," Iqbal once observed, "to accept the normal level of human experience as fact and reject its other levels as mystical and emotional. The facts of religious experience are facts among other facts of human experience and, in the capacity of yielding knowledge by interpretation, one fact is as good as another. . . . For the purposes of knowledge, then, the region of mystic experience is as real as any other region of human experience and cannot be ignored merely because it can-not be traced back to sense-perception."[83] R.M. Bucke who used the term "cosmic consciousness" for mystic experience, not only held that this experience "must not be looked upon as in any sense supernatural or supernormal," but even went further to point out that this consciousness is ever going through a process of evolution in the human species and that it will some day become the psychological condition of a majority of the human race.[84] Anyway, the working of this faculty, if at all we can call it a faculty, is autonomous in the sense that it cannot be subjected to a strictly rational discipline or reduced to a logical syllogism. This was clearly recognised by no less a person than Plato him-self. According to this philosopher of antiquity, just as the Ideas are self-existent and cannot be derived from the facts of sense-experience, so the intuition which perceives these ideas is independent of discursive reason and sensations. With all the progress in sciences which were once supposed to be purely rational and naturalistic, a contemporary physicist would freely talk of the existence of a super-sensible reality and of the super-rational modes of knowledge for its comprehension. Modern science, although it does not offer a proof of religion which could exactly take the place of mystical experience, "encourages a spiritual view of the world and lends its support to the mystical insight".[85] After all we can and must, somehow or other, have a knowledge of God's attributes if He is really to be the goal of our moral aspirations and the object of our worship. An unknowable and "aloof-God" cannot become the basis of a popular religion.

However, Sayyid Aḥmad assures us, failure to know the nature of something does not at all imply its non-existenc.[86] On hearing a voice only,

---

[83] Sir Mohammad Iqbal, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, pp 15 and 22.
[84] See W.T. Stace, *Mysticism and Philosophy*, p. 26.
[85] John Macquarrie, *Twentieth-Century Religious Thought*, p. 248.
[86] *Sayyid Aḥmad*, op. cit., III, 259.

we are certain that there is someone around producing it, although we may not know as to who he is and what is his nature. Similarly, we may differ, as far as we can, regarding the exact characterisation of God, but about the existence of Him we have absolutely no doubt. This fact has nowhere been more clearly recognised than in the thought of Kant, the celebrated upholder of reason as the superiormost instrument of knowledge available to man. Equipped with the forms of perception and the categories of understanding, the maximum that man can know is the phenomenal existence: thing-in-itself or the noumenon is unknowable. But still he is reported to have said: "We cannot ward off the thought nor yet can we endure it that a being, conceived as the highest of all possible beings, should, as it were, say to itself: 'I am from eternity to eternity, beyond me is nothing save that which exists solely by my will; but whence am I ?' Here everything gives way beneath our feet."[87]

The strong conviction regarding the existence of God, Sayyid Aḫmad points out, is not based on any blind faith in the veracity of the Qur'ān and in the sayings of the Holy Prophet. In-stead, the Qur'ān, according to him, clearly envisages a demonstration of the existence of God with the help of certain references to Nature and to the wonders that it displays. These references, he goes on, can be understood without any religious implications and without any involvement of faith. They have an appeal to common sense and, thus, can claim universal application. Thus all people, whether they belong to one religion or the other or, allegedly, to no religion at all, whether they follow any prophet or not, do necessarily believe in God as the Creator or Maker of the world."[88] "Man," he once wrote to a friend, "simply can-not forget God. He pursues us so tenaciously that even if we wish to leave Him, we cannot. Similarly, we ourselves are so indissolubly related to God that even if He wishes to leave us, He can-not."[89]

One of the most evident phenomena of Nature which have been shown to prove God's existence is the fact of causation. We find things and events around us which owe their existence to certain causes. These causes, we discover, are themselves the effects of certain causes of their own. And so on. The unending character of this receding series of causes and effects is unthinkable. Rational propriety demands that we should stop at an uncaused

---

[87] Quoted by IL j. Paton, *The Modern Predicament*, p. 207.

[88] Sayyid Aḫmad, op, cit., III, 18.

[89] Quoted by Alṭāf Ḥusain Ḥālī, *Ḥayāt Jāvid*, pp. 869-70.

cause which itself may be understood as the cause of everything. This supreme cause is God.[90] The possibility that Nature as a whole may be self-existent and uncaused is summarily ruled out. A whole entirely consisting of contingent elements, Sayyid Aḥmad holds, cannot but be contingent itself. Further, God, Who is thus proved to be uncaused, would be a Necessary Being because, if He were possible and contingent, He would have been dependent for His existence on a cause external to Him. From the necessary nature of this being, it, according to Sayyid Aḥmad, irresistibly follows that He is without beginning and without end, primordial as well as everlasting.

The above is a "cosmological" argument for the existence of God. In the widest sense of the term, all a-*posteriori* arguments, i.e. those which proceed from the world (cosmos) to God, are cosmological. In a narrower sense, however, the term stands for those arguments which go from the non-self-explanatory character of the universe to the self-explanatory being of God. Now what exactly is the principle of explanation involved here? if it is the principle of sufficient reason, then God's priority over the universe would be only a logical one and in phrases like "impossibility of infinite regress," "receding series of causes and effects," etc., the references would have no sequential import. If, on the other hand, it is the causal principle, cause-effect relationship having been understood as succesional in Nature, then God is proved to be chronologically prior to the world. In the history of religious thought this argument has generally been propounded in such a way that it would admit of both these interpretations. The former, which is more plausible and less open to objection, is, however, most generally accepted as the true version of the cosmological argument. The latter is characteristically the layman's point of view which Sayyid Aḥmad also seems to hold. Declaring God as the uncaused cause of every-thing, he, in one of his essays, goes on to enumerate the characteristics of the law of causation. Here he expressly states that the chain of causes and effects is extended in time in such a way that cause always comes before and the effect later on.[91]

Apart from the general criticism that has traditionally been levelled against the popular version of the cosmological proof of God's existence as formulated above, it may here be pointed out that it, at least, suits well the kind of naturalistic philosophy which claims to be theistic at the same time.

---

[90] Sayyid Aḥmad, op. cit., III, 28-32 ; I, 8-19, etc

[91] Ibid., III, 30.

Naturalism and, for that matter, any philosophy that gives priority to Nature over everything else or regards it as sufficient in itself to explain all happenings cannot really admit of a personal God. Cosmological argument does establish the existence of a God, but certainly not of one who may be called a person characterised with what Iqbal has termed "a terrific be," having a direct organic concern with the affairs of the world and of man. "A first Cause of the Universe," says John Hick, "might or might not be a deity to whom an unqualified devotion, love and trust would be appropriate."[92] In fact, by virtue of this argument, God is reduced to just an item in the long chain of causes which is arbitrarily raised "to the dignity of an uncaused first Cause".[93] His relation to the world, on these premisses, stands reduced to a temporal one. God is made a participant in the time stream and, in the last analysis, a part of the natural order itself which is a temporal existence. And, moreover, strictly on the basis of this argument, God is practically rendered a superfluity—an "absentee God" of Carlyle—in so far as the present affairs of the world are concerned. Long ago, we are made to believe, God created the first caused cause and gave to it all the laws to be passed on to further causes and to the whole Nature. Once thus reposed in the natures of things, they cannot be changed even by God Himself. God, says Sayyid Aḥmad, is free to enact any law He likes, yet once a law is made nothing at all happens against it.[94] Now, to say that the laws of Nature cannot be violated by God is to say that they have a fixity and are made to he independently operative for all times. God, on these premisses, would be like an emperor who has abdicated his sovereignty in favour of his disobedient offspring who now refuses to give back to his predecessor any of the powers once given to him by the latter or relinquish in his favour any part of his territory. Such a conception of God, says J.M.S. Baljon, is thoroughly "abstract and bloodless".[95] God, the creator, according to 'Alī Bakhsh, a contemporary critic of Sayyid .Aḥmad, is thus "not the originator of everything but is merely the First Cause, the cause of the first thing caused; everything else is produced by its own cause... . Thus it comes to this that it would be wrong to say that God creates

[92] John Hick, *Arguments for the Existence of God*, p. 103.
[93] Sir Mohammad Iqbal, op, cit., p. 28.
[94] *Sayyid Aḥmad*, op. cit., XIII, 4.
[95] J.M.S. Baljon, op. cit., p. 67.

everything."[96]

The basic fallacy committed by the cosmological argument due to which it easily invites such criticism is that it abstracts only one aspect of our experience of the cosmological happenings, i.e. their causal behaviour, at the total exclusion of our experience as such. Hence the incomprehensiveness of the conclusion. Talking of the cosmological proofs for the existence of God, H.J. Paton writes that "they appeal . . . not to a rich and full and diversified experience but to its bare bones. The inference, so to speak, is not from the living body of experience, but only from its skeleton. Hence," he goes on, "the cosmological argument is arid and it may be asked whether it is worthwhile trying to make these dry bones live."[97] This can be expressed otherwise by saying that this argument takes the universe as, at the most, the sign of God and not His symbol. The difference between a sign and a symbol will be made in the sequel.

Further, the cosmological argument, as enunciated by Sayyid Aḥmad, evidently moves round the concept of cause as it was popular in the contemporary world of science. Cause was considered to be a sufficient principle of explanation and one that always produced the corresponding effect. Having proved God as the final cause of everything, it was thought to have been established that the existence of God is indispensable for the existence of the universe. The definition of the notion of cause has since undergone a change. It is no longer a principle of explanation. Cause and effect have only a relationship of regularity of sequence or even, as Russell says, of nearly invariable sequence. The maximum that we can talk of is material implication: necessity there is none. Consequently, the effect cannot be predicted with immaculate precision when the so-called cause has occurred, nor can the corresponding cause be named when the effect takes place. Causal laws are now a matter of statistical calculation of probabilities. Cosmological argument thus loses much of its significance against the context of twentieth-century thought.

Besides the cosmological argument, which Sayyid Aḥmad most often mentions, he sometimes also demonstrates the existence of God on the basis of the phenomenon of purpose in the universe. He, in tact, holds on to a teleological concept of Nature side by side with a mechanical concept of it

---

[96] Quoted in ibid., p. 92,

[97] H. J. Paton, op. cit., pp. 193-94.

and easily moves from one to the other. B.A. Dar accuses him, in this case, of committing a self-contradiction. Sayyid Aḥmad, he says: "grafted the purely theistic view of nature [i.e. the view which admits of a divine purpose in the working of nature] on its totally anti-theistic interpretation current during his days. . . . It was . . . a totally illegitimate transition from a mechanical to a teleological view of nature; but Sayyid Aḥmad," he goes on to say, "never seemed to bother about logical consistency so long as his arguments led him to the conclusion which he wanted to arrive at."[98] However, these two forms of argument have sometimes been shown to be even complementary to one an-other, although Sayyid Aḥmad himself did not specifically recognise this. The cosmological argument, if at all it does prove the existence of an uncaused First Cause, does not prove necessarily one which is mental rather than material. To prove that it is mental, a recourse is also to be made to an argument from design or a teleological argument which allegedly explains the evidence of purpose, the adaptation of means to ends and a general harmony characterising the entire cosmos. The Qur'ān says: "He created the heavens and the earth with truth"[99] (i.e. for serious end). Further, ". . . Our Lord, Thou hast not created this in vain."[100] So, when we find things of the world existing in a beauteous, proportionate manner, says Sayyid Aḥmad, we infer that there is a sagacious designer who has made them in order to realise some grand purpose of His. Talking of the variegated universe, he observes: "Scientists say that those various appearances are not caused by anything else, but that it is due to the peculiarity of this matter itself that those different forms occur. If these different forms of hydrogen are the products of chemical compounds, then it does not yet prove that these forms are caused by a peculiar quality of that matter. . . . No explanation can be given for this: how those atoms which resemble each other and belong to the same group become more united to each other, and how it can happen that by a special combination they take here the shape of a mountain and there that of a river or an ocean.... This shows that there must exist a Great and Wise One Who has the power to combine those atoms in such many ways."[101]

---

[98] B.A. Dar, *Religious Thought of Sayyid Aḥmad Khān*, pp. 152-53.
[99] The Qur'ān, xvi. 3.
[100] Ibid., iii. 190.
[101] Quoted and translated by J.M.S. Baljon, op. cit., p 69.

Whatever be the argument—whether teleological or cosmological—the one thing that is indubitably certain, according to Sayyid Aḥmad, is that God's existence can be established on natural grounds and with the help of the natural reason of man:

> We have no special need of an external revelation or any other source of knowledge for that purpose. This is the position which has been termed naturalistic theism. Sayyid Aḥmad quotes many verses of the Qur'ān to support his thesis, for example:
>
> "In the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the alter-nation of night and day, and the ships that run in the sea with that which profits man, and the water that Allah sends down from the sky, then gives life therewith to the earth after its death and spreads in it all (kinds of) animals, and the changing of the winds and the clouds made subservient between heaven and earth, there are surely signs for a people who understand."[102]

And so on Even prophets, according to Sayyid Aḥmad, had a recourse to naturalistic observation when they desired to have a comprehensive knowledge of God.[103] Prophetic experience of Abraham, as recorded in the Qur'ān, he says, points to the same fact. The Qur'ānic account is as follows:

> "And thus did We show Abraham the kingdom of the heavens and the earth and that he might be of those having certainty. So when the night overshadowed him, he saw a star. He said: Is this my Lord? So when it set, he said: I love not the setting ones. Then when he saw the moon rising, he said: Is this my Lord? So when it set, he said: If my Lord had not guided me, I should certainly be of the erring people. Then when he saw the sun rising, he said: Is this my Lord? Is this the greatest? So when it set, he said: 0 my people, I am clear of what you set up (with Allah). Surely I have turned myself, being upright, wholly to Him Who originated the heavens and the earth, and I am not of the polytheists."[104]

However, in spite of the usefulness of a naturalistic approach, it is nowhere implied in all the Qur'ānic references that the phenomena of Nature are in any way sufficient proofs for the existence of God. There can, in fact, be no logical argument for His existence in which Nature is accepted as the

---

[102] The Qur'ān, ii. 164.

[103] Sayyid Aḥmad, *Tafsir al-Qur'an*, III, 45.

[104] The Qur'ān, vi. 7680.

major premiss. Nature is finite and temporal and God is infinite and eternal. These are different orders of being and so cannot hold together. Stoics were among the earliest to uphold a natural theology, but their God, we know, was fundamentally an existing entity of the same kind as the world. Hence the inadequacy of a Stoic approach for the religion of Islam which conceives of God as essentially different from Nature. Observation of Nature as a prerequisite for the knowledge of God has, in fact, been emphasised by the Qur'ān due to the mere fact that Nature furnishes pointers to God and suggests the right direction in which a search for Him can be fruitfully continued. So it is only an evocative technique. It simply furnishes the occasion to have a knowledge of God Who, thus, in spite of its relevance to Him, retains His singularity and autonomous character. This can be further elucidated by the fact that Nature displays symbols, not signs, of God. Paul Tillich has clearly distinguished between a sign and a symbol. "A sign signifies something by arbitrary convention whereas a symbol participates in that to which it points." A symbol, thus, "opens up levels of reality which otherwise are closed to us" and also "unlocks dimensions and elements of our own soul."[105] " . . . higher plane of [reality]," says Lord North-bourne, "can never be described in terms of a lower, yet the lower is always a symbol of the higher and, as such, can suggest or evoke it. Thus on the terrestrial plane everything is a symbol of the higher reality from which it derives its own degree of reality, as it were by reflection or refraction."[106]

If God's existence had been demonstrable for everyone simply on the basis of an observation of Nature, it is sometimes argued, it would really have been against God's declared intention to treat human individuals as free and responsible persons. Given that intention, "He does not override the human mind by revealing Himself, in overwhelming majesty and power but always approaches us in ways that leave room for an uncompelled response of human faith."[107] Once proof has been given, we lose our right to choose. We do not, for instance, decide to accept the conclusions of mathematics and logic; we merely look to the rigour of their respective arguments. So if the existence of God were conclusively demonstrable, we would not be left with any possibility of making a free decision to have a loving faith in Him. This is

---

[105] Paul Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith*, p. 42.
[106] Op, cit., p. 33.
[107] John Hick, op. cit., p. 104.

what has been known as the "religious coercion argument" against proofs for the existence of God. Evidently, the Qur'ān too envisages no compulsion in matters of religion.'[108] Although it declares itself to be a Book manifest[109] and fully explained,[110] it sufficiently guards against any encroachment on the pleasures of free choice of its readers. Reading the same verses from the Holy Qur'ān, some people choose to follow the right path while others choose to go the wrong way.[111] The Prophet of Islam is reported to have once said to some insistent questioners: "Do not put to me too many unnecessary questions. Whoever does it is an enemy of the Muslims because the answers given would become binding on them and thereby their liberty of action would be curtailed."[112]

God, Who is conceived to be the Cause of all causes and the Supreme Creator, is unique in being indissolubly and absolutely one. Even the essence of God is identical with His existence be-cause He essentially exists. There is no duality of substance and attributes, subject and predicate, in the nature of God. The Qur'ān, no doubt, describes Him as Willing, Knowing, Powerful, Just, etc., and the orthodox have always held that such expressions only imply that God possesses as qualities will, knowledge, power, justice and so on. Sayyid Aḥmad, however, in agreement with the Mu'tazilites, rejects the orthodox standpoint in the interest of Divine unity. Attributes of God, he holds, are His very essence: "God is alive, not by virtue of life, but by virtue of His essence; He knows, not by virtue of any organ of know-ledge, but by virtue of his essence; He sees, not by virtue of any organ of vision, but by virtue of His essence; He hears, not by virtue of any organ of audition, but by virtue of his essence."[113]

Oneness of God is, really, the one cardinal principle on which the Qur'ān lays the maximum emphasis, polytheism being an abominable and unforgivable sin.[114] Sayyid Aḥmad tries to establish the truth of this principle, after the fashion of the Qur'ān itself, on the basis of the uninterrupted systematic unity of existence. Things of the world, to all appearances, are

---

[108] The Qur'ān, ii. 256 ; vi. 105 ; xvii. 7 ; xviii. 29 ; lxxvi. 3.
[109] Ibid., xii. 1, etc.
[110] Ibid., vi. 115.
[111] Ibid., ii. 26.
[112] Quoted by Freeland Abbot, Islam and Pakistan, p, 13.
[113] Sayyid Aḥmad, *Maqalāt*, III, 3.
[114] The Qur'ān, xxxi 13.

disjointed pieces, but, when we carefully investigate into them, they are found to be organically related to one another. That the universe is a cosmos and not a chaos and that there is, what Max Planck has called, "the unity of the World Picture," is the basic conviction without which no scientific observer can validate his results. The finger that I raise, Spinoza is reported to have said, has its repercussions in the farthest of the stars that shine and in the remotest corners of the universe. Carlyle wanted to bring home the same fact when he paradoxically remarked that the co-operation of the entire universe is involved in the growth of a single blade of grass. Sayyid Aḥmad, in this connection, employs the analogy of a clock whose various parts jointly con-tribute towards the unitary working of the whole. The hands, that seem to be moving independently, have in fact the entire mechanism behind them from which they derive the justification for their movement.[115] It is such unity of Nature which necessarily points to the unity of its creator whose will has been carried through.

Thus God's unity is derivable from the multiplicity—homogeneous as it is—of the universe, because God is the wilful creator of them all. Earliest Muslim philosophers, Fārābi, Ibn Sind' and others had, however, denied that God's act of wilful creation can go along with His absolute oneness. These are mutually contradictory concepts, they believed. If God creates the multifarious universe directly by His own volitional act, then, by virtue of the nature of the result thus produced, He Himself becomes multiple. To avoid this alleged contradiction and to vouchsafe Divine unity, they resorted to the doctrine of emanation. According to this doctrine, from the One God only another "one," i.e. the First Intelligence, emanated by an unvolitional process just as, for instance, certain corollaries would follow from the definition of a triangle or rays would proceed from the sun. Similarly, from the First Intelligence emanated the Second Intelligence; from the Second Intelligence, the Third Intelligence, and so on, till the Tenth Intelligence produced the world of form and matter of ours. So from one only one can come. This was the cardinal principle of the philosophers. Sayyid Aḥmad rejects this entire view and holds on to the doctrine of creation.[116] He says the kind of Absolute Oneness that the philosophers seek to vouchsafe stands violated by their own views too. If God is the One after the philosophers' way, then,

---

[115] Sayyid Aḥmad, *Maqalāt*, I, 16.
[116] Ibid., III, 97.

Sayyid Aḥmad rightly thinks, not even one should proceed from Him. God, he says, is one simply because He is the absolute creator of everything. The Qur'ān, when it demonstrates the oneness of God, irresistibly refers to the phenomena of Nature. Had there been more gods than one, it argues, the unity of Nature itself would have been disturbed and there would have been chaos and confusion all over.[117] Further, it says:

> "Or, Who created the heavens and the earth, and sends down for you water from the cloud ? Then We cause to grow thereby beautiful gardens—it is not possible for you to make the trees thereof to grow. Is there a god with Allah'?.. .
>
> "Or, Who made the earth a resting-place, and made in it rivers, and raised on it mountains and placed between the two seas a barrier? Is there a god with Allah? .. .
>
> "Or, Who answers the distressed one when he calls upon Him and removes the evil, and will make you successors in the earth'? Is there a god with Allah? .. .
>
> "Or, Who guides you in the darkness of the land and the sea, and Who sends the winds as good news before His mercy? Is there a god with Allah? .. .
>
> "Or, Who originates the creation, then reproduces it, and Who gives you sustenance from the heaven and the earth? Is there a god with Allah. ..."[118]

Sayyid Aḥmad lightly dismisses the possibility that there might be existent another universe absolutely independent of, and unconnected with, the universe with which we are familiar. This will easily imply the existence of another creator in spite of the Qur'ānic arguments. This, according to Sayyid Aḥmad, is just an imaginary possibility and Islam cannot be left at the mercy of imaginary premisses.[119]

Oneness of God, according to Sayyid Aḥmad, has three aspects. There is, first of all, the unity of essence: God is essentially one. Even the trinitarian Christians talk of "three in one" and hence subscribe to the belief in the one essence of God. Second is the unity of attributes: It is not a different God

---

[117] The Qur'ān, xxi. 22.

[118] Ibid., xxvii. 60-64.

[119] Sayyid Aḥmad, *Maqālāt*, I, 18-19.

who is, for instance, kind and forgiving from the one who is full of wrath and fury. All attributes are one and they are one with the essence of God. Third is the unity of being the sole object of worship: God is one and unique in being worthy of our prayers and our humility towards Him. This third aspect, Sayyid Aḥmad points out, was specifically stressed by the Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him), while the other two were already known to the people of earlier revealed religions.[120]

God is eternal, whereas the things that we perceive with the help of our senses are fluctuating and transitory. In a way, as it has already been pointed out above in the beginning of the pre-sent paper, nothing that ever exists can enter into absolute nonentity. It is the forms and qualities of things that disappear and are replaced by certain other qualities. Thus, even if all the attributes of all the things disappear, something, Sayyid Aḥmad points out, must remain. It is this something which is God. By virtue of being thus the ground of all knowables, God is Him-self unknowable. And being the Supreme Creator of everything, He is all-knowing: It would be impossible that one does not know one's own creation. This, says Sayyid Aḥmad, can be understood on the analogy of a watch-maker who knows, even before manufacturing the watch, as to what will be its constitution and how it will operate.[121] So all the actions that a human individual performs are known to God beforehand. This, how-ever, does not amount to predetermination. It is only prescience or foreknowledge. If, for instance, I know by virtue of my know-ledge of my friend's character and habits as to how he will behave in a particular situation, this does not amount to compelling him to behave that way,

Another essential attribute of God is His will. Nothing can possibly happen unless He wills it so. There is, however, a difference of opinion among philosophers as to how this will operates. Sayyid Aḥmad does not agree with those who think that it comes into operation on every occasion, when something happens or when an action is performed. This is the doctrine of occasionalism which was held dear by the Ash'arite thinkers and by Ghazālī. This doctrine would envisage a direct impact of God on the affairs of man and the universe. Sayyid Aḥmad, on the other hand, thinks that God's will operates indirectly through the laws of Nature and through

[120] Ibid, III, 13-15.
[121] Ibid., III, 201.

the natures of things. Fire, for instance, burns by virtue of the will of God. The occasionalists would say that on every occasion of fire's contact with something combustible, God creates the quality of burning in it. Sayyid Aḥmad would say that fire burns by dint of its nature which has been granted to it once for all by God, the Creator par excellence of everything.

A related problem is that of God's omnipotence. Laymen think that, if God could not suspend the natures of things, perpetrate miracles and literally grant our prayers, He would not remain omnipotent. He would, instead, become impotent and powerless, they say, in the face of the callous regularity of the clock of Nature. Sayyid Aḥmad, however, thinks that God's power is not to be conceived as haphazard. It would not negate omnipotence of God if we say that He cannot do anything that is inherently foolish, absurd and illogical. His omnipotence is wise and regular. Such a prudent and wise omnipotence of God, he thinks, can be vouchsafed only if we attribute the behaviour of things to the things themselves. Sayyid Aḥmad has explained this fact in a beautiful allegory described in one of his articles.[122]

God's omnipotence and His autonomous will, as these attributes are understood by a layman, and, specially when these are bracketed together with the goodness of God, pose a difficulty with regard to the problem of evil which is generally regarded to be insoluble. Consider the following dilemma presented by Hume: "Epicurus's old questions are yet unanswered. Is He [i.e. God] willing to prevent evil but not able? Then is He impotent. Is He able, but not willing? Then He is malevolent. Is He both able and willing? Whence then is evil?"[123] The entire force of this poser, it must be noted, depends on all the words used here being understood literally. On that plain of understanding the charge has never been answered and never will be answered. There have no doubt been philosophers who tried to dismiss this problem by explaining away evil in one way or the other. For some of them evil has in fact no positive existence; it is negative in nature, a mere privation of goodness. And God, it is said, cannot be held responsible for a mere absence, for something which does not even positively exist. According to another such device, evil is represented to be due to the partial view of the universe which is of course inevitable to finite human minds. If we had a whole view of the universe, it is claimed, we would find everything nice and

---

122 Ibid., XV, 50-53.

123 David Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, Part X.

the so-called ugly and evil spots would be seen even to enhance the beauty and goodness of the whole. "The very blemishes and defects of nature," Berkeley once observed, "are not without their use in that they make an agreeable variety and augment the beauty of the rest of creation as shadows in a picture serve to set off the brighter and more enlightened parts."[124] However, these, and all other, solutions of this kind seem to be a "patent fraud". Evil may be a mere privation of goodness or simply due to our partial view of the entire scheme of things. But will it solve the problem? Does evil disappear simply because we have learnt to use harmless phrases for it? "To the cultured Irish Bishop comfortable in his palace," says W.T. Stace commenting on Berkeley's point of view, "the terrible agony of the cancer patient, or of the man burned alive in fire, might seem to make in the world an 'agreeable variety,' but they are not this to the man who suffers them. And even if the appearance of evil is due to a partial view of the world, it will still be the case, that the partial view itself really exists and is an evil existence."[125]

The solution to this and other such riddling and paradoxical difficulties regarding Divine characterisations can, we think, to some extent be found in the Mu'tazilite doctrine of the identity of God and His attributes. To say that the attributes of God are His very essence is to say that, essentially, they have an entirely ontological status and thus are independent of human understanding which, in the final analysis, is the source of all confusions. When the natural reason of man feigns to comprehend supernatural concepts, confusions are bound to arise. Sayyid Aḥmad, although not in this very context, holds on to the Mu'tazilite position that the existence and the essence of God are mutually identical.

---

[124] Bishop Berkeley, *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, Section 152.
[125] W.T. Stace, Time and Eternity, p. 57.

IQBAL AND THE WESTERN THOUGHT: A FEW PARALLELS

Mohammad Ahmad Shamsi

These days we often hear of "collective consciousness," but this term is used in relation to a people rather than to any one of its constituent groups or the people all the world over. There is, however, no reason why it should not be employed, with even greater relevance and force, for creative writers, philosopher-poets and world historians. Separated though they are from one another by time and space—they are born in different centuries, they inhabit different countries, follow different religions, belong to different cultures and write in different languages—yet they often happen to think the same thoughts and, strangely enough, they not infrequently express these thoughts in almost the same phraseology. I know of no English word that takes cognizance of this phenomenon in the commonwealth of world literature, but it is fully recognised in Persian and Urdu and is described by the technical word *tawārud*. Whereas the *Persian-English Dictionary* compiled by Steingass explains it as "coming together to the watering place," its technical meaning in *Ghiyāth al-Lughāt* is given as "two poets composing the same hemistich or couplet, quite independently of each other". Thus in its broader sense we may use the term *tawārud* to cover two poets entertaining the same poetic fancy or two writers formulating and presenting the same idea.

Such literary and intellectual phenomena are not difficult to explain if and when they occur. Once we accept the theses that (i) "The proper study of mankind is man"[126]; and that (ii) "Great poetry drops from heaven," we, in fact, admit that poets and writers who treat of the same subject-matter, that is to say, their fellow-men, and who owe their skill to the same power, viz. Divine inspiration, may sometimes stumble on or come by the same idea and express it in much the same way. As a Persian poet has put it,

---

[126] Alexander Pope, *Essay on Man* (London: Oxford University Press, 1905), p. 37.47

یـــک چراغیســـت دریـــن
خانـــه کـــة از پرتـــو آن
بـر کجـا مـی نگـری انجمـنے
ســـــــاخته انـــــــد

"This great mansion of the universe has but one Lamp, and it is all due to its: efracted light

That thou findest so many centres of activity busy in plying their trade here, there and everywhere]

As the source of artistic inspiration, the fountainhead of intellectual light and the mainspring of creative activity all over the world is one and the same, it is little wonder if, in effusions of poetic insight, in pieces of inspired writing and in systems of philosophic thought, we now and then come across instances of similarity in thought and expression of poets and writers of totally different cultures and civilisations. We may, therefore, rightly claim that great minds not only think alike but often cast their thoughts in much the same mould. When such similarities in thought and expression occur in two poets or writers, we may often discover some affinities between their general thinking and particular philosophy of life as well.

In this article I undertake the study of a few of Iqbal's coup-lets which contain thoughts basic to his theory of art and philosophy of life, but which have been expressed in no dissimilar words by some Western poets and thinkers as well. These thoughts are so deeply embedded in his own poetic, intellectual and spiritual make-up and are so delicately interwoven with the texture of his message that he cannot be suspected of having picked them up from an external source and grafted them into his own poetry. We can, however, gain deeper understanding of his meaning and better appreciation of his high rank among world thinkers if we pursue this line of study.

William Blake (1757-1827) is outstanding as a mystic and visionary in English literature. His poems are a revolt against the domination of materialism and rationalism of the eighteenth-century England. In the following "Proverb of Hell" from "The Marriage of Heaven and Hell" is

enshrined his final word on how great art is born, prophetic poetry is produced and a true artist works his way to what the world will not willingly let die: "No bird soars too high if he soars with his own wings."[127] This very idea which he expresses with the symbol of a bird is embodied by Iqbal with the symbol of a bud:

نفس کے زور سے وہ غنچہ
وا ہوا بھی تو کیا
جسے نصیب نہیں آفتاب
کا پرتو[128]

The blossoming of a bud as an act of mere volition is but of little avail,
If it has been denied the life-giving kiss of the sun.]

Both the poets emphasise the importance of Divine inspiration without which genius is reduced to mere talent and poetry to lifeless versification ; they are at one with each other in declaring that self-conscious efforts, technical skill and mechanical virtuosity are of little help to an artist unless he is divinely inspired. Like Iqbal, Blake had the incomparable gift of expressing the profoundest idea in the simplest of language and he, too, rejected the excessive claims of rationalism on man and did battle against materialism in his own day.

Another instance of similarity in the ideas and expressions of the two poets is provided by the following "Proverb of 1-Tell": "A fool sees not the same tree that a wise man sees"[129] and Iqbal's couplet:

پرواز ہے دونوں کی اسی
ایک فضا میں

---

127 *The Poetical Works of William Blake* (Oxford Editions of Standard Authors, London, 1943), p. 250.

128 *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbāl Urdū* (*Bāl-i Jibril*) (Lahore: Sh. Ghulam Ali & Sons, 1977), p. 366.

129 *The Poetical Works of William Blake*, p. 250.

کــــرگس کـــا جهـــاں اور ہے
شـــاہیں کـــا جہاں ـــاور ہے[130]

[Both the eagle and the vulture take to their wings in the same air, But they wing their way to regions totally different from each other's]

In almost an identical style the two poets here express the same idea, viz. that the objects of a man's sight vary in their appearance no less than in their essence in direct proportion to the sum total of the knowledge, the wealth of experience and the sharpness of intellect which he brings to bear upon them. It is, there-fore, the richness or triviality of his character, the soundness or shallowness of his outlook on life and the sublimity or depravity of his ambitions that determine his function and his place in society and set the direction of his achievements and failures. Even when two men look at the same object, even when they find themselves in the same situation and breathe in the same atmosphere, they perceive the object, react to the situation and are affected by the atmosphere differently simply because their perceptions, reactions and emotions are conditioned by their antecedents, preoccupations and aspirations which in themselves are of different complexion and origin.

In his poem "Elegiac Stanzas," suggested by a picture of Peele Castle in a storm, painted by Sir George Beaumont, William Wordsworth (1770-1850) praises the painter's hand be-cause it "adds" to what he paints:

"the gleam,

The light that never was, on sea or land,
The consecration, and the Poet's dream."[131]

These lines exquisitely describe how the magic touch of the artist's brush transforms common things and everyday experiences into pieces of immortal beauty. Iqbal expresses the same idea in the following couplet, though he shifts the scene from the world of painting to that of poetry:

---

[130] *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbāl Urdū* (*Bāl-i-Jibril*), p. 156.

[131] *The Poetical Works of Wordsworth* (Oxford Standard Authors, London, 1960) p. 450.

جمیل تر ہیں گل و لالہ
فیض سے اس کے
نگاہ شاعر رنگین نوا میں
ہے جادو[132]

[Thanks to the poet's sensibility, roses and tulips look fresher,
brighter and lovelier still,
As and when the vision of the melodious singer—the poet –lends
them a charm and radiance, all his own]
The fact of the matter is that all artists
"(Whether the instruments of words they use
Or pencil pregnant with ethereal hues)"[133]

bring us a heightened awareness of the visible world, and this is the gist of the quotations from the two poets. Wordsworth is avowedly the poet of Nature and the poet of Man, which titles are seldom conferred on Iqbal, although quite an appreciable number of his verses and poems, particularly in the earlier part of his poetic career, are devoted to holding the mirror up to Nature. Nevertheless, the great artists that these two poets are, they know the function, the demands and the niceties of their "high calling," and the lines quoted from them comprise their authentic pronouncements on the glory and the greatness of their art.

Expressing himself with the exuberance of young men—he was only twenty-two when he wrote these words in a letter to B.R. Haydon—John Keats (1795-1821) touches upon the goal a poet sets before himself to achieve and, in fact, does achieve:

> "the looking upon the sun, the moon, the stars, the earth and its contents as material to form greater things, that is to say, ethereal things—but here I am talking like a mad man, greater things than our

[132] *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbāl Urdū* (*Bāl-i-Jibril*), p. 305.
[133] *The Poetical Works of Wordsworth*, p. 207.

Creator himself made."[134]

This may appear to be too ambitious a plan to execute but, shorn of its youthful lavishness and extravagance, though without any diminution in its broad outlines and inner spirit, it takes on this sedater, soberer and saner form in Iqbal:

بے ذوق نہیں ہے اگرچہ
فطرت
جو اس سے نہ ہو سکا، وہ
تو کر[135]

[Even though Nature herself is not without a fine taste
in the matter of creation,
[Thou shouldest do what even she has failed to accomplish.]

With all their God given gifts of great sensibility and creative power, artists are but men of flesh and blood and, like any other mortal of common clay with whom they spend their daily life, they may at times misunderstand the nature of their own impulses. Hence they have to exercise the greatest vigilance at the time when they are engaged in creative work lest they should be swept off their feet by a false emotion or a weak moment—an emotion and a moment which do not involve the whole of their being. Whatever they compose or create under these sham stimuli shall be lacking in conviction and may result in emotion-al anarchy or mental chaos. Franz Kafka (1883-1924) takes note of this pitfall and warns authors against "false hands that reach at one who is writing". Like much that comes from the pen of this German novelist and essayist, the words of precaution are not very clear, but their obscure meaning leaps into the fullest clarity when they are read in the light of the following couplet of Bāl-i Jabrīl:

---

[134] H.E. Rollins, Ed., *The Letters of John Keats* (Massachusetts : Harvard University Press, 1958), p. 143.

[135] *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbāl Urdū* (*Bāl-i JJibrīl*), p. 59.

صاحب ساز کو لازم ہے
کہ غافل نہ رہے
گاہے گاہے غلط آہنگ بھی
ہوتا ہے سروش![136]

[It is incumbent upon a musician not to be oft his guard
for a single moment when he is composing music,
For there are times when the Muses themselves
are false in their notes.]

In Iqbal's couplet "musician" stands for all creative artists and *sarosh* which I have translated as the Muses—the patron goddesses of all fine arts—is used for the inspirational stimulus which, due to slackness on the part of these artists, may put them off the track of artistic integrity. The world can be spared much third-class writing by first-class writers only if this warning is heeded.

In his autobiography *Up From Slavery*, Booker T. Washing-ton (1859-1915), an American negro, the first among his race to break free from the shackles of illiteracy and poverty and to rise to a high position in the United States, expresses his belief in the highly educative and deeply ennobling influence a man receives by living in close company of and comingin to constant contact with persons of exemplary character. He writes:[137]

"The older I grow, the more I am convinced that there is no education which one can get from books and costly apparatus that is equal to that which can be gotten from contact with great men and women."

The conviction grew upon him as a result of his personal experience, but Iqbal illustrates the superiority of education by example to education by

[136] Ibid , p. 367.
[137] *Up from Slavery* (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc. 1901),

precept with an allusion to the Qur'ānic story of Abraham and Ishmael:

یہ فیضان نظر تھا یا کہ
مکتب کی کرامت تھی
سکھائے کس نے اسماعیل
کو آداب فرزندی؟[138]

[Was it the training he received from his illustrious father,
or was it any formal education he got at a centre of instruction;
What was it that made Ishmael a model of filial obedience?]

To be satisfied is to cease from struggle and to stagnate. What drives a man onward and goads him into striving for greater progress and higher attainments is an inner feeling of discontent with his present achievements. Walter Pater (1839-1894) overstates the case when he claims that "The way to perfection is through a series of discontent,"[139] and John Galsworthy (1859 1933) talks like a doctor when he says: "I'm glad you are dissatisfied--it is very healthy to be dissatisfied." E.M. Forster (1879-1970) presents the same idea more convincingly in his epigram that "There are stirrings of life in discontent." The moment you read this pithy saying of Forster the following coup-let of Iqbal flashes through your memory, so great is the unison of thought and expression between the two, barring, of course,
the obvious difference that the one is from a prose writer and the other from a poet ;

---

[138] *Kulliyātl-i-Iqbāl Urdū* (*Bāl-i Jibril*), p. 14. V.G. Kiernan in *Poems from Iqbal* (London; John Murray, 1955), translates it as follows :

Was it book-lesson, or father's glance, that taught
The son of Abraham what a son should bear?"

[139] Walter Pater, The Renaissance (London : Macmillan & Co., 1913), p. 103.

نـــا صـــبوری ہے زنـــدگی دل

کـــــــــــــــــــــــــــی

آہ! وہ دل کـــــــــہ ناصـــــــــبور

نہـــــــــــــــــــــــــــیں[140]

[Discontent is the very life-blood of the heart.
Ah! pity the heart which is not discontent.]

What Forster and Iqbal have said is a psychological truth and not a poetic fancy. Generally speaking, it is the idealists who are discontented, and this discontent is, strangely enough, a great motive power. So long as their ideal is not realised, they continue putting in their best efforts for its realisation: their hearts are inflamed with the desire and their struggles are animated with the hope of attaining their ideal. But the moment it is attained, the joy of endeavour is gone and a feeling of satiety takes its place. A.C. Ward illustrates this very situation with a concrete example in these words:

> "The climber whose eyes are on the peak while his feet are distant from it, is moved by that joy of endeavour which is lost in achievement and is gone. . . . The spirit at length embraced by Beauty is made one with Beauty and the joy of contemplation and desire is conditional upon our present distance from Beauty."

Making a brilliant use of two traditional terms of our roman-tic poetry—separation from one's beloved and reunion with her—Iqbal proves how the former is far superior to the latter, or, to quote from Ward, how the joy of endeavour is lost in achievement:

عـالم سـاز و سـاز مـیں وصـل

سـے بـــڑھ کـــے ہے فـــراق

[140] *Kulliyātl-i-Iqbal Urdu* (*Bāl-i Jibril*), p. 335.

وصـــل مـــیں مـــرگ آرزو!

ہجـــر مـــیں لـــذت طلـــب[141]

[In the matter of sweet inflammation of the heart and the joy of future possession of the beloved, reunion with her yields the palm to separation from her:
In reunion the glow of desire is extinguished but in separation it is always there.]

Time is common to all human experience, though it is baffling in its significance. What it is, few of us understand, but one thing about it is quite clear: our life is made or marred by the way in which we utilise or waste our time, act cautiously or incautiously and react or fail to react promptly, properly and adequately to its exigencies. In his story *Markheim*, R.L. Stevenson (1850-1894) makes the following comments on this aspect of Time:

"Every second is a cliff—if you think upon it--a cliff a mile high—high enough, if we fall, to dash us out of every feature of humanity."[142]

Although the whole of the first stanza of "Masjid-i Qartabah" is devoted to a philosophical exposition of the reality and significance of Time, the third and the fourth couplets in it deal with Time as arbiter of men and remind us of what Stevenson says about our being put on trial every moment of our life:

تجـھ کـو پرکھتـا ہے یـہ، مجـھ

کـــو پرکھتـــا ہے یـــہ

سلســـلۂ روز و شـــب،

صـــیرفیئ کائنـــات

[141] Ibid., p. 406.

[142] R L. Stevenson, *Selected Poetry & Prose* of X.L. Stevenson (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.), p. 138.

تـو ہـوا اگـر کـم عیـار، مـیں

ہـــوں اگـــر کـــم عیـــار

مـوت ہے تیـری بـرات، مـوت

ہے میـــــری بـــــرات[143]

[Thou art being tested by it, I am being tested by it
This succession of night and day is the umpire of the universe.
If thou failest to come up to the standard, or if I fail to come
up to the standard,
Death shall come to thee as thy lot, Death shall come to me
as my lot]

Dealing with the march of time, Oswald Schwarz, the Austrian psychologist, says: "Time is the greatest power in man's life; it moves on relentlessly, completely indifferent to man's wishes and fears, and those who fall out of step are left on the roadside."[144] Iqbal's poem "Time" is a monologue in which Time itself expatiates on its own characteristics, much in the vein of the spirit of the quotation from Schwarz. The poem is original both in thought and expression, but its fourth couplet is not dissimilar from what the Austrian psychologist says about Time in the lines quoted above:

---

[143] *Kulliyātl-i-Iqbal Urdu* (*Bāl-i Jibril*), p. 385. V.G. Kiernan translates it as follows :

"You are brought to their test ; I am brought to their test—

Day revolving with night, touchstone of all this world;

Weighed in their scales you and I, weighed and found

wanting, shall both"

Find in death our reward, find in extinction our wage.

[144] Oswald Schwarz, *The Psychology of Sex* (Pelican Books, 1949), p. 291.

نہ تھا اگر تو شریک محفل، قصور میرا ہے

یہ کہ تیرا؟

مرا طریقہ نہیں کہ رکھ لوں کسی کی خاطر

مئے شبانہ[145]

[If thou vast absent from my cocktail party last night,
who is to blame for'it—thou or I
I don't believe in laying by the drink of the previous night
for an absentee.]

There is another world where time does not exist in the form in which we experience and know it here on this side of the grave. Islam urges' its followers never to forget that other world and to look upon their worldly life as a probationary period. If they lead it properly, discharging all their duties to God and man as best as they can, they are promised great reward and brilliant success in the Hereafter. Dwelling upon the impact of Islam on the very earliest generations of Muslims in all parts of the Islamic world, H.A.R. Gibb writes that Islam

> "... bade every man go about his work with the fear of eternal punishment before his eyes, remembering that this world is but a temporary habitation, and that every gift it has to offer —power, riches, pleasure, learning, the joy of parenthood—is vanity and temptation, not indeed to be rejected, but to be used with a deep sense of the awful responsibilities which they entail."[146]
>
> This is a very objective and precise summary of Islam's view of man's life in the material world and Iqbal presents its quintessence in the following couplets:

---

[145] *Kulliyatl-i-Iqbal Urdu* (*Bal-i Jibril*), p. 422.

[146] H.A 12. Gibb, *Mohammadenism* (London : Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 129.

کھو نہ جا اس سحر و شام میں

اے صاحب ہوش

اک جہاں اور بھی ہے جس میں نہ

فردا ہے نہ دوش[147]

[You man of wisdom ! do not lose yourself in this world of alternating day and night.
Be mindful of that other world, too, in which there are neither any tomorrows nor any yesterdays.]

یہ مال و دولت دنیاء یہ

رشتہ و پیوند

بتان وہم و گماں لا الہ الا

اللہ[148]

[All these riches of the world and all these bonds of blood relationship
They are but idle images of our fancy. There is no god but God.]

What happens to us when we are wholly absorbed in the material world? Wordsworth answers the question in his well-known sonnet wherein he says:

"Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers
Little we see in Nature that is ours;
We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon."[149]

In his sonnet "October 1803" he further elaborates upon this very theme and

---

147 *Kulliyātl-i-Iqbāl Urdu* (*Bāl-i Jibril*), p. 366.
148 Ibid. (*Ḍarb-i Kalim*). p. 477.
149 *The Poetical Works of Wordsworth* (Oxford Standard Authors, Lon-don, 1960), p. 206.

concludes that

…virtues and faculties within
Are vital . . . riches are akin
To fear, to change, to cowardice and death."[150]

These lines put one in mind of Iqbal's following couplet in which he has surpassed himself in felicity of expression, lucidity of language and music of thought:

من کی دنیا؟ من کی دنیا، سوز
و مستی جذب و شوق
تن کی دنیا؟ تن کی دنیا سود و
سودا مکر و من[151]

[The world of the spirit. What is the world of the spirit ? It is all ecstasy of delight and desire, incandescence of passion and fervour. The world of matter. What is the world of matter ? It is all parsimoniousness about profit and loss and addiction to sharp practices.]

The Theory of Ego and the name of Iqbal are so closely associated with each other that we cannot think of the one without thinking of the other. Although its philosophical development and poetic application are all his own, there are writers belonging to other times and climes who emphasise the importance of one's being true to oneself and of believing in one's own worth in an objective way. For instance, this is how N.V. Peale advises his readers to lead a rich and successful life: "The first step is to plant in your mind the seed of a wholesome self-appreciation. You must cultivate a

---

[150] Ibid., p. 245.

[151] *Kullyāt-i-Iqbāl Urdū* (*Bāl-i Jibrīl*), p. 323. Kiernan translates it as follows :

-World of soul—the world of fire and ecstasy and longing :

World of sense—the world of gain that fraud and cunning blight."

genuine understanding of the worth and significance of yourself." The following couplet of Iqbal says much the same thing but in a poetic way:

غافل نہ ہو خودی سے، کر
اپنی پاسبانی
شاید کسی مرحوم کا تو
بھی ہے آستانہ![152]

[Do not neglect the development of your ego ; take good care of ourself.
Perhaps you, too, in your own right, are worthy of all that reverence which is the due of a great shrine.]

Iqbal's views on the place of women in society appear to be so much out of step with what is regarded as emancipated thinking on the subject these days, that even his staunch supporters and sincere admirers sound a little apologetic about them. With-out going into the details of the vexed question, I want to quote first from George Bernard Shaw and then from Andre Maurois on the topic (woman) to which Iqbal devotes one section of nine poems in *Ḍarb-i Kalīm*. In recent years the pace of social change has been so fast that even the boldest thinkers of yesterday stand discredited today as orthodox and old-fashioned; these two European thinkers, therefore, may not sound very revolutionary to us these days. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to remember that in their own time they did strike terror even in the hearts of their free-thinking readers, so radical were their views on a good many subjects. Shaw was a veritable bull in the china shop of the English society and he turned quite a few applecarts there. He declares that "Man's genius is

[152] Ibid., p. 349.

for art in its various forms, woman's for maternity." Andre Maurois is even more explicit in his assertion that "Women are excellent assistants rather than original creators. Woman's real creation is her child."[153] The last couplet of Iqbal's poem "Woman" differs from quotations from the two Western writers as much as poetry differs from prose, but in its essentials it makes the same point and strengthens it with an allusion to a historical fact:

مکالمات فلاطوں نہ لکھ

سکی لیکن

اسی کی شعلے سے ٹوٹا

شرار افلاطون![154]

[She could not produce any monumental work like
"The Dialogues of Plato" ;
[Nevertheless, it was the flame of a woman that emitted
the spark of Plato.]

Iqbal's Qalandar is another name—one out of so many—for the true believer or "*Mu'mīn*," and it will not be far amiss if the term "Superman" made current by G.B. Shaw is used as its nearest equivalent in English. But, apart from other differences in finer shades of meaning, *Qalandar* and "Superman" differ from each other inasmuch as the latter is yet to be born, and if and when he makes his debut in the world, he will be all intellect and no emotions, whereas the former stands for the ideal already realised and embodied in the numerous followers of the Holy Prophet in the first era of Islam and afterwards. In fact Iqbal uses the term as a reminder of the historical past as well as a pointer to future possibilities. The most outstanding trait of Iqbal's *Qalandar* is that he is in charge of his activities; his activities are not in charge of him:

---

153 Andre Maurois, *The Art of Living* (Bombay : D.B. Taraporevala Sons & Co., 1948), p. 32.

154 *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbāl Urdū* (Ḍarb-i Kalīm), p. 556:

مہـــر و مـــہ و انجـــم کـــا

محاســـــــب ہے قلنـــــــدر!

ایـــام کـــا مرکـــب نہـــیں،

راکـــــــب ہے قلنـــــــدر![155]

[*Qalandar* audits the working of the whole of the solar system:
Instead of being ridden by Time, he rides on it.]

If the thought-content of this couplet is paraphrased in the modern English of scientific vintage, it can easily be put in these words of Oswald Schwarz:

> "Animals are particles of the stream of life, forming it and being swept along by its currents. . . . Man, on the other hand, has been given the fateful capacity to step out of this stream, to make use of it, and even to divert it if necessary. . . . In short, life happens to animals, but man is the maker of his destiny."[156]

Discussing the merits of mere persuasion and ability to force issues, Machiavelli (1469-1527) declares: "All armed prophets have conquered and all unarmed prophets come to grief."[157] Many an eyebrow is likely to be raised when I suggest that, even after making due allowance for the difference of temperament and approach between Machiavelli and Iqbal, I find the following couplet not much different from the quotation from *The Prince*, for both of them stress the role of power in realising one's goals, howsoever Divine and altruistic they may be:

رشی کے فاقوں سے ٹوٹا نہ برہمن

کـــــــــــا طلســـــــــــم

عصـا نـہ و تـو کلیمـی ہے کـار بـے

---

[155] Ibid., p. 503.
[156] Oswald Schwarz, op. cit. p. 292.
[157] Machiavelli, *The Prince* (Baltimore: The Penguin Classics, 1961). p. 52.

[No fastings of Mahatmas will destroy the Brahmin's sway;
Vainly, when Moses holds no rod, have all his words resounded]

Of course, one swallow does not make a summer and a solitary, stray similarity of thought and expression between two men of letters provides too meagre a ground to take their names in the same breath and to claim any affinity between them. What I have tried to do in this article is to collocate a few quotations from different Western poets and writers with the couplets of Iqbal that have struck me with their being gems of much the same wisdom in thought and felicity of expression. To my mind, this is one of the ways to demonstrate the universality of Iqbal's genius and to gain a deeper understanding of some aspects of his theory of art and philosophy of life.

[158] *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbāl Urdū* (*Bāl-i Jibrīl*), p. 362. English translation by VG. Kiernan, op. cit., p. 35.

IQBAL'S EMPHASIS ON THE STUDYOF HISTORY

Reyazur Rehman

Dr. Abdullah[159] is of opinion that Iqbal should be included among historians. No doubt, Iqbal's thoughts are pregnant with historical events, but the importance of history to him begins from the poem "March 1907".[160] Before this, it must be remembered, the study of history was discouraged by him. He was very much vocal in explaining his point of view. What, says Iqbal, remains there in the tales of old times?[161] The events of the past have had no meaning. Now since 1907 the past is all important. That poem promises the regeneration of the past glory.

Some contents of the poem "March 1907" like the Divine promise to the Muslims, of the conquest over the Roman empire, the reference to Ḥijāz, the emphasis on desert and the tiger-like bravery of the Muslims. There is warning for the Western civilisation that it will not last long.

It was his "study" of the history of early Islam which could make him conscious of the missions, to glorify *Tawḥīd* and to establish Khilāfat as he emphasises in "Jawāb-i Shikwah".[162] Besides, in the themes of "Shikwah" anti "Jawāb-i Shikwah," Iqbal is echoing the voice of the past. To improve the deteriorating conditions of the present, the rehabilitation of qualities of the other time are of great importance, the most vital element of which is *Tawḥīd*. It was the faith in *Tawḥīd* which made them dynamic, chivalrous, fearless, truthful, just and selfless.

In the poem "Khitāb Ba Jawānān-i Islām"[163] (1912), again, it is history which presents to Iqbal the qualities and conditions of the early Muslims. He wants the Muslims to know their ancestors who were great conquerors, although the desert was their abode and who remained indifferent to wealth

---

159 Journal *ol Pakistan Historical Society*, 'Allama Iqbal Centenary Celebrations, 1977.
160 *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbāl Urdū Bāng-i Darā,* pp. 140-42.
161 *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbāl Urdū Bāng-i Darā*, pp. 68.76.
162 *Kulliyāt-i-lqbāl Urdū Bāng-i Darā*, pp. 199-208,
163 Ibid., p. 180.

and to worldly pleasure. All these are reflections of history.

Besides, in one of the poems, "Muslim,"[164] composed during this period, that is 1912, Iqbal himself tells us that history has been the source of his inspiration.

Conducive to National Consciousness. As for an individual, it is equally necessary for the nation to know its goal without which its life would be meaningless. Life without purpose would be-come a lifeless entity. Iqbal says: "A living nation is living because it never forgets its dead."[165] It is history which keeps the spirit of a people alive. And because it records the achievements of the past, which is to be the source of inspiration to the present, it leads to the path of national mission.

"The skilful vision that beholds the past
Can recreate before thy wondering gaze
The past anew; wine of a hundred years
That bowl contains, an ancient drunkenness
Flames in its juice. ..."[166]

Iqbal asserts that for maintaining the national entity, the glories of the past should not be forgotten. In a crisis to improve upon the present and to ensure a happier future, the inspiration must be derived from the past.

"Break not the thread [of continuity] between the past and now
And the far future. ..."[167]

Thus to Iqbal history is all important. It is the source of national cohesion. It is the source of national consciousness and national mission. National life can become inspiring and active for the mission. This is what Namier says: "History pleases and inspires ..."[168]; ". . . the past is on the top of us and with us all time."[169]

Role of Muslims in History. According to the general consensus of opinion, serious thinking generally emerges during the period of crisis. There starts

---

164 ibid., pp. 195-96.

165 S.A. Vahid, Ed. *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal* (Lahore : Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1964). p. 45.

166 A J. A rberry. Tr. (*Iqbal's Rumūz-i-Bekhudi*), *Mysteries of Selflessness* (London : John Murray, 1953), p. 62.

167 Ibid.

168 L,B. Namier in the Verieties of History, ed. Frits Stern (History and Political Culture), pp 372-73.

169 Ibid,, p. 373.

pondering under the conditions of insecurity and dissatisfaction. Minds are engaged in an endeavour to know as to why the situation is heading towards more and more anxieties, insecurities and diissatisfaction.[170] "In an hour of crisis, when the order of a society flounders and disintegrates, the fundamental problems of political existence in history are more apt to come in view than in periods of stability."[171]

At such an hour Iqbal makes the Muslims conscious of their responsibility. They must rise and save humanity from destruction.[172] It is his love for mankind that he denounces Machiavelli for causing bitterness and dissensions in human society against the teaching of Christianity.[173] His anguish at the sufferings of humanity is revealed in his New Year's Message broadcast from Lahore station of the All-India Radio on 1 January 1938:

> "As I look back on the year that has passed and as I look at the world in the midst of the New Year's rejoicings, it may be Abyssinia or Palestine, Spain or China, the same misery prevails in every corner of man's earthly home, and hundreds of thousands of men are being butchered mercilessly. Engines of destruction created by science are wiping out the great landmarks of man's cultural achievements. ..."[174]

Iqbal's unreserved admiration and eulogy for scientists, poets, saints, thinkers, irrespective of creed, colour or language, who have contributed to the greatness of man, clearly shows his humanist attitude.

Although there has been the general opinion that Iqbal was concerned with the Muslims, and he wrote for the Muslims. But this is not the whole truth. He was particularly but not exclusively concerned with the Muslims. Alongwith the Muslims he was concerned with humanity at large. To quote Iqbal himself: "I feel it is my duty as a Muslim and as a lover of mankind, to remind them of their true function in the evolution of man-kind."[175] This is evident also from his poem "March 1907" wherein he expresses the desire of serving humanity. He believes in the creation of a new world for a new "Adam".[176] 'Ābid Husain is correct in supporting this view.[177] Muslims should

---

[170] Sorokin, p. 3.
[171] Eric Voegelin, The New Political Science (University of Chicago, 1969), p. 193.
[172] Kulliyāt-i Iqbāl Fārsī (Zabūr-i 'Ajam), p. 475.
[173] Arberry, Tr., op. cit , pp. 32-33
[174] S.A. Vahid, op. cit., p. 374.
[175] Ibid., p. 98.
[176] *Kullyāt-i-.Iqbāl, Fārsi.* (*Payām-i Mashriq*).

act to improve human situation in order to save humanity.

It must be remarked that in so many of his works Iqbal has stressed upon the Muslims[178] to fulfil their historical mission of liberating mankind. In his lecture "Islam As A Moral and Political Ideal" (of 1908), it has been stressed on the Muslims that "it is their mission to set others free".[179] In *Rumūz*[180] the Muslims are being cited as a "just nation" according to the Qur'ān. They are called upon to establish justice. In the *Jāwīd Nāmah*[181] and *Pas Chih Bāyad Kard*,[182] it is being impressed upon the Muslims that they have come with a revolutionary mission and they must act to save the civilisation.

Quite naturally, at this stage one would find oneself at a loss to discern the elements of humanitarianism in Iqbal's rejoicings in poem "March 1907" at the destruction of the Roman empire by Islamic forces. On course, to understand Iqbal's viewpoint some amount of ingenuity is necessary.

Some of the elements of humanitarianism are to be envisioned in the poem of 1907 where the destruction of Roman empire has been elugoised. The silent voice from "Ḥijāz" has brought the message that the lion that once emerged from the desert and had upset the Roman empire will awake once again.[183] In these lines 'Abd al-Qādir:[184] finds him to be only a seer and nothing more than that. Seer he might have been ; this does not concern us. What concern us here is the political implications in these lines. It must be noted that the emergence of Islam is desired, not as a conquering force, but as a force of liberation as it did in the past. To Iqbal defeat of Rome implies the victory of the forces of liberation. This is what Iqbal emphasises in other places. The defeat of the Roman empire in his view was the defeat of tyranny and oppression and victory of the power of freedom. It is being asserted[185] here that the tyrannical rule could be destroyed by the power of Haidar, by the asceticism of Bū Dharr and the truth of Salamān.

---

[177] Iqbāl Bā Kamāl, pp. 240-41.

[178] *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbal Fārsī: Zabūr-i-`Ajam*, p, 475 ; Payām-ī Mashriq, p. 361 ; *Pas Chih Bāyad Kard*, p. 44 ; *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbāl Urdū Bāng-i. Darā*, p, 240.

[179] S. A. Vahid Ed , op. cit., p, 55.

[180] *Kulliyāt-ī-Iqbāl Fārsī* (*Rumūz-i Bekhudī*), pp. 139 40.

[181] Ibid. (*Jāvīd Nāmah*), p. 43.

[182] Ibid (*Pas Chih Bāyad Kard*), p. 46.

[183] *Kulliyāt-ī-Iqbāl Urdū (Bāng-i Darā)*, p. 140.

[184] *Abd al-Qādir*, p. 97.

[185] *Kulliyāt-i-Iqbal Urdū (Bāng-i Darā)*, p. 270.

Such a view of Iqbal finds its expression in so many places of which a few are noted below.

(a) In the *Shikwah*[186] it is stressed that Muslims destroyed the rule of the Kaisar who enjoyed god-like authority, and thence they secured equality and freedom for mankind.

(b) This view that the victory of the Muslims over Rome was the victory of forces of liberation appears again in a speech delivered in a meeting at Lahore after the First World War to protest against the unjust treatment meted out to Turkey by Britain. The irony of the situation, Iqbal pointed out, was that the right to control over their own territory was being denied to those who secured liberty to the people of Rome at a time when they were smarting under the oppressive rule of the Kaisar.[187]

Many Western thinkers support the view that the Muslim conquest brought benefit for the conquered. Even B. Russell, although not sympathetic to Islam, has had to admit that the Muslims in history had been more tolerant and humane:

> "Throughout the Middle Ages the Mohammedans were more civilized and more humane than the Christians. Christians persecuted Jews. . . . In Mohammedan countries, on the contrary, the Jews at most times were not in any way ill treated."[188]

W. Durant also holds a similar view about the tolerance shown to the religious groups.[189]

B. Lewis unequivocally holds the Muslim rule preferable to that of the Romans. To substantiate it, he quotes a few "Apocalyptic and a Christian historian" who in the criticism of the Roman Empire for tyranny far excelled Iqbal as it will be seen:

> "We may compare with this the words of a later Syrian Christian historian: 'Therefore the God of vengeance delivered us out of the hand of the Romans by means of the Arabs. . . . It profited us not a little to be saved from the cruelty of the Romans and their bitter hatred towards us.'[190]

---

[186] Ibid , pp. 165-66.

[187] B.A. Dar, Ed *Anwār-i Iqbāl*, pp. 43-44.

[188] B. Russell, *History of Western Philosophy*, p. 343.

[189] W. Durant, p. 147.

[190] Bernard Lewis, *The Arabs in History* (London: Hutchinson and Co., Fourth Edition, 1966), p. 58.

For their liberating role, the Muslims drew their inspiration from the Prophet, who was the harbinger of the principles of freedom, equality and brotherhood, as is evident from Iqbal's lecture of 1908. Here it is emphasised that Islam had "elevated those who were socially low".[191] Very significant is his dedicated love and reverence for the Prophet whom he refers to as the one "who brought the final message of freedom and equality to mankind".[192] This lecture concludes with a message for the Muslims that "it is their mission to set others free". The Prophetic role as the heralder of freedom, equality and brotherhood has been emphasised also in the *Asrār-ī Khudī*.[193] And in the Rumūz, paras after paras have been devoted to the liberating role of Islam and as a mission left by the Prophet as a legacy.

But lqbal is not content merely be emphasising the liberating role of Islam. He is equally anxious to create conditions for the individual to enjoy freedom and equality including economic justice. For this, Khilāfat as a political system is much more suit-able than other forms of government: Khilāfat is based on the supremacy of law where there is no place for "personal authority," and where both the ruler and the ruled are "subject to the same law".[194] These are the basic conditions for the enjoyment of freedom and equality.[195] Something more would have been said about Iqbal's inspiration from the liberating role of the past. But in the present context glance must be given to the charge on Iqbal for communalism. Let us examine its validity.

Search .for Golden Age in History. Iqbal has been charged for preaching his own creed for he ceased to believe in Indian nationalism. He drew inspiration from the glorious past of Islam and for the re-emergence of which he urged Muslims to act and to struggle.[196] It has been commented by Kiernan that Iqbal "indulged in unguarded rhetoric about holy wars and the Sword of Islam, and extolled action as if it were an end in itself."[197]

It is an evasion of the facts of history that has led them to misread the

---

[191] Vahid, Ed., op. cit., p. 54..

[192] Ibid.

[193] *Kulliyāt-ī Iqbāl Fārsī* (*Asrār-i Khudī*), p. 20.

41. J. S. Mill,

[194] Vahid, Ed., op cit.. pp. 51-52.

[195] H. Laski, *Grammar of Politics*, p. 150.

[196] S. Sinha, *Poet of the East*, p. 93 ; W.C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, p. 162.

[197] Kiernan, op. cit., p. xxiii.

ideas of Iqbal. It is known that the crisis was largely responsible for the emergence of his ideas. To resolve the crisis, to tide it over and to improve the situation, it has been the case of all the nations to seek inspiration from its own national history. It has been rightly asserted by Crossman:[198] "We attempt to seek a golden age, or to reconstruct a broken society in the pattern of that age." The study of Greek philosophers and specially of Plato assumes much importance today in view of crisis.

There is, therefore, nothing communal here. It is known to a student of history that every nation must have a history of its own, which may be the source of inspiration for it. The most dominating and powerful factor for maintaining national consciousness, in the words of J.S. Mill is: "the possession of a national history and consequent community of recollections; collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incident in the past."[199]

And if a nation does not have its own history with a glorious past, it seeks inspiration from the history of other nations which influenced its ideas and thoughts.

Although "Greek philosophy is philosophy of the Greek and for the Greek," yet, as just said, it continues to inspire the West: "Now history matters more to us, and none is more really contemporary than that of the Greeks."[200]

The West has had to depend upon Greek philosophy because there was no other source for her to seek remedy against the enslavement of man in the name of religion. The Renaissance was mainly inspired by Greek thought.

To improve the conditions in the present, it becomes necessary to seek its link with the past to justify a movement or a revolution ; if no such link can be traced out in history, it is even invented, as, for example, the social contract theory. "The con-tract theory of the origin of state is false and worthless as a record of facts. . .,"[201]

Now, if social contract theory which is the basis of modern democracy is unhistorical, there is no reason to mark a thinker as a communalist, if he is inspired not by any "imaginary golden age in history," but rather by an age

---

198 RH.S., Grossman, *Plato Today*, p. 14.

199 J.S. Mill.

200 42. Barker, *Greek Theory of State*, pp. 17-18; *idem, Principle of Social and Political Theory*, pp. 109-10.

201 John Dewey, *Reconstruction n Philosophy*, p. 56.

which is well recorded in the past events. A period of history in which he finds the dignity of man being ensured through the establishment of the supremacy of impartial and impersonal law, treating both the ruler and the ruled alike, and where the power was exercised not for any other purpose than to establish the supremacy of law.

SAKI-NAMAH

From Iqbal's Bal-i Jibril

Translated by M. Hadi Hussain

Spring's caravan has pitched its tent
At the foot of the mountain, making it
Look like the fabled garden of Iram
With a riot of flowers—iris, rose,
Narcissus, lily, eglantine,
And tulip in its martyr's gory shroud.
The landscape is all covered with
A multicoloured sheet, and colour flows
Even in the veins of stones like blood.
The breezes blow intoxicatingly
In a blue sky, so that the birds
Do not feel like remaining in their nests
And fly about. Look at that hill-stream. How
It halts and bends and glides and swings around,
And then, collecting itself, surges up
And rushes on. Should it be stemmed, it would
Cut open the hills' hearts and burst the rocks.
This hill-stream, my fair saki, has
A message to give us concerning life.
Attune me to this message and,
Come, let us celebrate the spring,
Which comes but once a year.
Give me that wine whose heat
Burns up the veils of hidden things,
Whose light illuminates life's mind,
Whose strength intoxicates the universe,
Whose effervescence was Creation's source.
Come lift the veil off mysteries,
And make a mere wagtail take eagles on.

The times have changed; so have their signs.
New is the music, and so are the instruments.
The magic of the West has been exposed,
And the magician stands aghast.
The politics of the *ancien regime*
Are in disgrace: world is tired of kings.
The age of capitalism has passed.
The juggler, having shown his tricks, has gone.
The Chinese are awaking from their heavy sleep.
Fresh springs are bubbling forth from Himalayan heights.
Cut open is the heart of Sinai and Faran,
And Moses waits for a renewed theophany.
The Muslim, zealous though about God's unity,
Still wears the Hindu's sacred thread around his heart.
In culture, mysticism, canon law
And dialectical theology
He worships idols of non-Arab make.
The truth has been lost in absurdities,
And in traditions is this *ummah* rooted still.
The preacher's sermon may beguile your heart,
But there is no sincerity, no warmth in it.
It is a tangled skein of lexical complexities,
Sought to be solved by logical dexterity.
The sufi, once foremost in serving God,
Unmatched in love and ardency of soul,
Has got lost in the maze of Ajam's ideas:
At half-way "stations" is this "traveller" stuck.
Gone out is the fire of love. O how sad!
The Muslim is a heap of ashes, nothing more.

O saki, serve me that old wine again,
Let that old cup go round once more.
Lend me the wings of Love and make me fly.
Turn my dust to fireflies that flit about.
Free young men's minds from slavery,
And make them mentors of the old.
The *millat's* tree is green thanks to your sap

You are its body's breath.
Give it the strength to vibrate and to throb;
Lend it the heart of Murtaza, the fervour of Siddiq.
Drive that old arrow through its heart
Which will revive desire in it.
Blest be the stars of Your heavens; blest be
Those who spend their nights praying to You.
Endow the young with fervent souls;
Grant them my vision and my love.
I am a boat in a whirlpool, stuck in one place.
Rescue me and grant me mobility.
Tell me about the mysteries of life and death,
For Your eye spans the universe.
The sleeplessness of my tear-shedding eyes;
The restless yearnings hidden in my heart;
The prayerfulness of my cries at midnight
My melting into tears in solitude and company;
My aspirations, longings and desires;
My hopes and quests; my mind that mirrors the times
(A field for thought's gazelles to roam);
My heart, which is a battlefield of life,
Where legions of doubt war with faith—
O saki, these are all my wealth;
Possessing them, I am rich in my poverty.
Distribute all these riches in my caravan,
And let them come to some good use.

In constant motion is the sea of life.
All things display life's volatility.
It is life that puts bodies forth,
Just as a whiff of smoke becomes a flame.
Unpleasant to it is the company of matter,
but it likes to see
Its striving to improve itself.
It is fixed, yet in motion, straining at
The leash to get free of the elements.
A unity imprisoned in diversity,

It is unique in every form and shape.
This world, this six-dimentioned idol-house,
This Somnat is all of its fashioning.
It is not its way to repeat itself.
You are not I, I am not you.
With you and me and others it has formed
Assemblies, but is solitary in their midst.
It shines in lightning, in the stars,
in silver, gold and mercury.
Its is the wilderness, its are the trees,
Its are the roses, its are the thorns.
It pulverises mountains with its might,
And captures Gabriel and houris in its noose.
There is a silvergray, brave falcon here,
Its talons covered with the blood of partridges,
And over there, far from its nest,
A pigeon helplessly aflutter in a snare.

Stability is an illusion of the eyes,
For every atom in the world pulsates with change.
The caravan of life does not halt anywhere,
For every moment life renews itself.
Do you think life is great mystery?
No, it is only a desire to soar aloft.
It has seen many ups and downs,
But likes to travel rather than to reach the goal:
For travelling is life's outfit: it
Is real, while rest is appearance, nothing more.
Life loves to tie up knots and then unravel them.
Its pleasure lies in throbbing and in fluttering.
When it found itself face to face with death,
It learned that it was hard to ward it off.
So it descended to this world,
Where retribution is the law,
And lay in wait for death.
Because of its love of duality,
It sorted all things out in pairs,

And then arose, host after host,
From mountain and from wilderness.
It was a branch from which flowers kept
Shedding and bursting forth afresh.
The ignorant think that life's impress is
Ephemeral, but it fades only to emerge anew.
Extremely fleet-footed,
It reaches its goal instantly.
From time's beginning to its end
Is but one moment's way for it.
Time, chain of days and nights, is nothing but
A name for breathing in and breathing out.

What is this whiff of air called breath?
A sword, and Selfhood is that sword's sharp edge
What is the Self? Life's inner mystery,
The universe's waking up.
The Self, drunk with display, is also fond
Of solitude ;—an ocean in a drop.
It shines in light and darkness both;
Displayed in individuals, yet free from them.
Behind it is eternity without
Beginning, and before it is
Eternity without an end;
It is unlimited both ways.
Swept on by the waves of time's stream,
And at the mercy of their buffeting,
It yet changes the course of its quest constantly,
Renewing its way of looking at things.
For it huge rocks are light as air:
It smashes mountains into shifting sand.
Both its beginning and its end are journeying,
For constant motion is its being's law.
It is a ray of light in the moon and
A spark in stones. It dwells
In colours, but is colourless itself.
t has nothing to do with more or less,

With high and lc w, with fore and aft.
Since time's beginning it was struggling to emerge,
And finally emerged in the dust that is man.
It is in your heart that the Self has its abode,
As the sky is reflected in the pupil of the eye.

To one who treasures his self bread
Won at the cost of self-respect is gall.
He values only bread he gains with head held high.
Abjure the pomp and might of a Mahmud;
Preserve your Self, do not be an Ayaz.
Worth offering is only that prostration which
Makes all others forbidden acts.
This world, this riot of colours and of sounds,
Which is under the sway of death,
This idol-house of eye and ear,
In which to live is but to eat and drink,
Is nothing but the Self's initial stage.
O traveller, it is not your final goal.
The fire that is you has not come
Out of this heap of dust.
You have not come out of this world;
It has come out of you.
Smash up this mountainous blockade,
Go further on and break out of
This magic ring of time and space.
God's lion is the Self;
Its quarry are both earth and sky.
There are a hundred worlds still to appear,
For Being's mind has not been drained
Of its creative capabilities.
All latent worlds are waiting for releasing blows
From your dynamic action and exuberant thought.

It is the purpose of the revolutions of the spheres
That your Selfhood should be revealed to you.

You are the conqueror of this world
Of good and evil. How can I tell you
The whole of your long history?
Words are but a strait-jacket for reality.
Reality is a mirror, and speech
The coating that makes it opaque.
Breath's candle is alight within my breast,
But my power of utterance cries halt.
Should I fly even a hairbreadth too high,
The blaze of glory would burn up my wings.

A REQUEST

While sending your valuable article for publication in The Iqbal Review, please make sure that:

(1) Your name and address, both professional and postal, are clearly and legibly written on its first and last pages.

(2) References to footnotes are consecutively numbered and footnotes are given in the conventional manner.

(3) Sufficient margin is given on the left and the article is written or typed only on one side of the paper.

(4) The article is thoroughly checked and revised.

Thank you!

—Editor, Iqbal Review

CHHU-MANTHAR AS A SING-SANSKRIT TERM

S. Mandihassan

The Sanskrit word, *manthar*, would correspond to the Arabic word '*amal*. Accordingly, a "formula against snake bite" would be, in Hundusthani, either *sanp-ka-manthar* or *sanp-ka-'amal*, equating, *manthar*='*amal*. We otherwise know that when a formula, *manthar* or '*amal*, is recited, the cure is immediate, but the mechanism of action challenges common sense. On the contrary, there must be something positively mysterious on account of which the formula would owe its power. The word *manthar* is well known and cannot be considered mysterious. To make it effective there is the necessity of adding a word, obviously unknown, and as such something mysterious.

We now turn to the Chinese. Giles[202] gives, as character 2638, the word *chhu*, translating it as "to get rid of". Alongwith it we find the term *chhu*-ping. Ping appears as character 9300, meaning "disease, sickness". Then the term *chhu*-ping would literally mean "to get rid of a disease". As it often happens in colloquial language, terms are abbreviated. Here it means that *chhu*-ping has been reduced to *chhu*, when this alone would suggest "get rid of the disease," with the word disease or ping in Chinese being understood. Now Dore[203] actually gives the word *chhu*, as the abbreviated substitute of *chhu-ping*. He renders *chhu* properly as follows: "to remove, e.g. a disease, or its cause, to root out". Thus *chhu=chhu-ping*. Then *chhu* of popular usage was taken as the loan-word and prefixed to *manthar*. *Chhu*, being unknown, as a word, functioned, on that account, as the mysterious additive to *manthar* relatively well known. With such addition *chhu-manthar* became a generic formula which, when pronounced, would root out any disease.

It is like uttering the term "Open Sesame" in Arabian Nights when Sesame remains something mysterious and precisely, on that account, valuable. *Chhu* in *chhu-manthar* occupies such a position, and *chhu* being a verb

---

202 H. A. Giles, Chinese-English Dictionary (1892).

203 H. Dore, Chinese Superstitions (Shanghai, 1916), III x.

makes the term meaningful.

Summary. A magical formula, or *manthar*, should have a mysterious element to be effective. A general formula against disease would be *chhu-manthar*, when *manthar* means formula while *chhu* would be the real mysterious element. In Chinese it is the abbreviated term *chhu*-ping, to root out a disease. Then *chhu-manthar* signifies "remove the disease" and, as such, the term becomes meaningful. But the *chhu* remaining unknown, it functions as a mysterious element, when *chhu-manthar* becomes a magical formula—to expel a disease so forth.

BERGSON'S NOTION OF INTUITION

Mrs Arifa Shameem

The basic theme of Reality for Bergson is Time. Reality is time continuous and living. It is different from spatialised time which is an artificial construction of stationary moments. For a meaningful grasp of time Bergson felt that none of the time-honoured epistemological theories are suitable. Empiricism and rationalism both render a partial picture of Reality. To grasp time one needs a living experience of Reality. This living experience in which time is given in its richness and fulness is intuition. Bergson's theory of intuition is a unique and lasting contribution to human thought. By giving an elaborate account of intuition in *Introduction to Metaphysics*[204] and other works,[205] Berg-son has made a definite advance in epistemology. He has brought to light one of the unexplored faculties of human knowledge. The great philosophical genius has been, for the last two thou-sand years, groping for truth in darkness with certain tools that might have been helpful, but were certainly not adequate. Bergson has called attention to a completely new way of looking at Reality, a way of knowing with which we are all familiar but to which we rarely pay attention. We are hardly aware that without any formal logical constructions, we have access to truth in a very natural experience called intuition.

In this study we shall try to explicate what is this primary experience intuition to which Bergson is calling attention, and in what way it is different from some other commonly held notions of intuition, especially that of the rationalists.

Intuition in ordinary discourse is often referred to as a mysterious experience through which some future events are sensed or predicted before they actually take a shape. Intuition is here very much like extra-sensory

---

[204] Henry Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics* (Tr. I.E. Hane), (New York : Bobb's, 1955).
[205] *Idem, Creative Evolution* (Tr. from French by A. Mitchell), (Macmillan). 79

perception. This kind of experience is often described as something mysterious and uncommon. Such experiences cannot be related to other experiences. They are experienced abruptly without any effort of mind. Such experiences remain inexplicable, scientifically or otherwise.

Intuition of this kind was never recognised as a true experience by common sense, science or philosophy. People reporting such experiences are often looked at with mistrust. However, modern psychology is engaged in finding scientific basis for such abnormal experiences. These experiences may be of some interest to parapsychology, but are certainly not of any interest to established science or philosophy.

Philosophers often distinugish between non-sensory and sensory intuition. Our knowledge of red or blue colour, or of pleasure and pain are classed as sensory intuitions. They are simple, non-conceptual experiences which are accepted as true *prima facie*. G.E. Moore[206] brings to notice that our apprehension of "good" is a non-sensory intuition. It is a simple unanalysable notion. Such simple notions as "good" and simple perceptual qualities such as "yellow," according to G.E. Moore, are apprehended by non-sensory and sensory intuitions, respectively. Intuition is here recognised as a faculty of apprehending simple qualities, sensory or non-sensory.

Kant ascribes a completely new meaning to intuition when in "Transcendental Aesthetic"[207] he describes space and time as intuition. Space is the intuition of the outer sense. Time is the intuition of the inner sense. They are the formal conditions of sensory experience.

A more popular and commonly accepted notion of intuition is what is offered by the rationalists.[208] The intellectual intuition of the rationalists can appropriately be described as "immediate apprehension," "intellectual vision," a "sudden light," or a "flash of light". It is a high intellectual activity in which things are "illuminated". Though intuition of this kind is sudden, it is certainly not abrupt. Normally, it follows after a laborious process of reasoning. Intuition of this kind is considered to be the highest intellectual apprehension which is recognised as superior to discursive or deductive reasoning. It normally comes as an aid to deduction. Sometimes it

---

[206] G E. Moore, *Principle Ethica* (Cambridge: University Press. 1960), pp. 1-36.

[207] Immanuel Kant, *A Critique of Pure Reason* (Tr. N.K. Smith), (New York: St. Martin Press), pp. 65-91.

[208] Rene Descartes, *Meditation on First Philosophy*, reprinted in Philosophical Works of Descartes, Ed, & Tr. by E .S. Haldane and G R. Ross (Cam-bridge: University Press, 1967), Vol. I.

supplements deduction. Deductive and intuitive reasoning complement each other in most rationalistic systems. Some thinkers believe that deductive reasoning cannot proceed without being supplemented by intuitive insight at every step of deduction. Self-evident truths are normally said to be known intuitively. A *priori* truths is another name for intuitive knowledge. First-person statements about psychological states to which one has a privileged access are claimed to be known intuitively. Immediate inferences are examples of intuitive knowledge. But intuition is normally considered to be non-inferential know-ledge. Most of the indefinable notions are claimed to be known intuitively. In any process of reasoning, when discursive reasoning fails, intuition comes to its aid. Science and philosophy alike recognise the significance of intuition in the domain of know-ledge. In fact, scientific and philosophical progress owes much to intuition.

In contemporary phenomenology Husserl[209] used the term "intuition" in a slightly different sense. When Reality is uncovered by analysis, intuition apprehends the essences. Analysis and intuition here are two aspects of the same experience. The former lays bare the thing-in-itself, the latter grasps it immediately. The former uncovers, the latter discovers.

However, intuition, as understood by phenomenologists, or the sense in which other rationalists understand it, is characteristically different from Berg on's notion of intuition. Perhaps all rationalists would agree that such intuition states are momentary. In these states of enlightenment bits of truth are grasped. The intuitive mind gets partial glimpses of truth. In such experiences, parts of Reality are exposed to light. These bits of truth are joined together by the synthetic activity of the mind and systems are built Mathematical systems are built very much in the same manner. It requires great mental effort and labour to construct systems on the basis of partially intuited truths. Most of the great rationalistic systems are semi-intuitive and semi-deductive constructions. Descartes and Spinoza graded intuition as the highest level of intellectual activity. However, it needs to he supplemented by the level of imagination and deduction. Bits of truth are seen in flashes of light only after discursive reason is tired. Intuition of this kind is like a key to some problems. It is like a turning point. When discursive reason cannot go further by itself, intuition suddenly comes to its aid and turns enquiry in a

---

[209] *Phenomenology and Natural Sciences*, Eassys and Translated edited by Joseph J. Kocklemans and Theodore J. Kissel (Notrthwestern University Press), pp. 83-117.

new direction not thought out before. Intuition of this kind, though not abrupt, is certainly unexpected.

Bergson's notion of intuition is fundamentally different from all the above notions of intuition. Sometimes, Bergson's language suggests that this experience is different in kind from intellect and has its roots perhaps in instinct. It is a cognitive tendency fit to grasp Reality as life and duration. Intellect works on matter, intuition works on life. Intellect grasps the immobility, intuition grasps the mobile.

"Our intelligence as it. leaves the hands of nature has for its chief object the unorganized solid."[210]

"Of immobility alone the intellect forms a true idea."[211] About intuition he writes:

> "It is to the very inwardness of life that intuition leads us—by intuition I mean instinct that has become disinterested, self-conscious, capable of reflecting upon its object and of enlarging it indefinitely."[212]

The above lines might suggest that intuition is different in kind from intellect. However, intuition is certainly not conceived by Bergson as anti-intellectual. Bergson looks at intuition as a superior kind of experience. It is a high cognitive activity which combines an affective state. In fact, the division of human mind in cognition, connection and affection is very artificial. It looses sight of certain experiences which are both cognitive and affective in character. Sensations of pleasure and pain, for instance, are not purely affective states. They are also awareness of a special kind and hence cognitive in character. Intuition is a higher experience than sensation. Intuition is a feeling intellect. Intuitive experience is a living experience of a living Reality. Bergson describes it as "intellectual sympathy".

Intuition functions in a very unique manner. It does not apprehend bits of truth. It perceives truth as a *whole*. Intuitive knowledge is not an artificial construction of bits of truth with the help of synthetic activity of the mind. Reality is not a synthetic unity for Bergson. It is not a sum total of parts. Truth is never given in units. It cannot be distributed in so many parts. There are no bits of truth. Reality is a whole. It is not one. It is not many. It is itself:

---

[210] Henry Bergson, Creative Evolution, p. 169.
[211] Ibid.
[212] Ibid., p.194.

living, enduring and becoming. Intuition grasps this living, enduring Reality, but not by a simple cognitive activity. It also feels Reality with its full life or vigour. To know is to feel and live. This is a unique experience which is not describable. Words can suitably describe thoughts or ideas, simple or complex. But thoughts and ideas are immobile unities. They are like snaps of a living Reality. Intellect functions analytically. It stabilises Reality, breaks it up into units, and tries to explain each unit with the help of concepts or symbols. It there-by misses the inherent pulsation of movement, How can movement, when stabilised, be known meaningfully? Zeno's paradoxes were the result of stabilised conception of movement and time, Time is not a sum total of spatialised moments or units. It endures and flows without ceasing and without any pauses.

Bergson feels that no language is fit or can be fit to explain this living, enduring Reality. Knowledge must resemble its object. There should be a real correlation between the subject and the object of knowledge. Besides, conceptual knowledge is symbolic. It consists of a series of ideas. Each idea is expressed through a word. Every word stands for some simple or complex idea or thought. But ideas are partial pictures of stabilised Reality. They cannot capture or preserve Reality that is living and enduring. Besides, Reality is a whole. This whole is not an artificial construction of parts. Nor is it a simple unity which can be grasped by a single unit of thought. Moreover, the whole is not stationary or immobile that can be comprehended in one unit of thought. The whole is never complete. It is all the time growing, enduring or changing. What words can be used to describe a whole that changes before it is grasped? Does it mean, therefore, that one cannot grasp the whole because the whole is changed before it is grasped? In other words, is Bergson suggesting that we should give up the hope of understanding this unique whole because the whole is changed before one attempts to understand it or because it is never fully given?

Bergson is not a sceptic. He has full confidence in human ability to grasp the Reality. But he is not satisfied with the time-honoured methods of realising knowledge. Perception and reason are adequate for scientific pursuits. But they are not appropriate to grasp Reality which is a living, enduring whole. This enduring whole is grasped in a unique way which is intuition. But the act of intuition is not a single or simple act of apprehension. Intuition is a living experience that is suitable for the apprehension of a living Reality. Reality has no leaps. It is continuous. Nor in

intuitive activity do we jump from one concept to another. Reality is not given in bits. Nor are there any bits of intuitive vision. Reality is an evergrowing whole. In-tuition is a living experience which corresponds to, and embraces, its unique object. It truly captures Reality with its life and vigour. To be more precise, in Bergson, there is no dichotomy of subject and object. It is intellect that breaks Reality into subject and object and draws an artificial line between them. In the state of intuitive experience, the known and the knower are identical. The object is not outside them. It is lived in experience through intuition. In intuition we have the highest intimacy with Reality. It is an acquaintance of a very unique kind. With conscious efforts one can have greater acquaintance, greater familiarity, and greater intimacy with Reality. This experience captures Reality as a whole.

It will be helpful here to compare Bergson's view of intuiting "whole" with Gestalt theory of perception.[213] Wertheimer, Kohler and Kaffka, the main representatives of Gestalt school, have propounded the theory that our perception is essentially a perception of a whole. But a whole is not simply a sum total of parts. A Gestalt is a whole whose parts unite in a unique way, such that the whole is always different from the sum total of its parts. To appreciate a melody, we need to be aware not simply of tones in isolation, but a succession of tones that combine in a unique way. A melody has a Gestalt quality independently of the separate parts. Kaffka deni s that there is an absolute correspondence between our perceiving and the stimuli. He draws a distinction between geographical environment and behavioural environment. We should not lose sight of the behavioural tendency of the mind always to perceive wholes. However, though the wholes are described by the Gestalt psychologist as more than the sum total of its parts, they are explicable in terms of certain laws. The law of proxity, for example, explains the geographical environments, i.e. that certain objects that are similar or proximate tend to be seen together. The law of simplicity explains the behavioural aspect, i.e. the internal forces that facilitate perception of Gestalt. One of the internal forces, for example, is that mind tends to see simple and good figur s. Mind has its own way of perceiving figures.

However, the experience of wholes described by the Gestalt psychologists is different from the experience of the whole as described by

---

[213] Paul Edward, Ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan Co. Inc. and The Free Press), III-IV, 318-22.

Bergson. The Gestalt, no doubt, changes with the change of background, but this is no inherent quality of the whole itself. A change of perspective determines the whole to change, and the whole assumes a new form for the perceiver. The Gestalt psychologists, however, admit that there are some constant qualities in the geographical environment. These qualities combine with the perceiver's behavioural environment, and the whole takes new forms. In other words, the whole changes with the change of subjective and objective background and assumes new forms with respect to them. The whole itself is nothing but a configuration of parts. The parts now take this shape, now the other, with the change of backgrounds.

The whole in Bergson is a completely different thing. The *Gestalt* psychologists have their emphasis on perception of *segregated wholes*,[214] whereas in Bergson it is the *whole Reality* that is perceived in intuition. It is neither a sum total of parts, nor a mere configuration. The whole is something unique which is ever growing and changing. "We cannot step in the same river twice," is a popular way of expressing this thought. The river is totally changed before you step in it again. So is Reality for Bergson which is pure time or duration. It is never the same in quality and experience. Duration or time is a living whole which goes on taking ever new forms and shapes. It is a moving whole which is continuously in a state of change inherently. Intellect may try to immobilise it, but then it fails to and rstand it. A unique experience is required to grasp this whole. Intuition catches this whole in its full life and vigour.

We feel here some difficulty with Bergson's notion of the experience of the whole in an intuitive experience. Granted that intellect tends to immobilise the whole and, therefore, renders only a partial picture of the whole; is it not true that each individual who attempts to grasp this ever-changing reality has a limited access to it? Each individual has his own specific point of entry into the whole. Does it not follow that each individual's specific frame of reference or point of entry is going to determine how he is going to grasp and interpret the whole? In other words, each individual sees the whole with reference to his own mental horizon. By mental horizon or point of entry we mean his limits of experience. The mental horizon of each individual determines his understanding of the whole. Being limited by his mental horizon each individual can get only a partial

---

[214] Ibid

view of Reality. It is not possible for any individual to transcend his mental horizon. To transcend his mental horizon is to go beyond the limits of his experience. But within the natural limits of his experience he can see only one phase of Reality as it appears to him. The whole with its richness and fulness still remains beyond his grasp. Only an absolute consciousness can grasp the whole in its wholeness. Such an absolute consciousness perhaps would be identical with the whole itself. A finite individual at the most can have some glimpses of the whole. But these glimpses are not the same as full experience of the whole in its wholeness. With the help of these glimpses a finite mind can reconstruct the whole through its synthetic activity, but that would be an artificial construction which will not be acceptable to Bergson as a true experience of the whole.

There is another difficulty. If each individual grasps through a unique experience, named intuition, a unique Reality, it would imply that we all have different views of Reality in our own ways. How can our experience of Reality be public? In other words, how can we talk about the *same* reality in a meaningful way? There seems to be no way of making these experiences public rather than personal and to talk about them meaningfully. Does, then, the whole remain unknowable in its wholeness? Bergson would not admit that. But it seems that Bergson's theory of intuition fails to establish the possibility of having the experience of the whole in its wholeness. Bergson rejects perceptual knowledge on the ground that it can give some images of the Reality but not the Reality itself. Concepts break Reality into parts and reconstruct an artificial whole which is far removed from Reality. But what about intuition? Does it not also render a partial experience of the whole ? In what way, then, intuition is superior to perceptual knowledge? Reality is known in intuition more intimately and more closely. Does it not follow that each knower has this intimacy only with a phase of the whole and not with the whole of Reality in its wholeness ? Walking in the downtown of Paris and familiarising oneself with a part of the city is not the same as knowing the whole city of Paris in its variety and fulness.

We would like to agree with Bergson as far as his criticism of perceptual and conceptual knowledge is concerned, namely, that such knowledge is partial and artificial. But we feel that Berg-son's own theory of intuition does not solve these difficulties. It is another substitute which might be helpful but which does not promise much.

However, Bergson feels that intuition is, in any way, superior to

perceptual or conceptual knowledge, because it establishes a more intimate relation with Reality than the first two. But this intimate experience is said to be beyond description. It is in-expressible. Symbols cannot represent it. Ideas and representations tend to immobilise Reality. They miss its theme which is mobility. No thoughts can capture this mobility. No words can symbolise the flow of Reality. Reality which is pure duration or time can be grasped in a unique experience, but it cannot he represented in thought and expressed in words. It remains, there-fore, inexpressible and indescribable.

At this point Bergson has been much criticised. Most analytical thinkers are of opinion that what cannot be expressed is not knowledge. There is no thought that cannot be expressed, no experience that cannot be symbolised. Does it mean that all talk about Bergson's intuitive experience of time is absurd. Much depends on what you understand by expressibility. If expressibility or description is understood to mean representation and reproduction, then surely intuitive experience is inexpressible. But so is sensory experience. My experience of pleasure or pain or red or black colour is also inexpressible. By no effort of language can I reproduce or represent my experience of pleasure or pain or red or black colour; and by no effort of imagination can one who has not had similar experiences understand what I am referring to. Yet all sensory experiences which are *prima facie* incommunicable are expressed in language. But they are expressed in a different sense. By expressibility here we mean ability to provoke similar experiences in others, Sensory experiences are expressible in this sense. And so is Bergson's intuitive experience. Words cannot represent or reproduce pleasure or pain or intuitive experiences. But they can certainly provoke similar feelings in others. In this sense Bergson's intuitive experience is expressible. Bergson never falls short of vocabulary to express his experience of Reality, and he expresses it most fluently and lucidly.

The intuitive experience Bergson is talking about is no doubt a private experience. But he believes we all presumably share this experience. We can all have access to it in our private experiences. Intuitive experience, therefore, is public also. It is by empathy that such an experience becomes public. However, it may be argued against Bergson that sensory experiences and Bergson's intuition of time are not at par. The former has been commonly recognised as sensory intuition which is unquestionably shared in common by all of us. But that we all share a unique experience of time in intuition in a unique sense is open to question.

LETTERS OF IQBAL

Bashir Ahmad Dar

This collection of Iqbal's letters comprises only those written in English. The compiler has tried' to include in this volume as many English letters as were available. There are several letters so far not included in any collection of Iqbal's letters.

Mr Dar has provided Introductory Notes to almost all letters adding footnotes where necessary, to enable the readers to comprelent the letters easily.

Pp. xii, 270. Rs 30.00

IQBAL ACADEMY PAKISTAN
90/B-2, Gulberg III, Lahore