

name (so Gould, 'Mark,' in *Inter. Crit. Com.* p. 62). (2) It is supposed that the name is a variation of *Baalzebub*, and that both the form and the significance have undergone change. As to the form, it is supposed (a) that the final *b* was changed to *l* by conscious perversion, so as to make it mean 'dung,' as *ba'al* (= 'lord') is sometimes changed to *bēsheth* (= 'ashame') (cf. *Esh-baal*, 1 Ch 9<sup>20</sup>, with *Ish-bosheth*, 2 S 2<sup>20</sup>); this perversion transformed 'fly' to 'dung,' or 'filth.' (b) Baudissin (*PRE*<sup>2</sup>) holds that *b* was changed to *l* in popular pronunciation, without intent to change the meaning, as *Bab-el-Mandeb* is sometimes changed to *Bab-el-Mandel*; and (c) Riehm (*HWB*<sup>2</sup>) held that in the time of Christ *Baal-zebub* was Aramaized to כְּלֵי־רִבּוּת (= 'lord of enmity'), and so was the exact equivalent of Διάβολος, or Satan.

As to the significance of *Beal-zeboul* in the NT period different theories have been proposed to account for his evolution from the OT god. Geiger (*Urschrift*, p. 53) thought that the god of the hated Philistines became the representative of heathen power, and so the arch-enemy of Israel. He found confirmation of his view in the fact that, in Aramaic, רִבּוּת would be phonetically transformed into רִבּוּ (= 'hostility'). This theory, though plausible, lacks historical confirmation. The Philistines were not a formidable enemy after the early days of the kingdom. Syrians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans took successively the place of principal enemy, and it is hardly probable that the god of Ekron, who is mentioned in but one narrative of the OT, could have continued to hold this place. Had he done so, he could not have escaped mention.

Another view is expressed in the Talmud, which regards the fly as the representative of evil. In *B'rakhoth*, 61a, it is said: 'The evil spirit lies like a fly at the door of the human heart.' Again, in *B'rakhoth*, 10b, it is said that the Shunammite woman (2 K 4<sup>1</sup> ff.) perceived that Eliha was a man of God, because no fly crossed his table. This estimate of the fly goes back to the *Mishna*, for in *Aboth*, 5<sup>2</sup>, we read: 'A fly, being an impure thing, was never seen in the slaughter-house of the temple.' In reality the revival of interest in *Baal-zebub* in the NT was due to literary causes. Cheyne has pointed out that Lk 9<sup>34</sup> shows that in the time of Christ the narrative of 2 K 1 possessed a strange fascination for people. Probably both the hostility to *Baal-zebub* expressed in that narrative and the perversion of his name into the Aramaic כְּלֵי־רִבּוּת (= 'lord of hostility') helped this literary interest to make *Beal-zebub* a synonym of Satan. As the name meant 'lord of flies,' this would be sufficient to call into existence the Talmudic conception that the fly is a kind of imp, especially as Lv 11 and Dt 14 imply that it was to be reckoned among unclean flying things.

The change of *zebub* to *zeboul* in the NT was, no doubt, due to conscious perversion. In addition to the analogy of *bēsheth*, cited above, the Talmud (*'Abōdā sārā*, 18b, cf. Dalman, *Aram. Gram.* p. 137) shows that כְּלֵי as applied to the sacrifices of the heathen was changed to רִבּוּת ('dung').

LITERATURE.—Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ* on Mt 12<sup>24</sup>, Lk 11<sup>25</sup>; Movers, *Pflanzler*, 1841, l. 200 ff.; Geiger, *Urschrift*, Breslau, 1867, p. 53; Riehm, *HWB*<sup>2</sup>; Baudissin, *PRE*<sup>2</sup>; Winckler, *Geographie Israels*, 1896-1900, l. 223, 225; Peake, in Hastings' *DBI* l. 211<sup>b</sup>; Cheyne, *EBI*, col. 407 ff.; Kohler, *JH* ii. 629<sup>b</sup>; Kittel, 'Könige,' in Nowack's *Handbuchcommentar*, p. 123; Allen, 'Matthew' (Edin. 1907), in *Inter. Crit. Comm.* p. 107; Gould, 'Mark,' 1896 (ib.), p. 62; Plummer, 'Lukæ,' 1896 (ib.), p. 201.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

**BĀB, BĀBIS.**—*Bāb* (باب) = 'Gate' in Arabic) was the title first assumed by Mirzā 'Alī Muḥammad, a young Sayyid of Shirās, who in A.H. 1290 (= A.D. 1844) began to preach a new religion,

which spread through Persia with extraordinary rapidity, and, in spite of violent persecutions, culminating in the execution of the founder on July 9, 1850, and of some twenty-eight of his principal disciples on September 15, 1852, has continued to gain strength until the present day. Both the history and the doctrines of this religion present so many remarkable features, that the subject has, almost from the first, attracted a great deal of attention, not only in the East but in Europe, and latterly in America; and the literature dealing with it, even in European languages, is very extensive; while the Arabic and Persian writings, manuscript, lithographed and printed, connected with it are so numerous and, in some cases, so voluminous, that it would hardly be possible for the most industrious student to read in their entirety even those which are accessible in half a dozen of the best-known collections in Europe. An exhaustive treatment of the subject is therefore impossible, and we must content ourselves with a sketch of the most important outlines of the history, doctrines, and literature of the religion in question.

1. **Antecedents.**—In order to understand properly the origins and developments of Bābī doctrine, it is, of course, essential to have a fair knowledge of Islām, and especially of that form of Islām (the doctrine of the *Ithnā 'ashariyya* division of the Shi'a, or 'Sect of the Twelve' Imāms), of which Persia has from the earliest Muhammadan times been the stronghold, and which, since the 16th cent. of our era, has been the State religion of that kingdom. Information on this subject must be sought elsewhere in this Encyclopædia under the appropriate headings; but, even for the most elementary comprehension of the early Bābī doctrine, it is essential to grasp the Shi'ite doctrine of the Imāmate, and especially the Messianic teaching concerning the Twelfth Imām, or Imām Mahdī.

According to the Shi'ite view, the prophet Muḥammad appointed to succeed him, as the spiritual head of Islām, his cousin 'Alī ibn Abī Tālib, who, being married to Fātima, was also his son-in-law. 'Alī's rights were, however, usurped in turn by Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān; and though he was elected Khalifa after 'Uthmān's death, he was assassinated after a brief and troubled reign of five years (A.D. 656-661). His eldest son, al-Ḥasan, the second Imām, abdicated five or six months after his father's death in favour of the Umayyad Mu'āwiya. His younger son, al-Ḥusayn, the third Imām, attempted to regain his temporal rights by a rash revolt against the Umayyads, but perished on the fatal field of Karbalā (Kerbala) on Muḥarram 10, A.H. 61 (Oct. 10, A.D. 680), a day still celebrated with wailing and mourning in all Shi'ite communities, especially in Persia. The nine remaining Imāms all lived in more or less dread of the Umayyad, and afterwards of the 'Abbāsīd khalifas, and many of them died by poison or other violent means. They were all descended from al-Ḥusayn, and, according to the popular belief, from a daughter of Yazdigird III., the last Sāsānian king, who was taken captive by the Arabs after the battle of Qādisiyya, and given in marriage to al-Ḥusayn. This belief, which was prevalent at least as early as the 3rd cent. of the Hijra, since it is mentioned by the historian al-Ya'qūbī (ed. Houtsma, ii. 293, 363), undoubtedly explains, as remarked by Gobineau,\* the affection in which the Imāms are held in Persia, since they are regarded as the direct descendants not only of the prophet Muḥammad, but also of the old royal house of Sāsān. The Divine Right of the Imāms to the temporal supremacy of which they had been unjustly deprived, and the absolute dependence

\* *Rel. et Philos. dans l'Asie Centrale* (ed. 1866), p. 275.

of the faithful on the spiritual guidance of the 'Imām of the Age,' thus became the two most characteristic and essential dogmas of all the various Shi'ite sects. 'Whosoever dies,' says a well-known Shi'ite tradition, 'without recognizing the Imām of his time, dies the death of a pagan.'

Now, according to the 'Sect of the Twelve,' the Twelfth Imām, or Imām Mahdī, was the last of the series. But since, according to their belief, the world cannot do without an Imām, and since this last Imām, who succeeded his father in A.H. 280 (=A.D. 873-4), disappeared from mortal ken in A.H. 329 (=A.D. 940-1), it is held that he never died, but is still living in the mysterious city of Jābulqā, or Jābulā, surrounded by a band of faithful disciples, and that at the end of time he will issue forth and 'fill the earth with justice after it has been filled with iniquity.' This Messianic Advent is ever present in the mind of the Persian Shi'ite, who, when he has occasion to mention the Twelfth Imām, or Imām Mahdī (also entitled *Hujjatullāh*, 'the Proof of God,' *Baqiyatullāh*, 'the Remnant of God,' *Sāhibu'z-Zamān*, 'the Lord of the Age,' and *Qā'imū 'Alī Muhammad*, 'He who shall arise out of the house of Muḥammad'),

always adds the formula *عجل الله فرجه* ('May God hasten his glad Advent!').

Now, in connexion with Bābī doctrine, it is to be noticed first of all that the 'Manifestation' (ظهور) of Mirzā 'Alī Muḥammad the Bāb took place, as already said, in A.H. 1280, exactly a thousand years after the succession of the Imām Mahdī to the Imāmate, or, in other words, at the completion of a millennium of 'Occultation' (غيبت). For the Imām Mahdī, according to the Shi'ite belief, appeared in public once only, on his accession, when he performed the funeral service over his father, after which he became invisible to the bulk of his followers. During the first 69 years of the millennium of 'Occultation,' however, his instructions and directions were communicated to his followers, the Shi'a, through four successive intermediaries, each of whom bore the title of *Bāb*, or 'Gate.'\* This period is known as 'the Minor

Occultation' (غيبت صغرى). In A.H. 329, however, this series of 'Gates,' or channels of communication between the Imām and his followers, came to an end, and such communication became impossible. This later and longer period (which, according to the Bābī view, lasted from A.H. 329 to A.H. 1280) is known as 'the Major Occultation'

(غيبت كبرى).

It was in this sense, then, that Mirzā 'Alī Muḥammad, at the beginning of his career, declared himself to be the *Bāb*, or 'Gate,' viz., the gate whereby communication, closed since the end of the 'Minor Occultation,' was re-opened between the Hidden Imām and his faithful followers. He did not invent this term, nor was he even the first to revive it, for it was used in the same sense by ash-Shalmaghānī, a Messiah of the 10th cent. of our era, and by others.† So far as recent times are concerned, however, it was the Shaykhī school, founded by Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsā'ī (b. A.D. 1733, d. A.D. 1826) which revived the idea that amongst the faithful followers of the Twelfth

\* For their names, and a fuller account of the whole matter, see the present writer's tr. of the *Traveller's Narrative*, ii. 296 ff.

† For a full discussion of this matter, see the note on the meaning of the title 'Bāb' in the tr. of the *Traveller's Narrative*, ii. 226-234.

Imām there must always exist one, whom they entitled *Shi'a-i-Kāmil* (شيعه كامل), 'the Perfect Shi'ite,' who was in direct spiritual communication with him. Neither Shaykh Aḥmad nor his successor Sayyid Kāzīm of Rasht (d. A.D. 1843-1844) made use of the title 'Bāb,' but their conception of 'the Perfect Shi'ite' was practically identical with the idea connoted by that title. To this Shaykhī school, or sect, belonged not only Mirzā 'Alī Muḥammad himself, but Mullā Ḥusayn of Bushrawayh, Qurratū'l-'Ayn, and many others of his first and most zealous disciples. On the death of Sayyid Kāzīm his followers were naturally impelled by their doctrine concerning 'the Perfect Shi'ite' to seek his successor. There were two claimants, Mirzā 'Alī Muḥammad, who on May 23, 1844,\* within a short time of Sayyid Kāzīm's death, announced himself to be the 'Bāb,' and whose followers were consequently called 'Bābis'; and Ḥājji Muḥammad Karīm Khān, a scion of the Qājār Royal Family, who was recognized, and whose descendants are still recognized, by the conservative or stationary Shaykhīs as their spiritual head. It is in the teachings of the Shaykhī school, therefore, that the immediate origins of early Bābī doctrine must be sought; but no European scholar has yet made a critical study of the works and doctrines of Shaykh Aḥmad and Sayyid Kāzīm. Those who desire somewhat fuller information on this subject may be referred to the *Traveller's Narrative*, ii. 234-244. A full and critical study of the Shaykhī doctrines would, however, form an indispensable preliminary to such a philosophical history of the Bābis as must some day be written.

2. History of the movement during the life of the founder. — The first period of Bābī history begins with the 'Manifestation' on May 23, 1844, and ends with the martyrdom of the Bāb at Tabriz on July 9, 1850. The detailed history of these six years will be found in the translations of the *Traveller's Narrative* (Camb. 1891) and the *New History of . . . the Bāb* (Camb. 1893), while a fairly complete bibliography of earlier works on the subject, both European and Oriental, is given in the former work (ii. 173-211). In the *JRAS* for 1889 (vol. xxi. new ser. pp. 485-526 and 881-1009) are also discussed critically various matters connected with both the history and the doctrines of the sect. Of the three chief histories composed in Persian by members of the sect, the earliest and most instructive is that written between 1850 and 1852 by Ḥājji Mirzā Jānī of Kāshān, who must have finished it only a little while before he was put to death among the twenty-eight Bābis who suffered martyrdom at Tīhrān (Teheran) on September 15, 1852. Of this work the only complete manuscript, so far as the present writer can ascertain, which existed (until he caused it to be transcribed for himself) was *Suppl. Pers.* 1071 in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, one of the MSS brought from Persia by M. le Comte de Gobineau, the talented author of *Les Religions et les philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale*. Another MS in the same collection (*Suppl. Pers.* 1070) contains the first third of

it, while the *New History* (تاريخ جديد) is a recension made (about A.D. 1875-1880) by Mirzā Ḥusayn of Hamadān, containing many additions, but also remarkable for some extremely important omissions and alterations. There is thus sufficient material for an edition of this most important document, which the present writer is now (1908) printing. The *Traveller's Narrative*, the third of the three principal systematic accounts compiled by the

\* This date, and even the exact hour of his 'Manifestation,' is given by the Bāb in two passages of the Persian *Bayān* (Wāḥid ii. 7, and vi. 13). See *Trav. Narr.* ii. 218-226.

Bābis of their history, is not only later, but deals less with the early history of the movement than with the biography and writings of Bahā'u'llāh, to whose son 'Abbās Efendi (also called 'Abdu'l-Bahā) its authorship is ascribed. The accounts of Bābi history given by Muhammadan writers (notably by the Lisānu'l-Mulk in the *Nāsikhū't-Tawārikh* and by Riżā-quli-Khān in his supplement to the *Rawzatū's-Safā*) must, as a rule, be used with great caution, but exception must be made in favour of the late Sayyid Jamālu'd-Dīn al-Afghān's article on the Bābis in Buṭrusu'l-Bustāni's Arabic encyclopædia the *Dā'iratu'l-Ma'ārif* (Beirut, 1881), and of a more recent history compiled in Arabic by a Persian doctor named Za'imu'd-Dawla, and published at Cairo in A.H. 1321 (A.D. 1903-4),\* from both of which, in spite of the prejudice against the Bābis which they display, important facts may be gleaned.

A very brief summary of the events of this first period (A.D. 1844-1850) is all that can be given here. The Bāb himself, who was only twenty-four years old at the time of his 'Manifestation,'† and not thirty when he suffered martyrdom, was a captive in the hands of his enemies during the greater portion of his brief career, first at Shirāz (August-September 1845-March 1846), then at Isfahān (March 1846-March 1847), then at Māktū near Urumiyya, and, for the last six months of his life, at the neighbouring castle of Chihriq. He enjoyed the greatest freedom at Isfahān, where the governor, Miñūchihir Khān, a Georgian eunuch, treated him with consideration and even favour; but he was able to continue his writings and to correspond with, and even receive, his followers during the greater part of his captivity, save, perhaps, the last portion. He himself, however, took no part in the bloody battles which presently broke out between his followers and their Muslim antagonists. Of these armed risings of the Bābis the chief were in Māzandarān, at Shaykh Ṭabarsī near Bārfurūsh, under the leadership of Mullā Ḥusayn of Bushrawayh and Ḥājji Mullā Muḥammad 'Alī of Bārfurūsh (autumn of 1848 to summer of 1849); at Zanjan, under Mullā Muḥammad 'Alī Zanjāni (May-December 1850); and at Yazd and Nīriz, under Aghā Sayyid Yahyā (summer of 1850), while a second rising at Nīriz seems to have occurred in 1852.‡ Amongst other events of this period to which the Bābis attach special importance, and of which they have preserved detailed accounts, is the martyrdom of 'the Seven Martyrs' at Tīhrān, which also took place in the summer of 1850.§ During the later period of his career Mirzā 'Alī Muḥammad discarded the title of 'Bāb' (which he conferred on one of his disciples) and announced that he was the *Qā'im*, or expected Imām, and even more than this, the *Nuqṭa* (نقطه), or 'Point.' It is by this title (*Ḥaṣrat-i-Nuqṭa-i-Ulā*, 'His Holiness the First Point'), or by that of *Ḥaṣrat-i-Rabbiyu'l-A'lā*, 'His Holiness my Lord Most High,' that he is generally spoken of by his followers, though latterly the Bahā'is, desiring to represent him as a mere forerunner of Bahā'u'llāh—a sort of John the Baptist—seem to have abandoned the use of these later and higher titles. But from the Bāb's own later writings, such as the Persian *Bayān*, as well as from what is said by Mirzā Jāni and other contemporary writers, it is clear that he was regarded as a divine being, and that in a very full sense, as will be shown when the doctrines

of the Bābis are discussed, when the term 'Point' (*Nuqṭa*) will also be explained. The circumstances attending the execution of the Bāb at Tabriz on July 9, 1850, and especially his strange escape from the first volley fired at him,\* are fully recorded in the histories already mentioned, and need not be recapitulated here. His body, after being exposed for several days, was recovered by his disciples, together with that of his fellow-martyr Mirzā Muḥammad 'Alī of Tabriz, wrapped in white silk, placed in a coffin, and concealed for some seventeen years in a little shrine called Imām-zāda-i-Ma'sūm between Tīhrān and Ribāṭ-Karim. At a later date it was transferred to 'Akkā (St. Jean d'Acree) by order of Bahā'u'llāh, where it was placed in a shrine specially built for that purpose.†

3. Period of *Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel's* supremacy (A.D. 1850-1868).—Before his death the Bāb had nominated as his successor a lad named Mirzā Yahyā, son of Mirzā Buzurg of Nūr, and half-brother of the afterwards more famous Mirzā Ḥusayn 'Alī, better known as Bahā'u'llāh. Mirzā Yahyā was, according to Mirzā Jāni, only 14 years old at the time of the Bāb's 'Manifestation,' so that he must have been born about A.H. 1246 (=A.D. 1830-1831). His mother died when he was a child, and he was brought up by his step-mother, the mother of his elder half-brother Bahā'u'llāh, who was about 13 years his senior.‡ Mirzā Jāni, our oldest, best, and most unprejudiced authority (since he was killed in 1852, long before the schism between the Ezelis and Bahā'is took place) reports Bahā'u'llāh as saying that he did not then know how high a position Mirzā Yahyā was destined to occupy. At the early age of 15, about a year after the 'Manifestation,' he was so attracted by what he heard of the Bāb and read of his writings, that he set off for Khurāsān and Māzandarān, met Janāb-i-Quddūs (i.e. Mullā Muḥammad 'Alī of Bārfurūsh) and Qurratu'l-'Ayn, and, with Bahā'u'llāh, attempted to join the Bābis who were besieged at Shaykh Ṭabarsī, but was prevented by the governor of Amul. In the fifth year of the 'Manifestation' (A.H. 1265=A.D. 1849), shortly after the fall of Shaykh Ṭabarsī, the Bāb, having heard of Mirzā Yahyā's youth, zeal, and devotion, declared that in him was fulfilled the sign of the Fifth Year given in the tradition of Kumayl, 'A Light shining from the Dawn of Eternity,' conferred on him the title *Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel* ('the Dawn of Eternity'), sent him his own rings and other personal possessions, authorized him, at such time as he should see fit, to add 8 *wāḥids* (or 'Unities' of 19 chapters each) to the *Bayān*, and appointed him his successor. On the Bāb's death, therefore, *Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel*, as we shall now continue to call him, was recognized with practical unanimity by the Bābis as their spiritual head; but, owing to his youth and the secluded life which he adopted, the practical conduct of the affairs of the Bābi community devolved chiefly on his elder half-brother Bahā'u'llāh, or Janāb-i-Bahā, as he is called by Mirzā Jāni. There seem to have been some rival claimants, notably Mirzā Asadu'llāh of Tabriz, entitled 'Dayyān,' who was, according to Gobineau (p. 277 f.), drowned in the Shaṭṭu'l-'Arab by some of the Bābis who wished to put an end to his pretensions; and, according to Mirzā Jāni, certain other persons, such as 'the Indian believer' Sayyid Baṣīr, Aghā Muḥammad Karāwi, and a young confectioner entitled 'Dhabīḥ' (ذبح)

\* This work is entitled *Miftāḥu Bābi'l-Abwāb* ('the Key of the Gate of Gates').

† The most reliable evidence points to October 9, 1820, as the date of his birth. Mirzā Ḥusayn 'Alī, afterwards known as Bahā'u'llāh, was a year or two older (see *Trav. Narr.* ii. 218 ff.).

‡ See *Trav. Narr.* ii. 253-261.

§ *Id.* ii. 211-218.

\* See, however, the *New History*, p. 301, n. 1 *ad cala.*, which contains a correction of a detail given by Gobineau.

† See the *Traveller's Narrative*, ii. 46, and n. 1 *ad cala.*

‡ The date of Bahā'u'llāh's birth is given in Nabli's rhymed chronicle as 2 Muḥarram, A.H. 1238 (=November 12, 1817). See *JRAS*, 1889, p. 521.

مَنَاز), claimed to be theophanies or Divine Manifestations.\* Mirzā Jāni actually exulted in this state of things, declaring that just as the tree which bears most fruit is the most perfect, so the religion which produces most divine or quasi-Divine Manifestations thereby shows its superiority to other creeds. But none of these persons appears to have had any considerable following, and for some time Şubḥ-i-Ezel enjoyed, nominally at least, an uncontested supremacy.

For two years (July 1850–August 1852) little was heard of the Bābis; but on August 15, 1852, three or four adherents of the sect made an attempt on the life of Nāṣirū'd-Dīn Shāh as he was leaving his palace at Niyāvarān to go out hunting. The attempt, which appears to have had no countenance from the leaders of the Bābis, failed, but led to the fierce persecution of the sect, of whom some twenty-eight prominent members, including the beautiful poetess Qurratu'l-'Ayn, Mullā Shaykh 'Alī, called 'Janāb-i-'Aẓīm,' Āghā Sayyid Ḥusayn of Yazd the Bāb's secretary Sulaymān Khān, and our historian Ḥājjī Mirzā Jāni, were among the most conspicuous victims. The object being to make all classes participators in their blood, the doomed Bābis were divided among the different classes and gilds, beginning with the *'ulamā*, the princes of the Royal House, and the different Government offices, and ending with the royal pages and students of the *Dārū'l-Funūn*, one victim being assigned to each, and a rivalry in cruelty was thus produced which made that day, Wednesday, September 15, 1852, equally memorable and horrible to all who witnessed it. The fortitude of the Bābi martyrs, and especially the death-ecstasy of Sulaymān Khān, produced a profound impression, and, as Gobineau says, probably did more to win converts to the new faith than all the previous propaganda.†

Bahā'u'llāh and Şubḥ-i-Ezel both escaped death on this occasion, though the former was arrested,‡ and a price was set on the apprehension of the latter.§ Both ultimately escaped to Baghdad, where they arrived about the end of 1852, Bahā'u'llāh, who was imprisoned in Tīhrān for four months, arriving soon after his half-brother.¶ For the next eleven or twelve years (1853–1864) Baghdad was the headquarters of the sect, of which Şubḥ-i-Ezel continued to be the ostensible head, and is even implicitly acknowledged as such by Bahā'u'llāh in the *Iqān*, composed by him in 1861–1862. In the *Traveller's Narrative* (ii. 54 ff., especially pp. 55 and 62–63 of the translation), which contains the official Bahā'i version of these transactions, it is implied that the nomination of Şubḥ-i-Ezel was a mere blind, that Bahā'u'llāh was from the first intended, and that his 'Manifestation' took place in A.H. 1269 (=A.D. 1853), which the Bābis call the year of 'after a while' (سنة بعد حين), for حين, 'while,' = 8 + 10 + 50 = 68, and the year 'after' is '69). Ostensibly, however, his claim to be 'He whom God shall manifest' dates from A.H. 1263 (A.D. 1866–1867), the end of the Adrianople period, which agrees with Nabil's statement ¶ that he was fifty years old when he thus manifested his true nature, for he was born in A.H. 1233 (=A.D. 1817).

\* Another such claimant, according to Şubḥ-i-Ezel, was Husayn of Milān, who perished in the persecution of 1852 (see the *Traveller's Narrative*, ii. 230 f.), while two other claimants, Sayyid Husayn of Hindiyān and Shaykh Imā'īl, are mentioned (see also p. 267 f. of the same, where other pretenders are named).

† For further details see the *Traveller's Narrative*, ii. 323–324.

‡ *Ib.* pp. 51–53 and 227.

§ *Ib.* p. 274 f.

¶ See *J.R.A.S.* 1889, pp. 945–948.

¶ *J.R.A.S.* 1889, pp. 964 and 963, verso 10.

The records of the Baghdad period are comparatively scanty, but the propaganda went steadily on, though conducted with a caution and prudence foreign to the early days of the sect. About a year after his arrival at Baghdad, Bahā'u'llāh retired alone for two years into the highlands of Turkish Kurdistan, living chiefly at a place called Sarkaldū, and occasionally visiting Sulaymāniyya.\* By the Bahā'is this retirement is regarded as a kind of preparation and purification; by the Ezelis, as due to annoyance at the opposition which he encountered in his plans from several prominent Bābis of the old school. Şubḥ-i-Ezel, a man of modest and retiring disposition, seems to have lived in great seclusion both before and after this event, and the disputes which appear to have occurred at this period seem to have been chiefly between Bahā'u'llāh and his adherents on the one hand, and Mullā Muḥammad Ja'far of Nirāq, Mullā Rajab 'Alī *Qahūr*, Sayyid Muḥammad of Isfahān, Sayyid Jawād of Kerbelā and the like on the other. Ultimately, owing to the hostility of the Persian Consul at Baghdad, Mirzā Buzurg Khān of Qazwīn, and Mirzā Ḥusayn Khān *Mu-shīrū'd-Dawla*, the Persian Ambassador at Constantinople, the Turkish government was induced to expel the Bābis from Baghdad, where their proximity to the Persian frontier, and to the Shi'ite shrines of Kerbelā and Najaf, afforded them great opportunities of proselytizing among their countrymen. This took place in the spring or early summer of 1864. They were first taken to Constantinople, where they remained for four months, and thence banished to Adrianople, where they arrived about the end of the year above mentioned. There they remained for nearly four years (Dec. 1864–August 1868), and there it was that in A.H. 1263 (A.D. 1866–67) Bahā'u'llāh publicly announced that he was 'He whom God shall manifest,' foretold by the Bāb, and called on all the Bābis to recognize him as such, and to pay their allegiance to him, not merely as the Bāb's successor, but as him of whose Advent the Bāb was a mere herald and forerunner.

This announcement, which naturally convulsed the whole Bābi community, was gradually accepted by the majority, but was strenuously opposed not only by Şubḥ-i-Ezel but by a considerable number of prominent Bābis, including more than one of the original 18 disciples of the Bāb known as the

'Letters of the Living' (حروف حي). The strife waxed fierce; several persons were killed; † charges of attempted poisoning were hurled backwards and forwards between the two half-brothers; ‡ and at length the Turkish government again intervened and divided the two rival factions, sending Şubḥ-i-Ezel with his family to Famagusta in Cyprus, and Bahā'u'llāh with his family and a number of his followers to 'Akkā in Syria, which places they respectively reached about the end of August 1868. To check their activities, however, and provide the government with the services of a band of unpaid informers, they caused four Bahā'is with their families and dependents to accompany Şubḥ-i-Ezel, and four of the Ezelis to accompany Bahā'u'llāh. All of the latter were killed, one before they left Adrianople, and the other three soon after their arrival at 'Akkā. Of the Bahā'is at Famagusta, one died in 1871 and one in 1872, while the third escaped to Syria in 1870. The fourth, Mushkin Qalam, a celebrated calligraphist, remained in Cyprus for some time after the British occupation, but finally left on

\* *Traveller's Narr.* ii. 64 f., 256 f. Nabil says that he was 39 years of age when he withdrew, and 40 when he returned.

† See *Traveller's Narrative*, ii. 363–364.

‡ *Ib.* pp. 350 f. and 365–369.

Sept. 14, 1896, for 'Akkā, where the present writer met him in April 1890. The Famagusta exiles numbered in all thirty persons, of whom full particulars are preserved, in consequence of the allowances to which they are entitled, in the State Papers of the Island government, which are epitomized in the *Traveller's Narrative* (ii. 376-389). Subh-i-Ezel and some of his family are still (1908) residing at Famagusta, while descendants of some of the other exiles are also living in the island in various capacities. Concerning those banished to 'Akkā the same detailed information is not available, but their number appears to have considerably exceeded that of the Ezeliā.

4. Period of Bahā'u'llāh's supremacy (A.D. 1868-1892).—The schism which divided the Bābīs into the two sects of Bahā'īs and Ezeliā, though its beginnings go back to the earlier period of which we have just spoken, now became formal and final, and henceforth we have to consider two opposed centres of Bābī doctrine, 'Akkā in Syria, and Famagusta in Cyprus. Although there is much to be urged in favour of Subh-i-Ezel's position, it cannot be denied that practically his influence is very slight and his followers very few. When the present writer visited him in 1890, apart from his own family only one of his adherents, an old man named 'Abdu'l-Aḥad, whose father was among the Bābīs who perished at Zanjan in 1850,\* was resident at Famagusta. In Persia very few Ezeliā were met, and those chiefly at Kirmān. One of Subh-i-Ezel's sons-in-law, Shaykh Ahmad of Kirmān, was a man of considerable talent and learning, but he was put to death at Tabriz in 1896 on a charge of complicity in the assassination of Nāṣiru'd-Dīn Shāh in May of that year. He was the author of the *Ḥashī Bihisht*, a lengthy treatise on the philosophy, doctrine, and history of the Bābī religion, from the polemical portions of which, directed against Bahā'u'llāh, extracts are cited in the *Traveller's Narrative* (ii. 351-378). Subh-i-Ezel is still (July 1908) alive and well; but, interesting as he is historically and personally, he can no longer be reckoned a force in the world, though as a source of information about the early history and doctrines of the Bābīs he is without a rival, and speaks with a freedom and frankness not to be found at 'Akkā, where policy and 'the expediency of the time' necessarily play a much larger part. Subh-i-Ezel may, in short, in his island seclusion, be compared to Napoleon I. in St. Helena—a man who has played a great rôle in stirring events and times, but whose active life and power to mould men's thoughts and deeds have passed away. His writings are numerous, but little known or read outside his immediate circle, and no one has yet devoted himself to the study of the large collection of those acquired by the British Museum in recent years, through the instrumentality of Mr. C. Delaval Cobham, lately Commissioner at Larnaca in Cyprus. Of Bābīism as a living force, affecting both East and West, 'Akkā has been the centre for the last forty years, and seems likely so to remain; and thither we must now divert our attention.

The claim of Bahā'u'llāh to be a new and transcendent 'Manifestation' of God steadily and rapidly gained ground among the Bābīs, and involved a complete re-construction of the earlier Bābī conceptions. For if, as Bahā'u'llāh declared, the Bāb was a mere precursor and harbinger of his advent, then, in the blaze of light of the New Day, the candle lit by Mirzā 'Alī Muḥammad ceased to merit attention, and, indeed, became invisible. The Bahā'īs, as a rule, show a marked disinclina-

tion to talk about the Bāb or his early disciples, or to discuss his life or doctrines, or to place his writings in the hands of the inquirer, while latterly they have avoided calling themselves Bābīs, preferring to be known simply as Bahā'īs. The Bāb's doctrines were, in their eyes, only preparatory, and his ordinances only provisional, and Bahā'u'llāh was entitled to modify or abrogate them as seemed good to him. The real question at issue between Ezel and Bahā' was admirably described by Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, lately British Minister at Tih-rān, as entirely similar to that which divided the respective followers of St. Peter and St. Paul in the early days of the Christian Church—the question, namely, whether Christianity was to be a Jewish sect or a new World-religion. The old Bābī doctrine, continued unchanged by the Ezeliā, was in its essence Shi'ite; for, though the Bābīs put themselves outside the pale of Islām by rejecting the finality of the Qur'ān and the mission of Muḥammad, as well as by many other innovations both in doctrine and practice, their whole thought is deeply tinged with Shi'ite conceptions, shown, for example, even by their heterodox views as to the 'return to the life of the world' of the Prophet Muḥammad, his daughter Fātima, and the Twelve Imāms, and their identification of their own protagonists with one or other of these holy personages.

A wholly different spirit pervades the teachings of Bahā'. His religion is more practical, his teaching more ethical and less mystical and metaphysical, and his appeal is to all men, not especially to Shi'ite Muḥammadans. His attitude towards the Shāh and the Persian government is, moreover, much more conciliatory, as is well seen in the celebrated Epistle to the King of Persia (*Lash-i-Sulṭān*) which he addressed to Nāṣiru'd-Dīn Shāh soon after his arrival at 'Akkā.\* This letter, of which a translation will be found in the *Traveller's Narrative* (ii. 108-151 and 390-400), was sent by the hand of a young Bahā'ī called Mirzā Badī', who succeeded in carrying out his instructions and delivered it in person to the Shāh, for which boldness he was tortured and put to death.† At the same time Bahā'u'llāh addressed other letters (called by the Bahā'īs *Alwāḥ-i-Salṭān*, 'Epistles to the Kings') to several other rulers, including Queen Victoria, the Tsar of Russia, Napoleon III., and the Pope.‡

For a complete history of the sect during this period full materials are not available, but generally speaking it may be said to consist, so far as 'Akkā itself is concerned, of alternations of greater and less strict supervision of the exiles by the Ottoman government, gradual development of organization and propaganda, and the arrival and departure of innumerable pilgrims, mostly Persians, but, since the successful propaganda in the United States, including a good many Americans. In Persia, where the religion naturally counts most of its adherents, there have been sporadic persecutions, to which the Bahā'īs, in accordance with Bahā' command, 'It is better that you should be killed than that you should kill,' have patiently submitted. Among these persecutions may be especially mentioned, since the execution of Mirzā Badī' in July 1869, the following. About 1880 two Sayyids of Isfahān, now known to their co-religionists as *Sulṭānu'sh-Shuhadā* ('the King of Martyrs'), and *Mahbūbu'sh-Shuhadā* ('the Beloved of Martyrs'), were put to death by the clergy of that city.§ In October 1888, Aghā Mirzā Ashraf of Abāda was put to death in the same

\* Probably in the summer of 1860 (see *Trav. Narr.* ii. 202).

† See *Trav. Narr.* ii. 102-106.

‡ Extracts from these, translated into English, will be found in *J.R.A.S.* 1880, pp. 963-972.

§ See *J.R.A.S.* 1880, pp. 480-492; *Trav. Narr.* ii. 166-169.

\* In *J.R.A.S.* 1897, pp. 761-837, the present writer published a tr. of a memoir on the insurrection at Zanjan, written for him by this old man.

place, and his body mutilated and burned.\* In the summer of the following year, seven or eight Babis were put to death with great cruelty, at the instigation of Aghā-yi-Najafi, in the villages of Si-dih and Najaf-ābād near Iṣfahān.† On Sept. 8, 1889, a prominent Bahā'i named Ḥajji Muḥammad Rizā of Iṣfahān was stabbed to death in broad daylight in one of the chief thoroughfares of 'Ishq-ābād (Askabād) by two Shi'ite *fidā'is* sent from Mashhad for that purpose. The assassins were sentenced to death by the Russian military tribunal before which they were tried, but this sentence was commuted to one of hard labour for life. This was the first time in the fifty years during which the sect had existed that condign punishment had been inflicted on any of their persecutors; their rejoicings were proportionately great, and Bahā'u'llāh made the event the occasion of two revelations in which Russian justice was highly extolled,‡ and Bahā's followers were enjoined not to forget it. In May 1891 there was a persecution of Babis at Yazd, in which seven of them were brutally killed (on May 18), while another, an old man, was secretly put to death a few days later. In the summer of 1903 there was another fierce persecution in the same town, of the horrors of which some account is given by Napier Malcolm in his *Five Years in a Persian Town* (Lond. 1905).

One of the most interesting phenomena in the recent history of the Bahā'is has been the propaganda carried on with considerable success in America. This appears to have been begun by a Syrian convert to Bahāism named Ibrāhīm George Khayru'llāh, who is the author of many English works on the subject, and is married to an English wife. He seems first to have lectured on the subject at Chicago about 1892, for in the Preface to his book, *Bahā'u'llāh* (Chicago, 1900), he says (p. vii.) that he 'began to preach the fulfilment of the truth which Christ and the Prophets foretold over seven years ago.'§ Born in Mount Lebanon, he lived twenty-one years in Cairo, and was then converted to the Bahā'i doctrine by a certain 'Abdu'l-Karīm of Tīhrān. Afterwards he settled in America and became naturalized as a citizen of the United States. The propaganda which he inaugurated seems to have been at its height in 1897 and 1898, and there is now a community of several thousand American Bahā'is, a considerable American literature on the subject, and a certain amount of actual intercourse between America and the headquarters of the religion at 'Akkā. More will be said on this subject presently.

5. From the death of Bahā'u'llāh until the present day (A.D. 1892-1908).—Bahā'u'llāh died on May 16, 1892, leaving four sons and three daughters. Differences as to the succession arose between the two elder sons, 'Abbās Efendi (also called 'Abdu'l-Bahā, 'the Servant of Bahā,' and *Ghuṣn-i-A'zam*, 'the Most Mighty Branch') and Mirzā Muḥammad 'Alī (called *Ghuṣn-i-Akbar*, 'the Most Great Branch'). Bahā'u'llāh left a testament, entitled *Kitābu' Ahdi*, which was published, with some introductory remarks and a Russian tr., by Lieut. Tumanski in the *Zapiski* of the Oriental Section of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society, viii. (1892). In this important document he says:

'God's injunction is that the Branches (*Aghān*), and Twigs

\* See *Trav. Narr.* ii. 169 and 400-406.

† *Id.* i. 406-410.

‡ See *Trav. Narr.* ii. 411 f. The texts of the revelations were published by Baron Rosen on pp. 247-250 of *Collections Scientifiques de l'Institut des Langues Orientales*, vi. (St. Petersburg, 1891).

§ It was at the 'Parliament of Religions,' held at Chicago in 1893, that the Bahā'i doctrines first began to arouse considerable attention in America.

(*Afnān*)\* and Kinsfolk† (*Muntasabīn*) should all look to the Most Mighty Branch (*Ghuṣn-i-A'zam*, i.e. 'Abbās Efendi). Look at what We have revealed in my (*zio*) Most Holy Book (*Kitāb-i-Aqdas*): "When the Ocean of Union ebbs, and the Book of the Beginning and the Conclusion is finished, then turn to Him whom God intendeth (*man arādahu'llāh*), who is derived from this Ancient Stock." He who is meant by this blessed verse is the Most Mighty Branch: thus have we made clear the command as an act of grace on our part. Verily, I am the Bountiful, the Gracious. God hath determined the position of the Most Great Branch (*Ghuṣn-i-Akbar*, i.e. Mirzā Muḥammad 'Alī); after his position. Verily, He is the Commanding, the Wise. Verily, we have chosen the Most Great after the Most Mighty, a command on the part of One All-knowing and Wise. . . . Say, O Servants! Do not make the means of order a means of disorder, nor an instrument for [producing] union into an instrument for [producing] discord. . . .

Thus far, then, it would appear that, in face of so clear a pronouncement, no room for dissension was left to Bahā'u'llāh's followers. But almost immediately, it would seem (for the history of this fresh schism has not yet been dispassionately investigated, though much has been written on either side, not only in Persian but in English), the old struggle between what may be described as the 'stationary' and the 'progressive' elements broke out. 'Abbās Efendi apparently claimed that the Revelation was not ended, and that henceforth he was to be its channel. This claim was strenuously resisted by his brother Mirzā Muḥammad 'Alī and those who followed him, among whom were included his two younger brothers, Mirzā Badi'u'llāh and Mirzā Ziyā'u'llāh,§ Bahā'u'llāh's amanuensis, entitled *Jamāb-i-Khādīmu'llāh* ('the servant of God,' Mirzā Aghā Jān of Kāshān), and many other prominent Bahā'is, who held that, so far as this manifestation was concerned, the book of Revelation was closed, in proof of which view they adduced the following verse from the *Kitāb-i-Aqdas*, or 'Most Holy Book': 'Whosoever lays claim to any authority before the completion of a millennium is assuredly a liar and a calumniator.' The dispute has been darkened by a mass of words, but in essence it is a conflict between these two sayings, viewed in the light of the supernatural claim—whatever its exact nature—which 'Abbās Efendi did and does advance. On the one hand, Bahā'u'llāh's *Testament* explicitly puts him first in the succession; on the other, being so preferred, he did 'lay claim to an authority' regarded by the partisans of his brother as bringing him under the condemnation equally explicitly enunciated by Bahā'u'llāh in the *Kitāb-i-Aqdas*. As in the case of the previous schism between Bahā'u'llāh and Subh-i-Ezel, so here also the conflict was between those who held that every day of Theophany must be succeeded by a night of Occultation, and those who felt that the Light by which they had walked could not be extinguished, but must rather increase in brightness. And, as before, the conservative or stationary party was worsted. For a time a certain equilibrium seems to have been maintained, but steadily and surely the power and authority of 'Abbās Efendi waxed, while that of his brother waned. Very bitter feeling was again aroused, and this time over a large area; for not only Persia, but Egypt, Syria, and America were involved. Ibrāhīm Khayru'llāh, the protagonist of the Bahā'i faith in America, finally espoused the cause of Muḥammad 'Alī;¶

\* 'The Branches' (*Ghuṣn*, pl. *Aghān*) are Bahā'u'llāh's descendants; the 'Twigs' (*Afnān*) are the Bāb's kinsfolk.

† Or perhaps 'adherents' is meant by *Muntasabīn*.

‡ i.e. We have placed 'Abbās Efendi first, then Mirzā Muḥammad 'Alī.

§ One of these brothers subsequently died, and in 1903 the other joined 'Abbās Efendi and renounced his previous allegiance.

¶ i.e. authority to promulgate fresh revelations, and enact new or repeal old ordinances.

¶ According to his own statement (*The Three Questions*, p. 23), he visited 'Akkā and was well received by 'Abbās Efendi, but was not allowed to hold intercourse with the other brothers. Only seven months after his return to America did he denounce 'Abbās Efendi and declare his allegiance to Muḥammad 'Alī.

but missionaries, including the aged and learned Mirzā Abu'l-Faḥl of Gulpāyān, were sent out in the beginning of 1902 to the United States to oppose him,\* and at one time he professed to be in fear of his life.

6. Doctrine. — A full discussion of Bābī and Bahā'ī doctrine, even were the time ripe for it, would far exceed the limits of an encyclopædia article. Before proceeding to set forth such a sketch of its most salient features as is possible within these limits, we must call the reader's attention to one or two general considerations.

(1) The Bāb's own doctrine underwent considerable development and change during the six years (A.D. 1844-1850) which elapsed between his 'Manifestation' and his death, and to trace this development it would be necessary to examine all his voluminous writings in a much more careful, detailed, and systematic manner than has yet been done. To mention only a few of the chief substantive works which issued from his pen, there is the *Ṣiḡrat-nāsā* (of which Gobineau quite misunderstood the nature when he described it as the *Journal des Pèlerins*, for it is a devotional work designed for the use of pilgrims to the shrines of the Imāms) and the *Ṣaḥīfatu Bayān-i-Harāmīyā*, both composed in the year of the 'Manifestation.' Then there is the *Dalā'il-i-ṣab'ī* ('Seven Proofs'), and a number of Commentaries (*Ta'wīl*) on different *sūras* of the Qur'ān, notably the *Commentary on the Chapter of Joseph* (also called *Qayyūmāt-i-Asmā*), and the Commentaries on the *sūras* entitled respectively *al-Baqara*, *al-Kawthar*, *al-Aḥq*, etc., all of which belong to the earlier period before the Bāb announced that he was not merely the 'Gate' leading to the hidden Imām, but the Imām himself, nay the 'Point' (*Nuqta*) of a new Revelation. Of his later writings, to all of which, as we shall see, the name *Bayān* ('explanation,' 'utterance') is applied, the Persian *Bayān* is, perhaps, the most systematic, but there are also several Arabic *Bayāns*, a *Kitāb-i-Āḥkām*, or 'Book of Laws' (tr. by Gobineau at the end of his *Religions et Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale*), and one or two 'Books of Names' (*Kitāb-i-Asmā*). Few of these books are easy reading, and he who has read even one or two of them will be inclined to agree with Gobineau's judgment, 'le style de Mirza Ali Mohammed est terne, raide et sans éclat'; while some are so confused, so full of repetitions, extraordinary words, and fantastic derivatives of Arabic roots, that they defy the most industrious and indefatigable reader. The works of Ṣubḥ-i-Esāl closely resemble those of the Bāb, but the Bahā'ī writings, especially in the later period, are much clearer and easier of comprehension, besides which the tendency of Bahā'ī thought was to avoid abstruse metaphysics and unintelligible rhapsodies, and to treat chiefly of ethical subjects.

(2) As there has never been anything corresponding to a 'Church Council' among the Bābis, the greatest divergence of opinion will be found among them even on questions so important as the Future Life. All agree in denying the Resurrection of the Body as held by the Muḥammadans; but while certain passages in the Persian *Bayān* seem to indicate that the spirit of the deceased continues to take an interest in his earthly affairs, and while certain sayings of the older Bābis lend colour to the assertion of their enemies that they inclined to the doctrine of Metempsychosis (*Tandarūḥ-i-Ārṣād*), generally held in abhorrence by the Muslimans, other Bābis understand the 'Return (*Ri'ā*) to the life of this World' in a less material and more symbolic sense, while some disbelieve in personal immortality, or limit it to those holy beings who are endowed with a spirit of a higher grade than is vouchsafed to ordinary mortals.

(3) It must be clearly understood that Bābism is in no sense latitudinarian or eclectic, and stands, therefore, in the sharpest antagonism to Ṣūfism. However vague Bābī doctrine may be on certain points, it is essentially dogmatic, and every utterance or command uttered by the 'Manifestation' of the period (i.e. by the Bāb, Ṣubḥ-i-Esāl, Bahā'u'llāh, 'Abbās Efendi, and Muḥammad 'Alī respectively) must be accepted without reserve. Tolerance is, indeed, inculcated by Bahā'u'llāh: 'Associate with [those of other] religions with amity and harmony' is one of the commands given in the *Kitāb-i-Aḥqāq*. But the same book begins as follows: 'The first thing which God has prescribed unto His servants is Knowledge of the Day-spring of His Revelation and the Dawning-place of His Command, which is the Station of His Spirit in the World of Creation and Command. Whosoever attaineth unto this hath attained unto all good, and whosoever is debarred therefrom is of the people of error, even though he produce all [manner of good] deeds.' In other words, works without faith are dead. The Bāb himself, and his immediate followers, were still less inclined to tolerance; according to the *Bayān*, no unbelievers were to be suffered to dwell in the five principal provinces of Persia, and everywhere they were, as far as possible, to be subjected to restrictions, and kept in a position of inferiority. The Bābis are strongly antagonistic alike to the Ṣūfis and to the Muḥammadans, but for quite different reasons. In the

case of the Ṣūfis they object to their latitudinarianism, their pantheism, their individualism, and their doctrine of the 'Inner Light.' With the Muḥammadan outlook they have really more in common; but, apart from the natural resentment which they feel on account of the persecutions which they have suffered at the hands of the 'ulama' of Islām, they condemn the refusal of the Muslims to see in this new 'Manifestation' the fulfilment of Islām, and, in short, regard them much as the Christians regard the Jews. For similar reasons the Bahā'is detest the Esāfis, whilst among the former the followers of 'Abbās Efendi dislike and despise the followers of his brother Muḥammad 'Alī.

According to the Bābī conception, the Essence of God, the Primal Divine Unity, is unknowable, and entirely transcends human comprehension, and all that we can know is its Manifestations, that succession of theophanies which constitutes the series of Prophets. In essence all the Prophets are one; that is to say, one Universal Reason or Intelligence speaks to mankind successively, always according to their actual capacities and the exigencies of the age, through Abraham, Moses, David, Christ, Muḥammad, and now through this last Manifestation, by which the old Bābis and the present Esāfis understand the Bāb (whom they commonly speak of as *Ḥaṣrat-i-Nuqta*, 'His Holiness the Point'; *Ḥaṣrat-i-Rabbīyū'l-Ālā*, 'His Holiness my Lord the Supreme,' etc.), while the Bahā'is, who reduce the Bāb's position to that of a mere forerunner, or herald (*mubashshir*), comparing him to John the Baptist, understand Bahā'u'llāh. In essence all the Prophets are one, and their teaching is one; but (to use one of the favourite illustrations of the Bābis) just as the same teacher, expounding the same science, will speak in different, even in apparently contradictory, terms, according to whether he is addressing small children, young boys and girls, or persons of mature age and ripe understanding, so will the Prophet regulate his utterances and adjust his ordinances according to the degree of development attained by the community to which he is sent. Thus the material Paradise and Hell preached by Muḥammad do not really exist, but no more accurate conception of the realities which they symbolize could be conveyed to the rough Arabs to whom he was sent. When the world has outgrown the teaching of one 'Manifestation,' a new 'Manifestation' appears; and as the world and the human race are, according to the Bābī view, eternal, and progress is a universal law, there can be no final Revelation, and no 'last of the Prophets and seal of the Prophets,' as the Muḥammadans suppose. No point of the Bāb's doctrine is more strongly emphasized than this. Every Prophet has foretold his successor, and in every case that successor, when he finally came, has been rejected by the majority of that Prophet's followers. The Jews rejected their Messiah, whose advent they professed to be awaiting with such eagerness; the Christians rejected the Paraclete or Comforter whom Christ foretold in prophecies supposed by the Muḥammadans to have been fulfilled by the coming of Muḥammad; the Shi'ite Muḥammadans never mention the Twelfth Imām, or Mahdī, without

adding the formula *عجل الله فرجه* ('May God hasten his glad Advent!'), yet when at last after a thousand years the expected Imām returned (in the shape of the Bāb), they rejected, reviled, imprisoned, and finally slew him. The Bāb was determined that, so far as it lay in his power to prevent it, his followers should not fall into this error, and he again and again speaks of the succeeding Revelation which 'He whom God shall

manifest' (*من يظهره الله*) shall bring, and of other later Revelations which in turn shall succeed that *ad infinitum*. Indeed, he goes so far as to

\* Several American papers describing this mission are in the present writer's possession. One (*The North American*, Feb. 16, 1902) gives portraits of Mirzā Abu'l-Faḥl, his companion Hajji Niyās of Kirmān, and of 'Abbās Efendi himself, and heads its leading article ' Astonishing Spread of Babism.'

say that if any one shall appear claiming to be 'He whom God shall manifest,' it is the duty of every believer to put aside all other business and hasten to investigate the proofs adduced in support of this claim, and that, even if he cannot convince himself of its truth, he must refrain from repudiating it, or denouncing him who advances it as an impostor. It is these provisions, no doubt, which have always given so great an advantage to every fresh claimant in the history of Bábism, and have placed what may be called the 'Stationary Party' (e.g. the followers of Şubḥ-i-Ezel and, later, of Muḥammad 'Alī) at so great a disadvantage.

From what has been said above, the Western reader may be tempted to think of the Bábī doctrine as embodying, to a certain extent, the modern Western rationalistic spirit. No mistake could be greater. The belief in the fulfilment of prophecies; the love of apocalyptic sayings culled from the Jewish, Christian, and Muḥammadan Scriptures and traditions; the value attached to talismans (especially among the early Bábīs); the theory of correspondences, as illustrated by the mystical doctrine of the Unity and its manifestation in the number 19, and the whole elaborate system of equivalences between names, based on the numerical values of letters, point to a totally different order of ideas, and are, moreover, ingrained in the true Bábī doctrine, as distinguished from the same doctrine as presented to and understood by most American and European believers. Even the practical reforms enjoined or suggested by the Báb are generally based on some quite non-utilitarian ground. Thus the severe chastisement of children is forbidden, and consideration for their feelings enjoined; but the reason for this is that when 'He whom God shall manifest' comes, he will come first as a child, and it would be a fearful thing for any one to have to reproach himself afterwards for having harshly treated the august infant. This and other similar social reforms, such as the amelioration of the position of women, are not, as some Europeans have supposed, the motive power of a heroism which has astonished the world, but rather the mystical ideas connected with the 'Manifestations,' 'Unities,' numbers, letters, and fulfilment of prophecies, which to European rationalists appear so fantastic and fanciful. But, above all, the essence of being a Bábī or a Bahá'í is a boundless devotion to the 'Person of the Manifestation,' and a profound belief that he is divine and of a different order from all other beings. The Báb, as we have seen, was called by his followers 'His Holiness my Lord the Supreme,' and Bahá'u'lláh is called not only 'the Blessed Perfection' (*Jamál-i-Mubárak*), but, especially in Persia, 'God Almighty' (*Ḥaqq ta'álá*). Then also there are differences of opinion as to the degree of divinity possessed by the 'Person of the Manifestation,' and not all the faithful go so far as the poet who exclaims: 'Men call thee "God," and I am filled with angry wonder as to how long thou wilt endure the shame of Godhead!'

Something more must now be said as to the 'Point,' the 'Unity,' and its manifestation in the number 19, and other kindred matters. The idea of the 'Point' (نقطه) seems to rest chiefly on two (probably spurious) Shi'ite traditions. 'Knowledge,' says one of these, 'is a point which the ignorant made multiple.' It was this 'point of knowledge'—not detailed knowledge of subsidiary matters, but vivid, essential, 'compendious' knowledge of the eternal realities of things—to which the Báb laid claim. The second tradition is ascribed to 'Alī, the first Imám, who is alleged to have declared that all that was in the Qur'an was

contained implicitly in the *Súratu'l-Fatiḥa*, or opening chapter of the Qur'an, and that this in turn was contained in the *Bismilláh* which stands over it, this in turn in the initial B (ب) of the *Bismilláh*, and this in turn 'in the Point which stands under the ب'; 'and,' 'Alī is said to have added, 'I am the Point which stands under the ب.'

Now the formula *Bismilláh* (بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ) ('In the Name of God the Merciful, the Forgiving') comprises 19 letters, which, therefore, are the 'Manifestation' of the 'Point under the ب,' just as the whole Qur'an is the further 'Manifestation,' on a plane of greater plurality, of the *Bismilláh*. Moreover, the Arabic word for 'One' is *Wahid* (واحد), and the letters composing the word *Wahid* (و=6; ا=1; ح=8; د=4) give the sum-total of 19. This 'first Unity' of 19 in turn manifests itself as  $19 \times 19$  (19<sup>2</sup>) or 361, which the Bábīs call 'the Number of All Things' (عدد كل شيء), and the words *Kullu shay* ('All Things') are numerically equivalent to  $ك=20 + ل=30 + ش=300 + ي=10$  360, to which, by adding 'the one which underlies all plurality,' 361, 'the Number of All Things,' or 19<sup>3</sup>, is obtained.

To the number 19 great importance is attached by the Bábīs, and, so far as possible, it is made the basis of all divisions of time, money, and the like. Thus the Bábī year comprises 19 months of 19 days each, to which intercalary days 'according to the number of the H (ه),' i.e. 5, are added to bring the solar year (which they proposed to restore in place of the Muḥammadan lunar year) up to the requisite length. The same names (*Bahá, Jalál, Jamál*, etc.) serve for the months and the days, so that once in each month the day and the month (as in the Zoroastrian calendar) correspond, and such days are observed as festivals. The year begins with the old Persian *Naw-rúz*, or New Year's Day, corresponding with the Vernal Equinox, and conventionally observed on March 21. The month of fasting, which replaces the Ramaḍān of Islām, is the last month of the year, i.e. the 19 days preceding the *Naw-rúz*. The Báb's idea of a coinage having 19 as its basis has been abandoned, along with many other impracticable ordinances, some of which are explicitly abrogated in the *Kitáb-i-Aqdas* or others of Bahá'u'lláh's writings. The 'Unity' is also manifested in the divine

attribute *Ḥayy* (حي), 'the Living,' which equals  $8+10=18$ , or, with the 'one which underlies all plurality,' 19. The Báb accordingly chose 18 disciples, who, with himself, constituted the

'Letters of the Living' (حروف الحی) or 'First Unity.' The choice of Mirzá Yahyá, 'Şubḥ-i-Ezel' ('the Dawn of Eternity'), by the Báb as his successor, was probably also determined by the fact that the name *Yahyá* (يحيى = 38) was a multiple of 18, on which account Şubḥ-i-Ezel was also called *Wahid* (وحيد), which is numerically equivalent to 28 (the number of the letters constituting the Arabic alphabet), and signifies 'unique,' i.e. manifesting the Unity.

The importance attached by the Bábīs to the numerical equivalents of words is seen elsewhere,



and especially in their habit of referring cryptically to towns connected with their history by names of an equivalent value. Thus Adrianople, called

in Turkish *Edirne* (أدرنة), is named *Arpa's-Sirr* (ارض السر), 'the Land of the Mystery,' both words, *Edirne* and *Sirr*, being numerically equivalent to 260. So Zanjan (زنجان=111) is called *Arpa'-A'la* (اعلى=111), and so on. Other strange expressions with which the Bábí writings (especially the earlier writings) abound constantly puzzle the uninitiated reader, who will have to discover for himself that, for example, the expression 'the Person of the Seven Letters' (ذات الحروف السبعة) is one of the titles of the Báb, whose name, 'Ali Muhammad, consists of seven letters. Even in Bahá'u'lláh's works such obscure terms occur as *al-Buq'atu'l-Hamra*, 'the Red Place,' which means 'Akká, and the like.

The Báb laid down a number of laws, dictated in many cases by his personal tastes and feelings, which have practically fallen into abeyance. Such are his prohibition of smoking and the eating of onions (though these are still observed by the Ezelis), his regulations as to clothing, forms of salutation, the use of rings and perfumes, the names by which children might be named 'in the *Bayán*, the burial of the dead, and the like. The laws enacted by Bahá'u'lláh in the *Kitáb-i-Aqdas*, with the exception of the law of Inheritance, are simpler and more practical, and the whole tone of the Bahá'í scriptures (which, of course, according to the Bahá'í view, entirely abrogate the Báb's writings) is more simple, more practical, and more concerned with ethical than metaphysical questions. Historically, there is much to be said in favour of Subh-i-Ezél's claim, since he was certainly nominated by the Báb as his immediate successor, and was equally certainly so recognized for a good many years by the whole Bábí community; while, assuming the Báb to have been divinely inspired (and this assumption must be made not only by every Bábí but by every Bahá'í), it is difficult to suppose that he should choose to succeed himself one who was destined to be the chief opponent of 'Him whom God shall manifest.' Yet practically it cannot be doubted that the survival and extension of the religion formed by the Báb were secured by the modifications effected in it by Bahá'u'lláh, for in its original form it could never have been intelligible, much less attractive, outside Persia; and even there, when once the ferment attending its introduction had subsided, it would probably have sunk into the insignificance shared by so many Muslim sects which once played an important rôle in history.

At the present day there are a few Bábís of the old school who call themselves 'Kullu-shay'is,' and decline to enter into the Ezelí and Bahá'í quarrel at all; there is a small, and probably diminishing, number of Ezelis; and a large, but indeterminable number of Bahá'ís, of whom the great majority follow 'Abbás Efendi ('Abdu'l-Bahá), and the minority his brother Muhammad 'Alí. Latterly the followers of Bahá'u'lláh have shown a strong disposition to drop the name of Bábí altogether, and call themselves Bahá'í, and to ignore or suppress the earlier history and literature of their religion. Alike in intelligence and in morals the Bábís (or Bahá'ís) stand high; but it is not certain to the present writer that their triumph over Islám in Persia would ultimately conduce to the welfare of that distracted land, or that the toler-

ance they now advocate would stand the test of success and supremacy.

LITERATURE.—An exhaustive treatment of the literature of this subject would have to deal with the following divisions:

I. *BÁBÍ SCRIPTURES*, all in Arabic or Persian, regarded by all or by certain sections of the Bábís as revelations, and including:

(a) *Writings of Mirzá 'Alí Muhammad the Báb* (A.D. 1844-1850).—These were divided by the Báb himself into

'five grades' (*Shu'ún-i-Khames*, شُورُونِ خَمْسَه),

viz. verses (*ayát*, آيَات), supplications (*manáshát*,

مناجات), commentaries (*tafsír*, تفاسير), scien-

tific treatises (*Shu'ún-i-'Ulmiyya*, شُورُونِ عِلْمِيَّة), or

*ghosar-i-'Ulmiyya*, (صور علمية), and Persian writings

(*Kalimat-i-Farsiyya*). The term *Bayán* applies especially to the writings of the 'first grade,' and includes all the *ayát*, or verses in the style of the Qur'án, produced by the Báb during his whole career. To special collections of such verses the term *Bayán* is also applied, and in this sense there are several Arabic *Bayáns* and one Persian *Bayán*, which last is, on the whole, the most systematic and intelligible of the Báb's writings.\*

(b) *Writings of Mirzá Yahyá, 'Subh-i-Ezél'*.—Of these one of the earliest (composed before 1835, since it is mentioned by Gobineau, whose book was published in that year) is the *Kitáb-i-Núr*, or 'Book of Light.' A list of some of Subh-i-Ezél's writings, drawn up by himself, will be found in *Traveller's Narratives*, li. 240 ff. Others are described in the 'Catalogue and Description of 27 Bábí Manuscripts' by the present writer, published in *J.R.A.S.*, 1892 (xxiv. 483-493, 600-602, etc.). In the last few years the British Museum Library has, through the good offices of Mr. Claude Delaval Cobham, lately Commissioner at Larnaca in Cyprus, been enriched by an extensive collection of manuscript works by Subh-i-Ezél.

(c) *Writings of Mirzá Husayn 'Alí 'Bahá'u'lláh'*.—One at least of these—a polemical work in Persian named *Iqán*, 'the Assurance'—was composed about A.D. 1849-1850, during the Baghdad period, that is to say, previously to Bahá'u'lláh's 'Manifestation.' The remainder belong chiefly to the period intervening between that event and Bahá'u'lláh's death (A.D. 1856-1892). Since every

letter (*lawh*, لوح='tablet') written at Bahá'u'lláh's

dictation—and many were written every day—is regarded by his followers as a revelation, it would be manifestly impossible for any human being (except, possibly, his amanuensis) to enumerate them. The most important of his books, besides the earlier *Iqán*, the *Súra-i-Haykal*, the *Alphabet-Saláfi*, or 'Letters to the Kings' (including the letter sent to Násiru'd-Din Sháh, as above described, in A.D. 1869), are the *Kitáb-i-Aqdas* (which contains the most systematic and compendious statement of the doctrines, laws, and ordinances promulgated by Bahá'u'lláh), the *Lawh-i-Bashárá*, the *Kalimat-i-Mahmúda*, and, lastly, the final Testament (*Kitábu 'Adh*) already mentioned. Several 'authorised' collections of these and other Bahá'í scriptures have been lithographed in the East. The *Kitáb-i-Aqdas* has been printed at St. Petersburg, in 1890, with a Russ. tr., by Captain Tumanaki, who also published the *Kitábu 'Adh* in 1892. In the same year Baron Victor Rosen published the *Lawh-i-Bashárá*. The whole of the Epistle to Násiru'd-Din Sháh and portions of the other Epistles to the Kings have been translated by the present writer in the *J.R.A.S.*, 1889, and in *Traveller's Narratives*, li.; and a French translation of the *Iqán* ('*Livre de la Certitude*') was published by M. Hippolyte Dreyfus and Mirzá Habibu'lláh Shírázi in 1904.

(d) *Writings of 'Abbás Efendi* (now called 'Abdu'l-Bahá).—Of these mention may be made of the *Mu'awazát*

(مفاوضات), or 'Outpourings,' recently published in the original Persian, and in Fr. and Eng. translations, by Miss Laura Barney and M. Hippolyte Dreyfus.

(e) *Writings of Mirzá Muhammad 'Alí*, the brother and rival of 'Abbás Efendi.

II. *DEVOTIONAL, DOCTRINAL, AND APOLOGETIC WORKS* by companions and disciples of the Báb, Subh-i-Ezél, Bahá'u'lláh, 'Abbás Efendi, and Mirzá Muhammad 'Alí, of which in recent times a considerable number have been composed in English by American believers and a smaller number in French. Many of the early Bábís, such as Mullá Muhammad 'Alí of Bártursh (*Jand-i-Qaddús*), left writings which have been preserved in manuscript.† Mirzá Abu'l-Faql of Gulpáyagán, a devoted fol-

\* See the *Traveller's Narratives*, li. 235-247, especially the definitions from the Persian *Bayán* given on p. 244 f. concerning the 'five grades'; see also *J.R.A.S.* xxiv. (1892) 452 f.

† For description of such a collection of the writings of *Jand-i-Qaddús*, see *J.R.A.S.*, 1892, 483-487.

lower of Bahá'u'lláh, composed, about A.D. 1887, a Persian tract called *Istidhābiyya*,\* in which he endeavoured to prove to the Jews that the advent of their expected Messiah was fulfilled by the 'Manifestation' of Bahá'u'lláh; and he also wrote and published in Cairo a Persian work of 781 pages entitled *Kitāb-i-Ferā'id*, in which he replied to attacks made on the Bahá'is by Shaykh 'Abdu'l-Salām. In defence of Subh-i-Esál's position and in elucidation of the primitive Bábi doctrine and the philosophical ideas underlying it, there is the very rare and instructive *Hašt Bihisht*† of Shaykh Ahmad of Kirmán (called Bábi), who was put to death at Tabris about 1896. There is also a considerable literature, manuscript and lithographed, connected with the controversy which arose after the death of Bahá'u'lláh between his sons;‡ and this controversy is reflected in numerous English printed works produced in America by the respective partisans of the two brothers.

ii. **HISTORICAL WORKS** written by believers (such as the *History of Mirzá Jani of Káshán, the New History, the Traveller's Narrative*, and part of the *Hašt Bihisht*), or by opponents (such as the account given by the official historians of the Persian Court, Riza-quali-Khán and the Lisán-i-Mulk, in the supplement to the *Lawqat-i-Safá* and the *Náshih-i-Tusaráh* respectively), or by more or less impartial observers, Asiatic or European. Among the most valuable of those written in the East from a hostile, or at least a critical and not very friendly, point of view, mention should especially be made of Sayyid Jamá'ud-Din's art. in the *Dá'irat-i-Ma'árif*, or Arabic Encyclopedia, of Butrus-i-Bustáni, and of Mirzá Muḥammad Mahdí-Khán Za'imu'd-Dawla's *Muḥabbaḥ-i-Bábiyya*, also in Arabic, published at Cairo in A.H. 1321 (A.D. 1903-1904). This last, though written in the form of a history, is rather polemical than historical, but it contains important information obtained from original oral sources, and a certain number of *pieces justificatives*. Another more purely polemical work, composed in Persian by a Christian convert to Islam, named Husayn-quali, dedicated to some of the *mujtahids* of Kerbela and Najaf, entitled *Minháju'l-Tálibin fi radd-i-Bábiyya*, and lithographed at Bombay in A.H. 1320 (A.D. 1902), also deserves mention.

iv. **BÁBI POEMS**.—From the time of Qurratu'l-'Ayn, the Bábi heroine who suffered martyrdom in A.D. 1852, until the present day, poetry of a religious and often of a rhapsodical character has been produced, though not in very great abundance, by Bábi writers. The most celebrated Bábi poets since the time of Qurratu'l-'Ayn are Nabíl, 'Andalib, Na'im of Abáda, and Mirzá Yahyá Sar-Khush; but their poems are sporadic, and there does not seem to be any considerable collection of Bábi poems, either from one or from diverse pens.

v. **POLEMICAL WORKS**.—Some of these have been incidentally mentioned above under classes ii. and iii., but there exist others, such as the *Rajmu'ah-Shaytán fi radd-i'l-Bayán* ('Booning of the Devil, on the vices of the Bayán'), by Hájji 'Abdu'l-Rahim, lithographed (without date or place of issue) about A.D. 1892. This tract professes to be written in refutation of a Bábi apology entitled *Kitāb-i-Imán fi iqdhāri-Nuqtat-i-Bayán* ('the Book of Belief, setting forth the Point of Revelation,' i.e. the Báb), which apology is incorporated in the refutation. There are, however, reasons for believing that, under the guise of a weak and unconvincing refutation, the writer's object was to argue in favour of the Bábi doctrine, as held by the elder Bábis and the Eselis, since he speaks respectfully of the Báb 'on account of his holy lineage,' makes the refutation of Subh-i-Esál depend on that of the Báb (whom he does not effectively refute), and practically confines his attacks to Bahá'u'lláh.

vi. **THE ENGLISH AND FRENCH WRITINGS** of American and French believers in Bahá'ism (for only in the latter days of Bahá'u'lláh did the doctrines of which the Báb was the originator spread beyond Asia) may conveniently be placed in a separate class. The chief of those which have come into the present writer's hands (and there are, no doubt, many others with which he is unacquainted, for Bahá'ism is now active in America, and has its centres, associations, schools, and endowments) are, in chronological order, as follows:

Ibráhím George Kheiralla (i.e. Khayru'lláh) assisted by Howard MacNutt, *Behá'u'lláh* ('The Glory of God'), 2 vols., Chicago, 1900; *Facts for Behaists*, tr. and ed. by I. G. Kheiralla (this pamphlet deals with the dispute between 'Abbás Efendi and his brother Muḥammad 'Alí, and supports the claims of the latter), Chicago, 1901; Ibráhím George Kheiralla, *The Three Questions*, 26 pp. of English and 15 pp. of Arabic *pieces justificatives* (n.d.); Stoyan Krstoff Vatralsky, *Mohammedan Gnosticism in America: the origin, history, character, and esoteric doctrines of the Truth-knowers* (from *AJTh*, Jan. 1902, pp. 57-78), Boston, 1902; Gabriel Sacy, *Le Règne de Dieu et de l'Agneau, connu sous le nom de Babysme*, Cairo, 1902; *Le Livre des Sept Preuves* (a tr. of the

Báb's *Dalá'il-i-Sab'a*), tr. by A. L. M. Nicolas, Paris, 1902; *The Revelation of Bahá'u'lláh*, compiled by Isabella D. Brittingham, U.S.A., 1902; Myron H. Phelps, *The Life and Teachings of Abbás Efendi*, with Introduction by Edward G. Browne, London and New York, 1903; *Le Livre de la Certitude* (a tr. of the *Iqán*), tr. by Hippolyte Dreyfus and Mirzá Habibullah Shirazi, Paris, 1904; *Le Bábisme Arabe, le Héros secret du Babysme de Síyyid Akh Mohammed dit le Báb*, tr. from the Arabic by A. L. M. Nicolas, Paris, 1905; Arthur Flaherty Dodge, *Whence? Why? Whither? Man: Things: Other things*, Westwood, Mass., 1907. One Eseli manifesto, consisting chiefly of extracts from the *New History, the Traveller's Narrative*, and other works by the writer of this article, has also appeared in America under the title of *A Call of Attention to the Behaists or Babists of America*, by August J. Stenstrand, and is dated from Naperville, Ill., Feb. 18, 1907; Miss Laura Clifford Barney, who at different periods spent a considerable time at Akká, and has also travelled in Persia, collected orally the answers of 'Abbás Efendi to a number of questions which she put to him on all sorts of subjects, and to which he replied from time to time. These replies have been published in the original Persian, in English, and in French almost simultaneously. The Persian text is entitled *An-Núrc-i-abhá fi Muḥawadāt-i-'Abd'li Bahá*, and on the English title-page *Table Talks, collected by Laura Clifford Barney*, London, 1908. The English version is entitled *Some Questions answered . . . from the Persian of 'Abdu'l-Bahá*, translated by Miss L. C. Barney. The French version, translated from the Persian by Hippolyte Dreyfus, is entitled *Les Leçons de St. Jean d'Acre . . . recueillies par Laura Clifford Barney*, Paris, 1908.

EDWARD G. BROWNE.

**BÁBÁ LÁLIS**.—The name of a modern Indian monotheistic sect founded by one Bábbá Lál in the first half of the 17th cent. A.D. The sect is apparently now extinct. Bábbá Lál was a Khattri by caste, born in Málwá in Rájputána. He became the pupil of a *Bhakti* apostle (see BHAKTI-MÁRGA) named Chetan Swámi, whom he followed to Lahore. He finally settled at Dehanpur, near Sarhind (Sirhind) in the Panjáb, where he founded the sect which bears his name.

Bábbá Lál was one of those Indian reformers of the 16th and 17th cents. who, like Kabír, Dáda, and the Emperor Akbar, endeavoured to found a purely monotheistic religion, combining elements derived partly from the beliefs of the Musalmán Sufis and partly from those of the followers of the Hindu *Bhakti-márga*. Like Kabír, he followed the *Bhakti-márga* in the name by which he referred to the Supreme, viz. Ráma; but also, as in Kabír's teaching, this Ráma was not to him the Deity incarnate as the earthly prince of Oudh, but was God the Father Himself, or, in other words, Ráma after he had returned to heaven from his incarnate sojourn upon earth. The doctrine of incarnation, which is an important part of the teaching of the *Bhakti-márga*, had no place in his system. On the other hand, as in the *Bhakti-márga* and as in Sufism, the keynote of his system was an all-absorbing love directed to a gracious personal God. As he himself says, 'The feelings of a perfect disciple have not been, and cannot be, described; as it is said: "A person asked me, What are the sensations of a lover?" I replied: "When you are a lover, you will know."'

Bábbá Lál's doctrine attracted the attention of the liberal-minded prince Dárs Shukoh, the eldest and favourite son of the Emperor Sháh Jahán, who sent for him and had several interviews with him in the year A.D. 1649. A report of these interviews is preserved in a Persian work entitled the *Nádír-u-n-nikāt*, our only authority on Bábbá Lál's teaching. From this we gather that, besides the devoted love which was the essence and foundation of his religion, he taught that the human soul is a particle of the Supreme Soul, just as water contained in a flask is a part of the water of, say, the river Ganges. The flask which separates it from its source is the body, and blessed is the moment when the flask ceases to exist, and the water once contained in it can be reunited with the parent stream. The difference between the water in the flask and that in the Ganges is that a drop of wine added to the former would impart to

\* *JRAS*, 1892, pp. 701-706.

† *Ib.* pp. 685-695.

‡ Of works belonging to this class the two following (published in A.H. 1318 and 1319 [=A.D. 1900-1901 respectively]), of which the present writer happens to possess copies, are in defence of Mirzá Muḥammad 'Alí and against the claims of 'Abbás Efendi. The first is entitled *Ityánu'd-Dá'ir li-man yarádu'l-Iqbála wa siyá'is-sabli*, and the second appears to be from the pen of Mirzá Áqá Jan of Káshán, called *Khádím'u'lláh* ('the Servant of God'), who was for many years Bahá'u'lláh's amanuensis, and was afterwards among the most prominent of the supporters of Mirzá Muḥammad 'Alí and the opponents of 'Abbás Efendi.