
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

fact, then, that such passages, from the Old Testament, so well fall in with even a Christian train of thought, shows that our nature may yet sympathize with this language of the Idumean Mourner; and that, even with our boast of a better faith and a higher spirituality, he was, after all, not so far behind us *practically*, however dark he may have been in his theoretical views.

[To be concluded.]

ARTICLE II.

THE SOOFEES.

Compiled from Tholuck's Ssufismus sive *Theosophia Persarum Pantheistica*, and from othe r sources, by Daniel P. Noyes, M. A., Byfield, Mass.

The Soofees are a sect of Mohammedan Mystics, or Quietists. "Traces of the Soofee doctrine," says Sir John Malcolm, "exist, in some shape or other, in every region of the world. It is to be found in the most splendid theories of the ancient schools of Greece, and of the modern philosophers of Europe. It is the dream of the most ignorant and the most learned, and is seen at one time indulging in the shade of ease, at another traversing the pathless desert." The opinions of this sect have prevailed most extensively in Hindostan and Persia. At the time when the author just quoted wrote his history (which was published in 1829), their numbers, in the latter kingdom, were estimated by some as high as two, or even three hundred thousand; and the great reputation acquired by one of their ancient priests, enabled his descendants to occupy the Persian throne from A. D. 1500 to 1736.

The name (Soofee) is derived, in the opinion of Tholuck, from the Arabic "*sof*" (wool), in allusion to the material of their garments. Others have referred it to the Arabic "*sufa*" (pure), and some to the Greek "σοφός" (wise).

A variety of opinions have prevailed, likewise, with regard to the origin of the Soofic doctrines. Some have been disposed to look for it in the philosophy of India; others, in that of Greece; and Tholuck was, at one time, inclined to the opinion that it took its rise shortly after the death of Haroun Al Raschid, among the Magi of Khorassan. But these views, on thorough examination, appear to be untenable; and we must, therefore, look to Mohammedanism itself, and the native character of the Eastern nations, for the source of this ancient mysticism.

Mohammed found the Arabs strongly inclined to monastic life; and, for the purpose of checking this tendency, he declared that "the journey to Mecca was accepted, by the Most High God, in its place." But his effort was unavailing. For in less than thirty years after his death, hermits had become numerous in the deserts; and so strong was the national propensity, that even the most eminent of his followers, Abubeker and Ali, were founders of monastic communities. These were the parents of the later organizations of like nature, and from them, even as late as the twelfth century, Soofism derived all its most famous doctors. The genius and the opinions of those holy men who were placed at the head of these associations, and whose memoirs have employed the ablest pens, furnish the most satisfactory proofs that the Soofic mysticism was something well known in that age. Anecdotes and sayings illustrative of this fact are abundant. The following may be taken as an example of them: Among the most distinguished of these Mohammedan pietists was a woman named *Rabia*, who died in the 185th year of the Hegira. In the Teskirat ol Aulia (Lives of the Saints), by Fereddeddin Attar, occurs the following: Once when Rabia was sick, Hasean Bassriensis, with Malik Dinar, and Schakik Balchi, came to see her. Hassan remarked, "He is not sincere in his prayers who refuses to endure the chastisements of the Lord." Then Shakik demurred, and said, "He is not sincere in his prayers who does not *rejoice* in the chastisements of the Lord." But Rabia, detecting an odor of self (egoitatis) in these words, spake as follows: "He is not sincere in his prayers who, looking upon his Lord, does not altogether forget the chastisements."

Ibn Chalican (a historian of high authority) relates of Rabia, that she was accustomed, late at night, to ascend to the roof of the house, and there to cry aloud: "O my God! The tumults of day are silent now, voices are hushed, and in secret the maiden rejoices with her lover; but I, in the solitude, delight in thy society, for Thee I avow to be my true lover."

Another saying of Rabia is particularly note-worthy: Once when walking over the pastures, she exclaimed: "Longing for God seizes me. The turf and stone, indeed, art Thou; but yet Thee, Thyself, I long to see." Then the Most High God, in his own person, without intervening instrumentality, spake in her heart, "O Rabia! hath it never reached your ears, how, when Moses prayed that he might see God, the mountain, to which certain particles only of the Divine majesty manifested themselves, was violently shaken and broken asunder? Do thou, therefore, remain content with my name!"[1]

[1] Created things were called, by the Eastern Mystics, the *names* of God.

Rabia visited Mecca. But having seen the Kaaba, for the purpose of worshipping which she had come—"For the Lord," said she, "do I need the Kaaba? What is the Kaaba to me? For I, indeed, have approached so near unto God that I may claim the promise, 'He who comes an handbreadth toward me, toward him will I go an ell;' what is the Kaaba, then, to me?" Once, when urged by her friends to marry, she replied, "Now for this long time has my person been held in the bonds of wedlock; and for this reason am I wont to say, that my existence in mine own self is extinct, but re-created in God; and from that time forth, dwelling beneath the shadow of His dominion, I am wholly in Him (tota Ille sum). Therefore let him who wishes me to become his spouse, seek me, not of myself, but of God."

When asked in what *manner* she had reached this height, "In this," she replied; "that all that I have found, I have lost in Him." But Hassan again inquiring, "By what method hast thou known Him?" "O, Hassan," she answered, "thou hast known after a method, and through certain means, but I *immediately* (sine modo)."

Some one inquired of her, whether she beheld God while worshipping Him. "Assuredly," said she, I behold him, "for whom I cannot see, I cannot worship." Once, when taken violently ill, she was asked the cause of her sickness, and replied, "I have been dwelling upon the delights of Paradise, and therefore my Lord hath chastised me." At another time, she exclaimed, "I am inwardly consumed, and there is no cure for me, but in union with my friend. Evermore shall I pine away, until, on the last day, I reach my goal." Hassan Bassriensis is reported to have been the author of the following: "In the first place, it will happen that the blessed, through the unveiling of the Divine majesty, will be lost in ecstasy for seven hundred thousand years; through their awe of Him they will perish, and, having beheld his loveliness, they will be absorbed into unity."

These examples (says Tholuck) of the mysticism of the first century of the Hegira, are by no means to be despised; and no one who is even moderately skilled in such matters, can deny that the closest agreement exists between it and Soofism; he could not fail of recognizing here the seeds and elements of the entire Soofic system.

But it was not till the second century of the Hegira, that this mysticism began to make its most extraordinary developments. This age holds a marked place in the history of Mohammedanism. Scarcely had the Grecian philosophy been introduced to the followers of the prophet, when a great diversity and conflict of opinions arose. The old traditional ways of teaching and of believing were, in some places, modified; in others, abolished. Men sought, in the solitude of ascetic

life, a refuge from the zeal of party. All things, in fine, began to assume new forms. This age beheld the rise of the four "orthodox sects," viz. that of Hanbal, of Haneefa, of Schaffei, and of Malik. It witnessed, also, the beginnings and the progress of the scholastic theology, with that of the heresies of the Mutaselitae and Batenici, the establishment of numerous monkish orders, and finally the rise of Soofism. While all things were in dire confusion, and doubt of the truth of their religion was filling the minds of men with uneasiness, mysticism, as is wont to be the case, insinuating itself, by degrees, into the breasts of those who clung the more steadfastly to their faith, secured an immense number of adherents, and spread its branches far and wide. From classes of men the most diverse, appeared those who, moved by conscientious impulse, gave up their accustomed habits, and devoted themselves solely to the task of commending to their fellow-countrymen a fervid zeal in the things of religion, and of showing by example as well as by precept, what the divine love can do. In some cases, persons of high rank and even robber-chiefs from the mountains, assumed the coarse garments of religionists.

A saying of one of these pious bandits has been preserved by Dschmi, in the Beharistan (hortus remus): "Fedil Ajad being asked, *who was base?*" replied, "He who worships God out of fear, or from hope of reward." And again, when they inquired, "But then, in what way dost thou worship God?" "In love," said he, "and friendship; for by the bond of love am I held in subjection to Him."

That the foundations of Soofism were laid at this time is evident from the fact, that from the 200th year of the Hegira onward, we find frequent mention made of it by authors whose writings still remain. It is settled, moreover, that the sect was already thriving in the time of Schaffei, who died in 204 H. There is extant, in the Teskirat ol Aulia, a saying of that learned Imaam, in which the Soofees are mentioned by name with commendation. Schaffei was wont to say: "The science of the whole world cannot compare with mine; but not mine, even, can compare with that of the Soofees." And Hanbal, another of the four great doctors, bestows no less praise upon them. He affirms that "the Soofee's quiet trust in God excels the most anxious zeal of other men."

The founder of the sect is even mentioned by name. Casivinius (the Arab geographer, "Plinius Orientalium") says that "*Abu Seaid Abul Cheir* was the founder of the system of Soofism or mysticism. After the manner of the Soofees, he built a caravansary, in token of his love to God, and commanded his followers to take food twice in the day. He is the founder of all the Soofic institutions and author of the

Soofic asceticism. Their "sheikhs" are all, to a man, disciples of *Seaid*, and their discipline rests upon the illustrious acts of our revered prophet."

Seaid's opinion of the aim and purport of Soofism, is given in Dschmi's Beharistan. When the "sheikh" Aben Seaid Abul Cheir was asked, "What is Soofism?" He replied, "What thou bearest on thy head, put down; and what thou bearest in thy hand, throw away; and whatsoever cometh upon thee, turn not back." That is to say, Renounce your possessions, and devote yourself without reserve.

From the above statements, we may gather the following important facts.

1. That within one century from the death of Mohammed, mysticism had made no inconsiderable progress among his followers.

2. That these earlier mystics claimed an immediate communion with God, which needed no words or signs, and expected a complete "union" with Him. They placed little value upon any forms or methods of approaching God. They insisted upon a "pure, unselfish" worship.

3. The views of some of them were tinctured with Pantheism; but—

4. Their mystic "science," and their "quiet trust," commanded the respect of some of the greatest, most learned, and pious among the Mohammedans.

5. It required about one hundred years for this vague, floating mysticism to organize into a system and a sect.

6. The man who was chiefly instrumental in this organization, regarded the *essence* of the system as consisting in the renunciation of worldly possessions, and an unflinching self-consecration.

The origin of Soofism, therefore, having been found, and its early form ascertained, we shall next endeavor to give some account of its subsequent development. It did not long restrain itself within the limits of a simpler piety and of a pure mysticism. In the third century of the Hegira, the Soofees divided into two leading parties. Both of these, the one under Bustamius[1] openly, the other under Dschuneid,[2] somewhat covertly, began to assume a mysterious style of discourse, to affect profundity in abstruse speculations, and to sow pernicious doctrines among the people. For this reason Ghasalius[3] accuses Bus-

[1] Died 261 H. [2] Died 297 H.

[3] Ghasalius died at Bagdad, A. D. 1127. This man, says Tholuck, if ever any have deserved the name, was truly a *divine*, and he may be justly placed on a level with Origen, so remarkable was he for learning and ingenuity, and gifted with such a rare faculty for the skilful and worthy exposition of doctrine. All that is

tamius and inveighs against him severely. The following passage is quoted by Pocoke. "The matter went so far that certain persons boasted of a union with the Deity, and that in His unveiled presence they beheld Him, and enjoyed familiar converse with Him, saying, 'thus was it spoken unto us, and thus we speak.' Bustamius himself is reported to have exclaimed, 'Laus mihi! Laus mihi!' that is, 'Let divine honors be paid me!' This style of discourse exerted a very pernicious influence upon the common people. Some of the husbandmen, indeed, letting their farms run to waste, set up similar pretensions for themselves; for human nature is pleased with maxims like these, which permit one to neglect useful labor in the conceit of acquiring spiritual purity through the attainment of certain mysterious degrees and qualities. This notion was productive of great injury, so that the death of one of these foolish babblers was a greater benefit to the cause of true religion than the saving alive of ten of them." Such are the words of Ghasalius. The divinity of man is more explicitly asserted by Bustamius than by any other of the Soofee teachers. Many of his sayings and precepts are imbued with so senseless a fanaticism, that weak minded persons would be led by them into a contempt for law as great as that of Carpocrates[1] or the Beghards.[2]

The Teskirat ol Aulia among other sayings of this mystic, has the following. Said Bustamius, "I am the sea that is bottomless and shoreless; (sine fundo, sine initio, sine terminis)."

When asked, "What is the throne?" "I am the throne of God," was his reply. "What is the tablet?" (i. e. on which the commandments were written.) "I am the tablet." "What is the pen of God?" (*ὁ λόγος*, the "Word" by whom God made the world.) "I am the pen." "What! Abraham, Moses, Jesus?" "I am Abraham, Moses, Jesus." "The Angel Gabriel, Michael, Israfil?" "I," said he, "am Gabriel, Michael, Israfil, *because* whatsoever has attained unto the true essence is absorbed into God and therefore is God."

There is nothing new under the sun, says Solomon; and however insane this pantheism of Bustamius may seem to be, the same errors

---

good, noble and sublime which his great soul had compassed, he bestowed upon Mohammedanism, and he adorned the doctrines of the Koran with so much piety and learning, that in the form given them by him, they seem in my opinion worthy the assent of Christians. Whatsoever was most excellent in the philosophy of Aristotle, or in the Soofic mysticism he discreetly adapted to the Mohammedan theology; from every school he sought the means of shedding light and honor upon religion; while his sincere piety, and lofty conscientiousness imparted to all his writings a sacred majesty. He was the first of Mohammedan divines.

[1] See Murdock's Mosheim, 2d Cent. P. 12. ch. 15. § 14.

[2] See Mosheim, 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries.

have existed among Christians. What S. Epiphanius hands down concerning the Messalians agrees with this word for word; e. g. "The sayings of these Messalians are surpassingly absurd. For, ask any one of them, and he will assert that he is anything that you please to name. If you mention some prophet, they are that prophet; or Christ, the reply is, 'I am Christ,' or one of the patriarchs, or an angel; they hesitate not to declare themselves to be whatsoever you name."

Again, Bustamius says, "While men imagine that they are worshipping God, it is God himself who adores Himself."

At another time he exclaimed, "How long, my God, art thou pleased that I remain intermediate between the individual and the absolute (inter egoitatem et Tuitatem). Cause this distinction to cease, that I in mine own individuality may cease (remove egoitatem)."

Again, "If on the last day they shall inquire of me, Wherefore hast thou done nothing? I shall be better satisfied than if the question had been, What hast thou done? For whatsoever *I* do belongs to my own individuality. But all individuality (egoitas) is idolatry, and idolatry is surely the worst of sins."

There is even current in the East an incredible report of Bustamius having ascended up to heaven. But although this is treated of in the works of the more pious Mohammedans as a sure and indubitable reality, Tholuck inclines to the opinion that we ought to understand Bustamius as using the term in the metaphorical sense of the Mystics who adopted it to designate the last and highest stage of the progress toward union. It is nevertheless true, that he has described this event in the most graphic and exalted language. His account is still extant in the Tesk. ol Aulia, and may be found in the Bombay Trans. Lond. 1819. p. 100.

Dschuneid, the leader of the other party, claimed by them to be the light of Soofism, although manifestly led into the same errors, was nevertheless, more cautious than Bustamius, and never affected so abstruse or so paradoxical a style of discourse. A few of his sayings are here quoted from the Tesk. ol Aulia.

They inquired of Dschuneid, "When a servant of God can be said to be truly his servant?" He replied, "If he is satisfied that from God all things have their source, that they remain in Him, and will at last return to Him." That is to say (if we understand him rightly), He is a true servant of God to whom God appears the beginning and the end of all things, literally and really, the "*all in all.*"

Once when inquired of concerning "*Tauhid*" (Union), he replied, "When with an absolute assurance thou knowest that activity and rest are created of God, without any operance of man, then hast thou

observed the laws of 'Tauhid;'" i. e. when thou hast lost all notion of individual activity, and of personal existence, in the recognition of the Eternal and the Absolute.

The end and aim of Soofism was thus described by him. "To free the mind from the too frequent assaults of perturbations, to take away the habit that is of nature, to extirpate human nature, to repress sensual instinct, to assume spiritual qualities, to be borne to the heights of true knowledge, and to do whatsoever is good—behold the end of Soofism."

To these sentiments of Dschuneid, it may not be inappropriate to subjoin the sayings of some of his illustrious contemporaries.

Abul Hussein Nuri says, "Soofism is neither a rule (praescriptio) nor a doctrine, but a something inborn. For were it a rule, the good of it might be secured by diligent observance; if a doctrine, by study. But it is a something innate; according to the words of the Koran, we are created with a Divine nature (cum indole Dei). Evidently no one is able by any diligent observance or study to possess himself of a Divine nature."

Hussein Nuri was accustomed to say, "If God veil himself from thee, no guide and no direction can lead thee to Him." In these words, according to the opinion of Tholuck, the fact that God does reveal himself to man, is adduced to prove that God is our true essence. 'If God be not our true essence, we cannot know Him,' would then be the proper interpretation of the above remark.

Abu Rugaim, a Soofee of great renown, who died 309 H., is reported by Casivinius to have spoken as follows respecting the "Union." "Tauhid is the extirpation of human nature and the unfolding of Divine types" (indicia).

Helhadschius ben Manssurus was another famous mystic who was noted for his sayings. Fancying that he had not gone far enough in assigning to man a Divine nature, he even presumed to declare himself openly to be *The Most High God*, and stripped the veil from his pantheism in the presence of the multitude, with strange audacity, even amid the flames of his funeral pyre, crying out in a loud voice, "*Numeri Unius* (*Dei*) *sunt membra Unius.*"

The disciples of Manssur were accustomed to write to their master in language like the following.

"O of all essences the essence, summit of all delights! We testify that thou assumest diverse forms, but now thou hast taken the form of Manssur; grant us thine aid! we seek assistance from thee!" etc.

The inquiry naturally arises, now, whether these pantheistic notions were of foreign origin, and were engrafted upon the simpler

mysticism of Saaid, or whether they are developments from a basis of Mohammedan doctrine. Tholuck inclines decidedly to the latter opinion, and considers that all the peculiar dogmas of the Soofees, their views respecting the enunciation of the world, or the annihilation of the distinction between "good and bad" and the rejection of all human laws, that these all *depend*, as it were, from that one doctrine of the "mystic union." It is not claimed that explicit and convincing testimony can be adduced that this dogma was held in *specific form* during the first two centuries after the Hegira. But whether known, by name, to Rabia and the mystics of her age or not, it was *really* familiar to them, and well understood. Nay, Mohammed himself may be claimed as the originator of it. Who has not heard of that saying of his, so often celebrated by his followers: "Momenta habeo ubi nec cherubinus me capit nec propheta" (I have moments when neither prophet nor angel can comprehend me). But this state which Mohammed speaks of is placed on a level with the "mystic union" of the Soofees. There is a little Turkish book which treats of this subject, where the "Conjunctio Mystica" is defined to be "a union with God free from every impediment." On another page, it is explained as "the extinction of one's individual existence in the being of God, as snow is lost in the ocean, and an atom in the sun."

In prosecuting our inquiries concerning the mysticism of the Soofees, the next question which presents itself is, Whether, after the manner of the Hindus, and others, they believed that the Divine union could be promoted by external rites and observances. The essence of those ceremonies of the Indian mystics (called by them *maschgul—occupatio*) consisted in shutting up, so far as possible, all avenues of sense, through which the external world can affect the mind; that, freed from every perturbation of thought, it may attain a state of profound tranquillity: this brings with it divine knowledge; nay, even the very light of Deity.

The discipline of Fo is similar to this. In the *Su-che-ulh-hang-king*, which is the most important of the sacred books of that religion, may be found the following passage: "He must abandon father and mother, his wealth, his possessions, and all conveniences of life, stifle all his passions, even to the least desire, to the end that he may attain a state of complete self-annihilation. He must be, in this state, immovable as mount Siumi."

That those enjoying the light of Christianity and professing its faith are not wholly secure from the invasions of this wondrously absurd superstition, our next extract affords but too convincing proof.

The following *recipe* for contemplation, used with signal success in

the eleventh century by the monks of Mount Athos, may be found in Waddington's Church History, Vol. III. p. 214: "Being alone in thy cell, close the door and seat thyself in the corner. Raise thy spirit above all vain and transient things; repose thy beard on thy breast, and turn thy eyes, with thy whole power of meditation, upon thy navel. Retain thy breath, and search in thine entrails for the place of thy heart, wherein all the powers of the soul reside. At first, thou wilt encounter thick darkness, but by persevering night and day, thou wilt find a marvellous and uninterrupted joy; for as soon as thy spirit shall have discovered the place of thine heart, it will *perceive itself luminous and full of discernment.*"

The Soofees, though much inclined to solitary contemplation, appear never to have fallen into any such gross absurdities. So far were they, indeed, from conceding any mysterious virtue to these observances, that Dschelaleddin, a Soofee of great authority, eloquently rebukes the practice of them. Sir John Malcolm bears testimony to the same fact. "The Persian Soofees," says he, "though they have borrowed much of their belief and many of their usages from India, have not adopted, as a means of attaining beatitude, those dreadful austerities which are common among the visionary devotees of India." They appear not even to have subjected themselves to the ordinary rules of monastic life. These, although by no means held in contempt, and though strongly recommended by some of their teachers, were yet practised by very few. Those who were able to attain the loftiest heights of contemplation, considered that if the mind were only free to divine meditation, all outward action were of small consequence. This disregard of the external and formal, sometimes amounted to a contempt for all rules of conduct, like that of the Beghards and Messaliane. The following sentiment occurs even in the Metsnewi of Dschelaleddin: — "When, on a certain time, a monk was accused to his superior of garrulity, sluggardliness and gluttony, and was admonished by him of the trite proverb, 'Mediam tenuere beati,' he is said to have replied as follows: 'Although to hold a middle course is wise and good, yet even this is to be done with reason. I am lord of meditation, not subject to it.' Therefore," adds Dschelaleddin, "he to whom a cake becomes divine light, eats whatsoever pleases him. It is permitted." If charges, then, of dissolute life are brought against the Soofees, it is not possible altogether to deny their correctness.

But although these Oriental mystics rejected the strict observances and absurd austerities of some of their European brethren, we still find certain "rules" for such as wished to enjoy the divine "approach." The first injunction laid down for their observance, returns to the

Plotinian ἁπλότης—a pure simplicity of soul, as may be seen from the following extract from the Gulschen ras of Asisius.

"It becomes him to lay aside every impurity and defilement that may chance adhering to him, the depraved doubts that arise in secret spontaneously, and the instincts of our brute nature. Freed from these hindrances, thou mayest attain that which is the highest achievement of all—*reject and expel wholly all thoughts whatsoever;* then, believe me, thou wilt be honored with the divine approach (appulsa: i. e. diverbio, colloquio de arcanis rebus), and all distinction between the knower and the known will cease."

The same fact is illustrated in the following sentences from Dschelaleddin: "Ho! thou who goest bowed down beneath the burden of thy knowledge! How is it that thou art contented with the name merely? Hast thou ever gathered roses from the letters *g. l.* (of Gul., Pers. for rose)? Remember, I pray, that the moon is in the heavens, and not at the bottom of the well.[1] What more shall I say? That thou mayest the better know thy pure essence, it is necessary that thou become a pure mirror, all individual qualities being rejected. For the Prophet hath said, 'He belongeth to the number of my people, who becometh my essence and my delight. And thus will he become when his soul shall behold me by that same light in which I see him; i. e. not through mere traditions and opinions, but in the drinking of the water of life.'"

If the above render the matter none the plainer, what follows may be more intelligible.

Once upon a time the Chinese, having challenged the Greeks to a trial of skill in painting, the sultan summoned them both into edifices built for the purpose, directly facing each other, and commanded them to show proof of their art. The painters of the two nations immediately applied themselves, with diligence, to their work. The Chinese sought and obtained of the king, every day, a great quantity of colors, but the Greeks not the least particle. Both worked in profound silence; until the Chinese, with a clangor of cymbals and of trumpets, announced the end of their labors. Immediately the king flew, with his courtiers, to their temple; and there stood amazed, almost beside himself with astonishment at the wonderful splendor of the Chinese painting, and the exquisite beauty of the colors. But meanwhile the Greeks, who had not sought to adorn the walls with

[1] The meaning seems to be: human knowledge is but the symbol that stands for the real truth—the reflection of the true essence—God: why so ambitious for knowledge, then? Seek the substance, which is, the immediate knowledge of God through union with Him.

paints, but had labored rather to erase every color, and give to the walls the finest polish, drew aside the veil which concealed their work. Then, wonderful to tell, the manifold variety of the Chinese colors was seen still more delicately and beautifully reflected from the walls of the Grecian temple, as it stood splendidly illuminated by the rays of the mid-day sun. And to these Greeks, the Soofees may well be likened; since, without formal repetitions, theories, or management of any kind, they aim at this one thing alone—that the heart, free from depraved desires, may be bright in its purity; for, with such purity, images of infinitude enter therein. Forms without form, and immense, resplendent from the world of mysteries, are imaged in the mirror of the heart within the breast; which neither the heaven that Moses writes of, nor the ocean is able to enfold, but the soul's mirror comprehends them; inasmuch as the seas and the realms of heaven are finite and circumscribed by boundaries, but the human spirit is infinite. What more? Either the heart is God, or God is the heart, and hence silence is imposed on the reasoning intellect."

Elated with delight at this simplicity, Attar exclaims, "O, how well with me! in that I am seen as one in my singleness, alone, lying hid in my love!" And the same again, "God is infinite, and breathes with a divine life, because he is seen in the singleness of unity (quia simplex videtur)."

Not unlike these are the views found in the Upnekhatum of the Hindus. We read there that, "In this so equable and quiet state of mind, when no change or succession of thoughts affordeth means for the measure of time, the infinite divine Power, in which abideth no notion of time, entereth the mind; nor can man, then, have any idea of time." For this reason they consider that the instant of union falls on eternity, and is exempt from all the limitations of time.

So in Metsnewi: "In my sorrow, the days (venia sit verbo) became *intemporal*—days and moments of activity all infinite." And in the same, again: "Once, early in the morning, the Prophet inquired of Ssaid, 'How hast thou arisen, my child?' To which he replied, '*faithful.*' Then the Prophet: 'But hast thou any sign that the garden of faith hath bloomed in thee?' And Ssaid answered, "Day and night have passed over me as a sword glances by a shield; for in a single act of thought have I comprehended the perpetuity of time, both that which has preceded the creation of the world, and that which comes after it. In such a state it is all the same whether thou numberest 100 years or one single hour." Also in the Metsnewi, we find the following: "So soon as Moses had perceived these words of God in his heart, he fled with headlong speed from the eternity that

was before the creation of the world to the eternity that will engulf its ruins."

Like some of the European Quietists, these Oriental mystics permitted themselves, at times, to adopt terms and figures from the marriage relation. Dschelaleddin, in Metanewi, calls his doctrine *nuptias*. Mohammed is said to have been admitted "to kiss the right hand of the bride." Yet the phrase seems to have been rather an unusual one; for in the same book, Dschelaleddin humbly prays that "they will not impute it to him as a fault, that he applies the word *sponsam* (betrothed) to the Deity."

Whether the Soofees, like other enthusiasts of both ancient and modern times, imagined that they saw God under a certain luminous appearance, it is not easy to determine. The Hindus had a superstition of this kind, as appears from the following passage from the Upnekhatum. "Brahm comes in the fancy sometimes dimly shining like a pearl, sometimes obscure as smoke, sometimes like sunlight or the brightness of fire, or like a breathing wind, or a glow-worm in the darkness, or coruscations of lightning, or a pure whiteness like unto crystal." God himself was held to be Light. We read: "God is light—more luminous than all luminaries." And again, "A form of light am I." With regard to the opinions of the Soofees respecting the Divine *appearance*, we have merely the intimations contained in two anecdotes. One of these, in which the saying of Rabia is quoted, has been already given. The other is on this wise.

"There once came a certain person to Dschaffar Ssadik who said to him, 'Show me the Lord!' To him Dschaffar replied, "Art thou ignorant what the divine oracle said to Moses—'*Never shalt thou behold me?*' He replied, 'That indeed I know well; but now the religion of Mohammed is our religion, and people are found who cry aloud, '*My heart seeth the Lord*,' or, '*I worship not a Lord whom I do not see*, or other like things.' When Dschaffar heard these words, he commanded the importunate man to be thrown into the Tigris. This was done; and so long as he was borne about upon the surface of the stream, with loud outcries he implored Ssadik to save him. But when he began to sink, and the waves to gather over him and threaten his life, and he seemed just ready to drown, then he began to pour forth prayers to God. Whereupon Dschaffar bade them draw him forth from the river; and so soon as his strength and senses had returned, 'Tell me, now, my friend,' said he, '*Hast thou seen God now?*' Then the man answered, 'While I was calling upon thee, O Ssadik, I was in a cloud; but from the moment I commenced praying to God, I beheld what I desired through a window opened in my breast.'"

It seems, on the whole, probable that the Soofees did not, in general, believe in any apparition of the Deity visible to sense. In the absence of reliable and decisive testimony, however, Tholuck refrains from expressing any decided opinion.

In reflecting upon the examples which we have now quoted from the Soofic writers, one is struck with the variety, the contrasts even, of opinion that are found among them. While some use such language only as is natural to every devout, meditative spirit, others rise to heights of extravagance and impiety that are absolutely insane. Some appear to be seeking after mere tranquillity and purity of soul, and habits of holy living, others are bent upon attaining a certain unknown, ineffable state of introversion and absence; a sort of crazy, religious dream, in which all rational and voluntary action shall be annihilated, and all consciousness of time and of life shall be thrown into utter confusion. The sentiments of some appear to contain nothing which is inconsistent with a sincere faith in the religion of the Koran. Others are pantheists, or *egotheists*.

Again, the extravagances of the system evidently arose from a perversion of very simple truths, such as usually takes place, when any one principle becomes the subject of exclusive and continuous study. They are, almost without exception, abnormal developments of doctrines common to the whole Christian and Mohammedan world. Thus, "Man is totally depraved." Accordingly, "human nature must be eradicated," "natural instinct must be repressed," all thought and sense of things external must cease, and the soul must be held in a continuous vacant dream, in which all earthly things shall be forgotten, and all "natural" action of the intellect and susceptibilities shall cease. So the Christian world all believe that man should be united with God; that he should live in close communion with Him who is the fountain of goodness and truth. This is our duty. It is a high privilege, proffered to us in infinite love. Let us therefore, said the Soofee, shut out the external world, and renounce all action but that of prayer and silent meditation. Here fanaticism begun; but it ends, as we have seen, in those swelling words of vanity, and acts of license, which proclaimed that the rule of reason and conscience had given place to the insane anarchy of passion and conceit. But the most extravagant of these mystics appears to have had a certain "reason in his madness," a mode of explanation that sufficed for himself; and as the philosophy of religion and of life made all clear and noble in his own view, he could afford to disregard the opinion which might prevail with the majority. Bastamius, for example, appears to us to have reached a pitch of conceit, which amounted to insan-

ity. He declared himself to be identical with the Deity, and with all the angels and the patriarchs. But he has a "reason" to give. His argument, in his own words, is as follows: "*quisquid ad veram essentiam pervenit, in Deum absorbetur, proinde Deus est.*" That is to say, "Whatever attains unto true essence, is absorbed into God—therefore is God." His philosophy of the matter, then, was probably something as follows: There is only one original, eternal, absolute essence —the "true essence" of all things. This essence is *one*—absolute unity. Men, who are individual and personal existences, are somehow separated from this great Unity of being; but they may return to it, be reäbsorbed, and again become one with this infinite, undivided, indivisible Power. All the angels and the patriarchs have long since reached this state. And I, Bustamius, have reached it, at last; and so I am one with God, who is the Absolute Unity. Hence I am one with whatsoever else is one with him, for his Unity is perfect. I am one with Gabriel, and Abraham, and Moses, and with the creative "Word."

Furthermore, since in the view of Bustamius the Deity himself is nothing more than this primal, *absolute* Power, in which, as in a vast sea of latent force, all other powers which now sustain specific forms, were originally held in solution, and into which all these individual natures, intelligent, brute, vital, and elemental, will ultimately merge —it follows, that the real *essence* of the human spirit is deity. In man, then (Bustamius probably argued), this divine power recognizes itself, and sees itself to be divine; and so, "while men suppose that they are worshipping God, it is, in reality, the deity who is paying adoration to himself."

In like manner, Mansur, regarding himself, thus, as a specific form of deity, could easily prove to his own satisfaction, that he was the Deity, temporarily clothed in a finite appearance, i. e. the Deity in specific form. What more reasonable, then, than that his disciples, being manifestly his inferiors, should address him in the language we have quoted—"O ens entium," etc.

The account given by Sir John Malcolm agrees well with the preceding. "It was the theory of the Soofee," says this author, "that God is diffused over all his creation. He exists everywhere and in everything. They compare the emanations of his essence or spirit to the rays of the sun, which, they conceive, are continually darted forth and reäbsorbed. It is for this reäbsorption into the divine essence, to which their immortal part belongs, that they continually sigh. They believe that the soul of man and the principle of life which exists throughout all nature, are not *from* God, but *of* God; and hence

those doctrines which establish an equality of nature between the created and the Creator." "Some, believing that the principle which emanates from God can do nothing without his will, and can refrain from nothing that he wills, altogether deny the existence of evil. They are complete optimists: everything is good with them, religion and infidelity, the lawful and the unlawful." "The Nazarenes," say they, "are not infidels because they deem Jesus a God, but because they deem him alone a God."

In concluding the present Article, we give a paraphrase of the remarks of Tholuck upon the subjective origin of the doctrine of "union."

"There is almost no religion," says our author, "that does not attribute many of the motions and affections of our souls to a certain superior guiding power, who according to his own good pleasure rules and sways the human heart. With regard to the extent of the Divine power which is thus put forth, neither Christians nor the world in general, have ever been able to come to a satisfactory conclusion. The philosopher concedes none to God; the Calvinists, with Augustine at their head, leave none for man; while the Lutherans have chosen, unsteadily indeed, but nevertheless with wisdom, a medium course. This discussion in which Christian theologians have striven to determine merely how much is to be attributed to Divine agency in *the reform of the life*, has been turned aside by the Mystics into questions of much greater difficulty. For they have gone on to inquire, to what "principium" our other actions are to be referred; and they ended in the conclusion that God must be regarded as the sole fountain of all human actions. Pursuing the same strain of argument, they infer that nature in its inner nucleus and source is divine, and that he who withdraws his mind from things corporeal to his own essence which exists in perfect purity within the recesses of his breast, he having drawn nearer to the Deity, as it were, is able to hear His voice. The error of the Soofees, therefore, is identical with that which has caused so many Christians to fall into mysticism and pantheism. For this question of "free-will" has vexed the Mohammedan theology not less than our own. The doctrine of "Divine influence" holds as high place in their system as in that of Christians.

"Unceasingly," says Dschamius, "a Divine affluence (copia) flows down from the world unknown into souls." And Dschelaleddin: "Into the breast of Omar floweth the voice of God, which is the root of all speech and of every language. All other tongues whatsoever, that which the Turk, the Persian, the Arab understands, are but echoings of this. But why speak of Turk and Arab? Nay, even the wood and stone are but repercussions of this voice; for in what mo-

meant soever it shall please God to cry aloud, '*Alast?*' (i. e. Art thou not a creature of mine?), matter replies, '*Bela*' (Even so).

"But while natural philosophers use the words 'copia' and 'vox' (affluence or power—word), moral philosophers have chosen the term 'attractio.' Thus we read that God in the first place 'draws' towards Himself by 'attractive' influences, so that his servant may turn his mind in the direction whence the attraction comes, and may be lighted up with love. Then follows the second step or the '*iter*' (the journey), and this is divided into two parts, the journey *unto* God, and *into* God, but ends at last in the 'ascent up to heaven.'[1]

"When we reflect upon these things, the real source of this dogma of union becomes abundantly plain. The 'union' itself may be defined to be, a steady bending of the mind upon God—a tranquil drinking in of the affluence that flows thence into the minds of mortals, so that those divine notions which we otherwise experience but scantily and only for single moments, then unitedly and in one flood as it were, whelm the soul in their tide and bear it away to Deity."

Now the seeds of this doctrine are most evidently contained in every religion which acknowledges the operance of Divine power upon the human heart. And so easily did they take root and grow, that we find this doctrine, or something very much like it, even in the writings of Ghasalius, that man of renewed orthodoxy, and hater of fanatics.

In his chapter on "prayers," occurs the following. "Prayers are of three degrees (involucra), of which the first are those that are simply spoken with the lips. Prayers are of the second kind, when with difficulty, and only by a most resolute effort, the soul is able to fix its thoughts on Divine things without being disturbed by evil imaginations; of the third kind, when one finds it difficult to *turn away* the mind from dwelling on Divine things. But it is the very marrow of prayer, when He who is invoked takes possession of the soul of the suppliant, and the soul of him who prays is absorbed into God to whom he prays, and his prayer ceasing, all consciousness of self has departed, and to such a degree, that all thought whatsoever of the praying is felt as a veil betwixt the soul and God. This state—adds Ghasalius—is called by the Mystics 'absorption,' for the reason that the man is so absorbed that he takes no thought of his body, or of

[1] This language is not so very unlike what we hear in our own day. There is the "awakening" corresponding to the "attractio;" the "seeking" (iter); the "finding" (*unto* God); and next, "communion" or "union" with God (*into*); and among some enthusiasts, a state answering even to the Soofic "ascent to heaven," may be found in the "*trance*."

anything that happens externally, none of what occurs in his own soul, but, absent as it were from all such matter whatsoever, is first engaged in going *toward* his Lord, and finally is wholly *in* his Lord. If only the thought occurs that he is absorbed into the Absolute, it is a blemish; for that absorption only is worthy of the name which is unconscious of itself. And these words of mine, although they will be called, as I well know, but foolish babbling by raw theologians, are yet by no means without significance. For consider. The condition of which I speak, resembles that of a person who loves any other object, as wealth, honor, or pleasure. We see such persons so carried away with their love, and others with anger, that they do not hear one who speaks to them, nor see those passing before their eyes; nay, so absorbed are they in their passion, that they do not perceive their absorption. Just so far as you turn your mind upon your absorption, you necessarily turn it away from that which is the object of it."

Again he says: "The commencement of this is the going to God (ad Deum), then follows the finding Him (in Deum), when the 'absorption' takes place. This, at first, is momentary, as the lightning swiftly glancing upon the eye. But afterwards, confirmed by use, it introduces the soul into a higher world, where the most pure, essential essence meeting it, fills the soul with the image of the spiritual world, while the majesty of deity evolves and discovers itself."

Says Tholuck: "He who has seen these examples, and given them a diligent examination, will cease, as I think, to search further for the origin of the doctrine of 'union.' For who can have failed to observe the close bond of connection which exists between pure and genuine piety and the dreams of enthusiasm? And who has not noted that succession of steps, of which the earlier demand a simple devoutness merely, while the later ones fade into the fume and vapor of fanaticism?

"The question, How far this power, which instils itself into the human mind and fills it, and bears it aloft, how far this flows from man's own nature, as from something divine and of independent existence, and how far from Deity, this I know not whether it is within the scope of any mortal to determine. It is certainly beyond mine. Whatever philosophers may guage concerning this matter, the disciples of Christ will never assign to the human mind a higher place than as a vessel or an instrument to receive divine gifts.

"The Soofees always professed—and this deserves our special attention—that the foundation of their doctrine lay in the maxim, '*Nosce teipsum.*' By this, they assuredly add themselves to the number of those mystics, according to whose theory the nature of the mind,

although one of the greatest simplicity as well as dignity, affords of itself, when correctly and skilfully developed, a knowledge of divine ideas and realities.

"But some may, perchance, inquire, What were those deceptions by which the Soofees were led to imagine that, in very truth, by this 'union,' they could attain divine knowledge? I answer, with Cicero: the same happens to ourselves, when we meditate diligently and continuously upon the mind, as they were wont to do. Those who gaze intently upon the sun in eclipse, frequently lose their eyesight altogether. So the eye of the mind, turned to gaze upon itself, is sometimes paralyzed. But this very paralysis is called, by the mystics, the moment of absorption, for the reason that then, not less than in the contemplation of God, all thought and all self-consciousness ceases. In this misty and torpid state of the mind, how easily one person can come to believe that he has been made a participator of divine life, and another that he has received into his mind the Supreme Divinity himself, no one finds it difficult to understand, especially when he remembers how, with many of these mystics, the powers of both body and mind are broken down by rigid fastings, and other macerations of the flesh."

There are several other chapters in this interesting book, giving the speculations of the Soofees upon the creation of the world, our first parents, free-will, and connected subjects; but our limits do not permit further extracts.

ARTICLE III.

MÜLLER'S CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN.

By Edward Robie, Assistant Instructor in Hebrew, Andover Theological Seminary.

[In the August Number of the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1848, we gave a brief abstract of the first book of Müller's *Christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, on the Nature and Guilt of Sin. The following Article is an outline of the remaining part of the work. It will be seen that the author unhesitatingly admits the generally received doctrine of the native depravity of man; but the view, which this doctrine leads him to take of the origin of sin, will probably be dissented from. Neither is it generally received by the theologians of his own country.