

REVIEWS

G. Lüling, *Die Wiederentdeckung des Propheten Muhammad*, Erlangen
1981, 423 pp.

Reprint from

JERUSALEM STUDIES IN ARABIC AND ISLAM

6

1985

The main ideas which Lüling propounds in the present book are as follows: the prophet Muhammad, like Jesus, perceived himself to be an angel, endowed with a pre-existent prophetic spirit; the Meccan contemporaries of Muhammad were "Hellenistic" Christians, whereas Muhammad himself represented the "Semitic", early Christianity ("Urchristentum"). He fought against the Hellenistic Christians of Mecca, because of their belief in the crucifixion of Jesus, and in the Trinity. These beliefs were considered by Muhammad as idolatry (*ʿibādāt al-awthān*) and as polytheism (*shirk*), respectively. In his struggle against the Hellenistic Christians, Muhammad gradually put forward the idea of the restoration of "*dīn Ibrāhīm*", i.e., the ancient "pagan" religion of central Arabia. The true facts about the original mission of Muhammad and his fight against the Hellenistic Christians of Mecca were suppressed by later orthodox Islam, in order to maintain peaceful relations with the outer Christian world, as well as to prevent inner Islamic conflicts.

In order to substantiate these assumptions, Lüling examines the content and form of the Qurʾān, the structure of the Kaʿba, and the nature of the deities worshipped by the Meccans.

As for the Qurʾān, the author adduces some passages which, in his view, reflect Muhammad's belief in his own angelic nature, as well as in the angelic nature of Jesus and the rest of the prophets.

One of these passages is XVII/93–96, in which, according to Lüling (p. 82), Muhammad insists that he is an angel, but admits, at the same time, that he cannot demonstrate his angelic nature, because angels do not walk about upon earth exhibiting their divine nature. It seems, however, that the true implication of this Qurʾānic passage is somewhat different. This passage seems to stress that Muhammad is nothing but a mortal messenger (*basharan rasūlan*)! The basic idea which is expressed here and elsewhere in the Qurʾān is that Allāh dispatches to each

community a messenger of its own kind, so that Muhammad himself is inevitably mortal, belonging to the mankind to whom he was sent (see also Qur'ān III/164, LXII/2; II/129, 151). In the present passage (XVII/94), Muhammad's fellow-tribesmen express their doubts as to whether Allāh indeed sends mortal beings as His envoys, to which a clear answer is given in the following verse (95): If angels were to live a peaceful daily life upon earth, then – and only then – Allāh would have dispatched an angel from heaven as a messenger to them, i.e., one of their own kind. In other words, a mortal messenger had to be sent to the mortal Meccans, just as mortal messengers had been sent to the previous mortal communities (see further VII/65, 73, 85 etc.).

Other Qur'ānic passages (III/79; IV/171–172; VI/50) are interpreted by Lüling along similar lines, with some arbitrary "reconstructions" of the original text which seem to lack a solid ground (see p. 63 ff.; 67 ff.; 82 ff.).

Another indication to Muhammad's belief in his own angelic being is found by Lüling in the Muslim traditions which present Muhammad as a pre-existent luminous being (p. 84 ff.). But, as far as Muhammad's own views are concerned, these traditions seem to be irrelevant.

As already noted by Goldziher,¹ Muhammad always insisted that he was merely a human being, although during his own lifetime, Muslim believers began to discern in the prophet supernatural qualities.² Muhammad's own views concerning his nature seem to be reflected faithfully in a whole series of traditions which have been surveyed by Goldziher. The most relevant for the present context is the following statement of Muhammad: "Do not praise me as Jesus, son of Maryam, is praised, but say: 'the servant of God and His envoy.'"³ This tradition may be relatively late, but it fully accords with the spirit of the Qur'ān, and for this reason it was believed to have been part of the Qur'ān itself.⁴

Further on (p. 97 ff.), Lüling returns to his idea about the existence of an "Ur-Qur'ān", i.e., a pre-Islamic Christian liturgical text which was considered sacred by both Muhammad and the Meccans. The

existence of such texts in pre-Islamic times is, however, not proved by Lüling, and the Qur'ānic verses which he adduces in this context (especially X/39, IV/82) seem to be irrelevant.

From the Qur'ān Lüling turns to Mecca and the Ka'ba. Being Christians, Quraysh and the Hums abandoned, according to Lüling (p. 123, 280), the pagan rites in 'Arafā, Muzdalifa and Minā. This, however, is inaccurate. Of these three places, Quraysh virtually abandoned only the rites of 'Arafā which was situated outside the *haram* of Mecca, but never those of Muzdalifa and Minā, which were situated inside the *haram*.⁵

The Ka'ba itself had been, according to Lüling (p. 126 ff.), a Christian church which served as the main cultic centre for the Meccans. Lüling's assumption derives from the fact that on the conquest of Mecca, Muhammad found inside the Ka'ba the images of Jesus and Mary, which he ordered to erase. This, according to Lüling, shows that the Meccans used icons for their Christian worship in the Ka'ba, whereas Muhammad himself, being an adherent of "Urchristentum" and of the *din Ibrāhīm*, was an iconoclast. (p. 130, 141, 153, 162 ff.) The truth is, however, that according to al-Azraqī, from whom Lüling draws these observations, Muhammad never ordered to erase the images of Jesus and Mary! On the contrary, al-Azraqī reports that Muhammad ordered to erase all the pagan images, except those of Jesus and Mary.⁶ These images endured for many years after Muhammad's death, till the days of 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubayr.⁷

The existence of such images inside the Ka'ba in pre-Islamic times does not indicate that Quraysh were Christians, but merely that some Christians (Bāqūm) participated with Quraysh in building and decorating the Ka'ba, as far as Muhammad himself was concerned, these images were quite harmless, and since the Qur'ān itself recognized Jesus and Mary as virtuous persons, there was no need to erase their images.

The main proof presented by Lüling for the Ka'ba having been a Christian church is the fact that on its north-western side there is a semi-circular open-air enclosure known as "Hijr". This area is regarded in

¹ I. Goldziher, *Muslim studies*, ed. by S.M. Stern, London 1971, II, 255 ff.

² *Ibid.*, 261 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, 257.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁵ See e.g., al-Azraqī, *Akhbar Makka*, in F. Wüstenfeld, *Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka*, vol. I, repr. Beirut n.d., p. 120, 123–124, 130–131.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 113.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 111–112.

Muslim tradition as the burial place of Hagar and Ishmael. The enclosure is taken by Lüling to be the remnants of a Christian apse which indicated the direction of prayer towards north-west, i.e., Jerusalem (p. 136, 138).

This assumption is very problematic. To begin with, nowhere in the sources is it implied that the Hijr ever functioned as an indicator of direction of prayer towards Jerusalem. It was merely a site for various rites, including prayer, which were connected with the worship of the Ka'ba itself. In this context, Lüling (p. 34–35, 139) contends that the *harba*, or *sutra*, used by Muslims during prayers, also showed the direction of prayer, which is, again, inaccurate. The *sutra* is merely a barrier which the Muslim places in front of himself in order to part between himself and the secular area in front of his eyes. In fact, the prophet used to set the *sutra* opposite his right or left eyebrow, and he never directed his entire face towards it.⁸

The main reason why the Hijr of the Ka'ba cannot be compared to a Christian apse is that according to Muslim traditions, this enclosure had always been an open area, which was included in the roofed building of the Ka'ba only for a limited period of time, by 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubayr (65H/684). These traditions are discredited by Lüling who holds that the Hijr was always a roofed section of the Ka'ba. But the evidence produced by Lüling to prove this is quite poor. To begin with, he relies upon a movie (!) as a circumstantial evidence for the assumption that the Hijr must have been always roofed (p. 134). Furthermore, on pp. 156–157 Lüling adduces a passage from al-Azraqī, 137, in which he believes to find a statement to the effect that the Hijr was destroyed together with the rest of the Ka'ba, when the Umayyads attacked Ibn al-Zubayr; this means, according to Lüling, that the Hijr had been a built section of the roofed Ka'ba already before the days of Ibn al-Zubayr. The passage from al-Azraqī, 137, is rendered by Lüling (p. 157) as follows:

Ich sah sie (die Kaaba), als wäre sie ein Frauenbusen, und sie wurde von oben bis unten erschüttert, und ich sah ihren Higr vergehen, und es stürzte das andere auf seine Ruinen (*'atarihi*).

⁸ See Abū Dawūd, *Sunan*, Cairo 1952, I, 159; Ahmad b. Hanbal, *Musnad*, Cairo 1313H/1895, repr. Beirut n.d., VI 4.

An examination of al-Azraqī's original text reveals immediately that this passage has nothing to do with the Hijr. Lüling simply read into this passage the word "*al-hijr*" instead of the correct "*al-hajar*" "*al-hārīhi*" is also a misreading instead of the correct "*al-hārīhi*". The accurate Arabic text of the last sentence in this passage runs as follows:

Wa-la-qad ra'aytu l-hajara yamruu fa-yahwī l-akharu 'ala al-hārīhi...
I saw each stone crossing (the air), while another one was falling (upon the Ka'ba), right after it.

This passage merely describes the massive bombardment of the Ka'ba by the Umayyads who shot stones at it from the *manjaniq* which had been set upon Abū Qubays.

A passage in al-Azraqī, 151, is similarly taken by Lüling (p. 157) to refer to the destruction of the Hijr during the Umayyad attack on Ibn al-Zubayr. It is rendered by Lüling as follows:

Ich sah, wie der Higr aufgeplatzt (infalaga...) und vom Brand schwarz geworden war, und weisses bröckelte in seine Höhlung (fi gaufhi), als wäre es Silber.

Here again Lüling mistakes the correct "*al-hajar*" for "*al-hijr*". The term "*al-hajar*" in this passage refers to the well-known Black Stone. The accurate Arabic text of this passage reads:

'an Abi 'Awn 'an abihī, qāla: ra'aytu l-hajara qad infalaga wa-iwadda minna l-hārīhi, fa-anzuru ilā jawfihī abyada ka-annahū l-falda.
From Abū 'Awn, from his father; he said: I saw that the Stone had cracked and blackened due to the fire, and I looked at its inside, being bright as if it were silver.

The Black Stone was originally a glittering stone, and according to this passage, its outer surface blackened due to the fire, but its inner brightness could still be seen through the cracks which were caused by the heat. The same information about this stone was recorded by al-Azraqī in another passage as well.⁹

A widely current tradition of the prophet¹⁰ alludes to the real structure of the Ka'ba in Muhammad's days. This tradition relates that

⁹ al-Azraqī, *op. cit.* 153. See also 'Abd al-Razzāq, *al-Musannaf*, ed. Habib al-Rahmān al-A'zamī, Beirut 1970, V, 38.

¹⁰ E.g., Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Cairo 1334H/1915, IV, 98 ff.; al-Azraqī, *op. cit.*, 142, 148, 219.

the prophet told 'Ā'isha, among other things, that he wished that a part of the Hījr were included in the Ka'ba. This tradition which was used by Ibn al-Zubayr as a legal basis for the actual inclusion of the Hījr in the roofed building of the Ka'ba, indicates most clearly that in Muhammad's days the Hījr was still an open area; this means that it never functioned as an apse. Lüling (p. 140-141) refers to this tradition without noticing the allusion made in it to the Hījr. He maintains that Muhammad merely expressed in this tradition his wish to reconstruct the Ka'ba according to the "principles" of Abraham (*qawā'id Ibrāhīm*). But, as a matter of fact, the phrase *qawā'id Ibrāhīm* (or, sometimes also: *asās Ibrāhīm*) refers to the stone foundations of the Ka'ba which, according to Muslim belief, were laid by Abraham and Ishmael (see Qur'ān II/127); these foundations included also the area of the Hījr, where some of these ancient stones were actually "discovered" by Ibn al-Zubayr. They were explicitly identified as *qawā'id Ibrāhīm*, and upon them the Hījr was eventually built as a part of the Ka'ba by Ibn al-Zubayr. This part was later on torn down by al-Hajjāj who wished to restore the Ka'ba as it had been in Muhammad's days.¹¹

Another fact which is taken by Lüling (p. 35) to indicate that the Hījr was a Christian apse is that this place is regarded in Muslim tradition as the burial place of Hagar and Ishmael. The tombs of these noble persons were indeed "discovered" by Ibn al-Zubayr within the area of the Hījr,¹² i.e., north-west of the Ka'ba. But this location of Ishmael's grave, as well as the location of the Hījr itself, is secondary. From some early Muslim traditions one may conclude that originally the Hījr, including the tomb of Ishmael, was *not* situated north-west of the Ka'ba, which means, once again, that it was never a Christian apse facing Jerusalem. The original open area known as Hījr was situated opposite the Black Stone, or Rukn, i.e., opposite the *eastern* corner of the Ka'ba, or rather, opposite the north-eastern wall of the Ka'ba, which is actually its façade. This is also the place of the well of Zamzam which is situated opposite the Black Stone, and of Maqām Ibrāhīm, which is situated nowadays opposite the door of the Ka'ba, not far from Zamzam. According to a tradition of Ibn 'Abbās as recorded by al-Fākihī,¹³ Ishmael's burial place was "in the Hījr, opposite the Black Rukn".

¹¹ al-Azraqī, *op. cit.*, 142 ff.

¹² *Ibid.*, 220, 149.

¹³ al-Fākihī, *Tarikh Makka*, MS Leiden, Or. 463, fol. 357a.

According to a tradition of Ka'b al-Ahbār,¹⁴ Ishmael was buried in the area spreading between Zamzam, the (Black) Rukn and the Maqām. Al-Mas'ūdī reports that Ishmael was buried "opposite the Black Stone".¹⁵ According to al-Kalā'ī, Ishmael was buried "inside the Hījr, next to the door of the Ka'ba".¹⁶ The same area was regarded as the burial place of other prophets as well. A tradition of Muqātil says that between Zamzam and the Rukn there were buried 70 prophets, including Hūd, Sāliḥ and Ishmael.¹⁷ Another tradition states that the graves of Nūḥ, Hūd, Shu'ayb, Sāliḥ and Ishmael were located between Zamzam and the Maqām.¹⁸ In a further tradition, the number of prophets buried between the Rukn, the Maqām and Zamzam is said to have been 77 or 99.¹⁹

The Hījr is also known as Ḥatīm, and this term as well originally referred to the open area opposite the façade of the Ka'ba. Several traditions relate that the Ḥatīm was situated between the Black Rukn, the door of the Ka'ba, Maqām Ibrāhīm and Zamzam, up to the area of the present Hījr.²⁰ In view of these observations, the entire concept of Lüling concerning the functions of the Ka'ba as a Christian church seems to be entirely baseless.

From the Ka'ba, Lüling turns to the deities worshipped by the pre-Islamic Meccans (p. 162-182). He deals with the 360 *asnām* surrounding the Ka'ba, with Hubal, Isāf and Nā'ilā, and also with Allāt, Manāt (not: al-Manāt!), and al-'Uzzā. All these deities are regarded by Lüling as Christian objects of veneration. In his view, Allāt, Manāt and al-'Uzzā represented Mary. 'Amr B. Luhayy of Khuzā'a, to whom the introduction of the worship of some of these idols in Arabia is attributed in the sources, was, according to Lüling, also a Christian.

Lüling's attempt to prove the Christian origin of the Meccan deities is unsuccessful. His wish to detect a Christian dogma in the pre-Islamic *talbiya* of 'Amr b. Luhayy (p. 165-166) is unconvincing, and his interpretation of an early verse dealing with al-'Uzzā (p. 175 ff.) is too

¹⁴ 'Abd al-Razzāq, *op. cit.*, V, 119-120.

¹⁵ al-Mas'ūdī, *Muraj al-dhahab*, ed. M.M. 'Abd al-Hamīd, Cairo 1965, II, 48.

¹⁶ al-Kalā'ī, *al-Iktifā' fi maghazi al-mustafa*, vol. I, ed. H. Massé, Alger 1932, 119.

¹⁷ al-Azraqī, *op. cit.*, 39.

¹⁸ al-Kharqūshī, *Sharaf al-nabi*, MS Br. Lib., Or. 3014, fol. 167b.

¹⁹ al-Azraqī, *op. cit.*, 34, 363.

²⁰ E.g., Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-buldan*, Beirut 1957, II, 273; al-Azraqī, *op. cit.*, 267.

arbitrary to be acceptable. The real nature of the Meccan deities has not been clarified by Lüling. As for the 360 *asnam* surrounding the Ka'ba, it must be observed that the same objects are also described as *ansāb* (sing. *masīb*), i.e., sacred stones over which the Meccans used to shed the blood of their sacrificial animals.²¹ The statues of Isāf and Nā'ila had the same ritual function,²² which means that the worship of these deities belonged to genuine Arab idolatry, and this is presented as such by the Qur'ān itself (V/3, 90).

The well-known fact that Allāt, Manāt and al-'Uzzā were regarded by the pre-Islamic Arabs as the "daughters of Allāh" is not discussed by Lüling. But precisely this notion of kinship between these deities and Allāh, the High God, excludes from the outset the observation that these goddesses originally represented Mary. It seems that the three daughters of Allāh were more related to the Jin, which were also regarded as having kinship with Allāh (see sūra XXXVIII/158; VI/100), and served as an important object of veneration for the Meccans, and especially for Khuḏā'a.²³ The deities which were regarded by the Arabs as "children" of Allāh – including the Jin – are called in the Qur'ān *shurakā'* (e.g., VI/100), so that those who believe in these deities are *mushrikūn*. The Qur'ānic polemics against these *mushrikūn* are focused on the idea that Allāh does not have children, which means that the deities worshipped by the *mushrikūn* as His children are vain (e.g., LIII/19–23; XXXVIII/149–153; XVII/40; XLIII/16–19; XVI/57; LII/39). It is evident, therefore, that in refuting the ideas of the *mushrikūn* concerning the children of Allāh, the Qur'ān addresses chiefly, if not solely, the Arab idolaters, so that there is not much ground for Lüling's attempt to confine the term *mushrikūn* to "Hellenistic" Christians only (p. 183 ff.).

In the last chapter (215 ff.) Lüling deals with the Qur'ānic passages about Abraham. But these passages as well do not seem to corroborate Lüling's basic postulate, namely, that the idea of the restoration of *dīn Ibrāhīm* was developed by Muḥammad as a part of his struggle against the Hellenistic Christians of Mecca. In fact, *dīn Ibrāhīm* is presented in

²¹ al-Tabarī, *Jamī' al-bayān fī taṣīr al-Qur'ān*, Bulaq 1323H/1905, repr. Beirut 1972, VI, 48–49.

²² al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-maghazī*, ed. J.M.B. Jones, London 1966, II, 795; J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, 3rd ed., Berlin 1961, 77.

²³ E.g., al-Suyūṭī, *al-Durr al-maḥḥūr*, Cairo 1314H/1896, repr. Beirut n.d., V, 292; Ibn al-Kalbī, *Kitāb al-asnām*, ed. A. Zakī Bāshā, Cairo 1914, 34.

the Qur'ān not only in contrast with Christianity, but also in contrast with Judaism and polytheism (see especially III/67; II/135). If Lüling's postulate were correct, one would have found in the Qur'ān a clear and direct confrontation between Christianity and *dīn Ibrāhīm*, which is entirely missing.

Further on (241 ff.), Lüling embarks upon the study of the meaning of *islām/aslama*. He connects it with Abraham who broke with his own father, and explains, accordingly, that *aslama* had originally only the negative sense of "to abandon", "to neglect", "to renounce", "to give up" (old religion, i.e., Hellenistic Christianity). Lüling (254–255) is even able to adduce an early Arabic text in which he believes to find the verb "*aslama*" in the meaning of "to renounce". The text is quoted by Lüling from Ibn Ḥabīb's *Muḥammāq*.²⁴ It forms part of the pact which was concluded by 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib and the tribe of Khuḏā'a, who were, according to Lüling, Christians. The text is rendered by Lüling (p. 254) as follows:

Dies ist, worauf sich Abdulmutalib und die Häupter des Stammes 'Amr der Khuḏā'a verschworen haben samt denen, die mit ihnen sind und *aslama* und *malaka*.

The last sentence in this passage is rendered by Lüling thus: "die sich lossagten und unabhängig gemacht haben." Lüling explains the meaning of the verb "*malaka*" according to Lane's lexicon, and goes on to state that the whole passage indicates that 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib and Khuḏā'a undertook to perform a kind of *hijra*, i.e., to abandon old tribal links, and to form a new confederation of the kind the prophet himself was to establish later on. Concluding his discussion, Lüling states that this passage contains the "erste erkennbare Vorläufer der spätern Koranischen 'islām-Bewegung..."

But here again Lüling seems to have misread the Arabic text. Instead of "*aslama*" and "*malaka*" one should read: "Aslam" and "Mālik"! These are the names of two well known tribes which belonged to the great tribal unit of Khuḏā'a.²⁵ The correct Arabic text of the above passage runs as follows:

²⁴ Ibn Ḥabīb, *al-Muḥammāq fī akḥbar Quraysh*, Hyderabad 1964, 90.

²⁵ On Aslam see M.J. Kister, "Khuḏā'a", *ET*?

hadhā mā lahālaḥa 'alayhi 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib wa-rijālāu Banī 'Amr min Khuzā'a, wa-man ma'ahum min Aslam wa-Malik...

This is the pact which was concluded by 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib and the leaders of Banū 'Amr of Khuzā'a, and the people of Aslam and Malik who were with them.

The passage has, therefore, nothing to do with the question of *aslama*.

Lüling's explanation of "*aslama*" in its negative sense of renouncing is not borne out by the pre-Islamic and Qur'anic usage of this verb. It has already been shown by some eminent scholars²⁶ that this verb in its pre-Islamic usage already denoted the abandonment of polytheism, on the one hand, *and* the exclusive worship of one God only, on the other. Various groups among the Arabs showed such monotheistic tendencies already before Muhammad, and there is nothing to indicate that the term *aslama/islām* which was used by them was specifically and exclusively connected with Abraham's break with his father.

Lüling maintains that in preaching the restoration of *dīn Ibrāhīm*, Muhammad actually returned to the cult of the High Places (Hebrew: *bāmōt*), which, in his view, was preserved in Arabia in its ancient biblical form (p. 261 ff.). According to Lüling, these High Places are referred to in Arabic sources as *jannāt al-jibāl* i.e., "the gardens of the mountains". This term is found by Lüling in an ancient poetic verse ascribed to Waraqa b. Nawfal in which, according to Lüling, the author of the verse expresses his aversion to the cult of *jannāt al-jibāl* (p. 281).

It seems that in this case Lüling has been misled by a defective edition of Waraqa's verses.²⁷ An examination of some parallel sources reveals that the correct reading is *jinnān*, not: *jannāt*.²⁸ The form *jinnān*, which is evidently the *lectio difficilior*, has nothing to do with gardens. It is actually the plural of *jinn*, i.e., demons (= *jinn*). The form *jibāl* is also defective. The true form, which is again the *lectio difficilior*, has been preserved in al-Zubayr b. Bakkar's *Nasab Quraysh*.²⁹ In this book, the relevant hemistich reads: *wa-tarkika jinnāna l-khabālī ka-mā*

²⁶ See the recent study of M. J. Kister, "On a monotheistic aspect of a Jāhiliyya practice", *JSAT (Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam)*, II, 1980, 39-40.

²⁷ Lüling quotes the verses of Waraqa from L. Cheikho, *Kitāb shu'arā' al-nasrāniyya*, vol. I, Beirut 1890, repr. Beirut 1967, 617.

²⁸ E.g., Abū l-Faraj al-Isfahānī, *Kitāb al-aghānī*, Cairo 1285H/1868, repr. Beirut 1970, III, 16, line 8; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, repr. Beirut 1974, II, 243, line 8. ²⁹ al-Zubayr b. Bakkar, *Jamharat nasab Quraysh*, vol. I, ed. M. M. Shakir, Cairo 1962, p. 418. And see the illuminating notes of the editor.

hiya. The true reading is, therefore, "*khabāl*", not "*jibāl*". The term *khabāl* is closely associated with the *jinn*, denoting the corruptness spread by the demons upon earth. The entire poem is addressed by Waraqa to Zayd b. 'Amr b. Nufayl, the well-known *hanīf* who abandoned the idolatry of Quraysh. Zayd is praised in the above hemistich for having abandoned the cult of *jinnān al-khabāl* i.e., the demons who spread corruptness.

It follows that the phrase *jannāt al-jibāl* is actually non-existent in ancient Arabic; in view of this, Lüling's interpretation of the verses of other early poets in which he finds further forms of allusion to the High Places seems to be equally doubtful (279 ff.). Likewise, Lüling's attempt to see in the Qur'anic *janna/jannāt* an allusion to the cult of *jannāt al-jibāl* must be rejected as well (286 ff.).

To return once more to Waraqa, Lüling takes him to be one of Muhammad's arch-enemies who opposed the latter's adherence to the cult of the High Places. The enmity of Waraqa towards Muhammad is illustrated by Lüling through a most arbitrary, and in fact baseless, "reconstruction" of the Arabic text of Ibn Hishām concerning Waraqa (281-286). Waraqa, according to Lüling, was a "Hellenistic Christian" which means that according to Lüling's own terminology he always adhered to "*ibādat al-awṭhān* of Quraysh. But even a brief glance at the above book of al-Zubayr b. Bakkar reveals the explicit report that Waraqa abandoned the "*ibādat al-awṭhān* and looked for the true *dīn*".³⁰ In fact, this person is explicitly mentioned among those Qurashīs who, together with Zayd b. 'Amr, abandoned the *dīn* of their own tribe, and looked for the *hanīfiyya*, the *dīn Ibrāhīm*. It was only later on that Waraqa became well versed in Christian lore.³¹ Although Waraqa never had the chance to embrace Islam officially, he is counted among the *ṣāḥba* of the prophet.³² Ibn Hajar, in his *Isāba*, quotes some verses of Waraqa from the original book of Ibn Ishāq (not in the recension of Ibn Hishām) in which Waraqa states that he is convinced that Muhammad was a true prophet to whom Gabriel spoke.³³

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 408.

³¹ Ibn Hishām, *al-Sīra al-nabawiyya*, ed. al-Saqqā, al-Abayārī, Shalabī (I-IV), repr. Beirut 1971, I, 237-238.

³² E.g., Ibn Hajar al-Asqalānī, *al-Isāba fī tamyiz al-ṣāḥba*, ed. al-Bijāwī, Cairo 1971, VI, 607 ff.

³³ *Ibid.*, VI, 609.

In order to illustrate the enmity of the Hellenistic Christians of Quraysh towards Muhammad, the follower of *din Ibrahim*, Lüling (p. 294 ff.) finally adduces a Muslim tradition which he defines as an "aussergewöhnlich... Bericht." This tradition relates that 'Uqba b. Abi Mu'ayt followed the advice of Abū Jahl, and threw the after-birth (*salā*) of a recently slaughtered she-camel at Muhammad's back, when the latter was prostrating himself in prayer.³⁴ According to Lüling, the *salā* actually covered the prophet: the after-birth was an ancient symbol of a prophetic mantle, and thus the Meccans wished to mock at Muhammad's prophetic aspirations. It seems, however, that the *salā* in this tradition has nothing to do with the so-called mantle symbol. It functions merely as a filthy object with which Quraysh tried to disgrace the prophet. This is corroborated, first of all, by the fact that in other versions of the same story, the *salā* is mentioned together with the intestines (*farth*) and the blood (*dam*) of the she-camel.³⁵ Furthermore, in another early version recorded by Ibn Sa'd,³⁶ the same 'Uqba, who is accompanied by Abū Lahab, is said to have put intestines (*furūth*) near Muhammad's front door. Muhammad removed them and put them in the street. The fact that in the above tradition the filthy offal is thrown at Muhammad during prayer indicates that apart from disgracing the prophet, Quraysh also tried to spoil his prayer. In a Shi'i version of the same event it is indeed related that Abū Jahl ordered to spoil Muhammad's prayer, and thereupon one of the Meccans threw intestines and blood at the prophet. It was Abū Ṭalib who came to Muhammad's rescue.³⁷ The same Abū Jahl features in several additional traditions in which he tries to stop Muhammad from praying, by threatening to throw stones at him, or to trample on his neck.³⁸

In conclusion, Lüling's present book about the emergence of Islam has been written with much inspiration, but its basic assumptions and conclusions can hardly be accepted.

Uri Rubin

³⁴ Ahmad b. Hanbal, *op. cit.*, I, 393, 417; al-Bukhārī, *Sahih*, Cairo 1958, IV, 127; V, 57; see also I, 69; IV, 53; Muslim, *op. cit.*, V, 179-180.

³⁵ al-Bukhārī, *op. cit.*, I, 138.

³⁶ Ibn Sa'd, *al-Tabaqat al-kubra*, Beirut 1960, I, 201.

³⁷ Ibn Shahrāshub, *Manaqib al-Abi Talib*, Najaf 1956, I, 54.

³⁸ E.g., Ibn Hishām, *op. cit.*, I, 319-320. And see the commentaries on Qur'an XCVI/6-19.