



ILL: 81001644

OCLC Number: 2222987

Request Type:

Staff Email: ill@library.newpaltz.edu

Billing Notes:

Title: Islam & Christian Muslim relations.

Uniform Title:

Author:

Edition:

Article: Clinton Bennett: Is Isaac without Ishmael complete? A nineteenth-century debate revisited

Vol: 2

No.: 1

Pages: 42-55

Date: 1991

Dissertation:

Verified: <TN:154332><ODYSSEY:137.140.20.68/ILL> OCLC 0959-6410

Borrowing Notes: Please send printout with request-- Ariel 137.140.20.194

Ship To: ILL/Sojourner Truth Library/SUNY College/300 Hawk Drive/New Paltz, NY 12561-2493

E-delivery

Addr: 845-257-3670 [ARIEL 137.140.20.194]

Ship Via: Oddysey/Ariel/FAX/1st class/

Ship Via: Oddysey/Ariel/

Return To:

ILL/James White Library
Andrews University,
4190 Administration Dr.
Berrien Springs, MI 49104-1400

Ship To:

ILL
Sojourner Truth Library
SUNY College
300 Hawk Drive
New Paltz, NY 12561-2493

Call shelved by title
Number:

Location: Sem Periodical/Lower Fl

Maxcost: @/S LVIS

Source: ILLiad

Affiliation:

DateReq: 8/15/2011 Yes

Date Rec: 8/16/2011 No

Borrower: ZLM Conditional

LenderString: *EXN,VCB,IHT,ICW



ILL: 81001644

Req Date: 8/15/2011

Patron: Bennett, Clinton

Author:

Title: Islam & Christian Muslim relations.

Article: Clinton Bennett: Is Isaac without Ishmael complete? A nineteenth-century debate revisited

Vol.: 2

No.: 1

Date: 1991

Pages: 42-55

Verified: <TN:154332><ODYSSEY:137.140.20.68/I

Maxcost: @/S LVIS

Due Date:

Lending Notes:

Bor Notes: Please send printout with request-- Ariel 137.140.20.194

NeedBy: 9/14/2011

Borrower: ZLM

Lender: EXN

OCLC #: 2222987

IS ISAAC WITHOUT ISHMAEL COMPLETE? A NINETEENTH-CENTURY DEBATE RE-VISITED

By CLINTON BENNETT

Biblical passages which Christians have traditionally applied to Islam, predicting the rise of false prophets and of false Christs, inform negative judgements. The theory of one nineteenth-century writer, Charles Forster (1787–1871) is examined as possibly offering a sympathetic Biblical-key in its interpretation of God's promise to Abraham that he would bless Ishmael and make him father of a great nation. Islam, Forster argued, fulfilled this promise: permitted to exist by God, Islam's eventual "bringing in" to the Kingdom would be by divine not human action. This raises questions about the propriety of proselytizing Muslims and suggests that theological disputation might yield to mutual striving to "do good works" or to obey God's will (Q.5:48; Matt 7:21).

The Nineteenth Century Re-considered

Recent research has suggested that the nineteenth century saw more creative Christian reflection on Islam than we have often assumed.¹ It also shows that interest in Islam was more wide-spread than we might think, sometimes moving from academic and theological journals into the popular press. Towards the end of last century, for example, a debate about whether Islam's influence was salutary or an 'unmitigated' curse' was carried for over a year in the letters column of *The Times*.²

Very early in the century, in 1829, one writer expressed surprise when his book on Islam was 'both in the metropolis and in every quarter of the United Kingdom ... received with a fervour and spoken of with an interest far beyond the expectations of the author'.³ That book, *Mahometanism Unveiled* by Anglican priest, Charles Forster (1787–1871) was reviewed by a dozen or more influential journals. In this article, we re-visit its argument, review its contemporary reception and the ongoing debate which it prompted, and argue that the theory it offers provides a usable key to aid Christians in attempts to understand the phenomena of Islam.

Lack of an hermeneutical key

Christians have often felt handicapped by lack of an hermeneutical — particularly of a biblical — key to assist and inform their understanding of Islam. Muslims, for their part, are able to base their attitude towards Christians on qur'ānic passages which refer explicitly to Christians, either by that noun or by the epithet 'People of The Book'. Though some of these passages pass negative judgement, several very positive passages allow Muslims to recognize a certain validity in the Christian Tradition.⁴ Nor have Muslims traditionally held that Christians need embrace Islam. However, the Christian canon was completed before the Qur'an and therefore contains no explicit references to Islam to which Christians can look for guidance in their attitude towards Muslims. Some Christians have, of course, experienced no difficulty in locating implicit references, but the majority of these lend themselves to a negative view — passages, for example, which predict the rise of false prophets and of false Christs (the anti-Christ of apocalyptic writings⁵). Thus 'Muhammad' features as the 'anti-Christ' in no few Christian writings on Islam.

The question thus arises — are there other biblical passages which could provide a more sympathetic understanding of Islam? Whilst not all Christians regard lack of a biblical key as problematical, many who believe that the Bible at least hints at God's plan for all peoples believe that it does contain clues which can help us understand the whole human story. Where, then, can we look for help in understanding Islam? Charles Forster began his search for a biblical key from the premise that the Bible does contain the blue-print of all history. We may not share this confidence today, but the fact that Forster's Biblicism allowed him to accommodate Islam within a framework of Christian reflection, suggests that his argument is still worth serious consideration. In the process of articulating his theory, Forster also provides some useful material to assist a sympathetic appraisal of Islam. This will be highlighted.

'To Insist on merely human causes is to take the world out of the hands of God'

Before examining Forster's theory, it is intriguing to ask the question 'What prompted his interest in Islam?' He wrote well before Christian mission had made much impact on the British public, indeed only seven years after the legalization of missionary activity in India. Specifically,

Forster refers to a conversation he had in 1820, whilst Chaplain to Bishop John Jebb of Limerick (1775–1833), with Dr William Phellan (1789–1830), Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, Forster's own *alma mater*, regarding Islam's origin and success. In any conversation, Phellan 'whatever might be the subject .. never failed to terminate in considerations drawn from the sacred writings' ⁶.

Thus Forster looked to scripture for his starting point. From 1820 until 1829, he turned seriously to a study of Islam, its history, faith and practice. His concern was, from the outset, to counter the arguments of writers who removed God's hand from history. He particularly reacted against Edward Gibbon's secular interpretation of history as well as against the 1784 Bampton Lecturer, Joseph White (1746–1814) who posited purely human causes for Islam's 'success and permanence'. Forster argued that 'to insist on merely human causes .. is .. to take the world out of the hands of God'.⁷ He became convinced that the origin of Islam could only be located 'in the one great primary cause and effect of all things, the special superintending providence of God'.⁸

What is significant here is that having decided to locate Islam's origin in 'divine providence', he began his study of Islam pre-disposed to think well of it since, by definition, 'divine providence' is benevolent, not evil. Several factors predisposed Forster to think well of Islam. As a result of his extensive reading, he became convinced that too many Christian writers had failed to do justice to the phenomena of Islam, principally because they were pre-disposed to think ill of Islam in general and of Muhammad in particular. They brought 'crude and indigested theories' to bear on their subject, bending 'facts to accommodate' them. 'Prejudice', said Forster, had 'too often usurped the place of sound reason'.⁹ He argued that to be unjust to the fair claims of another religion is also to be guilty of gross injustice to the claims of the Gospel. 'Truth', he considered, would be better served if 'Christian controversialists would learn to attend to less preconceptions and more facts'.¹⁰

Forster's research also resulted in him valuing the work of some earlier writers who had written more positively about Islam. He was especially influenced by his knowledge of the Moorish period of positive inter-action and by the writings of George Sale (1697–1736) and his nineteenth-century defender, Edgar Taylor (1793–1839). Writing in 1821, Taylor commented:

We are persuaded that of those who have considered the comparative influence of the Mahometan and Christian religions, there are few who have not at times found themselves compelled to admit that even the former must have been ordained for many wise and beneficent purposes, and to confide at any rate of great eventual good.¹¹

Perhaps most intriguing of all is the fact that Forster, writing then in Dublin and living most of his later life as a country Rector in Essex, never met a Muslim. Is it, we might ask today, legitimate for us to theorize about a faith whose followers we have not encountered? Forster would say 'yes' — since, whilst he might recognize the limitations imposed by lack of encounter, his conviction was that Christian theology needs to embrace everything God has done, is doing and will do in His world. If it claims to be 'good news' for everybody, the Gospel needs to be universal in scope and application.

'I have heard your request about Ishmael, I will bless him and ... I will make a great nation of his descendants' (Gen. 17:20)

Turning to scripture, to which, as an admirer of Phellan he was 'naturally led' as the 'most ancient and authoritative source of historical information', Forster looked to locate there a key to unlock a sympathetic Christian understanding of Islam.¹² Aware of Muslim reverence for Abraham, both as Muhammad's forbear through Ishmael and as spiritual father of all Muslims, Forster looked to scriptural references to Abraham and Ishmael as his starting point. Gibbon had sneered at this connection and in rebutting Gibbon, Forster researched extensively into the genealogical history of the Arabs. His findings formed Appendix Two of his book and were further expanded in his *The Historical Geography of Arabia* (1844). As he studied the Abraham story, Forster became convinced that God's original promise to Abraham (Gen. 12:2–3) subsequently branched into two separate yet related promises, indeed covenants. The 'greater promise' was channelled through Isaac but, argued Forster, another promise, subordinate though not invalid, went with Ishmael for whom Abraham prayed 'O that Ishmael might live in thy sight' (Gen. 17:18).

Anticipating the reply of some of his critics, who interpreted the 'blessing' promised Ishmael in purely material terms, Forster argued that Abraham had clearly desired, in his prayer, a spiritual blessing for his oldest son, whom he loved. Forster emphasised the significance of Muslim

circumcision as a sign of Ishmael's lesser covenant (indeed, Ishmael himself bore on his fore-skin the mark of the everlasting covenant, Gen. 17:23). Nor, he said, was Ishmael cut off from opportunities of religious improvement:

To his 80th year, he lived in or near contact with Abraham, and the true patriarchal faith; and at the last, he and Isaac met together, as brethren over the grave of their common father.¹³

Furthermore, for much of their history, the Arabs preserved the faith of their 'illustrious ancestor, Abraham, in its full and unalloyed integrity'. As late as the time of Moses, Jethro preserved worship of 'the Lord greater than all the gods' (Ex. 18:11). Forster thought Job to have been an Idumaen Arab possibly descended from Esau. He commented on the significance that the part of the Old Testament which contains:

some of the profoundest and most pregnant anticipations of the Messiah's kingdom should have been the production of an Idumaen Arab; and should have been adopted, from the first, as an integral part of the volume of Jewish revelation.¹⁴

Islam — the 'great nation' of promise

Thus, Forster argued, the 'great nation' of Islam represents the true fulfilment of the promise that Ishmael will receive a blessing and father a 'great nation' (Gen. 17:20, 21:13), since no other evidence exists which suggests that Ishmael's progeny enjoyed either spiritual blessings or material prosperity at an earlier period in their history. To what extent, then, did Forster recognize a spiritual validity in Islam? His theory posited that whilst Islam was 'subordinate' to the 'everlasting covenant' fulfilled in Christ, it yet possesses its own 'lesser fruits' which 'discover themselves in a reality of belief, a fervour of zeal and a sincerity of devotion which ... might put to shame the majority of the Christian world'.¹⁵ This suggestion quite astounded Forster's critics. He also rejected the "vulgar notion" asserted by many Christian apologists, that "Islamism is altogether a religion of form"¹⁶. "Imitation", too, he argued, might explain some points of resemblance between Islam and Christianity but it could by no means explain all of Islam's fruits. Thus

It was not imitation that made Moses and Mahomet alike the descendants of Abraham — that made the offspring and representatives of Isaac and Ishmael, whose covenants, in point of fact, they successively asserted ... it was not imitation that cast their common lot ... in the same Arabian soil: that caused the books of the Law and of the Koran to be composed and published [or that] ended their day ... on the eve of the two-fold irruption of their kindred nations .. that made Mahomet as well as Moses the successful founder of a polity which exists in full vigour after the lapse of 12 hundred years.¹⁷

Vindication of Muhammad

Forster's conviction that Islam contained 'spiritual fruit' also resulted in him defending Muhammad against some of the charges traditionally made against him by Christian apologists. For example, he suggested that many of the so-called 'moral blemishes' could be mitigated if tried not at the bar of the New but of the Old Testament. Extenuating historical circumstances, too, must not be overlooked. Muhammad may justly be compared with Moses: both leaders found their people sunk in immorality and paganism. Measured against the Mosaic code, 'objectionable features of Islam ... find sufficient precedents and parallels in the punitive precepts and carnal ordinances'.¹⁸

Both leaders, too, had to 'consult the possible rather than the desirable and (were) compelled to lower the standard of (their) reformation because of the people's hard-heartedness'.¹⁹ Given that Muhammad 'possessed no extraordinary advantages, no superior illumination' Forster wondered that his 'moral' code was not worse.²⁰ Neither Muhammad nor Islam could, he suggested, sustain comparison with the 'pure and searching light of the Gospel' but since scholars were unanimous in their opinion that Christianity in Arabia was 'totally corrupt' and that Muhammad knew only 'a vile parody of Christianity' it was hardly just to try him by a standard he did know.²¹

Thus, whilst he did not directly address the question of Muhammad's sincerity, his picture of Muhammad is one of a man who genuinely attempted to raise moral standards. Forster's view of Muhammad therefore represents a movement towards recognition of Muhammad as a type of latter-day Old-Testament prophet. Whilst this, for Muslims, falls short of an adequate recognition it does constitute a more sympathetic view than that of most earlier writers.

His positive view of Islam's 'spiritual fruit' also led him to question, as had Sale, the extent to which violence and the sword were responsible for Islam's spread. There were, he said, many examples of Islam spreading and flourishing — as in the North African desert — 'unshackled by the restraints imposed by a Mahometan government'. He had nothing but praise for the 'salutary moral influence of Islamism upon its negro proselytes'.²² Here, he anticipated the debate which later surrounded the writings of Edward Blyden (1832–1912) Reginald Bosworth Smith (1839–1909) and others, contested by George Knox of the Church Missionary Society, about whether Muslim *da'wa* or Christian mission most benefited Africa. Blyden contended that, in Africa, Islam's influence was salutary whilst Christianity's was retarding.²³

Forster was particularly angered by those writers who represented Islam as, always and everywhere, opposed to civilization. They wrote, he said, as if Islam must always be the opposite of their perception of and claims for Christianity. Thus Joseph White's Bampton Lecture:

aims too manifestly to dazzle by the force of ambitious contrasts: Christianity is merciful, therefore Mahometanism must be painted cruel. The zeal of controversy seems equally to forget the exemplary humanity of the Saracens in Spain and the merciless barbarity of the Spaniards in South America, and of the Portuguese in India. Even [he continued] during the iron middle ages, the religion of Mahomet was distinguished by a spirit of charitable and courteous beneficence. The treatment of Christians in Jerusalem by the generous Saladin may be cited as a memorable example.²⁴

Here, we are reminded not to compare the best of our tradition with the worst of our neighbour's which anticipates Reginald Bosworth Smith's rubric that we 'must always turn the mirror in upon ourselves'.²⁵ Perhaps Mt. 7:3 might merit the attention of all who engage in inter-religious dialogue: 'why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye?!' Forster's treatment also reminds us that it is too easy to caricature the history of Christian-Muslim encounter as solely one of hostility — ignoring positive examples of intellectual, scientific and commercial exchange. In fact, said Forster, Islam and Christianity had at times joined forces as joint civilizers of the world. The Jews, too, that 'miraculous people', had sometimes played a part in this extraordinary partnership through their role as brokers between Muslims and Christians, as if God, in the midst of his wrath, remembered his suffering people and raised them up to bridge the gap

between Isaac and Ishmael. Thus, during the flowering of Moorish learning, we saw:

the covenants of Isaac and Ishmael united for the one great providential end: and Mahometanism, Judaism and Christianity standing forth together, the joint enlighteners of the world.²⁶

Forster did not dispute that hostility often exists between Christian and Muslim, which fact he attributed to Genesis 16:12 — Ishmael's 'hand will be against everyone and everyone's hand will be against him'. In his interpretation of scripture, he was prone to pursue analogies too far. For example, he argued that although the result of God's promise and despite containing valid fruits, Islam yet represents a 'spurious' or 'counterfeit' Gospel. Islam is thus both curiously related yet also curiously opposed to the true religion. In this sense, Forster applied the traditional Christian epithet 'Anti-Christ' to Muhammad (incidentally, he also applied it to the Pope!). His intent, however, was not to label Muhammad as a 'false Christ' or even as a 'false prophet', but to mark him as one whose 'Gospel' represented human, if divinely sanctioned, effort. This might, indeed, be regarded as a logical consequence of the fact that in fathering Ishmael, Abraham had taken the promise of an heir into his own hands. Yet, though God intended Abraham's line to pass through Isaac, he could not and did not abandon the non-elected son 'born in the ordinary way' (Gal. 4:23). Ishmael was not the 'child of promise', but he was born to the man of promise. He was not adopted but legitimate. He was not an intruder but the elder son and, writes Walter Brueggemann, 'for some inscrutable reason God is not quite prepared to yield easily to his own essential plot'.²⁷ Tradition may have tried to 'abandon' Ishmael — Sarah and even Abraham may have exiled him — but God remained attentive to the outsider. Thus a tension developed between the elected and the non-elected who is yet treasured, and even at Abraham's death-bed, Ishmael stands as a 'man not without a story and a future'. Thus, Islam is neither 'outside' nor yet 'within' God's principal tradition of self-disclosure but both aids and hinders, supports and opposes that tradition. Yet Forster's Islam, like Ishmael at the cave of Machpelah, was not without a 'story and a future'.

Will Isaac and Ishmael Re-unite?

Islam's story, for Forster, was that it does contain 'spiritual fruit' which, at the very least, benefits those over whom it wields influence,

which at best lays 'the train for eventual acceptance of the whole Christian system'. Forster saw Islam as a 'preparatio evangelica' — it could 'prepare the way for the still more universal diffusion of Christian lights'.²⁸ Whilst not opposing Christian mission, he cautioned missionaries not to injure Muslim pride and sensitivity by offering false estimates of Islam's 'civil and intellectual influence'. Instead missionaries should avail themselves of Islam's pre-existing lights and 'fairly acknowledge what Muslims have'. Only by this means can 'we hope to make them sensible of what they have not'.²⁹

Forster praised the Moravians, whose religious instruction went hand-in-hand with 'civic improvement': 'it is this union which has rendered members of the Society of United Brethren, the first missionaries of modern Christendom; and its missions, models for the study and imitation of the whole Reformed communion'.³⁰ But what of Islam's future? Two scenarios present themselves. First — Forster hoped that some Muslims would embrace the 'greater truth' as a result of Christian missionary endeavour but secondly, he believed that Islam was distinguished by 'an upward progress towards the great inscrutable mystery of Catholic Christianity'. Here, Forster advanced an argument which many Christian writers discounted — the view that Islam was capable of progress or of reform. Ultimately, Forster's thinking was deeply eschatological: he argued that just as divine providence had allowed Islam's birth, so its eventual 'bringing in' would be brought about 'by extraordinary providential interposition'.

Thus Isaac and Ishmael would re-unite, their divided covenants become one:

by convergement in the fulness of time of Ishmael to Isaac, of Mahometanism to Christianity the whole world shall one day be poured into the fold of the true shepherd, our only Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.³¹

Forster associated this consummation with Isaiah 60 (see esp. verse 7) and, significantly, he also incorporated the Jews in this process, speaking of 'the final bringing in of Jew, Mahometan and Gentile, to the Church and Kingdom of the Gospel'. Indeed, this 'glorious fulfilment of the twofold covenant of God with Abraham' involved Islam and Christianity in a joint enterprise as 'civilizers of the world'.³²

Critical Reaction

Forster's book attracted both fierce criticism and cautious praise and remained a debating point throughout the century. One critic referred to his 'infidel theory' as 'approaching the verge of blasphemy',³³ and considered that if Islam really deserved 'the pedigree and praise bestowed it by Mr Forster', Christian missions might best print Qur'āns and send 'missionary Moulahs to the heathens'.³⁴ Forster, commented *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, must know only 'Christianity's "letters" and "externals" and not its "real spirit"'.³⁵ It is interesting to note that the 'Christian integrity' of some later writers who wrote sympathetically of Islam was also questioned by their critics. Others, however, praised Forster's 'candid, generous and Christian spirit .. it becomes us to listen respectfully to the charitable suggestions of a kind-hearted, pious and learned man'.³⁶ However, even his most outspoken critics praised Forster's scholarly ability — Sir William Muir rejected Forster's thesis as conferring divine origin on Islam but wrote that the book contained 'a vast fund of useful information which will well repay a perusal'.³⁷ Similarly, the *Wesleyan Methodist* conceded that 'incidentally, as well as directly, it touches on many points of importance very instructively'.³⁸

Indeed, references in significant works throughout the nineteenth century testify to continuing interest in his theory — for example, Muir's review appeared as late as 1845 and was re-published in 1897. Other writers who referenced Forster include Frederick Denison Maurice (1846), William Davenport (1869) and, amongst missionary scholars of Islam, John Muehleisen Arnold (1859) and John Drew Bate, whose *The Claims of Ishmael* (1884) revisited and rejected Forster's theory but expressed admiration for 'the industry of a man who has done more than any other man has ever done in this arid department of labour'. The Muslim scholar, Sir Sayyed Ahmad Khan, used Forster's *The Historical Geography of Arabia* (1844) in his chapter of the same title, in which he chose to cite only those authorities whose authenticity Forster endorsed.³⁹ Similarly, Muir made much use of Forster in one chapter of *The Life of Mahomet* (1858–1860).

The Continuing Debate

Four aspects of Forster's theory attracted particular criticism which, since they rehearse ongoing debates between 'defenders' and 'detractors' of Islam, are briefly highlighted below.

(i) Critics and later writers denied that the blessing promised Ishmael's offspring contained any spiritual aspect. Furthermore, Muslims could not be reckoned Ishmael's spiritual heirs in any comparable way with Christianity's legacy of spiritual lineage from Abraham through Isaac:

The church is part of the Israel of God but to suppose that all Muslims are 'reckoned among Hagar's offspring' would compel us to regard [Islam] not as a gigantic positive evil, but as a sort of qualified and secondary good.⁴⁰

Muir disputed that Muhammad was a descendant of Ishmael.

(ii) Nor could Islam be regarded as in any sense 'spiritually valid'. Instead of preparing the way for Christianity, it was, said Muir, an 'undisguised and formidable antagonist... an active and powerful enemy', Christianity's 'mortal foe'. Far from tending towards Christianity, it posed 'obstacles to conversion greater even than those of heathenism itself'. It presents 'a thick, impenetrable veil which effectively excludes every glimmering of the true light'.⁴¹ Thus, suggested *The Wesleyan Methodist*, Henry Martyn's labours would surely 'have been more productive of much better results in almost any part of the pagan world'.

(iii) Forster's critics also questioned his estimate of Islam's civilizing role. Periods of high learning and culture were dismissed, either as the mere preservation of inherited wisdom from the Byzantine world or as the result of external influence. Bate complained about apologists who argued that Islam 'promoted civilization' by (in his opinion) distorting reality: 'never weary', he said, of 'harping on the question of its elevating and humanizing benefits' they select one or two examples of Muslim pre-eminence but neglect the weight of history.⁴² In Muir's opinion, too, Islam was incapable of progress or of reform:

The Christian nations may advance in civilization, freedom and morality, in philosophy, in science and the arts but Islam stands still. And thus stationary, so far as the lessons of history avail, it will remain.⁴³

(iv) Forster's critics (and later writers) continued to explain Islam's spread as the result of violence, dismissing the evidence of T W Arnold's 'The Preaching of Islam' (1896). Thus, wrote a later missionary writer 'Islam was spread almost entirely by the cogent argument of the sword'.⁴⁴ Other writers, however, who, like Forster, attempted to accommodate Islam within a sympathetic framework of Christian reflection — amongst them F.D. Maurice, R. Bosworth Smith, Isaac Taylor — advanced arguments which corroborated Forster's conviction regarding Islam's ability to

reform; to prepare the way for Christian faith — and about its spiritual status. Like him, they also attempted to vindicate Muhammad from Christian calumny. Some of these later writers, too, gained the respect and friendship of some Muslim scholars.

Conclusion

For us today, many aspects of Forster's theory, perhaps even his interpretation of the Genesis story which undergirds it, will be of little value. Nevertheless, the fact that, in the process of articulating his theory, he was able to question and challenge many traditional misrepresentations of Islam (and that at an early point in the nineteenth century) yet results in some of the details of his work being more significant than its undergirding theory. For some, though, his biblical key will still merit consideration. Also, even if we reject the more eccentric, even contradictory aspects of his theory, we can still give serious thought to his eschatological vision of Muslims being brought, not by human initiative but by divine intervention into the Kingdom's fold.⁴⁵ Are Muslims amongst Christ's 'other sheep' (John 10:16). If they are, serious questions must be asked about the propriety of efforts to proselytize Muslims.

Perhaps, too, Forster's vision of Islam and Christianity jointly civilizing the world might merit our attention. Dare we postpone some of our theological disputes: 'Muslims, what think ye of Christ', 'Christians, what think ye of Muhammad' in favour of mutual striving to 'do good works', remembering that it is 'unto God to whom we shall all return'? If Muslims have not paid much heed in their relationships with Christians to Qur'an 5:48, then neither have Christians paid much heed to Christ's warning that 'not all those who call me, "Lord, Lord", will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only he who does the will of my father' (Mt. 7:21). Finally, despite the fact that Matthew Arnold bemoaned 'the absence in England of any force of educated, literary and scientific opinion which would make impossible the aberrations of amateurs like Charles Forster', and despite his own grandson's comment that his books were 'worthless', we conclude by suggesting that his 'ingenious speculation'⁴⁶ remains of some value even today. Indeed, said F D Maurice, it was Forster's 'ingenious speculation' which enabled him to try to deal fairly with facts which Christians had often perverted, thereby benefiting the Christian cause.⁴⁷

NOTES

1. See the present writer's Birmingham University PhD thesis, to be published during 1991 as *Victorian Images of Islam* (London: Grey Seal). Also Philip C. Almond, *Heretic and Hero: Muhammad and the Victorians* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989).
2. See *The Times* for 1887 e.g., Oct. 31 p. 13, Nov. 14 p. 4, Nov. 17 p. 13, Dec. 29, p. 2.
3. Charles Forster, *Vindication of The Theory of Mahometanism Unveiled*, British Library, Ref 4504 d14 29.
4. See for positive references, Qur'an 29:46, 3:45, 47, 5:70, 2:62, 5:82. For negative, Qur'an 4:171, 4:157.
5. See Mt. 24:24; Mk. 13:22; 1Jn. 4:1, 2:18, 22, 4:3; Rev. 16:13, Dan. 7, etc.
6. Margaret Phellan, ed., *The Remains of William Phellan* (London: Duncan and Cochran, 1832), 77.
7. C. Forster, *Mahometanism Unveiled*, hereafter referred to as Forster 1829 (London: Duncan and Cochran, 1829), 2:472-473.
8. *Ibid.*, 1:68.
9. *Ibid.*, 1:4.
10. *Ibid.*, 2:464.
11. E. Taylor "Sale's Koran" pp. 1-22 *Retrospective Review*, Vol III No 1, 1821 p. 3 cited in Foster 1829, vol II p. 459.
12. Forster 1829 1:70.
13. *Ibid.*, 2:484.
14. *Ibid.*, 2:420.
15. *Ibid.*, 2:359.
16. *Ibid.*, 2:464.
17. *Ibid.*, 1:294.
18. *Ibid.*, 1:75-76.
19. *Ibid.*, 1:327.
20. *Ibid.*, 1:78.
21. *Ibid.*, 1:75, 80 and see 319.
22. *Ibid.*, 2:523, n371.
23. See E. Blyden, *Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race* (Edinburgh: EUP, 1967), 1st publ. 1887, passim. See G. Knox in *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, 1888, pp. 649-666. See also E. Hulmes, "Edward Wilmot Blyden's Understanding of Christianity and Islam as Instruments of Black Emancipation in West Africa" *I.C.M.R.*, Vol I, 1990, pp. 44-65.
24. Forster 1829 2:469-470.
25. R.B. Smith, *Muhammad and Muhammadanism* (London: Smith & Elder, 1876) xii.
26. Forster 1829 2:329.
27. W. Brugerman, *Genesis Interpretation* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982) 184 ff.
28. Forster 1829 2:259-260.
29. *Ibid.*, 2:379.
30. *Edinburgh Review*, 1830, 33.
31. *Ibid.*, 2:371.
32. *Ibid.*, 2:360.
33. *Edinburgh Review*, 1830, 33.
34. *Ibid.*, p 331.
35. *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, vol viii, 1829, pp 684, 765.
36. *The British Critic* 1830, 41.
37. W. Muir, *The Muhammadan Controversy* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897) 45.
38. *WMM* p 682.
39. Sayyed Ahmad Khan, *Essays on The Life of Muhammad* (London: Trubner, 1878) 8, 17, 26.
40. *The British Critic*, 1830, 9.

41. W. Muir, *The Muhammadan Controversy*, op. cit., 47-48.
42. J.D. Bate *The Claims of Ishmael* (London: W.H. Allen & Co, 1884) 218.
43. W. Muir, *Life of Mahomet* (London: Smith & Elder, 1858-60) 4:601.
44. W. St Clair, *The Religion of The Crescent* (London: SPCK 1916) ix.
45. Foster 1829 Vol II p 372.
46. Arnold cited in Philip C. Almond, *Heretic and Hero* op. cit., 5; Edward Morgan Forster, *Marianne Thornton* (London: Edward Arnold, 1956) 145.
47. F.D. Maurice, *The Religions of the World* (London: MacMillan, 1846) x.