Because truth deserves a fair examination

TRUTH ON A SINGLE SCALE

A Map of Religions and Beliefs for Every Objective Seeker of Truth

Religions | Prophets | Scriptures | Philosophies | Doubt | Atheism



Hashim Hussein Ali Al-Khasawneh

TRUTH ON

A SINGLE SCALE

A Map of Religions and Beliefs

for Every Objective Seeker of Truth

Hashim Hussein Ali Al-Khasawneh

Truth on a Single Scale: A Map of Religions and Beliefs for Every Objective Seeker of Truth

Hashim Hussein Ali Al-Khasawneh

First edition, 2026 (1448 AH). Copyright © 2026 by the author.

English edition prepared from the Arabic original, *Al-Haqiqa bi-Mizan Wahid* (2026), with the author's participation. Quotations from scriptures follow the published translations listed in "A Note on Translations, Names, and Conventions."

The book in two lines: This is a book that does not tell its reader what to believe. It sets before the reader a wide map of what human beings have believed across history—religions and prophets, scriptures and philosophies, doubt and unbelief—then places in the reader's hands the tools of thinking and comparison, and leaves the decision to them.

The author holds a declared belief of his own. The reader will find it in "A Word from the Author," which closes the book after the appendices and its reference materials. It was placed last on purpose, so that the map is read before the mapmaker.

And if the size of this book gives you pause, begin here: beneath the title of every chapter and every study stands a summary of three lines. Read those summaries alone, end to end—about half an hour—and you will hold the whole map of the book. Then go down into whatever concerns you, in whatever order you please. Nothing in this book requires you to read it from front to back.

Contents

An Invitation to Think Again	1
Introduction: To the Honest Seeker	2
Before You Begin: Each in Its Own Tongue	9
A Note on Translations, Names, and Conventions	17
Part I: The Question	**19**
Chapter 1: Is the Human Being Made for Worship? (Humankind and the Search for God)	19
Chapter 2: The Human Being Between Faith and Doubt	40
Chapter 3: Did Ignorance Make Superstition— And Where Does Religion Stand in Relation to It?	53
Part II: The Seeker's Tools	**65**
Chapter 4: How Do We Think About Truth?	67
Chapter 5: The Biases That Blind the Seeker	75
Chapter 6: By What Standard Do We Compare?	82
The Seeker's Toolkit: The Book's Rules on a Single Page	87

Part III: The Map	**92**
Chapter 7: What Is Religion? and How Have Human Beings Studied It?	92
Study 7.1: "Heavenly" And "Man-Made"—The Origin of the Division, Its Limits, and Alternative Maps	104
Chapter 8: A Map of the History of Religions and Beliefs	111
Chapter 9: "God"—What Do Human Beings Mean When They Use the Word?	133
Study 9.1: One, or Many?—Monotheism and Polytheism on the Scales of History and Reason, and the Question of "He Begot No One, nor Was He Begotten	155
Chapter 10: The Intermediate Unseen—Magic, the Evil Eye, Blessing, and Good Fortune	167
Study 10.1: Angels and Celestial Beings Across Religions and Civilizations	191
A Study Annexed to Chapter 10: Lived Religion—Worship, Giving, and the Sacred Image	206
Chapter 11: Preaching and Mission—How Do Religions Present Themselves to Others?	214
Study 11.1: Why Do Religions Spread, Endure, and Divide?—Three Social Paths	239
A Chapter Completing Part III: What Have the Religions Said About One Another?	249

Part IV: Messengers and Intermediaries	**246**
Chapter 12: Messengers, Prophets, and Reformers in the Memory of the Peoples	246
Study 12.1: To Whom Were the Prophets Sent, and for What Age?—Particularity and Universality in the Messages Across the Religions	313
Chapter 13: The Phenomenon of Claimin Prophethood—How Do We Read It?	326
Chapter 14: Miracles and Wonders—When the Ordinary Splits Open	338
Part V: The Texts	**358**
Chapter 15: A Map of the Sacred Texts Across the Civilizations	358
Study 15.1: The Comprehensive Table of the Founding Texts—Twelve Axes by One Standard	369
Study 15.2: Religion and Languages—Where Did Language Come from, Why Did It Multiply, and Did Adam Have a First Language That Influenced All Languages?	391
Chapter 16: How Did the Texts Reach Us?	404
Study 16.1: The Mechanisms of Collection, Writing, and Preservation Under the Microscope—And the Great Comparison	422

Part VI: The Other Face	**446**
Chapter 17: The History of Doubt, Atheism, and Irreligion Across the Civilizations (The Other Face)	446
Part VII: The Field of Evidence	**480**
Chapter 18: Is There Evidence for God's Existence? (Stage One Evidence)	480
Study 18.1: How Does a Believer Present His Case?—The Principles of Dialogue with the Non-Believer	504
Study 18.2: The Facing Mirror—How Does a Non-Believer Present His Case to a Believer?	518
The Gate of Chapter 19: By What Standard Will We Judge? Declaring the Scale Before Entering the Field	530
A Study Annexed to Chapter 18: The Mystical Experience Across Religions—Is Everyone Describing the Same Mountain?	539
Chapter 19: How Does Each Religion Argue for Itself? (Stage Two Evidence)	547
Study 19.1: The Linguistic Inimitability of the Qur'an—The Argument and Its Discussion	551
Study 19.2: The Remaining Aspects of Inimitability—The Unseen, the Legislative, and the Numerical	563
Study 19.3: "Scientific Inimitability" And Allusions That Preceded Science—Across All the Sacred Books	573

Study 19.4: The Argument from Prophecies and Fore-tellings—The Two Facing Mirrors	589
Study 19.5: The Arguments from Testimony, Mass Transmission, and Fruit—The Social-Historical Trio —	600
Study 19.6: Which Book Could Truly Be the Word of God?	611
Part VIII: The Great Questions	**622**
An Introductory Study to Chapter 20: Fate and Predesti-nation Across Religions and Civilizations—Who Writes Destiny, and Where Does Human Freedom Stand?	622
Chapter 20: The Problem of Evil	635
Chapter 21: Satan and the Powers of Evil—The Dark Mirror	646
Study 21.1: The Iblis of the Qur'an—Does He Have a Presence in Other Religions and Civilizations?	666
Chapter 22: Does Morality Need God?	677
Study 22.1: The Lawful and the Forbidden Across the Religions—A Map of the Great Prohibitions and Their Systems	695
Study 22.2: A Comprehensive System of Life, or a Path of the Spirit?—A Map of "Legislative Comprehensive-ness" Across the Religions	708

Study 22.3: Religion and Power—A Map of the Relationship Between the Religions and Rule Across History to the Present	717
Study 22.4: The Religions and Wars—How They Influenced and Were Influenced, Whether the Sword Spread Religion, and How Religions Recede	732
A Study Annexed to Chapter 22: Women in the Scriptures, the Laws, and History—The File That Tests the Single Scale Most Severely	745
Chapter 23: Science and Religion—Adversaries or Neighbors?	756
Study 23.1: "Science Does Not Find God in the Laboratory"—The Limits of the Empirical Method	761
Study 23.2: Physics and Religion—The Science That Stands at the Edge of Metaphysics	773
Study 23.3: Astronomy and Religion—The Sky at Which Everything Began	783
Study 23.4: The Origin of the Universe in the Great Religions—The Creation Stories Before the Big Bang	791
Study 23.5: The Origin of the Human Being Across Religions and Cultures—Adam and Eve, the Single Origin, and the Question of Evolution	805

Study 23.6: Darwin and the Religions—How the Theory Changed People's Thinking, How the Clergy Confronted It, Who Accepted It and Who Refuted It, and the Strongest That Stands for It and Against It	817
Study 23.7: The Flood Across Religions and Civilizations—The Story of Noah: Does Everyone Know It, and What Does Their Knowing It Mean?	829
Study 23.8: Neuroscience, Psychiatry, and Religion—Science Enters the Believer's Head	844
Study 23.9: Philosophy and Religion—Adversaries or Neighbors?	855
Chapter 24: Death and What Follows	874
A First Introductory Study to Chapter 24: Soul and Body Across Religions and Civilizations—"What Am I?" Before "Where Am I Going?"	875
A Second Introductory Study to Chapter 24: The Day of Judgment (The Last Day) Across Religions and Cultures	890
The Body of Chapter 24: In the Depths of the Other Abodes—The Great Analysis	903
A Chapter Completing Part VIII: Religion in the Age of Acceleration—From the Industrial Revolution to Artificial Intelligence	917

A Study Annexed to the Chapter on the Age of Acceleration: The Future of the Religions—Who Endures and Who Fades, Who Changes and Who Holds, Who Grows and Who Shrinks?	932
Part IX: The Decision and the Road	**950**
Chapter 25: The Seeker's Options	950
Chapter 26: Accepting the Other—The Ethics of the Road	955
Study 26.1: Accepting the Other, Pluralism, and Freedom of Belief Across Religions and Civilizations—The Great Historical Survey	966
What the Journey Yielded: Ten Conclusions Before the Last Word	980
Appendices	**987**
Appendix A: A Comparison of the Ten Great Religions That Have Passed over the Planet	987
Appendix B — The Table of Figures by the Sixfold Classification	1004
Appendix C — Glossary of Terms	1019
Appendix D — Balanced Further Reading	1025
Appendix E — The Sources of This Book and Its Documentation	1032

Appendix F — The Major Claims on the Sevenfold Ladder of Examination	1035
Appendix G — The Religions in Numbers: The 2010 and 2020 Data	1045
Appendix H — The Book's Summary in a Few Pages: The Simplified Comparison	1061
Appendix I — The List of References	1070
Appendix J — The Index: Figures, Terms, and Traditions	1109
A Word from the Author: Where I Stood—and Where the Book Stood	1128

An Invitation to Think Again

Step back, a little, from ready-made ideas, from programmed minds, and from the beliefs we inherited without ever testing them for ourselves.

Give yourself a real chance to ask, to search, and to reflect—and then choose out of awareness and conviction, not out of habit and inheritance.

Do not fear the question; the truth is not afraid of those who ask it. Do not let what you are used to stand as a wall between you and what you are looking for.

Think with your own mind, search honestly, choose freely—and accept the other person, respecting their right to walk their road as you have chosen to walk yours.

My father once said to me:

"What you believe to be true, what you are convinced is true, what you were raised to hold as true—may not be true in any absolute sense."

This book began with that sentence.

Introduction: To the Honest Seeker

This book is for you—if you are someone who lies awake with the question and is not satisfied by answers handed down by rote. Perhaps you were born into a religion you inherited the way you inherited your name, and then one day a question knocked at your heart without asking permission: why this religion and not another? Perhaps you lost an old certainty and found yourself out in the open, in a place you never chose. Perhaps you are a believer at peace with your faith who simply wants to know what the neighbors believe. Perhaps you are an unbeliever who wants to see what you reject at its strongest, not its flimsiest. Perhaps you are a father or a mother whose child is asking what no one ever asked you. This book was written for all of you—and for anyone standing somewhere in between.

Why was it written? Because the bookshelf is crowded with people telling you what to believe. Books of religious outreach want you here; books of missionary persuasion want you there; books of atheism want you outside all of them. Every one of them shows you its own wares in the best light and its rivals' wares in the worst. The book that puts the whole map in your hands, hands you the scale, and then steps aside—that book is rare. That is what we have attempted: **a book that does not tell you what to choose, but makes you able to choose.**

What will you find in it? A journey in nine parts, twenty-seven chapters, more than thirty studies, and ten appendices. (A "study" is a focused inquiry nested within a chapter and numbered after it: Study 7.1, Study 23.9, and

so on.) The parts are arranged as a journey, each stage handing off to the next.

Before any of that, a short section lets the traditions speak for themselves: thirteen testimonies in the first person, about a hundred words each, so that you may know what a tradition's people believe, how they see their religion, and why they find truth and meaning in it. Nothing there is weighed or questioned—the book's first rule is to know a belief from its own people, and those pages are that rule's first application.

Then we begin with **the question itself (Part I).** Why do human beings turn to religion at all? How do they live between faith and doubt? And where does religion stand in relation to superstition?

Then—before you enter any arena—we hand you **the seeker's tools (Part II),** the heart of this book: how to think about truth, which biases blind you, and by what standard to compare. Part II closes with a "Toolkit" that gathers every rule in the book on a single page.

Then we unfold **the map (Part III):** what religion is and how it has been studied; what people have believed across the civilizations; how they have pictured God; what lies in the hidden layer of magic, the evil eye, and blessing; how religions present themselves; and what they have said about one another.

Then come **the messengers and intermediaries (Part IV):** who claimed to bring a message, to whom, and for what age—and how claims of prophecy and miracle are to be read.

Then **the texts (Part V):** a map of the sacred books and their languages, a comparison of them along twelve axes,

and the story of how they reached us, measured by criteria stated in advance.

Then **the other face (Part VI):** the history of those who did not believe. A map without that continent is an incomplete map.

Then the largest arena of reason, **the field of evidence (Part VII)**, in its two stages: is there evidence that God exists, and how does each religion argue for itself? A gate stands before it, declaring the standard before any verdict is reached. And on either side of it is the principles of dialogue—how a believer and a non-believer each present a case fairly to the other.

Then **the great questions (Part VIII),** where everyone collides. Destiny and evil. Satan. Morality, and everything that branches from it: the permitted and the forbidden, religion's reach over the whole of life, political authority, and war. Science and religion, with its files running from the origin of the universe and of humankind to Darwin, the Flood, and the brain. Death and what follows it. Finally, religion in the age of acceleration—and its future.

We end with **the decision and the road (Part IX):** what your options are, how to treat those who differ from you, and how to live with your question.

The appendices carry a survey of the ten great religions, a table of figures, a glossary, balanced further reading, a statement of sources, the major claims weighed on a single standard, the religions in numbers, a summary of the whole book, a bibliography, and an index of names and terms.

What is its charter? Five pledges we have bound ourselves to on every page. We set them down here so that you can hold us to them:

1. **Descriptive neutrality.** We present every belief as its own people understand it and in its strongest form, and we present its critique as its critics offer it and in its strongest form—for an argument that is to be defeated should be defeated in its best clothes, not its rags. **And the book does not, in its own voice, rank one religion above another.** Every preference you read in it is attributed to those who hold it: "its supporters hold . . . its critics object . . ." Whatever is the author's own opinion is confined to the paragraphs marked "A Word from the Author." The last of these closes the book, after the appendices. There the author states his creed in plain words—set apart from the text, not presiding over it.
2. **A constant distinction** among four layers that people blur together: the religious text, documented history, contested narrative, and myth.
3. **Opening questions, not imposing answers.** Every chapter ends with an open question, and the verdict is yours alone.
4. **Honesty about the limits of knowledge.** We say "we don't know" where we don't know. We say "most civilizations" where we cannot say "all". And we alert you whenever our only source for a people is what their opponents wrote about them.
5. **Respect for you and for every believer.** No intimidation, no enticement, and no mockery of anyone's belief—or of anyone's leaving it.

And by what method? Wherever we present a claim—religious or irreligious—we climb the same ladder of seven rungs: the claim; its strongest case; the strongest objection to it; the strongest reply to the objection; what is established; what is not; and the seeker's question. We call it the Seven-Rung Ladder. You will find it laid out in Chapter 4 and applied to the major claims in Appendix F.

Before the arena in which religions are compared, we declared the standard openly—the purpose of the comparison, its scope, its units, and its ten criteria—at the gate of Chapter 19. We pledged not to change it along the way: we do not demand rigorous documentation from one religion and then accept a spiritual experience from another. We said "most civilizations" where we could not say "all". We attributed every preference to those who hold it. And we kept the author's opinion inside the paragraphs marked "A Word from the Author."

And what is it made of ? A working library of more than a hundred sources in Arabic and English: the foundational works of the Islamic tradition (from Ghazali, Ibn Rushd, and Ibn Taymiyya to Ibn al-Qayyim and Baqillani); the founding texts of the religions and the commentaries of their own people; modern studies in comparative religion; philosophy of religion from both of its shores (Plantinga and Swinburne facing Mackie and Oppy); the literature of defense and critique from every faith community, each piece labeled by its genre; and the global surveys of religion, with their figures. We have recorded the sources for every chapter. We have pledged to you an independent, line-by-line audit of every number, date, and attribution in

the book—because a book that offers itself as a scale has no right to even a small error.

And how should it be read? The book is built to be read in order; its parts are a journey, and each stage hands off to the next. But its chapters were also written to stand on their own. Do not let the bulk of it intimidate you: beneath the title of every chapter and every study stands a summary of three lines—the question it takes up, and what it does with it. Read those summaries alone, straight through, and in about half an hour you will hold the map of the whole book: what it treats, where each file lies, and which chapters speak to whatever keeps you awake. Then go down into what concerns you, in whatever order you please. If one question burns in you, go straight to its chapter; every chapter carries cross-references to its siblings. If your time is short, read Part II (the tools) with the Toolkit that closes it, the gate of Chapter 19, and the appendix of major claims—there the book is in miniature. Do not read it to be done with it. Read it to begin.

A last word. We will not promise that you will close this book with your mind made up. No honest book can make that promise. But we promise what is within a book's power: that you will leave knowing the survey, knowing the evidence, and knowing yourself—so that if you choose afterward, your choice will be the choice of someone who has seen all the roads, not of someone who was shown only one. That, we believe, is the noblest gift a book can offer an honest seeker.

A note before you begin. The author of this book holds a belief, and he does not hide it. He states it plainly in "A

Word from the Author," which closes the book after the appendices and its reference materials—together with a pledge that this belief wrote no line of the main text and tipped no scale within it. If you would rather know your companion before the journey, read that word first. If you would rather weigh the map on your own scale before you weigh its maker—and that is what we hope—leave it for the end of the path.

Before You Begin: Each in Its OwnTongue

Thirteen testimonies in the first person, about a hundred words for each tradition—so that you may know what its people believe, how they see their religion, and why they find truth and meaning in it

Summary: Before analysis, comparison, and weighing, every religion deserves to introduce itself in the strongest form its own people recognize. Here the book's voice falls silent and each tradition speaks in the first person—not to persuade you, but so that you begin the journey seeing the world from inside its doors.

Why begin this way? Because much of what we know about other people's religions reached us from their opponents, or from books of comparison, and not from their own adherents. A Muslim may know Christianity from the refutations of it; a Christian may know Islam from missionary literature; and both may reduce Buddhism to an encyclopedia page. This book will compare, and weigh, and examine—but it will not do so before it has heard each side in its own tongue. Its first rule is: know a belief from its own people. These pages are that rule's first application.

How should these testimonies be read? They are not sayings transmitted word for word from particular individuals, and they are not verdicts the book adopts. They are an attempt at fairness: to compose, for each tradition, what an educated believer who loves his religion might

say if asked to show, in about a hundred words, why his path appears to him true and beautiful. That is why each testimony speaks with confidence, without apology, without comparison, and without criticism—all of that will come in its place. Read them together rather than singly, because the strength of this section lies in seeing that every house has an inhabited interior that may not be visible to someone standing outside it.

---

* Judaism—In the Voice of a Believing Jew

I am not an individual seeking his own salvation; I am a link in a covenant I did not sign alone. My fathers stood at Sinai, and I stood with them—so we say at every Passover: as though I myself came out of Egypt. God is One, without image and without partner, and He chose us not for any merit in us but to carry a trust: to live His law in the smallest details, so that I sanctify the table, the Sabbath, and the word. I do not so much await a private salvation as work at the repair of the world—*tikkun olam*. My questions to God are part of my faith, not a breach of it: the very name of my people means whoever wrestles with God. I am a witness, a memory, and a waiting.

* Christianity—In the Voice of a Believing Christian

I came to know that God is not a distant idea but a person who loved me first. He was not content to send a message. He came Himself, was born in a manger, walked among us, and died on a cross—not for a sin He committed but for a sin I committed. This is grace: that I cannot earn His love by my work, so He gave it freely, and all I must do is receive it. When He rose from the dead He opened a door that has not been shut since. So I do not worship a God who is a

stranger to pain—my God has tasted all of it. I know that I fail every day, and then return, and find Him waiting for me as the father waited on the road for his prodigal son.

* Islam—In the Voice of a Believing Muslim

I bear witness that there is no god but God alone, without partner, and that Muhammad is His servant and messenger. Between me and my Lord there is no priest and no intermediary; I call upon Him and He hears, I sin and repent and He forgives. His final message is preserved in its very wording. I read it in the language it came down in, and Muslims repeat its verses from the east of the earth to the west. My religion is not one compartment of my life but its method: in ablution and prayer, and in trade, marriage, and the right of the neighbor. I believe in all the prophets, from Adam to Jesus, making no distinction among them. I live between hope and fear: hoping for a mercy that has encompassed everything, fearing a day on which an atom's weight of good and an atom's weight of evil are weighed.

* Hinduism—In the Voice of a Believing Hindu

Truth is one; the wise call it by many names. What you see as many gods is nothing but faces of a single Absolute that no name can bound: Brahman. I am not this body nor this name. In my depths is the *atman*, which is not born and does not die, and my aim is to realize that it is not separate from Brahman. No single road is imposed on me: let the one ruled by his heart love. The one ruled by his mind know. The one ruled by action act without attachment to the fruit. My deeds shape my destiny by a law that favors no one, the law of karma, and I have lifetimes enough to learn. My religion is not a creed I sign, but a life I inherited across thousands of years.

* Buddhism—In the Voice of a Believing Buddhist

I do not ask you to believe me; I ask you to try. I have seen a simple truth: there is suffering in life, and my suffering intensifies the more I cling to what does not last—to things, to people, and to the idea of a fixed "I" that has no fixity. So when attachment lightens, suffering lightens. That is why I walk a path of eight branches: in my view and my intention, my speech and my action, my livelihood and my effort, my mindfulness and my meditation. I do not wait for a god to rescue me, nor do I make denying him my cause. My question is nearer than that: how do I put out this thirst that is burning me now? The utmost I hope for is not a bliss bestowed on me, but a waking I reach, and release from the round of birth and death.

* Sikhism—In the Voice of a Believing Sikh

One God, Creator, without fear and without enmity, unborn and undying: so our book opens. I do not seek Him in a forest or a cell; I seek Him while I work with my hands, share my earnings with others, and remember His Name. Those are the three foundations of my path: honest work, sharing, and remembrance. I have no priesthood and no castes; whoever enters our temple sits on the floor and eats from our common kitchen, prince or pauper. My holy book is my living teacher, gathering the poems of our sages together with poems of saints from other religions. I carry on my body the signs that remind me that if I see injustice, I am not permitted to pass by in silence.

* Jainism—In the Voice of a Believing Jain

Every soul holds a light that wants to be free, and the heaviest thing that puts it out is violence. So the rule for me is

stricter than others imagine: I harm no human, no animal, no insect if I can help it. I filter water before drinking it; I walk unhurried. Nor do I brandish absolute truth in anyone's face, for no single view encircles the truth: the elephant itself is other than what each of us blind men touches—so the humility of knowledge is a doctrine with me, not a courtesy. I do not wait for a god to release me. The path is my own work: to lighten my soul of the weight of its own deeds until it rises, light. My whole life is a training in reducing the harm in the world.

* Zoroastrianism—In the Voice of a Believing Zoroastrian

The cosmos is an arena of choice, not a stage for futility. There is light and there is darkness, and the difference between them is not theoretical: it passes through my heart every day. My God, Ahura Mazda, is wise and good, with no evil in Him. Evil is not from Him but against Him—and I am enlisted in this battle with three words I have kept since childhood: good thought, good word, good deed. I keep the fire in my temple not to worship it, but because it is the purest symbol of purity that I know. I do not renounce the world or flee it; building, farming, and honesty in dealings are worship. I know that the light will win in the end—and that my share in it is the measure of what I added to it.

* The Chinese Tradition—In the Voice of a Believing Confucian and Taoist

I do not begin from Heaven but from the household. The world's repair begins when the son is right with his father, the brother with his brother, the ruler with those he rules; when relations are straightened, everything is straightened. I learn from the ancients not because they are ancient, but because propriety and rite and music make a human being what he is. Yet I know the limit of contrivance: the Tao that can be spoken is not the eternal Tao, and the wisest thing I do is sometimes to do nothing—to run like water, soft, and overcome the hard. I honor my ancestors and so feel myself a link in a chain rather than a passing individual. I do not trouble myself much with what follows death: if a man cannot serve the living well, how shall he serve the spirits?

* Shinto—In the Voice of a Believing Shintoist

The sacred is not far off in a sky; it is here: in the mountain, the ancient tree, the waterfall, the field that feeds us. These are the *kami*, and they are not so much gods who rule as a presence that deserves respect. That is why I pass under the red gate and wash my hands and mouth before entering—not because I am guilty, but because purity is a state to be recovered, as clarity is recovered after dust. I do not, for the most part, ask for salvation from this world. I ask for harmony with it: seasons that pass in peace, a quiet house, a good harvest. I honor my ancestors, and celebrate the spring, and feel that my island itself is alive. My religion says little and is rich in rite and in gratitude.

* The Baha'i Faith—In the Voice of a Believing Baha'i

God is greater than can be grasped, yet He has not left us. He has sent, across history, a succession of educators—Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Krishna, and Buddha—each of whom taught humanity what it could bear in its own age. So the religions are not contradictory but chapters of one book, and our chapter has come: that humanity reach its maturity and become one people. Therefore I hold that the earth is one homeland, that human beings are the leaves of a single tree, and that prejudice—religious or national—is the disease. I have no priesthood; we gather, consult, and make our decision together. I believe that religion, if it contradicts science, has become superstition.

* The Indigenous Traditions—In the Voice of a Believing Animist

My land does not belong to me; I belong to it. The mountain I was born beside is my grandfather, the river is my relative, and the animal I hunt gives itself to me if I respect it and thank it—and if I behave badly, the game turns away from us and drought comes. I have no book, but I have songs, and ancestors who speak in dreams, and a mediator who knows how to travel where we cannot and repair what we have spoiled. I do not separate my religion from my life, because I have no word that means "religion" at all: farming is prayer, birth is rite, and death is a passage to the other side of the village. I fear one thing only: that the name and the song be forgotten.

* Irreligion—In the Voice of a Convinced Non-believer

(Set down here to complete the single scale: a book that hears every tradition in its own tongue hears also from whoever follows no tradition.)

I am not angry at God; I find no sufficient reason to believe that He exists. This is not a posture of superiority but of caution: I believe in proportion to the evidence, and I say "I do not know" when I do not know—which is harder than certainty, not easier. I see in the universe an order I do not need an intender to understand, and I see in history thousands of gods that died one by one. My morality is not without foundation: I do not injure because I know what injury means, not because I await a reward or fear a punishment. A single life with no repetition makes this moment more precious, not cheaper. I am here once; let what I leave behind be good.

And before you go on: you have now passed thirteen doors, each with an inhabited world inside it, and each with the logic that persuades whoever lives there. Keep hold of that feeling. You will need it every time a religion is placed on the scale, so that you remember that behind every cell in every table is a human being who sees truth and meaning in it. As for the deeper question—why did one of these voices seem nearer to your heart: the strength of its evidence, or the effect of upbringing and inclination in you?—that is the question of this whole book, and we will return to it.

A Note on Translations, Names, and Conventions

Scripture. Wherever this book quotes a sacred text, it quotes a published translation rather than rendering the Arabic author's citation anew: the Qur'an in M. A. S. Abdel Haleem's translation (Oxford University Press); the Bible in the New Revised Standard Version, with the King James Version where its wording is the one readers know by heart; the Bhagavad Gita in Eknath Easwaran's translation; the Pali Canon in Bhikkhu Bodhi's translations; the *Tao Te Ching* in D. C. Lau's; and the *Analects* in Edward Slingerland's. Where the author's own reading of a verse matters to the argument, the book says so.

God. The Arabic *Allah* is rendered "God" throughout, as it is by Arabic-speaking Jews, Christians, and Muslims alike. Where a tradition's own name for the divine is at issue—*Brahman*, *Ahura Mazda*, the *Tao*—the book keeps that name.

Names and terms. Arabic names appear in a simplified form without diacritics (Ghazali, not al-Ghazālī). Islamic terms that have entered English scholarship are used as they are—*tawhid*, *hadith*, *tafsir*—and each is explained at its first appearance and again in the glossary (Appendix C). The same holds for terms from other traditions.

Sources. Works originally written in English are cited and quoted from their English editions. Works in other European languages are quoted from standard English translations, named in Appendix I. And the Arabic works this book

rests on—Ghazali, Shahrastani, Qurtubi, Ibn Hazm, and the contemporary Arabic literature of comparative religion—are cited by transliterated title, with an English translation noted wherever one exists. Nothing in this edition is translated back into English from an Arabic rendering.

Honorifics. Muslim readers customarily add a blessing after the names of prophets ("peace be upon him"). In keeping with the practice of English-language scholarship, this edition leaves those blessings to the reader's own voice, and no disrespect is intended by their absence on the page.

Dates. Years are given in the Common Era; where a date belongs to the Islamic calendar and the difference matters, the Hijri year is added (AH).

The seeker. The book's introduction is addressed to *al-ha'ir al-sadiq*—literally "the sincere perplexed one," the person who is honestly at a loss. This edition calls that person *the honest seeker*, and addresses you, the reader, in the second person, as the author does throughout.

Structure. "Chapter" and "Part" keep their ordinary meanings. A "Study" is a focused inquiry attached to a chapter and numbered after it (Study 19.3 is the third study attached to Chapter 19). A "gate" is a short threshold text that states the rules before a demanding section begins. Appendices are lettered A through J.

Part I: The Question

Why does a human being search at all?

Chapter 1:

Is the Human Being Made for Worship? (Humankind and the Search for God)

The phenomenon, its four explanations, and what it does and does not prove

Summary of the chapter: On every continent and in every age we can trace, human beings have built grander houses for the unseen than for themselves. What explains an insistence that crosses every boundary of time and place? The scale of the phenomenon is mapped first, then four rival explanations—innate disposition, psychological need, social function, and cognitive evolution—each at its strongest, each against its strongest objection.

* First: The Scene—The Strangest Phenomenon in the History of Our Species

If a visitor from another planet came down to study human beings, it would not be struck by the fact that they eat, sleep, and fight. That is the way of all living things. What would stop it is something else, something we know no parallel to in any other creature:

In nearly every age, continent, climate, and stage of civilization whose traces we know—from the cave to the skyscraper—this creature has found itself lifting its head toward something above it, building for the unseen houses grander than its own, offering it the most precious things it has, and living and dying with its name on its lips.

Let us pause before the sheer breadth of the scene before we explain it, because the question cannot be properly measured until the size of the phenomenon has been seen.

In depth of time. The oldest traces of symbolic and funerary behavior in humans are older than writing, older than agriculture, older than cities. Graves tens of thousands of years old hold the dead laid out with care, with tools and ornaments and pigments beside them—as if those who buried them did not believe the story ended at the soil. Then comes the great surprise that overturned the assumptions of the scholars themselves: **Göbekli Tepe** in southern Turkey, a complex of massive carved stone pillars, built by hunter-gatherers about eleven and a half thousand years ago—that is, **before** human beings knew agriculture or settled life. The prevailing assumption had been that humans built the city first and then, with leisure, built the temple. This site suggests the reverse: that gathering for the sacred may have been among the forces that drew people together and settled them. Humans did not build the temple when they had time to spare. The temple was very nearly the first thing they built.

In geographic breadth. Civilizations that never once set eyes on each other—no bridge between the Nile valley and the Andes, none between Mesopotamia and the islands of the Pacific—nonetheless produced the same system: an object of worship, a rite, an offering, a priest or intermediary, a story about the origin of the world, and an answer about the fate of the dead. The names and faces change; the structure stays the same, to an astonishing degree.

* Second: The Map of the Worshiped—A Dazzling Variety in a Single Direction

Simply listing the kinds of things worshiped is half the matter. Let us arrange the survey so that its structure shows:

They worshiped the One God. The pure monotheism represented by the Abrahamic religions—one God, Creator, transcending His creation, without partner—and with it flashes of monotheism outside that circle: Akhenaten's revolt against the gods of Egypt in favor of Aten alone in the fourteenth century BCE; the *hanifs* of pre-Islamic Arabia; Ahura Mazda in some readings of Zoroastrianism. Tengri, the supreme sky god of the Mongols and Turks, whom they knew and revered without following any written law of his, as the travelers' sources describe them (Ibn Fadlan, and later the monks of the thirteenth century).

They worshiped many gods, one for every concern. The great pantheons—Enlil, Enki, and Ishtar in Mesopotamia; Zeus, Apollo, and Athena in Greece; Odin and Thor among the Germanic peoples. Three hundred and thirty

million deities in the popular Hindu reckoning—a division of divinity across the affairs of life: a god for rain and a goddess for fertility, a god for war and a god for the dead. As if humankind had projected onto the sky the order of the state it knew on earth—or, in the believer's reading, as if the first light of monotheism had been refracted through the glass of human beings and scattered into colors.

They worshiped the sun and the forces of nature.

Ra, Shamash, Surya, Amaterasu—the sun in particular was worshiped almost everywhere, and with it the moon, thunder, the river, the sea, the mountain, and fire. There is nothing strange in this: these were the greatest powers the ancients saw giving them life and able to take it away.

They worshiped animals, or held them sacred.

The sacred bull Apis, the crocodiles and cats of Egypt, the cow in India, and the animal totems of the peoples of the Americas, Africa, and Australia. Usually the animal itself was not the final object of worship but a symbol of a power dwelling in it or appearing through it—and this is an important methodological caution: much of what we call "worship of idols and animals" was described by its own practitioners as worship of what lies behind them. "We only worship them because they bring us nearer to God," as the Qur'an itself reports the pagan Arabs saying (39:3).

They worshiped deified human beings.

The pharaohs of Egypt, sons of Ra. The Roman emperors, deified by decree of the Senate after death (some of them in life); the emperor of Japan, descendant of the sun goddess until the middle of the twentieth century. The saints and holy men raised above humanity in the popular

religion of every faith. The modern age, too, has produced patterns of leader-veneration and personalized power in which some researchers see features resembling some of the functions of religious veneration.

They worshiped idols. Statues and standing stones, from Hubal, al-Lat, and al-Uzza to the idols of every continent—and the earlier caution applies to them: some worshiped the stone itself, and some made it a house for a meaning.

Some even worshiped "without a god." This is the strangest box on the picture, and the most telling. Whole Buddhist schools acknowledge no creator god, and yet they produced temples and rites, monks and prayers, and statues before which flowers are laid. It is as though the impulse to worship ran deeper in human beings than the doctrine of a Creator itself, finding its way out even where its usual object is absent.

Now look at the whole picture in a single glance: **a variety without limit in what is worshiped, and a broad constancy in the act of worship itself.** Most of the societies we know of historically have shared some form of veneration or religiosity, while differing widely in its object and its content. That striking combination is the heart of this chapter's question: what does it mean that most societies share the direction and differ over the address?

* Third: And What About Today? the Modern Numbers

One might suppose that all of this is a past that science has closed. The numbers say otherwise.

According to the broadest demographic survey of the world's religions (the Pew Research Center's 2025 report on 2020 data, built on more than 2,700 censuses and surveys), about 76% of the earth's population is affiliated with a religion: Christians about 28.8% (2.3 billion); Muslims about 25.6% (2 billion—and, by the data of this report for the decade 2010–2020, the fastest growing: they increased by 347 million in a single decade, more than the increase of all other religions combined); Hindus about 15%; Buddhists about 4%; and then the remaining religions.

On the other side, the "unaffiliated"—those belonging to no religion—reached about 1.9 billion people (an increase of 270 million in a decade). This is the phenomenon of the century, and it should be neither denied nor exaggerated. But a closer look holds a surprise that serves our question: the surveys show that many of these "unaffiliated" are not atheists. A broad segment of them believe in God, or in a higher power, or in some spirituality, even though they have left organized religion. In other words, the modern turning away is mostly a turning away from "the religious institution" rather than from "the religious impulse" itself—which returns, seeping even into secular people in new forms: energy spiritualities, meditation, "the universe sending signs," and the sanctification of causes and persons. Even in the most secularized societies, researchers

see in these forms something that resembles—functionally—some of what the temple once provided.

So the phenomenon is not merely historical. It continues before our eyes, receding in its traditional forms here and multiplying in new forms there.

* Fourth: Framing the Question Precisely Before Answering It

Up to this point the believer and the atheist very nearly agree: the phenomenon is broad, deep, cross-civilizational, and resistant to disappearance. The greatest opponents of religion did not deny the phenomenon; they were perplexed by it. We saw Freud himself, even as he predicted the passing of "the illusion," being asked the awkward question: why, then, does the human being of the age of science insist on "recreating his god" in every generation?

The whole disagreement is about the explanation. This chapter's question—"Is the human being made for worship?"—is precisely the question of explanation. Is this near-universal impulse **an implanted compass** pointing to a reality that stands behind the world? Or **an echo of needs,** psychological and social? Or **a side effect** of the way our brains are built?

Four major explanations compete for this phenomenon, each with its supporters among scholars and thinkers. We will present them one by one, each at its strongest, and then the strongest of what is brought against it.

* The First Explanation: Fitra—"An Implanted Compass Pointing to Its Maker"

This is the answer of the religions themselves, and it is most explicit in the Islamic tradition: "So [Prophet] as a man of pure faith, stand firm and true in your devotion to the religion. This is the natural disposition God instilled in mankind" (Qur'an 30:30); and in the hadith: "Every child is born upon the *fitra*"—the innate disposition. On this view a human being does not "learn" to turn toward the Creator the way one learns arithmetic. One is born with an implanted inclination toward Him in the depths, just as an infant is born with an inclination toward a breast it has never seen. The religions, for those who hold this view, do not plant the impulse; they direct it. Polytheism does not disprove it. It testifies to it, in a deviated form: the one who worshiped the sun was right to search for something to worship and wrong about the address.

Nor is the idea Islamic alone. Christian theology knew it as the "sense of the divine" (*sensus divinitatis*), affirmed by Calvin and revived by contemporary philosophers of religion such as Alvin Plantinga. The Stoics, and the Greeks before them, argued from what was later called "the argument from common consent": Cicero said, in effect, that no nation had sunk so far into savagery as to forget that the universe has a god. So the agreement of nations on the root of belief, despite their distance from one another, is evidence that its source is a shared nature, not collusion.

You have already met in this book the most eloquent contemporary voice for this position: Mustafa Mahmoud, who concluded after his journey that the *fitra* is "a

compass that does not err," and even said, sharply, that a mind which demands a proof of God's existence "has lost its reason." For God, in his view, is like light: by it things are seen, and it is not seen by anything else.

The strongest support for this explanation today comes from an unexpected quarter: the testimony of cognitive psychology itself. In recent decades the research field known as the "cognitive science of religion" has accumulated around a conclusion widely accepted among its researchers (most of them not religious): that the human child does not arrive as a blank page, neutral toward religion, but arrives strangely **prepared** for it. The child spontaneously leans toward teleological explanation ("mountains exist so that . . ."—even children from secular homes), attributes events to an intending agent, and accepts the idea of an invisible, all-knowing being with an acceptance that precedes instruction. So much so that major researchers in the field have described children as "natural believers," in the cognitive sense: ready to believe, with a readiness built into the hardware. If this is right, then the laboratory has come close to half of the *fitra* claim: that the readiness to believe precedes instruction—with the caution that these studies describe cognitive tendencies and say nothing about the truth of their object, and that their interpretation remains debated among the researchers themselves.

* The strongest objections to this explanation:

1. The implanting of an impulse is one thing; the truth of its object is another. Our being "prepared to believe" may be explained by a Maker who prepared us to know Him (this is what Plantinga says), or by evolution having prepared us for useful illusions (this is what the opposing camp says, as we will see). The datum is one; the two readings are opposite.

2. If the compass is one and implanted, why are the objects of worship scattered in the enormous dispersion we drew in the survey? The *fitra* camp replies: the compass fixes the direction, not the detailed address, and the deviation is an accident upon a sound original. A major historian of religions, Father Wilhelm Schmidt, went further, to the theory of "primitive monotheism": that the oldest layers of belief among the most ancient primitive peoples know a "supreme sky god," over whom intermediaries and lesser lords later accumulated. Believers saw in it an echo of the *fitra* and of "the first religion of the prophets." But honesty requires saying that Schmidt's theory has long been contested in the academy, and that it is opposed by the older evolutionary theory (Tylor and Frazer), which sees the path running the other way: from animism to polytheism to monotheism. A historical verdict is hard, because the oldest stages have no writing at all.

3. The third objection: the *fitra*—even if granted—establishes "religiosity in general" and does not favor any particular religion. The sun-worshiper and the worshiper of the One are both "answering the compass." This is correct, and the careful thinkers

among believers themselves concede it: for them the argument from *fitra* founds Stage One (that existence has a God to be sought) and leaves the identification of the religion to Stage Two and its evidence—which is exactly the division on which this book is built.

A thought experiment from the tradition closes the section: *Hayy ibn Yaqzan*. About eight centuries before today's questions, the Andalusian philosopher Ibn Tufayl (d. 581 AH / 1185 CE) performed on paper the experiment researchers wish for and cannot have in a laboratory: a child grows up **entirely alone** on an empty island, suckled by a gazelle, with no language, no society, no revelation. So how far does his reason reach on its own? Ibn Tufayl traces his ascent step by step: from dissecting the dead gazelle in search of the "thing" that had left her, to the observation of nature, to the recognition that the world came to be or is contingent, to **the Necessary Being**. Hayy reaches monotheism and mystical knowledge by pure reason and contemplation alone. Then he meets Absal, who has come from the island of the people of religion, and the two discover that what isolated reason reached **coincides** with what revelation brought—that is the story's great thesis, the twinning of wisdom and revealed law. Then they fail to reform the mass of literal-minded religious folk and return to the island: an ending of realistic bitterness about the limits of philosophy with the public. **The value of the experiment for our chapter is twofold, on its own scale.** It is the tradition's most eloquent depiction of the thesis that "*fitra* and reason find their way" (with an echo in the study on those who lived in the "interval" between prophets and those the message never reached). It is—to be fair—**a literary experiment, not a laboratory one**:

written by a believer who knew its conclusion in advance, so it does not "prove" that a real isolated child would reach monotheism (real cases of isolated children have had tragic cognitive outcomes).

But it shows something important in its own right: that this chapter's question ("Does a human being find the way by innate disposition?") is an original question at the heart of the Islamic tradition itself, not a modern import. **And by a nice turn of history,** the tale was translated into Latin (1671) and then English, read by the pioneers of the European Enlightenment and of empiricism, and scholars trace its influence on the whole later literature of "the island and solitude." It was among the first Arabic books to enter the modern European mind, and it is still being drawn on today (among this book's sources is the contemporary novel *Hurr ibn Yaqzan* by Amin Zaoui, a living fictional revival of the symbol).

* The Second Explanation: The Psychological—"Projecting a Need onto the Sky"

This explanation says: look at the human condition. A weak creature in a crushing universe, who—alone among living things—knows it will die, whom nature strikes without warning, and whom its own brother wrongs without reckoning. What would you expect of a creature in that state? To invent a heavenly father to protect it, a deferred justice to vindicate it, and a second life to console it. Religion, seen this way, is not the discovery of a truth but **the projection of a need.** Feuerbach said that man created God in the image of his wishes. Freud, in *The Future of an Illusion*, built his famous thesis: religion is an illusion

woven by desire, an extension of the protecting father-image from the childhood of the human species, and human beings will shed it as they mature.

The strength of this explanation is that it touches something many on both sides do not deny: religion has wide psychological functions—consolation, meaning, resistance to the terror of annihilation—and people cling to it more in hardship (as has rightly been said, there are no atheists in a foxhole under bombardment). It also explains parts of our map elegantly. Why were the life-giving sun and the nourishing river worshiped? Because human beings deify what they need.

The strongest objections to it:

1. **The genetic fallacy**—the most important methodological lesson in this whole chapter, so keep it: explaining the **origin** of a belief psychologically settles nothing about its **truth**. If it were shown that a child believes in the existence of its mother partly out of need for her, that would be no evidence that the mother is an illusion. Needing a thing does not disprove its existence. It may even (as we saw in the argument from thirst) be a clue to it: our thirst for water did not create water, but it pointed to it. The two readings—"we need it, so we invented it" and "we need it because we were made for it"—share the same psychological datum.
2. **The double-edged sword.** The game of psychoanalysis can be played in both directions. Just as one says "you believed out of a need for a father," one can say "you disbelieved out of a wish to be free of a father." We have read in this book Mustafa

Mahmoud's admission that the atheism of his youth was "pride in his own mind," not a search. We have read, on the other side, our own warning against generalizing that to every atheist. The fair rule: psychological motives exist in both camps; they explain persons and do not settle questions. Whoever wants the truth judges the evidence, not the intentions of those who hold it.

3. The psychological explanation stumbles before aspects of the phenomenon that do not look like "wishes." What wish is there for a God who holds to account, forbids, imposes hard duties, and demands one's life and wealth? If desire had made religion, it would have made it without hell and without obligations. The Freudians reply that the need for order and for a stern father is also a need—at which point it becomes clear that the theory now explains a thing and its opposite. And what explains everything explains nothing.

* The Third Explanation: The Social—"Society Worships Itself"

From a third angle, Émile Durkheim—the father of the sociology of religion—looked and saw that the essence of religion is not an individual's belief but **the act of a group**: the rite that gathers, the sacred that unites, and the taboo that draws the boundaries of the tribe. He went on to his bold thesis: when a group worships its god, it is—without knowing it—worshiping its own collective power. Religion is "society transcending its members." From this school the functional explanations multiplied: religion as an instrument of cohesion and of moral control (we read

its sardonic seed in the Greek Critias, before the common era: the gods are the invention of clever politicians so that people would fear a watcher they cannot see), as the codification of marriage, death, and property, and as an antidote to the disintegration of groups.

Its strength: it explains brilliantly the huge social face of the phenomenon. Why is religion mostly collective in character? Why do the boundaries of faiths coincide with the boundaries of groups? Why does religiosity intensify when identity is threatened? It is supported today by experimental studies on the effect of "big watching gods" in widening circles of cooperation among strangers—to the point that some researchers have argued that large civilizations could not have arisen without gods who watched everyone.

The strongest objections to it:

1. It is an explanation of religion's function, not of its origin or its truth. That a medicine gathers the sick in a hospital does not mean the disease is an illusion. The genetic fallacy is present here as well: the social usefulness of a belief neither proves nor disproves it.
2. It stumbles before the most powerful witnesses of the phenomenon: **the religious person who stands against his society.** If religion were the group's worship of itself, what explains the prophets, ascetics, and reformers who confronted their societies in the name of their God and paid the price? Abraham smashing the idols of his people; prophets driven out and killed; monks abandoning society altogether for the desert. These people

lived their religion **against** the collective power, not as its echo. Add to them their mirror image: the atheist who dissents from an entire religious society. The lone individual outside the flock, on both sides, is—in the view of the objectors—a witness that there is something in the matter deeper than group pressure.

* The Fourth Explanation: The Cognitive-Evolutionary—"A Side Effect of a Mind Designed for Survival"

(The most recent and most widely circulated formulation of this explanation is in Why We Believe in God(s): A Concise Guide to the Science of Faith *by J. Anderson Thomson, with a foreword by Richard Dawkins: an inventory of twenty "pre-installed" brain mechanisms on which, the author holds, belief rides. The foreword itself announces the book's camp, so it is read as the evolutionary side's brief in its fullest form, and weighed on this chapter's scale: an explanation explains receptivity; it does not settle truth.)*

This is the most recent of the explanations and the most present in the academy today. Its summary: our brains evolved for survival, not for abstract truth, and their hardware contains systems that served our ancestors and then produced—as a side effect—the capacity for religious belief. The most prominent of these systems:

The hyperactive agency detector. When you hear a rustle in the grass, it is safer to assume "an agent" (a predator? an enemy?) and be wrong a thousand times than to assume "the wind" and be right—except for the one time you become a lion's meal. So we inherited a mind that sees intention and an agent in every movement. And from that,

according to the theory, we saw an angry one behind the thunder and a generous one behind the rain.

Theory of mind and the teleological tendency. We are programmed to read intentions and to assume purposes ("why is this here?")—the tendency researchers found overwhelming in children—and it stretched from reading the intentions of human beings to reading the "intention" of the universe.

The economy of sticky ideas. Researchers such as the anthropologist Pascal Boyer have shown that successful religious ideas have a distinctive cognitive recipe: familiar in most respects, with a limited violation of intuition (a person . . . but one who knows everything; a human being . . . but one who does not die). Such ideas are the most transmissible and the most memorable—as if tailored to the mechanism by which ideas pass among us.

Then the proponents of this approach differ among themselves: is it a pure side effect, or did religion itself become an **adaptation**, selected for its usefulness (the cooperation of groups under the eye of watching gods)? But their conclusion is one: the religious impulse is "natural" in the biological sense—implanted in the hardware.

Its strength: it is the most precise account ever produced of the **mechanism** of religious receptivity, and it explains details of our map that had resisted explanation. Why are the supernatural agents in most cultures "persons" with intentions? Why do religious ideas stick and cross generations with such force?

The strongest objections to it—some of them from within the field itself:

1. Did you notice something? This explanation begins where the argument from *fitra* ended. Both concede that the religious readiness is **implanted in our makeup**; the whole dispute is over how to read the implanting. The design of a Maker who wanted us to know Him, or a survival accident that bequeathed us sticky illusions? Here the believer raises his deepest objection: by what right is the result called "an illusion" in advance? The eye is also a product of evolution, and no one says that light is an illusion because the organ that perceives it evolved. Perhaps the "agency detector"—like every perceptual organ—arose because there is an agent to be perceived. The atheist answers: a false analogy, for the eye is tested by the agreement of its perception with independent measurement, while the agency detector is proven wrong in countless cases (we see faces in clouds and intention in coincidences). The believer returns: proving it wrong sometimes does not prove it wrong always, or the eye would fall too, with its optical illusions. And so you see the debate alive and heated—reaching its philosophical peak in "Plantinga's evolutionary argument against naturalism," which turns the table: if my mind is the product of blind survival that cares nothing for truth, why should I trust it when it produces . . . naturalism itself?
2. The usual methodological objection applies here with its greatest force: all of this, however precise, is an explanation of "how we believe," not a verdict on "whether what is believed is true." The fair-

minded pioneers of the field say so themselves: the cognitive science of religion is logically neutral toward the existence of God. The believer can read it as a description of the instruments God installed in us for knowing Him, and the atheist can read it as an anatomy of the illusion machine—and the open book before them both is one and the same.

---

* Fifth: The Scale—What Does the Prevalence of Worship Among Human Beings Prove, and What Does It Not?

We come to the heart of the matter. Let us weigh with the precision of a goldsmith, not the enthusiasm of an orator.

What the phenomenon does not prove:

The sheer number of believers is not enough by itself to prove the truth of any particular belief. The appeal to the majority is a well-known fallacy, and majorities throughout history have agreed on grave scientific errors that were later shown to be false. Moreover, "believers" are not one bloc whose numbers can be cited: the sun-worshiper is a witness against the idol-worshiper, and the monotheist against them both—their consensus on "the direction" shatters at the first question about "the address." Whoever wants to say "most human beings are Muslims / Christians / believers in my God, therefore my religion is true" has gone beyond what the evidence can bear.

What the phenomenon does prove:

1. It shows that the religious impulse **is neither an aberration nor a local accident.** The supporters of the *fitra* explanation object that explaining

religion by political invention alone (Critias and his heirs) does not seem sufficient to account for the breadth of the phenomenon and the variety of its origins on continents that had no contact with one another. They concede at the same time that authorities and priesthoods have exploited the religious impulse a great deal. They hold that exploitation presupposes something there to be exploited. The proponents of the political explanation reply that the need for social control is a general need, so it is no wonder that it produces similar instruments in distant places.

2. It makes it more probable—on the testimony of the cognitive science of religion, as we have seen—that human beings are **prepared for religious belief in their very makeup.** Studies in this field indicate that humans have cognitive predispositions that may make some patterns of religious belief natural and easily acquired. What that means philosophically—whether a "*fitra*" in the religious sense or a side effect—remains disputed. So the answer to the question in its descriptive part is "yes," as far as these studies can bear; the answer in its interpretive part is the battle.

3. It proves that every position carries **a burden of explanation.** The atheist who thought himself exempt ("I simply don't believe your stories") stands before this anthropological mountain and is asked to explain: why. If your position is right—was most of our species sunk so deeply in one shared illusion that it built its civilizations, arts, and morals upon it? He has his answers, which we have presented, and they have their price. The believer is asked for

his corresponding explanation: why—if the compass came from a single Maker—did most of those who carried it lose His address? He has his answers (gradual revelation, corruption, trial, and intermediaries), and they have their price.

The conclusion fit for an honest seeker:

The prevalence of the impulse to worship is a descriptive fact, widely accepted; its meaning is the battle. The believer reads it as the thirsty man reads his thirst: as evidence of water somewhere in existence—thirst was not planted in vain, and the arrows of most of humanity would not have pointed toward the sky, at all their different angles, unless something up there were drawing them. The atheist reads it as a physician reads a symptom: the mark of a structure in the archer, not of a target in the sky—the direction of the arrows tells us about the bows, not about whether there is any game.

Between the two readings this chapter alone does not decide. The *fitra* is one strand in the rope from which, as we taught you, the great convictions are braided; the remaining strands—the arguments for God's existence, the problem of evil, the testimony of the scriptures, and the scales of comparison—are the matter of the chapters to come.

But leave this chapter with one small, precious certainty: **when you find in your chest that vague longing for something above you—on a night of illness, or under a star-strewn sky—you are not sick, not naive, and not alone. You are feeling one of the oldest and widest feelings of your species.** What does it mean? That is the journey.

Chapter 2:
The Human Being Between Faith and Doubt

The ladder of positions from certainty to denial; the ladder of the three claims and their burdens; the kinds of doubt; the legitimacy of the question in every tradition; the difference between the asker and the obstinate—and how to live while you search

> **Summary of the chapter:** Must you choose between blind certainty and a doubt that dissolves everything? This chapter draws a seven-rung ladder between full belief and full denial, distinguishes the kinds of doubt that keep you searching from the kinds that stop you cold, and teaches the ethics of the middle rung: how to live well before you have decided.

---

* Opening: The False Binary

Many people think that human beings come in two camps: believers and doubters. This binary—common as it is in debate and in the media—is **the falsest map a seeker could begin the journey with.** It erases from existence the very region where the seeker is standing, and makes them feel that standing there is a defect to be ashamed of, or an illness to be cured in a hurry. The truth, to which the whole history of religious thought bears witness, is that doubt and faith **are not two boxes but rungs on a single ladder**. That one and the same person moves among them

over a lifetime—even over a day. That the true opposite of faith is not doubt but **indifference.** The doubter asks because they care; the indifferent do not ask because they do not care. This chapter draws the ladder, sorts the kinds of doubt, examines what the religious traditions themselves have said about the person who asks—which is far fairer than is supposed—and then answers the practical question no one answers: how does a person live **during** the search, not before it and not after it?

* First: The Ladder of Positions—Seven Stations, Not Two

Take the question in its simplest form—"Does this universe have a God?"—and look at how many answers are possible between a decisive "yes" and a decisive "no."

(1) Settled certainty. A faith no question knocks at—either because its owner has tasted what makes the question unnecessary, or because they have not yet met the question. The Islamic tradition itself distinguished the two: **the faith of the knower** and the faith of the imitator—and you saw in the study on the geography lottery (Chapter 5) that the scholars of creed debated the validity of the faith of someone who has never inquired.

(2) Probable faith—with questions. A believer who acknowledges that their faith is a weighing of probabilities, not a proof; questions knock at it without demolishing its foundation. This is the condition of most thinking believers in history, even if they did not say so: Ghazali after *The Deliverer*, Küng after the critique, Mustafa Mahmoud after the journey—questions carried inside faith, not outside it.

(3) Searching perplexity. Someone who has suspended judgment because they are searching. This is the station of this book's first reader: movement, not stillness; a traveler, not a resident. No serious tradition condemns this position, as you will see, on one condition: that it be a search, not a residence.

(4) Agnosticism. Someone who has decided that the question lies beyond the reach of the instruments of knowledge. The biologist Thomas Huxley coined the term (1869) to describe his own position: suspending judgment on the unseen is the honest position, not the cowardly one. It comes in two degrees: provisional ("I do not know yet") and principled ("it cannot be known at all").

(5) Indifference. Neither deciding nor searching; the question has been dropped from the account, and the person has turned to the affairs of this world. It is the most crowded station today in affluent societies, and the hardest for dialogue, as you have seen: proofs are useless against it, because it never asked.

(6) Probable atheism. Someone who judges it more probable that there is no God—a probability, not a certainty. This is the position of most serious atheist philosophers (you saw Oppy offering "the best argument" as a probability).

(7) Categorical atheism. The certainty that there is no God. It is rarer than popular discourse suggests, because to deny an existence absolutely requires absolute knowledge.

And the rule of the ladder: the two end stations carry the heaviest burdens of argument, and the middle carries the lightest—which leads us to the ladder of burdens.

* Second: The Ladder of the Three Claims—And Their Burdens on Both Shores

Each of the seven stations is a **claim** with a burden, and the claims can usefully be divided into three, on both shores at once. **The lowest claim—"**the other side's evidence does not satisfy me"—carries the lightest burden: criticizing the other side's evidence is enough, and it ends in suspension of judgment, neither in proof nor in denial. **The middle claim**—"it is more probable that God exists / more probable that there is no God"—carries a heavier burden: its holder is now required to produce positive considerations that tip the balance, not criticism alone. **The highest claim**—"I know with certainty that God exists / there is certainly no God"—carries the heaviest burden, on both sides exactly alike: **the two certainties share the burden.** The most common fallacy in this whole subject is to argue at the lowest level and leap, at the end, to the highest: to criticize the opponent's evidence and then declare "therefore there is no God"—or to criticize the atheist's objections and then declare "therefore my religion is true." Both have gone beyond what their evidence can bear (we weighed this at the Gate of the Scale and in the two studies on dialogue). **So know your seat on the ladder, and declare it**—to yourself before anyone else.

* Third: The Kinds of Doubt—Doubt Is Not One Thing

(1) Methodical doubt. Doubt taken up as a tool for arriving, not as a place to live: Ghazali's doubt in *The Deliverer* (doubt in the senses, then in reason, until "certainty came to him" after two months of darkness); Descartes's doubt,

which tore everything down to build on “I think”; and the doubt of Hayy ibn Yaqzan, who built knowledge from nothing on his island. Chapter 4 called them “three who doubted in order to arrive.”

(2) The doubt of crisis. Born of a shock—a death, an injustice, a betrayal by religious people. It is doubt in the heart before the mind, and it is not treated with proofs (you saw in the study on dialogue that “the wounded” are not to be cornered with cosmological arguments).

(3) The doubt of accumulation. Small unanswered questions pile up until they become one large doubt. It is the most widespread kind of doubt in the internet age, where the objection arrives before its answer.

(4) The doubt of rebellion. Rejecting a religion because it is the religion of the authorities, or of the father, or of a suffocating community—a doubt about the stewards disguised as a doubt about the king (and our rule: bad stewards do not disprove the king).

(5) Social doubt. Doubting because one’s surroundings doubt—or believing because one’s surroundings believe. The two are faces of one coin called the geography lottery.

And diagnosis is half the cure. The doubt of crisis needs consolation before an argument. The doubt of accumulation needs ordering before an answer. The doubt of rebellion needs the king separated from his stewards. And only methodical doubt needs what people imagine every doubter needs: proof. **And the other shore has its doubts too.** Just as the believer doubts their faith, the unbeliever doubts their unbelief. The biographies of unbelievers are full of moments of “what if?” in illness, in loss, and before beauty. Some of them wrote those moments

down honestly (you saw in the chapter on the other face that an atheism which knows no doubt is no more sincere than a faith which knows none). Doubt belongs to no one camp.

* Fourth: The Legitimacy of the Question—What Did the Traditions Themselves Say About the Asker?

What frightens the seeker most is the suspicion that their religion criminalizes their question. The documents say otherwise—in every house. **In the Tanakh**, **Job** stands and cries out against God at the injustice that has befallen him, and **Habakkuk** stands and asks, "O LORD, how long shall I cry for help, and you will not listen?" (Habakkuk 1:2). Both books are sacred, and both their authors are rewarded, not condemned. The most faith-filled of the Psalms are the psalms of complaint ("My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" Psalm 22:1). **In the Qur'an**, **Abraham**—the friend of God—asks, "My Lord, show me how You give life to the dead," and his Lord asks him, "Do you not believe, then?" and he says, "Yes . . . but just to put my heart at rest" (2:260)—and he is answered, not rebuked. **Faith does not cancel the request for reassurance, and reassurance is sought only by a believing heart.** Moses asks to see God. And the angels themselves ask, "How can You put someone there who will cause damage and bloodshed?" (2:30). **In the hadith**, the Prophet's Companions come to him complaining of whisperings in their breasts that they consider too enormous to speak aloud, and the Prophet says: **"That is the very essence of faith."** The person who is alarmed by the thought is

necessarily a believer, for only someone who hates unbelief is alarmed by it. From this the careful scholars concluded that **the trembling of the heart at a question is not unbelief** but a sign of life. **In Christianity, Thomas** doubts the resurrection until he can touch, and he is not expelled but invited to touch. The father of the sick boy cries out, "I believe; help my unbelief!" (Mark 9:24)—the most honest prayer in the Gospels. John of the Cross writes of "the dark night of the soul" as a station on the path, not a fall. **In Buddhism**, the Buddha tells the people of Kalama: do not accept a thing because it is tradition, or because I said it, but only after you have examined it. The Zen school made "the Great Doubt" a condition of enlightenment: "Great doubt, great awakening." **In Islamic philosophy,** Ghazali built the greatest of the books of certainty on the greatest of doubts. **And the conclusion that gathers all the houses: the serious traditions condemned the obstinate, not the asker.** They condemned the one who said "we will not believe" after the proof had come to him, not the one who said "show me." The criminalizing of the question itself is a social culture produced by societies afraid for their cohesion, not by texts—a contemporary Arab writer, al-Diwani, called it **"the charge of thinking."** So know where the intimidation comes from: from the texts of your religion, or from the fear of your people.

* Fifth: The Asker and the Obstinate—Where Is the Line?

So the question is not the problem. What, then, did the traditions actually condemn? Three marks separate **the asker** from **the obstinate** in the literature of nearly every faith. **The first—readiness for an answer.** The asker wants an answer and accepts it if it comes. The obstinate wants the question as a weapon, and no answer satisfies him ("even if We opened a gateway into Heaven for them . . . they would still say, 'Our eyes are hallucinating,'" 15:14–15). **The second—consistency.** The asker doubts their own religion by the standard by which they doubt others; the obstinate trains doubt on one house and exempts the alternatives—which is exactly what the Gate of the Scale measures. **The third—movement.** The asker walks: reads, asks, tries. The obstinate sets up house at his question and takes pride in it—"perplexity is a station on the road, not a home," as the last chapter will tell you. Above the three marks, a lesson from inside the biographies of doubt themselves. **Mustafa Mahmoud**—who really passed through atheism and wrote *My Journey from Doubt to Faith*—admits at its opening that his early rejection was not a search for truth but "pride in his own mind": "I refused to worship God because I was absorbed in worshiping myself" (we weighed this admission in the chapter on biases, with its caveat: it describes its author and is no verdict on every doubter). **His Christian counterpart is Hans Küng,** who lived through the full historical and theological critique, had his church license to teach withdrawn, and then wrote *Why I Am Still a Christian*. The two

men, from two different houses, represent the second station on the ladder in its most mature form: a faith that came out of doubt, not a faith that never knew it. Their value for our reader is that they wrote in the first person, so the reader finds in them a fellow traveler, not a lecturer.

* Sixth: How to Live While You Search—The Ethics of the Middle Station

This is the most important section of the chapter, and the least written about in the whole library: books address the believer or the atheist, and few address the one standing on the path. Seven practical counsels for the searcher:

(1) Do not announce before you have examined.

Announcing commits you, closes the door, and turns retreat into a loss of face. Search in a silence that keeps your freedom.

(2) Do not burn bridges.

Your family, your religion, and your community are not the enemies of your search—and you will see in the chapter on accepting the other that the most precious thing you can lose through haste is not an argument but your mother.

(3) Keep the habits you need, without pretending. Someone who used to pray and then began to doubt is not obliged to abandon prayer to be honest. A spiritual habit may remain an anchor during the search, on Pascal's rule in reverse: practice may precede certainty without contradicting it—provided one claims nothing one does not believe.

(4) Put your questions in order.

Begin with Stage One (does the universe have a Creator?) before Stage Two (which religion?). Most perplexity is a disorder of sequence, not a failure of answers.

(5) Read from both shores at their strongest.

Do not read about your religion from its opponents, nor about atheism from its preachers—the rule "Know a belief from its own people," and the rule "whoever defeats the weakest of his opponents has not won."

(6) Give the search its time.

The great transformations in the lives of sincere people took years, not nights (Augustine, Ghazali, Tolstoy). Whoever decided in a single night had decided before it, in the dark.

(7) Keep your ethics fixed while your creed moves.

Someone who searches for the truth while wronging, lying, or being cruel has undone their search with their own hand. The shared moral core (Chapter 22) is solid ground to stand on while you rebuild the roof.

The Scale on the Ladder — And the Chapter's Question

The claim (common in many societies): "Doubt is a sin, and the question is the door to unbelief." **Its strongest case:** that unchecked doubt has in fact demolished the faith of many, and that the traditions warned against fruitless disputation. **The strongest objection:** that the traditions' own texts recorded the askers and rewarded them (Job, Abraham, Thomas). That the warning was against obstinacy, not against asking. And that a faith which cannot bear a question does not deserve the name of certainty. **The strongest reply:** that the distinction between asking and obstinacy is fine, and can be exploited as a pretext. **What is established:** that doubt is a matter of degrees, not a box. That the burdens of the claims are distributed across both shores. That the serious traditions did not criminalize the question but the turning away after the proof. And that the seeker has an ethics by which to live their station. **What is not established:** that doubt necessarily leads to faith or to atheism—it has led people in both directions. **And the chapter's question**—carry it with you into Part II, where you will be equipped, and into the whole book: **If alarm at a question is a sign of faith, as a prophet said, and the Great Doubt is a condition of enlightenment, as a monk said. Then which is more dangerous to the truth: to ask and be troubled, or not to ask and be at peace?** You chose when you opened this book.

Cross-references for the chapter: *the geography lottery, the faith of the imitator, and the biases in Chapter 5; three who doubted to arrive (Ghazali, Descartes, and Hayy ibn Yaqzan) in Chapter 4; the ladder of claims and the burden of proof in Chapter 4 and the Gate of Chapter 19.*

Chapter 3

Did Ignorance Make Superstition — And Where Does Religion Stand in Relation to It?

An examination of "the gaps thesis": its share of truth, its limits, religion's role in superstition and against it, and the effect of the battle on religion itself

Summary of the chapter: A familiar modern thesis holds that ignorance invented religion and that science has been steadily erasing the need for it. The "god of the gaps" is given its full due here before its limits are shown; then two further questions follow: how did the word "religion" come to carry this charge, and what has the long contest with science actually done to religion itself?

* Opening: The Thesis at Its Strongest

Before passing judgment on any idea, we present it as its own proponents state it at their strongest. The thesis carried by this chapter's question is old and explicit. Lucretius framed it a century before the common era in his materialist poem: **fear first made the gods.** Man saw the lightning split the sky and knew no cause for it, so he housed an angry god in the clouds. He heard the thunder and trembled. He saw the plague reaping and offered sacrifices. The Enlightenment then framed it as an equation: **ignorance of natural causes breeds supernatural explanation;**

every step science advances, the gods retreat a step. The god of thunder died the day electricity was understood. The god of plague died the day the germ was seen. And so the supernatural shrinks into the remaining "gaps" in the map of knowledge until the last gap is filled. This is the name that has settled on the thesis: **"the god of the gaps."**

Is it true? The honest answer is layered, so let us walk through it in order.

* First: The Thesis's Share of the Truth—Given in Full, Without Deduction

It would be lying to the reader to deny that a real segment of historical religiosity was **a primitive explanation of nature**, and that it did indeed dissolve before science:

- **The gods of the phenomena retired.** Indra, Thor, and Hadad, lords of thunder and storm, had no temple left the day lightning became a difference in electrical potential and the weather became pressure maps. The eclipse, for which nations once beat drums to frighten off the devouring dragon, became an appointment calculated to the second, centuries before it happens.
- **Spirit-medicine was defeated.** The explanation of epilepsy by possession, and of plague by divine anger or the poisoning of wells (and the massacres of Jews that this brought upon plague-era Europe!), receded before the germ and the vaccine—and no serious person has argued that the amulet is more useful than the serum.
- **The story of the lightning rod is the whole lesson of this subject.** For centuries it was believed that ringing church bells warded off lightning—

inscriptions against lightning were cast on the bells—and bell-ringing in storms was one of the deadliest occupations (a tall, wet tower is a perfect lightning trap!). Then Franklin came with a grounded metal rod, and some clergy hesitated: shall we thwart God's decree with a piece of iron? Then the rods went up on the church steeples themselves, and the lightning stopped killing the bell-ringers. **When religious explanations have been used as a direct substitute for the explanation of examinable natural mechanisms, they have historically retreated before scientific explanation as the empirical evidence advanced. That does not, in itself, amount to a verdict on religion outside this field.**

So the thesis has its share of truth within this range. But its proponents do not stop at this range; they extend it to religion as a whole: **religion as a whole is one great gap of ignorance that will be filled.** Here the serious trial begins.

* Second: Where Does the Total Thesis Break Down?—Five Objections

1. Does history support the equation "more science = less superstition"?

If superstition were the child of a shortage of information, it would have declined steadily as information accumulated. Reality is more stubborn. **The great witch-burnings did not blaze in the "Dark Ages" but in the Renaissance and the Scientific Revolution itself**—as you saw in the chapter on the intermediate unseen: the "ignorant" tenth-century Church counted

belief in witches' flight a delusion, while the Europe of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—the Europe of Copernicus, Galileo, and Newton—burned tens of thousands. Kepler himself, discoverer of the laws of planetary orbits, wrote astrological horoscopes for princes (and defended his mother when she was accused of witchcraft!). Then look around you today: **the most information-rich age in history is the very age of the flourishing of conspiracy theories, the flat earth, "energy," and the law of attraction**—shared by believers and atheists alike. So superstition does not feed chiefly on the absence of information. It feeds—as we dissected in the previous chapter—on the questions "why me?", on anxiety where control ends, and on the management of inequality; and no article in physics fills those. **Ignorance is a facilitating condition of superstition, not a sufficient cause—and science alone is an incomplete vaccine.**

2. The fatal confusion between "how" and "why"

The gaps that science filled are all of one kind: **gaps of mechanism**—how lightning happens, how a plague spreads. But the questions on which the great religions were built—why is there anything at all? does existence have a purpose? what is a human being worth? what comes after death?—are not gaps of mechanism awaiting a finer microscope. They belong to another layer, which we explained in the chapter on science and religion: not because science is "deficient," but because its method—as its own philosophers concede—works inside existence

and does not put existence as a whole on trial. Whoever says "we explained thunder, so we will explain meaning the same way" is measuring one layer by another. You have seen in all our chapters that the battles at the summit take place where the two camps **agree** on the science and differ over its reading, not where they are ignorant.

3. The great religions were not born in the workshop of explaining nature

Review what has passed before you. Moses did not bring a theory of meteorology but a covenant and a law of justice. The prophets of Israel shouted in the faces of kings about the rights of the widow, not about the explanation of the flood. The Buddha explicitly refused the questions of cosmology ("there is an arrow in your side—pull it out"). The Qur'an turned attention away from spectacular wonders toward morality, the hereafter, and signs to be reflected upon. **The turn of the Axial Age that we dated was precisely the passage of religion from the function of explaining nature to the function of meaning and value**—that is, mature religion abandoned "the gaps" two thousand years before modern science was born. This is supported by what the chapter on *fitra* found probable: the religious readiness precedes cognitive instruction (teleology, agency detection, transcendence) rather than being inferred from an explanatory failure. The child "prepared to believe" in a secular home saturated with explanations is not ignorant of causes; that child is built that way.

4. The careful believers themselves rejected the "god of the gaps"—and their cautionary tale is preserved

The most famous lesson in the subject: Newton—the greatest filler of gaps in the history of science—noticed irregularities in the planetary orbits that his calculations could not resolve, and proposed that the hand of God intervenes periodically to correct the system. A century later Laplace completed the finer mathematics, the orbits held steady without intervention, and when asked where God was in his system he gave his famous reply: **"I had no need of that hypothesis."** So who lost? Not God—but **the god of the gap that Newton had built on a hole in his arithmetic.** From that day the serious theologians framed the rule, and its most eloquent statement is Bonhoeffer's (the theologian the Nazis executed): it is a mistake to house God at the boundaries of our knowledge, where He retreats every time they widen. **We should find Him in what we know, not in what we do not**—in the law, not in the hole. This—notice—is exactly the logic of the Qur'an that has passed before you: the signs it presents are the sun **understood**, the rain **explained**, the embryo **described**—"Will they not look?" is a summons to the known, not the unknown. Exactly the logic of the believing founders of science, who saw the mark of wisdom in the **disclosure** of the laws, not in their obscurity. Fine-tuning, as in the chapter on evidence, is an argument **from** science, not from its gaps: the more the universe is understood, the more insistent the question becomes, "why is it so intelligible and so precisely governed?"

5. And even if the gaps version were wholly correct, its rebound question would remain

Even if we granted, for the sake of argument, that religiosity arose from explaining the unknown, the sword of the genetic fallacy you have learned would turn back on you: **the origin of an idea does not decide the truth of its object.** Chemistry was born from the womb of superstitious alchemy, and no one says the atom is an illusion because its grandfather was the philosopher's stone.

* Third: The Second Question—How Did "Religion Contribute" To Superstition? Both Scales at Once

Here we must hold the balance with both hands, because the word "religion" hides three different actors: **founding texts, institutions and clergy, and popular religiosity**—and each has its record.

The record of indictment—where religion really did contribute. Institutions that monopolized interpretation and criminalized the question (the file of the Inquisition and Galileo, with the complexities we have laid out). Clergy who turned fear into a market: the sale of indulgences that blew Europe apart, the paid manufacture of amulets and charms in every faith, and the intimidation of the common people to tighten obedience. The laxity of commentators in sanctifying popular reports until superstition seeped into the books of religion themselves—you read in our sources how Muhammad Husayn al-Dhahabi devoted an entire book to sifting the "Israelite tales" (*Isra'iliyyat*) that had invaded the Qur'anic commentaries:

an admission from within that the vessels of religion absorbed superstitions that were not its own. Finally, the use of "the unseen" as a cover for failure—whenever a treatment fails it is called fate, and whenever a ruler fails it is called a trial—so that criticism sleeps and responsibility is buried.

The record of innocence and merit—where religion was the greatest enemy of superstition. We detailed it at the close of the previous chapter, and we summarize it here. Monotheism waged the widest campaign of "supernatural cleansing" in history: it abolished soothsaying, divination, horoscopes, omens, and polytheistic amulets, and closed the market of intermediaries. The founding texts raised the banner of proof ("Produce your evidence, if you are telling the truth," 2:111) and censured the imitation of the fathers without knowledge. Religion sheltered science for centuries: monasteries copied the manuscripts. An Islamic civilization funded observatories and hospitals and translated the sciences of the nations under the ruling "wisdom is the believer's lost property". The first universities of Europe were daughters of the cathedrals. The founders of modern science—as we saw—regarded their research as tracking the traces of the workmanship. **So the bare statement "religion made superstition" wrongs history as much as the statement "religion is wholly innocent of it."** The honest formulation: the founding texts mostly fought superstition; popular religiosity repeatedly brought it back. The institution swung between its duty and its interests—and the battle of the reformers in every century was fought on exactly this line.

* Fourth: The Third Question—What Did This Battle Do to Religion Itself?

The effect of the gaps thesis on modern religion is among the deepest transformations of recent centuries, and it came in three waves.

The wave of withdrawal. A segment of theology (Western liberal theology in particular) believed the equation and began evacuating positions one after another: miracles are symbols, creation is a metaphor, religion is "feeling" and "values" rather than claims about reality—until some of it ended in a religion almost without the unseen, and people rightly asked it: then why do we need you at all? And its churches emptied.

The wave of counter-entrenchment. On the opposite face, **modern fundamentalism** was born. Few notice that it is the child of the same shock, not the continuation of "the venerable tradition": a tense literalism, and a wholesale rejection of anything that smells of the incoming science (the classical tradition was in many places more generous in interpretation than its frightened heirs). From this wave, too, came the particular Arab response we analyzed in the study on i'jaz: **the "scientific miracle"**—an attempt to turn the gaps into an offensive: instead of fleeing from science, religion chases it, proving that it got there first—with its gains for preaching and the methodological risks we detailed (tying a definitive text to changing theories is a dangerous bet).

The third wave, of maturity. Between the withdrawers and the entrenchers a third line crystallized, which its proponents—contemporary theologians and

philosophers of religion on both Abrahamic shores—regard as the most mature of the positions: **post-gaps theology**—a religion that welcomes everything science uncovers as mechanism (its Lord, for them, is the Lord of causes, not the tenant of their holes), that stakes its claim where they see its original place—in the questions of existence, law, meaning, and value (its arguments are of the kind of fine-tuning, the origin of existence, *fitra*, and documented revelation: all from the **known**, not the unknown). That recovers the function it was born for in the Axial Age: the making of the human being, not the explanation of thunder. **Its supporters regard it** as the most consistent, because it does not bet on a gap that will be filled. **Its opponents on both sides object:** the unbeliever sees in it an orderly retreat that lodges religion in a region examination cannot reach, making it unfalsifiable. And the religious entrencher sees in it a surrender of the plain sense of the text to every prevailing theory. The reader, with their own scale, stands among the three.

The Closing Scale: The Seeker's Kit — And a Double Warning

Leave this chapter with four things:

1. Superstition is a common enemy—of science and of authentic religion alike. Your battle against it does not oblige you to choose a camp: the physician fighting medical quackery, the jurist sifting the Israelite tales, and the scientist refuting the horoscopes are soldiers on a single front.

2. Beware the god of the gaps, if you are a believer. Whoever builds their certainty on "what science has failed to explain" has built on sand that the first discovery will wash away—the lesson of Newton and Laplace hangs over the door. A faith like the mountains is built on what is **established**, not on what is **obscure**.

3. Beware the "science of the gaps," if you are an unbeliever. The counter-promise—"science will answer everything, including meaning and value; just wait"—is the mirror image of the same error: a check drawn on an unseen future, a faith in gaps that will be filled with no proof that they will be. Methodological honesty binds both shores.

4. The decisive question that sums up the whole chapter: does the advance of knowledge dissolve religion? The answer the data impose (you saw their numbers in the chapter on *fitra*: secularization here and rising religiosity there, with the most learned nations divided): **it dissolves what was built on ignorance, and it does not touch what was built on the question.** The gods of thunder died, and the question "why is there thunder, and a universe behind the thunder, at all?" remained more present than ever. So turn the question on yourself, seeker, for

it is the practical touchstone of everything that has passed: **your religion—or your atheism—which is it built on: a gap waiting to be filled, or a question that knowledge does not fill but kindles?**

Part II: The Seeker's Tools

The compass—the heart of the book

* Why the Tools Come Before the Map

This is the part the whole book was written for—and that is why we have placed it here, at the heart of the journey rather than at its tail.

A few pages from now, an enormous map opens before you: thousands of religions; hundreds of figures who said they carried a message; dozens of texts that came to be held sacred; whole currents of doubt and unbelief; and then the field of evidence and the great questions. Whoever enters that map without tools leaves it in one of two states. Either a dazzlement that melts every difference and makes everything equal to everything else, or a confusion that grabs the first thing on offer and bolts the door. Neither is searching.

So before you take a step, we hand you three things here: **how to think** about a claim to truth, whatever its source. **Which biases** are at work in your head before you open any book. And **by what standard** to compare claims that compete for your heart. Carry these into the map and you will read every page after this one as someone who owns a scale. You will notice that the whole book keeps returning to them: there is no later chapter that is not an **application** of a rule from this part, and no standard we bring to bear on any claim whose root is not here.

This part does not answer your question for you. It attempts something harder and more useful: to give you the

tools to search for yourself. The difference between someone who is handed an answer and someone who reaches it is the difference between being carried to a mountaintop asleep and climbing it on your own feet. Both end up at the summit. Only one of them knows the way.

A note to the reader. In these three chapters you will meet examples and cross-references to later chapters you have not yet read. That is deliberate: the tool is shown here in the abstract and seen there at work. So do not worry if a name or a topic passes by that has not yet been explained—it will come in its place, and you will return to this part whenever you need to remind yourself of your scale. At the end of it stands **"The Seeker's Toolkit"**: every rule of the book on a single page, to carry with you for the rest of the road.

Chapter 4:
How Do We Think About Truth?

Summary of the chapter: Before you go looking for an answer, ask yourself: do you even have a method for weighing whatever answer arrives? Here you learn the kinds of evidence and the grades of certainty, and receive the tool the whole book will rest on: the sevenfold ladder of examination—seven rungs to apply to every claim you meet from today on, religious or not.

* Searching Requires a Method Before It Requires an Answer

Someone who sets out to find a treasure with no map and no compass may walk a long way and come back to where they started.

So it is with the person searching for the greatest truth of all. If you do not first ask yourself—*How do I know? What will I accept as evidence, and what will I reject?*—you will be tossed from one opinion to the next by the last book you read or the last speaker who persuaded you.

That is why the first question of method is not: *Does God exist?*

It is: *What makes me accept or reject any claim in the first place?*

Kinds of Evidence

When a person reflects on how we come to know things, they find that the evidence human beings appeal to is not all of one kind.

There is **rational evidence**: the logical proof that moves from premises to a conclusion, like the philosophical arguments for God's existence or against it. Its strength is that it needs no laboratory. Its weakness is that a conclusion can never be stronger than its premises; if someone disputes a premise, the whole structure collapses for them, even while it still stands for you.

There is **empirical evidence**: what can be observed, measured, and repeated. It is the most powerful tool science has, but its limits in our question are plain. God, as believers conceive of Him, is not a body inside the universe that could be placed under a microscope—and the unbeliever, for their part, cannot run an "experiment" on His nonexistence.

There is **historical evidence**: documents, artifacts, and chains of transmission. It is decisive for questions like *Did this event happen?* and *Did this text reach us as it was written?* But it answers "what happened" far better than it answers "what does what happened mean."

There is **testimony**: believing a reporter because you trust them. Most of our everyday knowledge rests on it; you have never seen Australia, yet you are certain it exists. Testimony, however, grows weaker the larger the claim it carries. That is why some philosophers have said that extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence—a maxim many English readers know from Carl Sagan—while others have replied that ruling out the extraordinary in advance is begging the question. This is a real dispute, and it should not be hidden from the reader.

Finally there is **personal experience**: the inner feeling, the sense of peace, the answered prayer, the sensation of

a presence. It is the evidence with the strongest effect on the person who has it, and the weakest force as an argument for anyone else—because the followers of nearly every religion report similar experiences.

The wise seeker does not discard any of these paths. But they know the weight of each one, and its limits.

* Three Men Who Doubted in Order to Arrive

In the human heritage there are three experiments in methodical doubt that every seeker would do well to consider. They show that doubt is not necessarily the end of the way; it may be its beginning.

The first is the experience of Abu Hamid al-Ghazali, in the eleventh century (the fifth century of the Islamic calendar), which he recounted himself in his book *The Deliverer from Error* (*al-Munqidh min al-Dalal*). Ghazali tells how, at the height of his scholarly fame, a radical doubt struck him. Why should I trust my senses, when they sometimes deceive me? And why should I trust my reason, when something above reason might come along and refute it, just as reason refuted the senses? Every certainty fell away from him for nearly two months, until he described his condition as an incurable disease that no arrangement of proofs could treat—because the proofs themselves had become the object of doubt. Then he came out of his crisis, and he spent the rest of his life examining the schools of thought one by one—the theologians, the philosophers, the esoteric Batinis, and the Sufis—before settling where he settled.

What matters here is not the conclusion Ghazali reached, but the method: a man among the deepest of

believers passed through a doubt fiercer than that of many unbelievers, and he saw no shame in it. He saw it as a condition of arriving.

The second is the experience of René Descartes, in the seventeenth century, and it is strikingly similar. Descartes resolved to tear down all his beliefs for a time and to accept nothing that could not withstand doubt, until he reached a point he could not doubt: that he was doubting—therefore thinking—therefore existing. From that point he built his philosophy, and from it his arguments for the existence of God.

Whether or not we are persuaded by his construction, the lesson is the same: organized doubt is a tool for building, and chaotic doubt is a tool for demolition.

The third is not the experience of a man but a thought experiment, written by the Andalusian philosopher Ibn Tufayl in his tale *Hayy ibn Yaqzan* ("Alive, Son of Awake"): a child grows up alone on an isolated island, with no language, no society, and no inherited religion. A gazelle raises him. Then he begins to reflect. He dissects animals to understand life, he watches the stars, he asks about the origin of things—until, in the story, by his reason alone he arrives at the existence of a Maker of the universe.

Ibn Tufayl wrote his tale for a purpose of his own, but the seeker today can borrow it as an honest test question: *If I had been born on an isolated island with no inheritance at all, where would my free reflection have led me?* No one has a definitive answer. But merely asking the question helps you tell what you believe because you have examined it from what you believe because you found people believing it.

* Certainty and the Balance of Probabilities

One last point in this chapter, and it is among the most important things a seeker needs to know.

In mathematics we reach absolute certainty: the sum of the angles of a triangle is not open to debate.

But in the greatest questions of life—existence, meaning, and destiny—human beings, believers and unbelievers alike, rarely reach certainty of that kind. What usually happens is that a person weighs the evidence and the considerations, one position comes to outweigh another, and they live by what outweighed—with a margin of questions that remain.

This is not a defect in the person, and it is not a defect in the question.

We make the most consequential decisions of our lives—marriage, career, emigration—on the balance of probabilities, not on mathematical proof. We cannot, in practice, suspend all the decisions of life until certainty is complete.

That is why the statement "I will not settle my position on faith until I have proof that is one hundred percent conclusive" may sound like scientific caution—but it may be a stricter standard than the one we ordinarily apply to many of our important decisions.

The more honest question is: *Which way does the scale of evidence tip for me, after an honest search?*

* The Master Tool: The Seven-Rung Ladder—This Book's General Method for Examining Any Claim

Everything that has passed in this chapter—the kinds of evidence, methodical doubt, and the distinction between certainty and the balance of probabilities—can be gathered into **a single ruler with seven marks**, fit for examining any claim, religious or irreligious, large or small. It is the general method this book follows wherever it presents a claim, and the one we urge you to carry into every discussion:

The claim → its strongest case → the strongest objection to it → the strongest reply to the objection → What is established? → What is not? → The Seeker's Question.

(1) The claim. Pin it down precisely first—for half of every argument is a quarrel between two wordings, not between two truths. "The universe has a Creator" is not the same as "Islam is true"; "religions are human in origin" is not the same as "there is no God." Ask: What exactly is being claimed? To what degree—as certainty, or as the more probable view?

(2) Its strongest case. Not its most famous case, nor its easiest, nor what ordinary followers say—but its strongest, as its deepest defenders make it, in its rigorous formulation rather than its popular one. (The argument from the universe's beginning in the form "everything that begins has a cause of its beginning," not "everything that exists has a maker.") Whoever presents the weakest evidence for an opponent's claim has cheated themselves before they cheated their reader.

(3) The strongest objection to it. The same rule, reversed: the strongest thing the deepest objectors have, not a straw man. Whoever defeats the weakest of their opponents has not won.

(4) The strongest reply to the objection. The conversation does not end at the objection. The claim's holders have replies to the strongest criticisms, and dropping this rung is the most common trick of atheist and religious polemic alike: each stops the film at the frame that suits it.

(5) What is established? After the four rungs, what do both sides concede—or what must a fair-minded person concede? It is very often less than the defender claims and more than the objector admits.

(6) What is not established? This is the noblest rung of honesty: naming what remains open, without forgery—neither turning a probability into a certainty nor a certainty into a probability.

(7) The Seeker's Question. What question stays with you after all of this? An honest examination does not end with a verdict dictated; it ends with a question carried. That is how every chapter of this book closes.

Why this order, exactly? Because each rung guards against a particular fallacy. The first guards against quarrels over wording; the second and third against straw men; the fourth against stopping the film; the fifth and sixth against inflating the result or belittling it; the seventh against the illusion of completeness. **And most of the religious argument you will hear in your lifetime stops at the second or third rung**—a proof is thrown, or an objection is thrown—and climbs no higher.

A miniature example on the ladder (developed in full in evidence). *The claim:* the universe has a transcendent cause. *Its strongest case:* the argument from the universe's beginning, in its contemporary theological form: whatever begins to exist has a cause. The universe began to exist (on the testimony of modern physics). *The refore it* has a cause—one that is not of its own kind. *The strongest objection:* who says the universe had a beginning in the absolute sense, rather than merely the beginning of our observed universe? And why could the cause not be a prior natural one? *The strongest reply:* an infinite chain of natural causes faces recurring difficulties, and a first cause, precisely by being first, cannot be of the same kind as the caused things that come to be. *What is established:* that the question "Why is there anything at all?" has a weight that physics has not dissolved, and that "a transcendent cause" is a rational and coherent answer to it. *What is not established:* that the argument by itself compels belief in a personal God with attributes, or that it compels every reasonable person with conclusive force. *The Seeker's Question:* if I accept a first cause—what is the bridge between it and a God who is worshiped?

In **Appendix F** you will find the major claims that pass through this book laid out on this ladder, card by card—the harvest of the whole book in the language of its single method.

Chapter 5: The Biases That Blind the Seeker

Summary of the chapter: The truth-seeker's most dangerous enemy is not an opponent, but his own biases. This chapter exposes three traps working in your head right now without your noticing: selective confirmation that shows you only what you want to see, the lottery of geography that shaped your creed before you were born, and the biases of the heart that dress desire in the clothes of proof.

* The Seeker's Most Dangerous Enemy Is Not the Opponent

The seeker may imagine that the battle is with the opposing arguments.

But the most dangerous thing you face is not your opponent's argument. It is your own biases.

The human mind is not a clear mirror that reflects the evidence as it is. It is closer to a skilled lawyer, defending whatever the heart has already attached itself to. The author of these lines put the idea to his children, in the counsels he wrote for them (*From Lockdown*), before he knew its academic name: "No one sees a matter as black or white; between him and the matter lie colors from his own self and his surroundings that tint it before he sees it." This whole chapter is a commentary on those colors. In recent decades cognitive psychologists have uncovered dozens of the mechanisms by which we deceive ourselves—and knowing them is half of escaping them.

* Confirmation Bias

The most famous of them all: we look for what confirms our view and ignore what contradicts it.

The believer reads the books of believers, follows the preachers of faith, sees a sign in every beautiful event—and grows more certain.

The atheist reads the books of atheists, follows the critics of religion, sees a proof in every painful event—and grows more certain.

Each of them thinks they have "searched," when in truth they have done nothing but collect support for their position.

The cure is simple to state and hard to do: read the strongest of what your opponents have written, not the weakest. Hear atheism from the most intelligent atheists, not the silliest; hear faith from the deepest believers, not the weakest in argument. Whoever defeats the weakest of his opponents has not won.

Confirmation bias has a textual version that is even more lethal, at work wherever the disputants share a single book. Fakhr al-Din al-Razi, the great medieval commentator, spotted it—from inside the arena of the sects, not outside it—in a rule that sums up centuries of controversy over interpretation: **"Every follower of a school claims that the verses which agree with his school are clear, and the verses which agree with his opponent's school are ambiguous."** In other words, the survey of "the plain text we build on" and "the interpreted text we set aside" is drawn in the mind before the book is opened, so each reads the scripture of his school while believing he

is reading the scripture. Its cure is of the same kind as its brother's: **the test of consistency.** Would you accept your opponent treating your texts by the same rules of interpretation you apply to his? If that makes you uncomfortable, you have caught the bias red-handed. (Here the rule of the Single Standard looks in through the window of interpretation.)

* The Geography Lottery

Then there is a fact every student of religion knows, and every seeker should face with courage:

The strongest predictor of a person's religion is the place where they were born.

Someone born in Pakistan is most likely a Muslim; someone born in Brazil is most likely a Christian; someone born in India is most likely a Hindu; someone born into a secular home in Europe is most likely irreligious.

What does this mean?

Precision is needed here, because the hasty conclusion is wrong in both directions.

This fact **is not enough by itself to prove** that all religions are false. It is logically possible for one of them to be true even though the distribution of people among them follows geography—just as the spread of mistaken scientific beliefs in many societies does not invalidate correct science for those it has reached.

But it **does prove** something else of great importance: that your inherited belief, whatever it is, reached you by a mechanism—the mechanism of birth and upbringing—that would have delivered you an entirely different belief

had you been born somewhere else. That mechanism, by itself, does not distinguish truth from falsehood.

This is why some researchers have proposed what may be called "the Outsider Test": examine your inherited belief with the same rigor with which you examine the beliefs of others. When you look at someone else's religion you ask about evidence, history, and consistency; when you look at your own inheritance you may settle for familiarity. Fairness demands one scale.

The test has a venerable ancestor within the tradition itself, unknown to many. Islamic theology opened the file of "**the faith of the imitator**" (*iman al-muqallid*) explicitly—the imitator being, in their usage, someone who believes by following his environment without knowing the evidence. Its scholars differed over it in positions preserved in the creedal texts and their commentaries (such as *The Jewel of Tawhid*, a widely studied creedal poem, and its commentators). Some held his faith valid without qualification, because it agrees with the truth. Some held it valid **but sinful**, for abandoning inquiry while capable of it. Some required that his imitation be firm, not shaken when the one imitated wavers. And some did not hold it valid at all. Throughout, they drew a consistent practical distinction between **the outward legal ruling in this world** (a child born to Muslim parents is ruled a Muslim without examination) and **the standing of salvation**, for the sake of which they urged inquiry and reasoning, and which most them made the first of all duties. So the question "Is your inheritance enough for you?" is no modern intruder in the houses of faith. It is a question their own leading scholars debated in the heart of their creedal

texts centuries ago—and that is witness enough that examining one's inheritance is a demand that grew up inside the walls, not an arrow shot from outside them.

Note, too, that this test is a double-edged sword and cuts both ways: the irreligious person who grew up in an irreligious setting inherited their position by the same mechanism, and must examine it with the same rigor.

* Biases of the Heart

Not all biases are cognitive. Some are emotional and social.

There is **the fear of social loss.** A person may be kept from changing their conviction by fear of their family and community, or fear of losing their standing in a religious group—or an irreligious one, equally. This is humanly understandable. But the seeker must distinguish between the question "What is true?" The question "What is socially safest?" They are different questions, however much everyone wishes their answers coincided.

There is **psychological comfort as a false criterion.** One person may cling to faith because the thought of death with no hereafter is unbearable. Another may cling to atheism because the thought of judgment and absolute accountability is heavy, or because a bitter experience with religious people drove them away. In both cases the decisive question is: does an idea's being comforting or disturbing count as evidence that it is true or false?

The answer is no. The truth may be comforting and it may be harsh, and our wishes have no vote in the council of reality.

There is **the generalizing of a bad experience.** Someone wronged in the name of religion may pass judgment

on all religion. Someone who has met a corrupt atheist may pass judgment on all atheism. Fairness requires that ideas be tried by their evidence and people by their deeds, and that the two files not be confused.

* Pascal's Wager and the Will to Believe

At the close of this chapter, a pause over two famous ideas that sit on the border between evidence and interest.

The French philosopher Blaise Pascal proposed what became known as "the Wager": if you believe and God exists, you win everything. If you believe and He does not exist, you lose nothing worth mentioning. But if you disbelieve and He exists, you have lost everything. The calculating mind, in his view, chooses belief.

Strong objections have been raised against the wager. Which God do we wager on, among the conceptions of the different religions? Would God accept a belief built on a calculation of profit rather than on conviction? Can a person even "decide" to believe, the way one decides to buy a product?

Pascal's defenders reply that the wager was never offered as a substitute for evidence but as a spur to take the question seriously, and that living the life of faith may open to a person a door that argument cannot.

In the same direction, the American philosopher William James defended a person's right to settle with the heart the great questions that evidence alone does not settle—provided they are live, momentous, and cannot be suspended—because suspending judgment on them is itself a decision, with its own price.

It is not our place here to decide between these views. But the seeker can take a lesson from them: the decision to believe is not a cold calculation performed in a vacuum. It is a complete human act, in which the mind, the heart, and one's life all take part. Being aware of this is better than denying it.

The Seeker's Question: If the decision to believe is a complete human act in which mind and heart both take part—which of the biases we have laid out is nearest to you, and how will you know that it is at work in you right now, as you read these lines?

Chapter 6: By What Standard Do We Compare?

Summary of the chapter: By what standard can you compare one religion to another without wronging either? Six scales, declared in advance—internal consistency, correspondence to reality, soundness of transmission, explanatory power, moral fruit, and lived experience—applied to all without exception, so that from here on your comparisons are comparisons, not impressions.

* There Have to Be Criteria

Suppose the seeker has gotten past their biases and now sits before the great map: monotheistic religions, polytheistic religions, spiritual paths, and irreligious positions.

How do they compare?

No one can offer them a formula that produces the answer automatically. But the long philosophical and human experience has yielded a set of criteria that reasonable people—from every position—use when they examine the great claims. We will present them one by one, each with its limits, because hiding the limits would be cheating the reader.

* The First Criterion: Internal Consistency

The first thing to examine in any system: does it contradict itself?

A claim that asserts a thing and its opposite in one of its foundations collapses before we even ask about its external evidence. This is a powerful negative criterion: it does

not prove that the consistent is true, but it exposes that the contradictory is false.

Its limit: the verdict of "contradiction" is not always easy. What looks like a contradiction may have, among the school's own people, a reasonable reconciliation and interpretation—or it may not. That is why the school's answer should be heard before judgment is passed on it, and then the answer itself should be assessed: is it a sound reconciliation, or an obvious strain?

* The Second Criterion: Correspondence with Reality

A system that speaks about the world can be questioned: does what it says collide with what we know about the world with settled confidence?

Here three things must be carefully distinguished: the text of the claim itself. The interpretations its followers give it. And our scientific knowledge, some of which is settled and some of which is provisional and changing. How many famous conflicts have in reality been conflicts between a revisable human interpretation and a revisable scientific theory—not between the core of a religion and the core of science.

* The Third Criterion: Sound Historical Transmission

A claim that rests on historical events and texts—and this is the case with the great religions—is asked: how did it reach us?

When were the texts written down? How much time passed between the event and its recording? Was the

transmission through many independent channels, or through a few? Do the ancient copies agree, or do they differ? And what does independent historical research say?

This is a field in which the religions differ in real, studiable ways. We have laid out its map in Part V. It is among the most fruitful areas for the seeker's research, because it deals with tangible data rather than mere reflection.

Its limit: sound transmission proves that a text reached us as it was originally stated; it does not by itself prove that its content is true. It is a necessary condition, not a sufficient one.

* The Fourth Criterion: Explanatory Power

Reason—in science and philosophy alike—tends to prefer the picture that explains the greatest number of phenomena with the least strain.

So the seeker would do well to set before every position—religious or atheist—a list of the great phenomena and ask: how does it explain them?

Why is there something rather than nothing? Why does the universe appear to be governed by laws? What is the origin of consciousness? Where does our stubborn sense come from that good and evil are real? Why do human beings, in most civilizations, reach for meaning and the sacred? And how do we explain evil and suffering?

Every position answers some of these questions with ease and stumbles over others. Atheism, for instance, finds evil to be expected in a world without purpose, but it is asked about the origin of existence, of consciousness, and of the objectivity of morals. Faith explains existence, order, and meaning, but it is asked about evil and suffering, as we

saw in an earlier chapter. The honest comparison is between whole systems—which carries lighter burdens and offers wider explanation?—not between the strongest points of one position and the weakest points of its rival.

* The Fifth Criterion: Moral and Human Fruit

"You will know them by their fruits" is an old piece of wisdom—the Gospel's own words (Matthew 7:16). A system is asked about its effect on the soul and on society.

But this is among the most easily confused of the criteria, and it must be held within two constraints.

First: compare the original teachings with the conduct of those who actually applied them, not with the conduct of everyone who claimed the name. The bad behavior of an idea's followers does not refute it, and their good behavior is not enough by itself to prove it.

Second: good fruit shows that an idea is useful, and usefulness is not truth. An illusion can sometimes help, and the truth can sometimes hurt. That is why this criterion remains a supporting consideration, tipping the balance, and never a judge ruling alone.

* The Sixth Criterion: Living Experience

Finally, there is a criterion the seeker will not find in books: to draw near.

To sit with the people of each position in their lives, not in their debates. To see how a deep believer faces the death of someone dear, and how a serious unbeliever builds the meaning of their life. To hear from each of them their story from the inside.

Some knowledge passes only through shared living, and some questions can be tested only in life itself.

The limit of this criterion follows from what has already been said: spiritual and emotional experiences are reported by the followers of every position. They open the heart to the possibility; they do not by themselves settle the dispute.

* The Rule of the Whole Scale

The methodological conclusion of this chapter:

No single criterion settles the matter by itself. The seeker who hangs their entire decision on one criterion alone—a miracle alone, or the problem of evil alone, or a personal experience alone—is building a house on a single pillar.

Wisdom is to gather all the criteria onto a single standard and then look: where do the probabilities accumulate? The great, settled convictions are like a strong rope: it does not hold by one strand, but by many strands braided together.

The Seeker's Toolkit: The Book's Rules on a Single Page

One ladder and twenty-five named rules govern this whole book. They are set out here in the abstract, each with a pointer to where it is put to work—so carry them with you, and come back to them whenever the road gets tangled.

We did not invent these rules in this part. We drew them out of the whole journey and gathered them here because you will need every one of them more than once. **Above all of them stands the ruler that orders them—(0) the Seven-Rung Ladder:** the claim → its strongest case → the strongest objection to it → the strongest reply to the objection → What is established? → What is not? → The Seeker's Question (Chapter 4; applied to the major claims in Appendix F).

* The mother rules of method

(1) The Fivefold Charter. Descriptive neutrality (every position at its strongest, then its strongest critique); the constant fourfold distinction among **text, history, narrative, and myth**; opening questions rather than imposing answers; honesty about the limits of knowledge; and respect for all believers (Introduction).

(2) The Single Standard. Every scale by which you weigh someone else's religion, you are bound to weigh your own; every error you forbid your opponent, forbid yourself. Do not change the scale along the way—demanding rigorous documentation from one religion and

accepting a spiritual experience from another (Chapter 6; the gate of Chapter 19 with its ten-point questionnaire; and the two studies on the principles of dialogue, 18.1 and 18.2).

(3) Know a belief from its own people. Do not judge a religion from the books of its opponents, nor from its silliest followers. **And whoever defeats the weakest of his opponents has not won** (Chapters 6 and 18).

(4) The tinted glass of opponents and narrators. Whenever your source on a people is what their opponents wrote, you are seeing them through tinted glass—so account for the tint (Chapters 12 and 17).

(5) The Two Stages. "Is there a God?" is one file; "Which religion is truest?" is another. Whoever mixes them loses both rounds (Chapters 18 and 19).

* Rules for reading the phenomenon

(6) An explanation explains receptivity; it does not settle truth. Discovering the mechanism of thirst does not disprove water—and this rule cuts in both directions (Chapter 1).

(7) Sincerity is not truth. A preacher's sincerity in his own heart is not enough by itself to prove his claim, and an unbeliever's wickedness does not refute his argument. Arguments are judged, not hearts (Chapters 13 and 18).

(8) Sound transmission is a condition, not a proof. That a text reached us intact is a condition for examining it, not evidence that it is true (Chapter 16).

(9) Mass transmission conveys *that*, not *why*. It strengthens establishing the report, and—on its own conditions—may strengthen establishing the event's core. But

it does not by itself settle the event's meaning or its cause (Chapter 19).

(10) Fruits corroborate; they do not found. The usefulness of an idea is a clue, not a proof. A superstition may be useful, and a calamity may be true (Chapters 19 and 22).

(11) The conduct of followers is disciplined evidence. The wickedness of followers does not by itself refute an idea, and their virtue does not establish it. But a repeated effect connected to an explicit teaching or to an institutional structure does enter the file as evidence (Chapters 22 and 26; Study 22.3 on religion and political authority).

(12) Position colors the jurisprudence of power. Before you evaluate a political theology or jurisprudence, ask: who wrote it, for whom, and from what position in relation to power? Position does not cancel an argument, but it explains much (Study 22.3).

(13) Ritual divides. Morality draws together. Traditions differ over rites and details more than they differ over many ethical fundamentals—without this implying that their moral systems are identical (Study 22.1 on the permitted and the forbidden).

(14) Description is not evaluation. Do not accept a value judgment disguised as a description. If it is said that one system is "more comprehensive" or "more complete," ask at once: by what standard? (Study 22.2 on the reach of religious law).

* Rules for examining claims

(15) The god of the gaps. What was built on a gap in science falls when the gap is filled. Do not build your faith on what science does not yet know (Chapter 3).

(16) Science does not find God in the laboratory—by definition, not by discovery. A method that is blind to anything beyond matter does not testify that nothing beyond matter exists (Chapter 23).

(17) The braided rope. The great convictions are braided from strands that reinforce one another. Whoever hangs a conviction on a single strand imagines that cutting the strand cuts the rope (Chapter 18).

(18) The burden of proof on the ladder. Certainty on either side carries the burden; suspending judgment, by itself, does not (Chapters 2 and 4).

(19) Razi's rule. "What agrees with my school is clear; what agrees with my opponent's is ambiguous." So test your interpretation by applying it just as consistently to your opponent (Chapter 5).

(20) The geography lottery and the Outsider Test. They dissolve the naive comfort of inherited belief without ruling on its truth—and they have ancestors within the creedal texts themselves (Chapter 5).

(21) Power and position before creed. The fiercest persecution happened wherever a power monopolized a creed—religious or atheist (Chapter 26).

(22) The table counts the claims; the field of evidence weighs them. The number of claimants neither refutes a claim nor proves it (Chapter 12 and Appendix B).

* Rules for the path

(23) Asking is not unbelief, and the obstinate is not the asker. The traditions condemned the obstinate, not whoever asks (Chapter 2).

(24) Dialogue is a door opened from both sides. Whoever enters hoping to persuade while unwilling to be persuaded has delivered a speech to a mirror (the two studies on the principles of dialogue, 18.1 and 18.2).

(25) The certainty of one who has seen all the roads. It is the only certainty that spreads to others—and the only one this book promised you (Chapter 27).

If you keep these twenty-five, you carry the whole book in your pocket. Everything after this page is their application to the widest map humankind has ever known.

Part III: The Map

Chapter 7: What Is Religion? and How Have Human Beings Studied It?

The problem of definition and its solutions; the students of religion from inside and from outside; and a map of the genres of writing about religions—a kit for telling them apart that you will carry into every library

> **Summary of the chapter:** Before you open any book "about religion," ask: who wrote it, and through what eyes? This chapter hands you the most valuable tool in the whole book: a map of the genres of writing about religion, teaching you to tell neutral description from disguised advocacy before you believe a single line.

⁎ Opening: Two Questions Before the Journey

You are about to set out on a tour of all the religions of the earth. It is wise to pause twice before you go. **First:** what is this thing we are going to chase in the first place? What is "religion"? (You will be surprised at how hard a question that looks so obvious turns out to be.) **Second:** you are not the first to walk this road. Before you, human beings studied the religions for centuries: believers studied them from the inside, academics dissected them from the outside, and preachers, opponents, and merchants of conspiracy wrote about them enough to fill libraries. **And you are about to inherit that whole library.** If you do not hold a map of its genres, you will fall into the first trap of the perplexed: reading a book of polemic and taking it for

What have human beings believed? How do we know? And how do they present their belief to us?

description, or a pamphlet of preaching and taking it for research. This chapter hands you both maps.

* First: What Is Religion?—The Obvious Question That Exhausted the Definers

Try to define "religion" in a way that gathers in all its instances and keeps everything else out, and you will see the trap. Say **"belief in a god,"** and you lose Buddhism (which, as you saw, sets aside the whole question of God) and schools of Jainism and Confucianism. Say **"belief in spiritual beings"** (Tylor's classic definition), and you widen a little, but there remain outside you the non-personal religious currents (the impersonal Brahman, the Tao). Say **"a relationship with the sacred"** (the school of Otto and Eliade: religion as the experience of "the holy"—that awesome, alluring mystery that overflows the ordinary), and you describe the emotional core well but fail at the boundaries: the flags of nations and the graves of leaders are "sacred" to their peoples. Say something **functional** ("religion is what welds a group around its symbols"—Durkheim; or "a system of symbols that gives existence an order and a meaning"—Geertz), and you admit into religion everything that does its work: extremist nationalisms, the cult of totalitarian regimes, and the crowds at a football match. **And that very breadth is a precious discovery, not merely a defect** (we made use of it in the chapter on the age of acceleration: the substitute "religions" of secularity).

The solution on which contemporary scholarship has settled is two complementary solutions, and we adopt both in this book. The solution of **"family resemblance"** (borrowed from Wittgenstein): "religion" is not a single essence but **a family of phenomena** that share overlapping features without any one member carrying all of them—like siblings who resemble one another with no single trait common to them all. The solution of **"dimensions"**: instead of a sharp definition, a list of dimensions whose presence is examined—the most famous being Ninian Smart's seven (the doctrinal, the ritual, the ethical, the narrative-mythic, the experiential-emotional, the social-institutional, and the material, in temples and icons). Any phenomenon in which these dimensions gather densely we call a religion without hesitation. Where only some of them are present, it stands at the edges of the family (which is why it is correct to describe totalitarian Marxism as a "quasi-religion," and we mean what we say). (And a sister instrument from the university classroom: William A. Young's seven **worldview questions**, asked of every religion in the same order—what it means to be human, the basic problem, its cause, the end, the means, the view of reality, and the sacred—built, by its author's declaration, for description rather than evaluation: one ruler laid across all the traditions, and a cousin of the axes on which our own simplified comparison runs in Appendix H.) **And do not forget the third layer:** the religions' definitions **of themselves**, from within. "*Din*" in the Qur'an stretches to cover judgment, community, and obedience ("Master of the Day of Judgement"; "you have your religion and I have mine") and is applied to the true and the false alike. The Indian *dharma* is the order of the cosmos and one's duty together, not "a religion" in the Western sense. Even the Latin *religio* divided its ancient etymologists: from

"binding" (to the god), or from "rereading" (of the rites)? The word itself is a biography of civilizations, and whoever translates without attention has confused the maps. **And the proper names of the religions are a second biography.** Read the survey's labels and a pattern appears: most are named for a founder (Christianity for Christ, Buddhism for the Buddha, Zoroastrianism for Zoroaster, Confucianism for the Master) or for a people and a place (Judaism for Judah, Hinduism for the river Indus)—while "Islam" names neither a man nor a nation but a concept: submission to God. The preachers have long pressed the observation (it opens one of the world's most translated *da'wah* (missionary outreach) tracts) as a mark of a message centered on no person and fenced by no ethnicity. The historian's caution must ride beside it: most of those names were coined **from outside and later—**"Christians" first at Antioch, "Hinduism" a Persian and colonial label for a continent of paths, and the traditions' own self-names tell a different story (the Buddha's people say *Buddhadharma*; the Jews say Torah and faith). So a name is evidence about the naming, not about the named. And a self-name declared inside a scripture is part of the claim under examination, not a neutral witness above it. The observation stands; what it proves is the question.

* Second: The Students of Religion from Inside—The Venerable Genres of the Tradition

Centuries before the modern "science of religions" was born, believers themselves produced whole disciplines for studying religion—and knowing them protects you from the illusion that analysis is a modern innovation. **Kalam, or systematic theology:** the rationalization of doctrine and its defense with the instruments of proof (you have

seen its workshops: moral good and evil, the divine attributes, the proofs of prophethood). **Philosophy of religion:** examining religious concepts themselves (what is a god? what is a miracle?) without presupposing the truth of any particular religion. **And the threefold distinction** that our adopted introduction to the field (al-Nashshar) draws: *kalam* (Islamic scholastic theology) defends from inside faith; philosophy of religion examines concepts with the neutrality of logic. The science of religions describes phenomena with the neutrality of history—three crafts the public confuses, and this book practices all three, aware of their limits. **The science of "religions and sects" (al-milal wa-l-nihal): an early Islamic achievement, and one of the roots of the modern field.** Muslims produced the oldest methodical genre for describing the religions and sects of the world: from al-Ash'ari's *Doctrines of the Muslims* on the sects of those who pray, to Ibn Hazm's *al-Fisal* (an encyclopedia polemical in temper), to the summit of the genre, **al-Shahrastani's *Religions and Sects*** (d. 548 AH), who bound himself in his introduction to a declared method: to present the doctrine of every sect "without partisanship for them or against them." He mostly kept his word, so that Western scholars have counted him a world precedent for the comparative history of religions. **And the summit of summits in fairness: al-Biruni** (d. 440 AH) in *An Inquiry into What India Has to Say*: a scholar who learned Sanskrit, lived among the Brahmins, and proclaimed his immortal charter: to report the doctrines of a people **in their own words and on their own terms,** "even if what they believe is false in our view." Then to compare and to judge in a separate chapter:

the separation of description from judgment, a thousand years before modern research methods—and it is the charter this book inherited word for word ("Know a belief from its own people"). **Then the newest genre in the houses of faith:** "comparative religion" as a course in colleges of Islamic law and theology (our sources hold its three institutional samples: an Algerian professor's lecture notes, master's-level presentations from Fez, and the school syllabus)—a genre academic in its tools and confessional in its orientation: it studies the religions with the methods of scholarship **while** having settled the question of truth in advance. Distinguishing it from the purely descriptive science of religions (which methodically suspends judgment—a genre now taught even in state high schools: the Philippines assigns its humanities students a required course called "Introduction to World Religions and Belief Systems") is the first thing a student of this subject is taught.

* Third: The Students of Religion from Outside—The Story of the Modern Science of Religions

Then the nineteenth century brought a new birth: that religion be studied **as a human phenomenon,** with the method of the geologist among rocks—neither to defend it nor to demolish it. Max Müller (translator of the sacred books of the East) launched it with his founding motto: "**He who knows one religion knows none**"—comparison is the condition of understanding. The great schools followed, whose fruits you met in Chapter 1 and now know by name: the early **evolutionist** school (Tylor and Frazer: religion as a stage, from animism through magic toward

science—a simplified linearity the field has since abandoned); the **sociological** (Durkheim: society worships itself in its symbols). The **psychological**, on both its wings (Freud: the illusion is the child of desire; Jung and James: religious experience is a deep psychological datum deserving study, not erasure—and James's *The Varieties of Religious Experience* is the opening of the sympathetic empirical study). **Phenomenology** (Otto: "the holy" is a primary category that cannot be reduced; Eliade: symbol and myth are the language of *homo religiosus*, to be read from inside their own logic). Field **anthropology** (from Malinowski to Geertz: live with the people to understand their religion as living fabric, not texts); and the contemporary **cognitive-evolutionary** school, which we examined with its kit (the brain's prepared systems). **And the rule for handling this whole inheritance, which we bequeathed you in Chapter 1 and now fix here officially:** each school **uncovered a real layer and claimed it was the whole.** Take the discoveries and leave the explanatory imperialisms, and remember that describing a mechanism does not settle the question of truth (that is the field of evidence, not the field of description).

* Fourth: The Map of Genres—The Great Kit for Telling Them Apart (The Most Useful Thing in the Chapter)

Now the most precious thing you will carry from this chapter. When you reach for any book "about religions"—on paper or on a screen—you are holding one of **ten genres**, each with its marks, its function, and its way of being read:

1. The texts of the tradition itself (sacred books and their internal commentaries): the first source for knowing "what they believe"—read by the rules of the chapters on texts.

2. The internal teaching presentation (a people's creed written by their scholars for their own public): the truest mirror of a religion as its own people understand it—and our golden rule is that every religion be described from this first.

3. Apologetics: the defense of a religion by argument against objections—an honorable genre with a declared bias, whose contemporary summit in Arabic is in our sources (Amiri on the Islamic side, Basilius on the Christian). You read it to learn **the strongest of what the religion's people have**, not to learn about their opponents (who mostly appear in it at their weakest).

4. The comparative missionary genre: presenting the religions of others to show the superiority of the author's own. Its marks (as in our adopted sample, *Why Choose Islam as a Religion?*): the strong points of one's own set against the weak points of the other; the other's sources drawn from the books of its opponents; and a scale settled before the weighing. **It is read as a document about its author, not about those it describes.**

5. The staged dialogue: one interlocutor holds both pens and writes two parties who "debate," and wins—a genre eighteen centuries old (from Justin's dialogue with Trypho the Jew to the digital "Ahmad and Mina"). Its mark, separating it from real debate, is that in a real debate each side writes its own argument (as in the debates of Baghdad, or the exchanges between Plantinga and his critics).

6. Counter-polemic: dissecting the other's religion to demolish it—from the ancient "refutations of the Christians" to today's websites "exposing" every religion. It may contain correct information, but it is **tinted glass of hostility** par excellence: selecting the ugliest and generalizing the aberrant. It is used to learn the objections, and then **every piece of information in it is checked against the sources of the religion's own people.**

7. The genre of warning: the literature of "the danger of the other to us" (our documented example: the literature warning against missionary work and Orientalism, which we saw become a syllabus with examinations). Its function is to fortify the group, not to describe the opponent—so its description of the other is functionally exaggerated by the nature of the genre. One of its branches is **the genre of "answering the slanders"**—lexicons and series that collect the opponents' "doubts" and answer them item by item (such as Anwar Zanati's *Lexicon of the West's Slanders Against Islam*): useful for cataloguing the objections in circulation, and governed by its structure: it usually chooses the objection in its weakest form and names Orientalism as a single hostile bloc—whereas Orientalism is a spectrum containing the fair-minded scholar and the malicious alike, **and its deepest critique came from inside Western academia itself** (Edward Said in *Orientalism*, 1978: that knowledge of the East was shaped in the service of power over it)—a critique this genre knows little of, because it assumes conspiracy where Said diagnoses structure.

8. The conspiracy lens: reading the history of religions as a tightly woven plot (Freemasonry, Protocols, hidden hands). Its five marks—memorize them: one explanation that explains everything. Secret evidence that by its nature cannot be examined. Every criticism of the theory counted as proof of it (the critic is "one of them"); sources that cite one another in a circle. Founding documents proven to be forgeries (like the Protocols) that stay alive after their exposure. A genre **to be studied as a phenomenon, never read as a source** (and this book has kept to that to the letter).

9. Testimonies of conversion: "my journey to / from religion"—a precious emotional genre for understanding the **experience** of religiosity and of conversion (our sources hold its finest examples), and its rule: the testimony is evidence about its author, not about the truth of the doctrine (sincerity is not truth).

10. The descriptive academic: its distinguishing marks are the methodical suspension of judgment, the presentation of every tradition from its own sources, the mention of disagreements within the field itself, traceable references, and the acknowledgment of the limits of knowledge. It is the stuff of our first "maps" (Smith, Keown, Knott, Armstrong), with the standing caution: **academics have their schools and their soft biases too**—the descriptive is the cleanest of the genres, not an infallible one.

And five questions by which to examine any book in a minute—carry them with you. Who is the author, and where does he stand in relation to the religion he writes about (its child? its opponent? its student?)? For whom

does he write (for his own people, to fortify them? for the other, to invite them? for the field, as research?)? Where do his sources on "the other" come from (from the other's own books, or from the books of its opponents?—the fastest detector of genre)? Does he cite **the strongest** arguments of those who differ from him, or the weakest? Does he separate his description from his verdict, or blend them so that you cannot see where the facts ended and the sermon began?

* Fifth: And Where Does This Book Stand on the Map?—A Duty of Transparency

Whoever teaches you to examine books must first put his own neck out. This book—in the terms of its own map—is an attempt in a genre thinly settled in Arabic: **"the neutral seeker's guide."** It borrows its charter from the descriptive academic (every religion from its own people; description before judgment; the strongest form for all), and adds what the academic does not do: it **enters the field of evidence and of weighing,** where the descriptive writers suspend judgment. But it enters it **as a referee of the arena, not a combatant**: it displays both weapons at their sharpest and leaves the final contest to you. As for its possible biases, the author will confess them to you himself in "A Word from the Author," which closes the book, declaring his creed and his pledge (and the fact that the drafting was done by an intelligent machine under the supervision of an author with a background of his own is a dimension you must account for). **So apply your five questions to it as you apply them to any other book.** The last thing he would want is for you to exempt him from your sieve.

* Conclusion: The Open Question

We have defined religion by family and by dimensions, toured centuries of its study from inside and from outside, and handed you the survey of genres and the questions of examination. The chapter's question remains suspended where it deserves to be: **can a religion—in principle—be understood from outside?** The insiders say: whoever has not tasted has not known—the prayer described is not the prayer prayed, and the student of love from books is blind to its reality. The outsiders say: rather, the drowning man cannot describe the sea—distance is the condition of sight, and from inside the whale the shape of the whale cannot be seen. Al-Biruni—the master of this chapter—stands in the middle, where we have chosen to stand: come close enough to hear them in their own words, and step back when you weigh: **the nearness of fidelity and the distance of the standard.** So if you now pick up any book about any religion. You will pick up many—you know for the first time exactly what you are holding, how it is to be read, and what it can properly establish for you. **That is the kit for your whole journey. Pack it.**

> ***Cross-references for the chapter:*** *the explanations of the origin of religiosity and their schools in Chapter 1; the rule "Know a belief from its own people" applied throughout the chapters of the picture; and the tinted glass of opponents in Chapter 17.*

* Study 7.1: "Heavenly" And "Man-Made"—The Origin of the Division, Its Limits, and Alternative Maps

Where did the naming come from? What does it describe, and what does it judge? Why do Judaism, Christianity, and Islam really belong in one basket—and is it right to put "the rest of the religions" in a single basket at all?

> **Summary of the study:** Arabic writing on religion rests on a division so familiar that it passes for neutral: "heavenly" religions and "man-made" ones. Here the label is traced to its root and weighed on a genuinely neutral scale—which exposes its weakest point at once: "man-made" is not one family, but a basket of negation holding everything left over.

---

* First: The Division Arabic Readers Are Raised on

Open any Arabic textbook or preaching manual on "comparative religion" and you will find the governing division in its first pages: religions are of two kinds—**heavenly** (revealed, divine: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) and **man-made** (of human devising: everything else—Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Zoroastrianism, and all the rest). You saw this very division in the samples from our institutional sources (the university and school curricula). It is not one author's terminology but **the backbone of the method** in modern Islamic writing on the subject. **Its lineage is clear.** It is a modern technical formulation (it spread with the rise of comparative writing in the last two

centuries) of a division with Qur'anic roots: the Qur'an sets apart **"the People of the Book"** with special rulings and a special address (marriage, slaughtered meat, and "arguing in the best way"), and it affirms that Judaism and Christianity have their origin in revelation sent down ("We revealed the Torah with guidance and light"; "We gave him the Gospel") upon which distortion and substitution later came—whereas all other worship is "mere names you and your forefathers have invented." So the division—**from inside the Islamic vision—is precise and tightly built**: it is the picture of revelation as Islam sees it: a single chain of heavenly prophethoods (Adam, then Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad), whose seal was preserved and whose predecessors were distorted, with everything else being human efforts or the remnants of prophethoods that faded away.

* Second: The Methodological Scale—What Does the Division Describe, and What Does It Judge?

But this chapter has taught you to ask of every classification: **is it a description, or a verdict?** Here is the crux of the study. The division "heavenly / man-made" is not a neutral description but **a prior doctrinal verdict cast in the shape of a classification.** To call a religion "man-made" is to have **decided in advance** that it comes from human beings, not from heaven—and that is exactly what the people of the religions dispute! The Hindu presents the Vedas as *shruti*—"that which was heard," eternal, composed by neither human nor god (the strangest and oldest of the claims to "heavenliness," as you have seen); the

Zoroastrian recounts Ahura Mazda's revelation to his prophet in visions; the Sikh receives the "Guru Granth," the Book-Teacher, as the word of truth sent down to Nanak and his successors. The followers of the new religions present their own "revelations." **Nearly every religion is "heavenly" to its own people, and most religions are "man-made" to everyone else.** The division even rebounds on those who use it: the Jew and the Christian do not grant that the Qur'an is heavenly, and the irreligious critic places all three in the "man-made" box!

So the classification—in the language of our chapter—**belongs to the genre of missionary and apologetic literature, not to the genre of academic description**: perfectly legitimate inside its own house and for its own function (teaching a Muslim the map of revelation as he believes it), and a begging of the question if it is offered to the seeker as a neutral map from which to begin the search. For then the answer has been handed over in the wrapping of the question. **That is why this book chose its declared method:** we use "heavenly / man-made" **where we present the Islamic perspective, attributed to it** (as we attribute to every religion its own map), and in our descriptive text we use the terms for the structural families that follow—which classify by shared characteristics, not by a verdict on the source.

Third: So Why Do the Three Really Belong Together? — A Real Family by Any Scale

Here is the study's subtle point: even setting the doctrinal verdict aside, grouping Judaism, Christianity, and Islam in a single basket **stands up by purely descriptive criteria.** They are a real family, sharing a structure that others share only rarely:

1. One lineage. All three trace their descent to **Abraham** and present him as the father of the monotheists (hence the most common academic name today: **"the Abrahamic religions"**—a term with a story of its own worth a line: the Qur'an was first to make "the religion of Abraham" a unifier above the quarreling communities: "Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian. He was upright and devoted to God"—and then the French Orientalist Massignon and his students revived the term in the twentieth century as a bridge for dialogue, and it spread through academia and diplomacy until it became the name of the field).

2. One structure of God. A personal monotheism: a Creator, transcendent, who speaks, legislates, and holds to account—not the impersonal Absolute of India, nor the Tao of China, nor the silence of the Buddha.

3. One channel of contact. Revelation descending on **prophets** and written down in a central sacred **book**—the structural triad (revelation / prophethood / book) that also earns them the names "religions of revelation," "People of the Book," and "scriptural religions". Compare religions whose axis is ritual, or wisdom, or harmony, with no central prophethood.

4. One architecture of time. A line from creation to resurrection, judgment, and eternity—not India's wheel (you saw in Chapter 24 how this difference alone overturns the whole question of salvation).

5. The ethics of law. A legislating divine will to be obeyed—not an automatic karma, nor Confucian propriety.

6. One cradle. The geography of the Semitic Middle East, its closely related languages, and an intertwined history of inheritance and controversy (each later member reads itself as the confirmation and correction of the one before—the cyclical structure you have met). **The upshot:** grouping the three is a **structurally correct grouping**, on which the believer's map and the academic's map agree. They part only over the interpretation: is it the mark of **a single heavenly source** for the chain (Islam's reading: the religion of the prophets is one), or the mark of **historical inheritance** in a family of ideas that grew in one soil (the reading of comparative scholarship)? The datum is one, and both readings are yours.

* Fourth: And Is It Right to Gather "The Rest" In One Basket?—A Critique of the "Man-Made" Category

Here our book puts its finger on the weakest point of the common division—not, this time, on the side of the verdict but on the side of **the classification itself**: the category of "man-made religions" **is not a family but a basket of negation.** Nothing unites its members but one shared description: that they are "not Abrahamic"! What kinship is there between the contemplative Vedanta of India, the ritual Shinto of Japan, the ethical Confucianism of the court,

and the animism of the forests? Gathering them in one box is like gathering "all the non-Arabic languages" into one language—a classification that measures distance from a center, not internal structure (scholars of method call this pattern "centered classification": most civilizations divide the world into "us" and "everyone else," as the Greeks divided humankind into Hellenes and barbarians).

The more accurate descriptive map—the one this book adopted from its first chapters—lays out the families by their characteristics: the Abrahamic family (as above). **The Dharmic family** of India (Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism, united by dharma, karma, samsara, and the goal of liberation—a real family with documented ties of descent); **the Taoist-Confucian family** of China (harmony, the Way, and the practical blend); **the family of ethnic-animist religions** (the non-missionary religions of peoples, bound to a nation and a land); **the ancient dualist and Gnostic religions** (Zoroastrianism, Manichaeism . . .). And **the new movements** (Baha'i, Mormonism, New Age . . .)—six families, not two, and within each of them differences you have learned to respect. **Even the other common binary** ("Eastern / Western religions") does not escape the same critique (Islam and Christianity are "Eastern" by birth!). The methodological lesson that gathers it all: **classifications are working maps, not final truths.** Every map answers one question superbly and distorts others—so ask what a map is for before you travel by it.

* Conclusion: The Study's Kit

You leave this study with three things: **knowledge of the lineage of the common division** (a Qur'anic root in "the People of the Book" and the landscape of revelation, and a modern technical formulation). **Its scale** (precise inside its own house, as the Muslim's creed about the sources of the religions—and a begging of the question if offered as a neutral map for research, since every religion is heavenly to its own people). **And its descriptive alternative** (the six structural families, headed by "the Abrahamic," which gathers the three by six structural bonds that scholars generally acknowledge, differing only over their interpretation). If from now on you meet a book that opens with "religions are divided into heavenly and man-made," you know exactly **what genre of book you are holding, from what window it looks, and how to profit from it without handing it the helm of your search**. That is the fruit of the whole chapter on tools, in one living example.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the picture of writing genres and the questions of examination in the body of this chapter; the Vedic claim of shruti and the differing conceptions of revelation in Chapter 16; and the cyclical structure (each later religion reading its predecessor) in the study on foretellings and in "What the Religions Said About One Another."*

Chapter 8: A Map of the History of Religions and Beliefs

The grand tour in seventeen stations, from prehistoric graves to the religions of the twentieth century—a map of what human beings have believed, drawn under the charter of neutrality and guided by the six families

> **Summary of the chapter:** Everything humanity has believed since the dawn of history, gathered into a single journey: seventeen stations carrying you from graves thousands of years older than writing itself to the religions of the twentieth century—a map built on six religious families, closing with five observations that change how you see the whole landscape.

* Opening: How to Read This Map

This chapter is the "grand tour" on which all of Part III rests: a historical survey of what human beings have believed across the civilizations, from the oldest funerary trace to the newest founded religion. Before we set off, five counsels for reading the map.

First. This is a map, not an encyclopedia. For every station we draw the broad features the seeker needs for weighing, and we refer their detail to the book's specialized chapters (conceptions of God are detailed in Chapter 9, the spread of religions in Chapter 11, the figures in Chapter 12, the texts in Chapters 15 and 16, Satan in Chapter 21, the afterlife in Chapter 24, and the cards of the ten great religions in Appendix A). The chapter is a spine to which those limbs are attached.

Second. Our compass in classification is the map of the **six families** drawn by the study "Heavenly and Man-Made" attached to the previous chapter: the Abrahamic, the Dharmic of India, the Taoist-Confucian of China, the ethnic-animist, the dualist-Gnostic, and the new movements. You will find the stations that follow settling into these houses, and we will spread them out again together at the chapter's close.

Third. The order is roughly chronological and geographical, and the borders between stations are weaker than the headings suggest: religions neighbor one another, cross-pollinate, and inherit, and you will see threads running from station to station.

Fourth. Remember the charter's distinction among the four layers: what we tell of every tradition is a mixture whose sources are sacred texts, artifacts, documented history, and later narratives. We will alert you whenever our knowledge of a people is drawn from the books of their opponents (as with Manichaeism, Arab paganism, and the religions of the Americas).

Fifth. The names of ancient sects and the ancient dates are approximate by nature and many of them are disputed, and today's numbers of adherents come from the great demographic estimates whose latest edition we detailed in Chapter 1.

* Station One: Prehistory—Religion Before Writing

Before human beings wrote a single letter, they buried their dead with a care that raises the question: graves tens of thousands of years old, furnished with tools, ornaments,

and red pigments, as if their people did not believe the story ended at the soil. Then they painted on the walls of their caves (Lascaux, Altamira, and others) scenes that many scholars judge to have had, in part, a ritual function—though the interpretation remains conjectural, for here we are reading minds that left us not one word. Then came the surprise of **Göbekli Tepe**, with which we opened the book: the temple built before agriculture and cities, suggesting that gathering for the sacred may have been among the builders of civilization rather than one of its luxuries. As for the content of these first religions, it is reconstructed by analogy with the oral religions that have stayed alive (they come in the stations on Africa, the Americas, and Oceania): a world inhabited by spirits and powers (what scholars call **animism**), intermediaries who cross between the worlds in trance (**shamanism**), and ancestors present in the lives of their descendants. Above all of that, among many peoples, that **remote high god** whom you met in Chapter 9, and whose strange presence the two camps will dispute in the study "One or Many." This is the mother layer—the oldest and longest-lived layer of religiosity—and to it belongs what we will call, in the conclusion, the family of ethnic-animist religions.

* Station Two: Mesopotamia—The Oldest Written Theology

In Sumer, then Akkad, Babylon, and Assyria, the first religions in history were written down: a pantheon (Anu, Enlil, Enki, Ishtar, Marduk . . .) administering the cosmos like a state; creation stories, the most famous being the *Enuma Elish*, in which Marduk makes the world from the corpse

of Tiamat and human beings are created from the blood of a slain god **to serve the gods**—the Mesopotamian human is a serf on the estate of the lords, and the temple (the ziggurat) is the center of economy and government. From Mesopotamia came down to us the Epic of Gilgamesh, with its immortal question about death; the flood of Utnapishtim, which scholars would compare with the flood of Noah (the weighing of the similarities is in the chapters on texts). The oldest written laws—from Ur-Nammu to the most famous, Hammurabi, who receives his law from the sun god Shamash, so that here too the law draws its authority from heaven. Its afterlife, however, is bleak: a dark underworld in which nearly everyone is equal—we paused there in Chapter 24 to see how the afterlife can be the worst thing in a religion.

* Station Three: Egypt—Maat, Judgment, and Akhenaten

On the banks of the Nile arose the longest-lived religious experiment (about three thousand documented years) and the one most preoccupied with death and immortality. Its first key is **Maat**: order, truth, and justice, a goddess and a cosmic principle at once, which pharaoh, priest, and peasant alike were charged with preserving against chaos. Its second key is **Osiris**: the murdered god who became lord and judge of the other world, and around whose court arose the oldest detailed and documented conception of moral judgment after death: **the weighing of the heart** against the feather of Maat, and the "declarations of innocence." That is, the binding of one's fate in the hereafter to one's moral conduct is older than the Abrahamic religions

by centuries—a fact whose two opposing readings (the trace of an ancient revelation and a shared *fitra*, or a transmitted human development) we presented in Chapter 24. Its third key is the episode of **Akhenaten**, which passed before you in Chapter 1: the pharaoh who closed the temples of the gods and imposed the worship of Aten alone in the fourteenth century BCE, in the oldest documented political experiment in monotheism. It lived a few years, the returning priesthood erased it, and it remains a puzzle scholars pull in different directions. With Mesopotamia and Greece, Egypt represents the great paganisms of the ancient world: the houses that went dark after thousands of years of burning, and the question of their extinction will meet you at the chapter's close.

* Station Four: Iran—Zoroaster and the Moral Splitting of the Cosmos

On the Iranian plateau, at a disputed date (estimates range from the second millennium to the sixth century BCE), **Zoroaster** proclaimed a message that overturned the logic of the neighboring religions: a supreme wise god (**Ahura Mazda**) faced by an evil spirit (**Angra Mainyu**); the cosmos as an arena of struggle between light and darkness. The human being—this is the revolution—**a conscript with a choice**, deciding by good thoughts, good words, and good deeds on which front he stands. And at the end of time a judgment, a resurrection, and a bridge to be crossed. Here was born a bundle of ideas whose influence would travel far—the cosmic adversary, the moral battle, the general resurrection—and scholars dispute how much of it seeped into Judaism after the exile and

from there into its two daughters; we laid the file out in the chapters on Satan and the afterlife. Zoroastrianism is still alive in a small minority (the Parsis of India and the Zoroastrians of Iran), among the most venerable of surviving religions and the smallest. (Its ritual face is as distinctive as its doctrine: an ever-burning flame tended in the fire temple as the symbol of the pure divine light—which earned its people the old, mistaken label "fire-worshipers," a charge their theologians have always answered: the fire is venerated, not worshiped; and the exposure of the dead in the "towers of silence," so that neither the pure earth nor fire be defiled by corruption—a practice now largely yielded, in Iran and the crowded cities of India, to burial and cremation.) From the same Iranian-Mesopotamian soil there came, in the third century CE, **Mani**, with his composite dualist religion in which he declared himself the seal of Zoroaster, Buddha, and Christ alike. Manichaeism spread from the Atlantic to China and was then almost totally annihilated by its opponents—its strange story, and the fact that most of what we know of it comes from the books of its enemies, are in the chapter on preaching and mission. These two houses (the Zoroastrian and the Manichaean) are the pillars of what we will call the dualist-Gnostic family.

* Station Five: India—All the Answers in One House

The Indian subcontinent is the most fertile religious soil the planet has known, and in it the second great family was born: **the Dharmic**. From the layers of the Vedas (the middle of the second millennium BCE onward) to the meditations of the Upanishads were born the concepts that

govern the whole Indian house: **Brahman** (the absolute reality) and **Atman** (the deep self), and the great saying of their oneness; **samsara** (the wheel of birth and death), **karma** (the law of recompense that drives it), and **moksha** (liberation from it—which is the goal). On this foundation stands **Hinduism**—not so much one religion as a family of religions and paths: the path of works and rites, the path of knowledge, and the path of love and devotion to a personal god (Vishnu and his incarnations, or Shiva, or the Great Mother). So that in it you find philosophical monotheism, popular polytheism, and pantheism side by side. This is why we said in the chapter on the concept of God: India is a house in which all the answers live. From its body came **Jainism** (Mahavira, roughly the sixth century BCE): a path of strict asceticism whose pillar is **nonviolence (ahimsa)**, even toward the smallest insect, with no creator god at all—the most venerable school of nonviolence in history, whose influence reaches Gandhi and beyond.

* Station Six: Buddhism—The Path That Crossed the Continents

From the same Indian house there came, in roughly the fifth century BCE, a prince named Siddhartha Gautama, shaken by the sight of old age, sickness, and death. He withdrew, practiced austerities, and then sat beneath a tree until he "awoke"—and became **the Buddha**. The summary of his awakening is the four truths you met on his card (Appendix A): suffering; its cause, craving; the possibility of its extinction; and the eightfold path to that extinction. There is no creator on this path and no abiding self—

only karma driving the wheel, and a goal that is **nirvana**. (Hence a question raised by scholars East and West and posed by contemporary Muslim writers in its sharp form: is it a **religion**, or a **moral rebellion against Brahmanism**—a rejection of caste, sacrifice, priesthood, and Atman together? Scholars of Buddhism answer that it is both: it arose as a *shramana* reform within the Indian house and then, with the institution of the *sangha*, its rites, and its temples, became a religion complete in every pillar. Hence this book's classification of it as an independent house within the Dharmic family.) The river divided into branches: **Theravada** (the older path of the monks, in Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia); **Mahayana** (the Great Vehicle, which opened salvation to all and raised the Buddha and the compassionate bodhisattvas to something like popular divinity—in China, Korea, Japan, and Vietnam); and Tibetan **Vajrayana**, with its esoteric rites. Buddhism was the first religion to cross the borders of its cradle in an organized, continental crossing—the story of its spread with no military conquest to speak of, and then of its expulsion from India itself, is in the chapter on preaching and mission—and it is today the world's fourth religion by numbers.

* Station Seven: China and Japan—Heaven, Order, and the Way

In China religion did not take the form of a "creed" with exclusive membership; the Chinese lived for ages with "the Three Teachings" in a single breast. **Confucianism** (Confucius, sixth to fifth century BCE): a system of ethics and society centered on filial piety, loyalty, and the reform of

family and state, revering "Heaven" (*Tian*) as a supreme moral order and keeping a courteous silence about the unseen. **Taoism** (attributed to Laozi): flowing with "the Tao"—the Way by which nature runs—in simplicity and spontaneity; later a popular church grew up around it, with gods, rites, and a quest for immortality. Then **Buddhism**, which arrived and became Chinese. Above the three, a layer older than them all: the veneration of ancestors and of the lords of house and field. This whole house is our third family, **the Taoist-Confucian**—the family of harmony, which made religion a way of life more than a doctrine of salvation. In Japan arose **Shinto**: the religion of the *kami*—the powers and spirits dwelling in the mountain, the waterfall, and the ancient tree—rites of purity and gratitude with no founding book and no organized doctrine, which came to coexist with the incoming Buddhism in a remarkable division of labor that still stands: to Shinto the joys of birth and marriage, to Buddhism the funerals of death.

* Station Eight: Greece and Rome—From Olympus to the God of the Philosophers

Greek popular religion you met in the chapter on the concept of God: the Olympian pantheon with its scandalous humanity; the rites of the city, which were civic loyalty before they were personal faith; and beside them an esoteric layer (the mysteries of Eleusis and Orphism) and the oracle at Delphi, which states consulted. What this station gave the whole history of religion was two new things: **philosophy**, which criticized the gods of the poets and rose to an "unmoved mover" and a "craftsman"—here "the

God of the philosophers" was born, whom the theologians of all the Abrahamic religions would borrow. **The criticism of religion** itself, from Xenophanes' mockery of gods made in the image of those who drew them to the trial of Socrates—we laid the story out in the chapter on the history of doubt. Rome inherited Olympus under Latin names and added its own genius: a religion of contract and ritual precision ("I give so that you may give"), the deification of emperors, and a broad imperial tolerance of the religions of the peoples—on one condition, participation in the worship of the state. On that condition its great collision with rising Christianity would take place.

* Station Nine: The Religions of the Steppe—Tengrism and Shamanism Among the Turks and Mongols

This is a station most popular maps leave out, though it was among the most widespread systems in history: from Manchuria and Korea in the east to the plains of Hungary in the west, the nomads of the Eurasian steppe, Turks and Mongols, held it for long centuries. Its pillar is **Tengri**: the eternal blue Sky, one supreme god who grants the khans their power ("By the power of Eternal Heaven"—so the decrees of the Mongols opened); beneath him the spirits of earth, water, fire, and the ancestors; and its intermediary the **shaman**, who ascends in spirit between the worlds as healer, diviner, and priest. It had no book, no law, no prophethood, and no mission—the condition in which, as you saw in Chapter 1, the Muslim historians described its people: they know God and revere Him and follow no law—which made it an ideal test case for our classifications: a supreme sky god with no structure of "creed."

Among its marvels is that the court of Genghis Khan and his grandsons gathered, in imperial tolerance, shamanists, Buddhists, Nestorian Christians, and Muslims who debated before the Khan—before the religion itself dissolved into the religions of the conquered peoples: the tribes of the Mongol west became Muslim and the tribes of the east became Buddhist, in one of the largest mass conversions in history. We analyzed the motives of this kind of conversion (politics, marriage alliances, trade, and civilizational prestige) in the chapter on preaching and mission.

* Station Ten: Arabia Before Islam—God and the Idols

Before Islam the Peninsula knew a mixture whose layers the seeker must distinguish, with the charter's caution: most of what we know of its paganism reached us through later Islamic sources (such as Ibn al-Kalbi's *Book of Idols*). The general scene: a broad acknowledgment of a supreme god named **Allah**, Creator of the heavens—the Qur'an itself argues with Quraysh from their own admission of this: "If you ask them who created the heavens and earth, they are sure to say, 'God'"—with gods and tribal idols associated with Him as intercessors (al-Lat, al-Uzza, Manat, Hubal . . .) around a Ka'ba that had become an assembly of idols, together with pilgrimage, sacred months, custodianship, and the trade of the seasons. Alongside this: a well-rooted Judaism in Yathrib, Khaybar, and Yemen; Christianity in Najran, al-Hira, and the borderlands of Syria. Zoroastrianism on the Gulf coast. And individuals the sources called the **hanifs**, who rejected the worship of idols on the religion of Abraham, without a book—you met them in

Chapter 1. In this composite soil—not in a vacuum—Muhammad was sent at the opening of the seventh century CE, and his religion will come in its station.

* Station Eleven: Judaism—Covenant, Diaspora, and Text

Its story is laid out in the chapters on God, the texts, and the figures, so here we summarize its historical frame: a small people on the margin of the empires carried the monotheistic revolution we described in Chapter 9—one God, ethical, jealous, without image, bound to His people by **a covenant**: election in exchange for commitment to a law. Its decisive stations: the Exodus (the founding event in liturgical memory); Sinai and the Torah; the kingdom and the Temple; then **the Babylonian exile** (587 BCE), which nearly erased it and instead drew out of it its deepest transformation—from a religion of temple and sacrifice to a religion of text, synagogue, and the preservation of identity in dispersion. Then the destruction of the Second Temple (70 CE), which completed the transformation: **rabbinic Judaism** arose on the Talmud and its commentaries and lived two thousand years as a scattered minority preserving its text and its law—the most astonishing case of survival the history of religions knows—down to its modern divisions (Orthodox, Reform, and Conservative) and its contemporary state, with the theological and political questions it raised, which are still burning. Beside it survived **the Samaritans**: a small community alive to this day, carrying its own Torah and holding sacred Mount Gerizim rather than Jerusalem—we made their text a complete laboratory case in the chapter "How the Texts

Reached Us." With this station opens the fourth great family—**the Abrahamic**—which will extend through the next two stations until it embraces more than half the population of the earth.

* Station Twelve: Christianity—From an Upper Room in Jerusalem to the Largest Religion on Earth

It began as a small Jewish movement around Jesus of Nazareth: an itinerant teacher who preached the kingdom of God, healed, and worked wonders by the testimony of his followers, and was then crucified under the Roman governor Pilate. Here is the decisive event: his followers' belief that he **rose from the dead**, the stone on which the whole religion was built ("if Christ has not been raised . . . your faith has been in vain"—Paul, 1 Corinthians 15:14), whose evidence and its critiques are weighed in the chapter on Stage Two evidence. Paul and others carried the good news to the nations and released it from the condition of the Jewish law, and it spread through the empire in a patient spread under intermittent persecution, until the situation turned with Constantine (fourth century: toleration, then patronage) and it became the religion of the state under Theodosius (380 CE). Its great councils (Nicaea, 325 CE, and after) began to settle its doctrine: the Trinity and the two natures of Christ. And along the edges of those settlements churches that dissented fell away (the Nestorians and the non-Chalcedonians), whose remnants are still alive from Egypt and Ethiopia to Iraq and India. Then came the two greatest schisms: the schism of 1054 between the **Catholicism** of Rome and the **Orthodoxy** of

the East, and the Reformation of the sixteenth century (Luther and Calvin), which detonated **Protestantism** with its countless branches on the two principles of "Scripture alone" and "salvation by faith." Today Christianity is the largest religion on earth by numbers and the most widely spread, and its demographic weight is migrating south: to Africa, Latin America, and Asia.

* Station Thirteen: Islam—The Final Revelation and Its Schools

In Mecca around the year 610 CE, Muhammad—at forty—began to receive what Muslims believe to be the revelation of God through Gabriel: a Qur'an to be recited, whose call was the pure oneness of God, the rejection of idols, and belief in resurrection and judgment. Thirteen Meccan years under persecution; then **the Hijra** to Medina (622 CE—the beginning of the calendar), where the community's state arose; then the conquest of Mecca and the unification of the Peninsula. And his death when the revelation was complete. After him the conquests erupted in an explosion that changed the survey of the world within a century, and the Qur'an was preserved by the dual mechanism (memory and writing) that we dissected in the study on transmission attached to Chapter 16. The great division came early, over **the imamate**: **the Sunnis** (about nine-tenths of Muslims today) held that leadership was a matter of consultation, while **the Shia** held that the Prophet designated Ali and his descendants as imams—and they branched (Twelvers, Ismailis, and Zaydis). **The Ibadis** remained the heirs of an early independent current. Within the Sunni house the four schools of law and the schools of creed matured. **Sufism** flourished as the path of purification and love (its spiritual counterpart across the

religions is in Chapter 9). And a scientific civilization arose whose story with science we presented in Part VIII. Islam is today the world's second religion and the fastest growing demographically.

* Station Fourteen: Sikhism—The Newest of the Great Independent Religions

In the Punjab, where the Abrahamic and Dharmic houses touch in daily contact, the last of the great independent religions was born in the fifteenth century CE: tradition tells that **Guru Nanak** vanished for three days and came out saying, "There is no Hindu, there is no Muslim"—proclaiming a pure monotheism of one God without images or incarnation ("the True Name"), while keeping karma and rebirth—a unique synthesis of the two families, with few parallels. Nanak and his nine successors rejected caste, monasticism, and empty ritualism, and exalted work and sharing (the free kitchen of the *langar*, where everyone is fed seated on one level, is its immortal social symbol). Under persecution the community became an organized warrior nation (the *Khalsa*). Then the line of teachers was sealed by the unique decision that has passed before you: **the Book** itself (the Guru Granth Sahib) was installed as a living, immortal teacher—a religion that sealed its prophets with a text. Its people today number about twenty-seven million, centered in the Punjab with a worldwide diaspora. (Among the pleasant surprises of the Arabic library is that one of the first learned introductions to it in Arabic was *The Religion of the Sikhs* by Muhammad Sulayman al-Ashraf of the University of Delhi—the pen of someone who knew Punjabi and its context, not a copier from a copier.)

* Station Fifteen: Africa—The Traditional Religions and Their Two Daughters in the Diaspora

South of the Sahara, thousands of communities lived by systems united—for all their immense variety—by a single structure that their modern students (John Mbiti among them) did justice to, after the contempt of the earliest scholars: **a supreme creator God** under the local names you met in Chapter 9 (Olodumare, Nyame, Mulimo . . .), to whom direct worship is seldom raised; beneath Him **spirits and powers** and intermediary deities (such as the *orisha* among the Yoruba); **living ancestors,** whose presence in the community is stronger than that of many of the living. Rites of passage that make the stages of life. Diviners and traditional healers—a religion lived, not a creed written down, with no book, no founder, and no name for itself: the most complete model of the family of ethnic-animist religions. When Christianity and Islam swept the continent these systems did not die. They seeped into the two newcomers in a way that produced African-flavored Christianities and Islams, and they generated in the forced diaspora—through the transatlantic slave trade—whole composite religions: **Vodou** in Haiti, **Santería** in Cuba, and **Candomblé** in Brazil, where the *orisha* put on the masks of the Catholic saints in one of the cleverest cases of religious disguise in history.

* Station Sixteen: The Americas and Oceania—Worlds Discovered Late

Before Columbus, great systems stood in the New World, most of whose heritage was destroyed with the conquest—so keep the charter's caution doubly in mind: much of what we know of them was written by the conquerors and their monks. Among **the Maya,** an astronomy and a sacred calendar of astonishing precision. Among **the Aztecs,** a thirsty sun watered with human sacrifices so that it would rise each morning—the most famous file of human sacrifice, and the most debated among scholars in its scale and its interpretation; among **the Inca,** the empire of the Son of the Sun and the veneration of ancestors. In the north the peoples of the plains and forests lived by "the Great Spirit," whom you met in Chapter 9, by the visions of the individual quest, and by the rites of the sweat lodge. In the islands of the Pacific religion turned on two concepts the region exported to the whole lexicon of the study of religion: **mana**—the power flowing through persons and things—guarded by the fence of **taboo**: the prohibition that isolates what is charged with power from the common people. In Australia the Aboriginal peoples—in the oldest continuous living culture on earth—carried the vision of **the Dreaming**: the founding time in which the ancestral beings roamed the land, drew its features, and laid down its laws. Not a past that has ended but a parallel present entered through rite, song, and the songlines across the sacred land. For them the land is literally their scripture, and this is why taking it from them was taking their religion itself.

At the two ends of the American continent, two other worlds complete the picture. In the Arctic (the Inuit and their neighbors from Alaska to Greenland), a hunting religion in an unforgiving environment: the supreme being distant in his effect, the daily presence that of the spirits of animal, sea, and weather; its most famous figure "the Mistress of the Sea," who withholds the seal and the whale when the taboos have been violated, so that the shaman (the *angakkuq*) descends to her on a spirit journey to mend what people have spoiled. A precise system of prohibitions governing hunting, birth, and death, whose essence is that the animal **gives itself** to the hunter if it is respected—so that ethics here is an economy of survival as much as a creed. **And in the Amazon**—where hundreds of peoples speak languages mutually unknown—three features recur: the shaman as intermediary and healer; sacred plants (such as ayahuasca) as a ritual door into the world of spirits. A conception the anthropologists named "perspectivism": that animals and plants are persons with a point of view, a soul, and a community, and that the difference between them and human beings is a difference of body, not of spirit—the jaguar sees itself as human and sees us as prey, and only the shaman crosses between the perspectives. On both continents much of this stayed alive beneath incoming religions, or blended with them in popular forms, or was deliberately revived in contemporary movements of identity.

What unites the religions of the indigenous peoples on the four continents. For all their distance from one another—is five features to which you will return whenever you meet them in this book: **(1)** no founder, no book, and

no written creed, but oral tradition, rite, and land. **(2)** Religion not separated from life: there is no word for "religion" in most of their languages, because hunting, farming, and kinship are all religion. **(3)** The land sacred in itself, not as a symbol—the place is the text. **(4)** The boundary between human, animal, ancestor, and spirit is movable, and the relationship with them is **exchange**, not the worship of submission. **(5)** The intermediary is an office (shaman, diviner, keeper of songs), not a prophet with a message. **And the scale's caution here is sharper than at any other station:** most of what we know of these religions was written by the pens of missionaries, administrators, and anthropologists, and much of it went out with epidemics and displacement before it was recorded, so that the rule "Know a belief from its own people" reaches here its greatest difficulty—which is why it has become part of modern scholarly method that an indigenous religion be told in the voices of its living people, not from the archive of those who studied them.

* Station Seventeen: The Modern Religions—And Non-Affiliation

The factory of religions did not stop. In the last two centuries the sixth family was born—**the new movements**—as creeds complete in every feature. Some came from an Abrahamic womb: **the Baha'i faith** (from the womb of a Shia Babism in Iran, nineteenth century): Baha'u'llah as a new messenger in the chain of "the Manifestations of God," with the unity of religions and of humankind as its central doctrine. It met a persecution we documented in the study on freedom. **Mormonism** (Joseph Smith, America, 1830),

with its added book and its renewed prophethood; **the Adventists** and **Jehovah's Witnesses**, from a prophetic Protestant stock; and **the Ahmadiyya** (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, India, 1889), which detonated within Islam the battle over the Seal of the Prophets detailed in the chapter on claims to prophethood. Some came from East to West in waves of gurus and meditation movements. And some are the floating spiritualities ("New Age" and its marketplace, which we analyzed in the chapter on religion in the age of acceleration). Beside all of this, **religious non-affiliation** grew until it became the third bloc in the statistics of the globe—you read its numbers in Chapter 1 and the history of its people in Part VI.

* The Chapter's Conclusion: The Six Families Together, Five Observations—And the Map's Open Question

Now lift your head from the stations and look at the survey all at once. The first thing you see is that the seventeen stations really did settle into the **six families** we promised you: **the Abrahamic** (Judaism and the Samaritans, Christianity with its churches, and Islam with its schools—and on its borders Sikhism by its monotheism and the Baha'i faith by its descent); **the Dharmic** (Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, and Sikhism by its karma); **the Taoist-Confucian** (the house of China and its extensions); **the ethnic-animist** (prehistory, Africa, the Americas, Oceania, Shinto, and the Tengrism of the steppe); **the dualist-Gnostic** (Zoroastrianism, Manichaeism, and those in their orbit); and **the new movements**. Notice that Sikhism fell into two families, that Tengrism is belief in a supreme god without the structure of a creed, and that Buddhism is a path of salvation without a creator—and

remember the rule of Chapter 7: classifications are useful working maps, not molds to which reality is cut.

Then five great observations that look out from the whole tour:

First—the recurring structure. Across distant continents and ages one structure recurs: a supreme power, intermediaries, rite, offering, a story of origin, an answer about destiny, a community, and a law of conduct. This is the datum with which we opened the book, and its two opposing readings—an implanted *fitra* or a shared human structure—have been in your hands since Chapter 1.

Second—cross-pollination, not isolation. There is no station whose threads do not run to its neighbors: Mesopotamia in the Tanakh, Iran in the Abrahamic religions, India in Buddhism, Greece in everyone's theology, Africa in the religions of the Americas. If anyone argues to you that the resemblance between two religions leads by itself to falsehood or to truth, we have laid out the measures of this delicate file in the chapters on texts and evidence: resemblance is a datum; its interpretation is the point of dispute.

Third—the question of salvation divides the picture. The deepest dividing line on the map is not between "heavenly and man-made" but between two architectures of existence: the Abrahamic architecture of the line (creation, one trial, judgment, eternity) and the Dharmic architecture of the wheel (repeated birth, with salvation in escaping it)—you saw in Chapter 24 how this difference alone overturns the whole question of salvation—and between them the Chinese houses of harmony, which made the question itself secondary.

Fourth—survival and extinction. On this map whole religious nations went dark (Mesopotamia, Egypt, Olympus, Manichaeism, the Tengri of the steppe) and others survived every ordeal (Judaism, the Samaritans, Zoroastrianism, the great Abrahamic religions, and the houses of India and China). The observer notices that all the survivors possessed some of this equipment: a preserved central text, or a tightly built community, or a law of identity, or a renewing mission—while what died was a religion of court, or a religion of land whose state fell or whose land was taken. Spread is one thing and roots another, as the lesson of Manichaeism taught you.

Fifth—the survey is not the verdict. This chapter showed you **what** human beings believed, and **when** and **where**—and said not one word about **which of them was right**. That is the business of the field of evidence (Part VII) and the scales of comparison (Part II). Beware here two opposite fallacies lying in wait for the reader of religious history: the fallacy of "the oldest is the truest" and the fallacy of "the newest is the most mature"—age and novelty are descriptions in time, not evidence.

There remains the chapter's question, which we leave with you: **When you look at this whole map—thousands of years, hundreds of creeds, billions of worshipers—do you read it as the record of humanity's long search for a God who exists and revealed Himself to it according to the capacity of its vessels? Or as the record of its long creation of gods in the image of its needs? Or do you read in it—as the Muslim does—the story of successive prophethoods, whose seal was preserved and whose predecessors were altered?** This is the question of the whole book, shown on the widest screen—and the remaining parts are your equipment for the answer.

* Chapter 9: "God"—What Do Human Beings Mean When They Use the Word?

The concept of God across religions and civilizations: its meanings, its origin, and the lines of its development

Summary of the chapter: When billions of human beings use the word "God," do they mean the same thing? Six axes analyze every possible conception of God, followed by a tour across twelve civilizations revealing how one word carried the most divergent meanings—from a God worshipped in fear, to a God worshipped in love, to a God asked for nothing at all.

---

* Opening: The Most Dangerous Word, and the Most Ambiguous

When the Muslim says "Allah," the Hindu "Brahman," the ancient Chinese "Tian," the Sioux "Wakan Tanka," and the philosopher "the First Cause"—are they speaking of the same thing under different names? Or of radically different things whose names happen to resemble one another in translation?

This is not a marginal linguistic question. It is among the most consequential questions in this whole book. Many conversations between believers and atheists—and among the people of different religions—are dialogues of the deaf, because each side fills the word "God" with a different content. The atheist who attacks "a bearded man above the clouds" is attacking a god that no serious theologian believes in to begin with. And the believer who

imagines that all the nations worshiped "his God" under other names is erasing enormous differences.

So before we ask "Does God exist?" (the chapter on evidence that is coming), we must ask: **the God in question—what is He, to those who have believed in Him?** This chapter answers in three movements: what have human beings meant by God? How did the concept arise? And how did it develop?

The First Movement: What Do They Mean? —The Tools of Analysis, Then the Grand Tour

* First: The Six Axes into Which Every Conception of God Can Be Analyzed

Rather than drown in hundreds of names, let us first grasp the keys. Every conception of God in history can be analyzed by six questions:

1. One, or many? Between the two lie degrees that simplification overlooks: full polytheism (a god for every concern). "Monolatry" (we worship our god and do not deny the gods of others—a stage scholars call henotheism and monolatry). And exclusive monotheism (there is no god but one, and all else is false).

2. A person, or a principle? A God who "hears and sees and loves and is angered and can be addressed" (the personal God), or an "Absolute" with no personality: a law, an order, a universal reality that is not prayed to but realized (Brahman, the Tao, the One of the philosophers)? This is the question the Arab Christian writer Habib Said used as the title of his chapter "Does God Have a Personality?"—and it is the deepest dividing line on our whole map.

3. Transcendent, or immanent? Outside the world and separate from it in exaltation (transcendence), or pervading the world, indwelling it, indeed its inner reality (immanence, pantheism), or both: transcendent in His essence, present by His knowledge and governance?

4. A creator from nothing, a craftsman from matter, or no creator at all? The Abrahamic religions hold the

first; most of the ancient paganisms the second (the god orders an eternal chaos that preceded him). Buddhism and Jainism the third (the world is a process without a beginner).

5. Intervening, or withdrawn? Does He hear prayer, send messengers, and direct history—or did He wind the clock and depart (the God of the deists)—or, in an astonishing ancient phenomenon we will come to, is He a high god who "retired," so that worship is directed to his intermediaries?

6. What is His relation to morality? The source of the good, its legislator and its judge—or an overwhelming power above morality, appeased by sacrifices rather than by virtue—or with no concern for it at all?

Memorize these six keys. With them you will take apart everything that follows—and with them you will later understand why the "arguments for God's existence" turn out, on examination, to establish some of these conceptions and not others.

* Second: The Tour of the Civilizations—Who Meant What?

1. The first (oral) religions: "the retired high god" and the spirits of the world

In the oldest layers of human belief—among the indigenous peoples of Africa, Australia, Siberia, and the Americas—an astonishing structure recurs, which historians of religion recorded (and which Eliade and Schmidt made a major issue): **a supreme sky god, a creator, very nearly one**—Nyame among the Akan, Olodumare among the

Yoruba, Mulimo/Modimo in southern Africa, Baiame in Australia, "the Great Spirit" (Wakan Tanka, Gitche Manitou) among the nations of North America, and Tengri of the blue sky among the Turks and Mongols. But a **distant** god: he created, then rose and withdrew, so that he has no great temples and no daily rites, and scholars call him "the idle god" (*deus otiosus*). Daily worship turns instead to the intermediaries: the spirits of the ancestors, the lords of places, the *orisha*—through the shaman and the diviner.

So what do they mean by God here? **A real creator who is not, in practice, worshiped, and a world crowded with intermediary powers that are the actual object of worship.** Believers have read this structure as a witness to a "primal monotheism" overlaid by intermediaries (a reading that meets the *fitra* thesis and the Qur'an's report of peoples who said "we only worship them because they bring us nearer to God"), and academics have read it in many ways—the debate comes in the movement on origins.

2. Mesopotamia: gods like humans . . . and humans as servants

In Sumer, Akkad, and Babylon the gods are **magnified persons**: Anu of the sky, Enlil of storm and command, Enki of wisdom and the waters, Ishtar of love and war—they eat and drink, rage and scheme and regret (in the flood myth the gods go hungry when the offerings stop, and gather "like flies" around the first sacrifice afterward!). Every city has its patron god, and the city's rise is its god's rise: when Babylon prevailed, Marduk rose to the presidency of the divine assembly, and the *Enuma Elish* was

written to legitimate his kingship—**theology here follows politics in open dependence**, an observation we will find recurring.

The most consequential thing in Mesopotamian theology is its answer to "why was the human being created?": created from the blood of a slaughtered god to carry the burden of toil on behalf of the gods and to feed them with offerings—**the human being is a servant, and religion is the maintenance of a working relationship with moody masters**, with morality a secondary matter. Compare this with what is coming in the Abrahamic religions, and you will see the size of the reversal.

3. Egypt: overflowing divinity, and order above all

The Egyptian meant by his gods (the *netjeru*) **the manifest powers of existence**: Ra the sun, Osiris death and rebirth, Isis motherhood, Horus kingship—with two unique features. The first is **combination**: the gods merge without embarrassment (Amun-Ra, Ra-Horakhty), as if the names were windows onto a wider reality—so much so that some scholars have read Egyptian texts of a monotheistic tendency describing "the One who made himself into millions." The second is that above the gods themselves stands a principle they serve: **Maat**—truth, justice, and cosmic order. So that the gods and the pharaoh are both stewards of Maat, not its owners, and in the court of the dead the heart is weighed against its feather. Then came the explosion of Akhenaten: the closing of all the temples in favor of Aten alone—the oldest restriction of worship to a single object documented by inscriptions, imposed by a king and erased by the priesthood after him, and left

standing as a witness that the idea of "the One" was thinkable about a century before Moses.

4. Iran: the pure god and his adversary—divinity splits morally

Zoroaster came with an idea that overturned the scene: **Ahura Mazda** ("the Wise Lord") is a god who is all goodness, light, and truth, from whom no evil whatever proceeds—all evil belongs to an opposing adversary (Angra Mainyu / Ahriman), existence is the arena of their war, the human being is conscripted by his thoughts, words, and deeds, and the end is the triumph of light, a resurrection, and a reckoning. What, then, did the Zoroastrian mean by God? **The absolute good, wholly freed from evil**—a purity purchased at the price of pure monotheism (since the cosmos now had two principles). The influence of this theology on the crystallization of the images of Satan, resurrection, paradise, and hell across the whole region is an enormous academic subject—you met its edge in the chapter on Satan.

5. Greece: from the scandals of Olympus to "the God of the philosophers"

Homer's gods are charming, corrupt persons: they fornicate, lie, and take sides—power without moral holiness. Here occurred one of the greatest moments in our entire history: **the philosophers themselves rebelled against the gods of their people in the name of a purer concept of God.** Xenophanes (sixth century BCE) mocked in anger: Homer attributed to the gods everything that is shameful among human beings. If oxen and horses had hands to carve, they would carve their gods as oxen and horses—

then he declared: one god, greatest among gods and humans, unlike mortals in body or in thought. From this critique a great ancestor was born: Plato and his supreme Good. Aristotle and his unmoved mover (pure perfection that moves the cosmos as the beloved moves the lover—but knows no particulars and hears no prayer!); then Plotinus and "the One," from whom existence overflows. Thus was born **"the God of the philosophers"**: absolute, demonstrable, perfect—and cold; not prayed to on a night of sickness. The tension between him and the living, addressable "God of Abraham" (as Pascal cried out in the note sewn into his coat: "God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob—not of the philosophers and scholars!") will remain one of the deepest tensions of this chapter and of the book.

6. India: all the answers in one house

India is the greatest laboratory of divinity; in it all the answers to our six axes lived together and conversed for centuries.

It began with **the gods of the Vedas** (Indra, Agni, Varuna)—a polytheism resembling its Indo-European cousins in Greece and Persia, with a striking early flash in the Rig Veda itself: "Truth is one; the wise call it by many names." Then **the Upanishads** made the great leap: behind all the gods lies one absolute, impersonal reality—**Brahman**—not a god you worship but a reality *that you are*: "*tat tvam asi*" (That you are). Your individual soul (Atman) is the Absolute itself, veiled—the furthest immanence in the history of religious thought. Then the need for a God who can be loved returned, and **bhakti** flourished: Vishnu the preserver, descending in incarnation (Rama, Krishna)

whenever truth declines; Shiva the destroyer and renewer. And the divine Mother—a personal God steeped in love and nearness. Philosophy gathered the two poles with elegance: Brahman without attributes (*nirguna*) for the sage, and with attributes (*saguna*) for the worshiper—**two faces of one reality, according to the capacity of the beholder.** So when you ask a Hindu—is your God one or millions? a person or an absolute?—the calm answer is: yes.

7. Buddhism and Jainism: the path that dispensed with a creator

Here is the dividing line on our map: **two complete religions with no creator god.** Buddhism does not deny "the gods" (the *devas* exist in its cosmology), but it strips them of everything that matters: they are mortal, inside the wheel of existence, and do not hold your salvation. The question of a first creator the Buddha refused among "the questions that do not help": you have been struck by an arrow (suffering). Pull it out, and do not ask about the maker of the bow. The highest law is not the will of a god but **dharma and karma**: a cosmic moral order that works by itself, with no legislator. So what does the Buddhist mean by "the sacred"? Not a person above the world but **a state beyond the world**: nirvana. It is this limiting case that led scholars to ask: is this a religion, or a philosophy of salvation?—and its answer is our standing lesson: the concept of "religion" itself is wider than the concept of "God."

8. China: God dissolves into order

The oldest Chinese layers (the Shang dynasty) knew **Shangdi**: a supreme personal lord consulted through oracle bones. He was gradually replaced by **Tian** (Heaven): at first semi-personal ("the Mandate of Heaven" grants legitimacy to the just ruler and withdraws it from the tyrant—a remarkable political-moral theology), and by the later thinkers an impersonal cosmic principle. **Taoism** brought the furthest form of impersonality: the Tao—the Way by which things run—"The way that can be spoken of is not the constant way": a primal reality above name and attribute, not worshiped but harmonized with. As for Confucius, he revered Heaven and the rites and explicitly refrained from the unseen: "You do not yet understand life—how could you possibly understand death?" **Chinese civilization as a whole is an example of a great nation managing its morality and its meaning by a nearly abstract sacred, with no central personal God**. Then note the irony: the common people refilled Heaven with gods of the kitchen, the city, and wealth; the personal vacuum is not left empty for long.

9. Israel: the revolution—one God, moral, jealous, without image

In a small corner among the empires occurred the deepest revolution in the history of the concept of God. **YHWH**, the God of Israel, differs from all his neighbors by a bundle of attributes that changed the world. **One and jealous**, accepting no partner ("you shall have no other gods before me," Exodus 20:3). **Moral to the core**: his covenant is a law of justice, and his prophets cry that God desires mercy,

not sacrifice (Matthew 9:13, echoing Hosea), and demands justice for the widow and the orphan—divinity fuses with morality in a fusion whose completeness had no known parallel (though flashes preceded it in the Maat of Egypt and the Ahura Mazda of Persia). **Without image**: the prohibition of representation is a total civilizational reversal—a God no eye confines, no temple, not even a name that is pronounced (the written YHWH is read "Adonai"). **The Lord of history, not of nature**: He reveals Himself in the Exodus and the covenant, not in the cycle of the seasons—so time itself became a line with a purpose, where it had been a circle.

Here our book pauses for its customary act of honesty: **how was this monotheism completed?** The Jewish tradition (and the Islamic) says: it was pure from Abraham and Moses, and the deviations were accidents. A broad segment of academics reads in the texts themselves the trace of a gradual path: from the worship of Israel's God with an implicit acknowledgment of the gods of the nations ("Who is like you, O LORD, among the gods?" Exodus 15:11) to the mature, declared, exclusive monotheism of the prophets of the exile ("I am the first and I am the last; besides me there is no god," Isaiah 44:6). The traditionalists reply that those earlier formulations are the rhetoric of challenge, not acknowledgment. The textual datum is one, and the two readings face each other—your scale is with you.

10. Christianity: God enters history—the One who is Three

Christianity inherited the one God of Israel and then said of Him the thing by which it parted from everyone: this God **became incarnate**. The eternal Word became a human being, Jesus, who was crucified, died, and rose—**God did not merely send a message. He came Himself and suffered with us.** From the joining of "God is one," "Jesus is Lord," and "the Holy Spirit is God" there was formulated, through the councils of the centuries (Nicaea, 325, and after), the mystery of **the Trinity**: one essence in three persons—not three gods (as opponents suppose) and not merely three names (as heresies the Church rejected said), but a oneness rich in relationship, so that its theologians said: because God is love, and love requires a lover, a beloved, and the love between them, God was relationship in Himself from eternity. So what does the Christian mean by God? **The One whose inner reality is mutual love, and whose love went so far that He descended and was crucified as a ransom.** This is exactly what the Jew and the Muslim regard as a breach of the summit of transcendence. So the Trinity and the Incarnation became the first line of fire among the three Abrahamic religions, and the subject of a coming chapter.

11. Islam: transcendence and nearness held together

Islam came—by its own account—to purify monotheism of everything that had clung to it: **"Say, 'He is God the One, God the eternal. He begot no one nor was He begotten. No one is comparable to Him'"** (112)—no incarnation, no son, no image, no representation, no indwelling; and the gravest of all sins is *shirk*, associating partners with God. But the Qur'anic distinctiveness—as its people

see it—is that it joined to this strict transcendence **a warm personhood and a nearness beyond description**: a God with ninety-nine beautiful names by which He is called (and the tradition's canonical meditation on them—Ghazali's *al-Maqsad al-Asna*—taught that every name carries **the servant's share**: to know "the Merciful" is to become merciful, to know "the Forbearing" is to grow forbearing—*takhalluq*, the adorning of the self with the character of the names: Islam's answer to what the rabbis called walking in His ways and the Eastern church called *theosis*—one bridge across the three houses, each of them policing the same border: imitation of the attributes, never likeness to the essence), who hears and sees and loves and is angered and answers ("if My servants ask you about Me, I am near," 2:186), and who is "closer to him than his jugular vein" (50:16). The governing rule is the verse of Consultation: **"There is nothing like Him: He is the All Hearing, the All Seeing"** (42:11): absolute transcendence in one half, personal attributes in the other, in a single breath. The tradition itself crowned a single verse as the condensed portrait of this God—**the Throne Verse** (Ayat al-Kursi, 2:255), which the Prophet, in Muslim's Sahih, named to Ubayy ibn Ka'b as the mightiest verse in the Book of God, and which millions recite daily as the house's shield.

Read it as this chapter has taught you to read, and you will find the whole grammar of the concept gathered in one sweep: pure oneness. Then the two attributes on which the theologians would build ("the Ever Living," the Self-Subsisting Sustainer). Then a negation that quietly retires entire mythologies of sleeping, tiring, relieved-by-shifts gods—"Neither slumber nor sleep overtakes Him".

Then ownership of all. Then the clause the afterlife chapter leaned on (intercession **only by His permission**—no circumventing of the Judge). Then knowledge that encompasses while creatures grasp of it only what He wills; then the Kursi spanning the heavens and the earth, and preservation of them both without weariness; and the seal of exaltation. It is transcendence and sovereignty from end to end—**and the neighbors on the page preach too**: the very next verse renounces compulsion in religion (2:256): maximal power declining coercion, an adjacency the commentators did not fail to notice, and which the seeker may weigh for himself. Around the balancing of this union turned one of the greatest internal debates in the history of Islam (the Mu'tazila insisting on transcendence to the point of denying the attributes; the people of hadith affirming them "without asking how"—you have read Ibn Manda in the thick of it; and the Ash'aris and Maturidis taking a middle path through interpretation). Then came the Sufis seeking a third face: neither reason's affirmation nor its transcendence but **the taste of presence**—until some of them strayed to the borders of pantheism (Ibn Arabi: creation as the manifestations and self-disclosures of the Real), and the controversy around him burns to this day.

12. The mystical common ground across the religions: the God who is tasted

A last pause in the tour reveals a phenomenon that crosses every border: at the heart of every great tradition a current arose saying that the true God is above every concept—known neither by proof nor by text alone but **by experience, self-annihilation, and love**: the Upanishads of India and Shankara; the Sufis of Islam; Eckhart and the Christian mystics (the "God above God" at whom language falls silent). The Kabbalah of the Jews (*Ein Sof*: the Infinite above all names); and the Tao that cannot be named. The resemblance among these across the continents—in language, in stations, and in wonder—is what the proponents of "the perennial philosophy" (such as Huston Smith) built their claim of a single essence upon. Their opponents reply that the experiences resemble one another because brains resemble one another, and the interpretations contradict one another. Here is our great question returning through the window of experience.

---

* The Second Movement: How Did the Concept Arise?

The detailed answer about the origin of **the religious impulse** in general was given in the chapter on *fitra*, with its four theories. Our question here is more specific: how did **the concept of God** itself arise? Five major theories compete.

1. From spirits to lords (Tylor and the early evolutionists). Human beings began by observing dreams and death and posited a "spirit". Then they generalized spirits across nature (animism). Then spirits grew into gods. Then the gods were unified—an ascending ladder from

lowest to highest. Elegant, but the field evidence let it down.

2. Primal monotheism (Schmidt). The ladder reversed: the oldest layers (as we saw in the oral religions) know one high god, over whom intermediaries and lesser lords accumulated—so polytheism is a decline from an origin, not an ascent toward it. Believers found in it an echo of the religions' own claim (Adam a monotheist, and polytheism an accident). Its opponents say: "the idle god" may itself be a late development, not the remnant of an origin. In fairness: a verdict is hard because the era has no writing, and the two theories read the one datum in two directions—a tune now familiar to you.

3. The deification of natural forces. The sun, the storm, and the river are the visible powers of life and death, so they were worshiped or personified as lords (Ra, Indra, Shamash). It explains a broad slice of the map—and does not explain the non-natural high god, nor Brahman, nor YHWH the Lord of history.

4. The deification of human beings (Euhemerism). The Greek Euhemerus said long ago: the gods are ancient kings and heroes magnified by memory. Its witnesses are real: Imhotep the architect became a god of medicine, emperors were deified by decree, and the saints swell in popular religion before our eyes. But it explains some gods, not the idea of God—for where did the standard come from, to which human beings were raised?

5. Projection (Feuerbach and his heirs). God is the human ideal image thrown onto the sky: our power is limited, so we imagined the Almighty. Our knowledge is

deficient, so we imagined the All-Knowing. Its strength is that it explains the glaring anthropomorphism of thousands of gods. Its limits are those you have met: the genetic fallacy (the origin of an idea is no verdict on its truth), and its reverse question: if we project our wishes, where did the idea of the transcendent Absolute, of whom "there is nothing like Him," enter human consciousness—an idea that negates the human image rather than magnifying it? Indeed the course of history we are about to see—from gods who resemble us to a God who transcends us—runs **against** the direction of projection.

The fair conclusion: each theory has a pocket of the survey that it explains brilliantly, and none explains the whole picture. The believer rises above them all with a comprehensive reading: a *fitra* that was implanted, a revelation that intervened, and human beings who distorted and reformed; and the atheist gathers their fragments into a natural, multi-factor narrative. And both—notice—are now explaining, not describing.

The Third Movement: How Did the Concept Develop? the Five Great Lines

If we stretch our sight across thousands of years, great lines of development emerge from the noise, recurring in the different civilizations.

The First Line: From the God of a Place to the Lord of the Worlds

Divinity began local: the god of the well, the lord of the city, the god of the tribe who traveled with it. Then, as horizons widened, God widened: Egypt was unified and Amun-Ra was compounded as lord of the two kingdoms. Babylon prevailed and Marduk rose. The Persian empire stretched and a single cosmic god suited it. When the exile carried Israel to Babylon, its God did not die with its land—instead explicit cosmic monotheism burst forth: the God of the exiles is Lord of the whole earth and the mover of Cyrus himself. Then Christianity and Islam globalized "the Lord of the Worlds" for good. The critic reads the line: gods swell as the kingdoms of their owners swell—theology is the shadow of politics. The believer reads: rather, the truth was cosmic from the first day, and it was human beings whose vessels were narrow and then gradually widened to receive it—with revelation leading the widening.

The Second Line: From the God of Power to the God of Morality—"The Axial Age"

The gods of the first layers are appeased by sacrifice, not by virtue. Then occurred what the philosopher Karl Jaspers called "the Axial Age": in the centuries between about

800 and 200 BCE, in widely separated civilizations **at nearly the same time**, the center of the sacred flipped from power to value: the prophets of Israel crying that God demands justice, not fat; Zoroaster making existence a moral battle; the Buddha and Mahavira making salvation a moral purification; Confucius founding Heaven on ethics; and Socrates dying for virtue. A bewildering simultaneity across continents that did not correspond—explained economically (cities, writing, and markets produced a responsible individual) and explained by faith (a single wave of guidance from a single source: "We sent a messenger to every community," 16:36). Whatever your explanation, since that age the question "what does God want of me morally?" has been the heart of religion, and still is.

The Third Line: From the Statue to What Lies Beyond Image

The ascending line of abstraction: a god who is carved and seen → a god whose image is forbidden (Sinai) → a god whose name is not pronounced → a God "like whom there is nothing" → the God of the philosophers, described only by negation (what He is not) → the silence of the mystics. Most of the great civilizations traveled some distance along this path. But it is a road with a price we have noted repeatedly: the higher the abstraction rises, the colder the relationship grows—so history balanced it with a countermovement of descent: the Christian incarnation, the Hindu avatar, the beautiful names and intercessions, and the saints of the common people. **The heart of the worshiper seeks a face, and the mind of the transcendentalist**

shatters every face—and their dialectic is the pulse of the whole history of divinity.

The Fourth Line: The Splitting of Every Tradition into "The God of the Philosophers" And "The God of the Worshipers"

This is the fruit of the third line: inside every great religion two poles arose, pulling at the one God—the theologians and philosophers raising Him to the demonstrable Absolute (the Necessary Being, the First Cause, Pure Act), and the worshipers and mystics bringing Him down to the Beloved who answers and is near. The seeker must know this split before entering the chapter on evidence, for a serious practical reason: **the arguments for existence establish—if they establish anything—the God of the philosophers (a cause, a necessary being, a designer). The distance from "the First Cause" to "the One who hears my prayer and forgives my sin" is a second journey, with other evidence**—and the confusion of the two stages (which we warned you about from the beginning of the book) usually happens at exactly this point.

The Fifth Line: Development Itself—One Datum and Two Final Readings

At last we reach the fork toward which this whole chapter has been walking. No one denies that the **concept** of God in human minds has moved through history: it widened, refined, abstracted, and grew moral. So what does this movement mean?

The critic's reading (formulated, in degrees, by popular books such as Armstrong's *A History of God*): the history of God is the biography of a human idea—we make our gods to the measure of our needs and our ages and

then remake them. It is enough to see God rising every time we rise to know who made him.

The believer's reading: what developed was **the vessel, not the water**—human understanding of God, not God. Just as the development of human understanding of the cosmos through physics does not mean the cosmos is an invention, so the clarifying of their understanding of God—through a revelation that unfolds gradually and reformers who correct—does not mean He is an invention. Indeed the direction of the path itself (from gods in our image to a God who breaks all our images) better fits the pull of a truth from above than the push of wishes from below.

Between the two readings we do not decide for you. But we send you out of this chapter with three fruits to carry into the rest of the journey: **a map** by which you know what each speaker means by the word "God" before you converse with them. **Six keys** by which to analyze any conception you meet. **A caution** that guards you against the greatest fallacy of the path: that the evidence coming in the following chapters is tested conception by conception—so the question is not "Does God exist?" in the abstract, but: **which God, from this whole map, does the evidence testify to?**

> ***Among the counterparts to this chapter's path in the major literature:*** *Karen Armstrong's works on the biography of the concept (A History of God, and The Case for God): the best-known historian of religions for the path of "God" between mythos and logos—to be read as a rich map, while staying alert*

> *to her own thesis (the priority of practice over doctrine, and mystical unknowing) as a position within the picture, not a verdict above it.*

Study 9.1: One, or Many? —Monotheism and Polytheism on the Scales of History and Reason, and the Question of "He Begot No One, nor Was He Begotten"

The history of the greatest division on the map of divinity; the rational arguments of both sides in full; and the map of "divine sonship" across the religions—with a Word from the Author, declared according to the book's method

Summary of the study: Two accounts of religious history compete: that humanity began monotheist and drifted, or began polytheist and gradually converged. The question looks historical, but it is theological at its core. Both accounts are weighed by their own evidence, arriving at last at the great theological obstacle: could God have begotten a son?

Preface: The Question That Splits the Map in Two

The whole map of Chapter 9—wide as it is—is split in two by a single question: **is He one, or many?** Whoever said "many" inherited a world inhabited by specialized lords who fight and intermarry. Whoever said "one" inherited the question of transcendence with all its weight. This study gives the question what it deserves: its history first (for the story of the rise of monotheism is among the greatest stories of human thought), then its rational field (which of the two hypotheses is more probable by logic?—we will weigh with the book's scale, and then the author will say his word, declared), and then its most delicate and most inflamed branch among the faiths: **does God have a son?**

* First: History—Did Human Beings Begin as Monotheists, or Polytheists?

You inherited from Chapter 1 the great academic dispute, and we fix it here in its place. The old **evolutionist school** drew the arrow ascending (animism, then polytheism, then a late monotheism—monotheism as the summit of maturity that thought reached last). And the school of **"primal monotheism"** (Schmidt and his field team) reversed the arrow: the oldest layers of belief among the most ancient isolated peoples know a "supreme sky god," a creator above all the spirits. Then the intermediaries accumulated and veiled him (which monotheists read as the echo of a "*fitra*" and of "the first religion of the prophets," upon which polytheism supervened—the explicit Qur'anic reading: "Mankind was a single community" and then they differed). An archaeological verdict is hard (the oldest stages have no writing), but the **intermediate patterns** are documented in a way that enriches the picture: between explicit polytheism and exclusive monotheism lie degrees the nations actually lived: "**preferring one god while acknowledging others**" (henotheism: "Who is like you, O LORD, among the gods?"—the wording of early biblical layers, verbatim). "**Worshiping one without denying the rest**" (monolatry: "you shall have no other gods **before me**"—a commandment that does not deny their existence but their worship); and "**the lord of lords**" in nearly every pagan pantheon (Marduk, Zeus, Odin, Ra—summits unifying above the many).

The great stations of the ascent, told honestly. Akhenaten (fourteenth century BCE)—the boldest

experiment in monotheism before Israel: a pharaoh who closes the temples of the gods, imposes "Aten" alone, and erases the name of Amun from the inscriptions—with its two readings: an astonishing early monotheistic pioneering (his hymn to Aten is famously compared with Psalm 104), or a solar, political "monotheism of power" that collapsed with the death of its owner and from which Egypt turned back within a generation—so not every monotheism is the same. **The monotheism of Israel**, whose texts disclose its path: from the early formulas of preference to the summit of explicit exclusivity in Isaiah: "I am the first and I am the last; besides me there is no god"—among the oldest forms of explicit, exclusive, continuously surviving monotheism in history, guarded by a law and a people's memory. **Zoroaster**, with his shaded monotheism (Ahura Mazda supreme—and a pole of evil facing him: is it a monotheism with a dualism beneath it, or a dualism with a One above it? A battle of classification still standing). **The independent Greek philosophical monotheism:** Xenophanes (sixth century BCE) mocking in anger—"if oxen had hands they would draw their gods as oxen!"—and declaring "one god, greatest, unlike mortals in body or in thought". And Aristotle's unmoved mover: the monotheism of proof without revelation. **And the strictest form on this axis: Islamic monotheism**—whose distinctiveness lies not in "one" as a number but in **"the One and Only"** as transcendence: the denial of partner, likeness, part, and son all at once, and the making of monotheism **the central issue of existence**, for whose sake creation, messengers, and books exist ("We never sent any messenger before you [Muhammad] without revealing to him:

'There is no god but Me, so serve Me'"). So that *shirk* alone became the sin unforgiven for whoever dies in it. **And outside the Abrahamic religions:** you saw in the body of the chapter the internal monotheisms of polytheism—from the immortal Rig Veda verse "Truth is one; the wise call it by many names" to the Vedanta of Brahman—so India testifies that the monotheistic impulse works even in the heart of the most fertile polytheism.

And the historical conclusion no fair-minded person disputes: whatever the disputed starting point, **the arrow of the outcome** is clear: whenever humanity's philosophical abstraction matured or a prophet came to it, **it ascended toward the One**. The great polytheisms themselves grew a One at their summits—until the followers of explicit monotheism today are more than half the population of the earth. The monotheist reads it as the *fitra* returning to its origin. The critic reads it as the maturing of abstraction or the dominance of monotheizing empires—and both readings are before you.

* Second: The Rational Field—What Do the Arguments for Oneness Prove?

The principal arguments for the oneness of God

1. The argument from mutual hindrance (*tamanu'*). It sets out from the verse "If there had been in the heavens or earth any gods but Him, both heavens and earth would be in ruins," and the theologians formulated it by supposing two gods, each complete in power and sovereignty. If their wills conflict and one of them does not take effect, incapacity appears. If two contradictory acts are ascribed to

them, their combination is impossible. And if their sovereignty is limited, then neither is the absolute God intended. The argument's strength is that it ties the concept of a perfect God to unity of sovereignty. Its limit is that it does not deny the existence of powerful but limited beings that another tradition calls "gods". What it denies is a plurality of absolute, equal gods.

2. The argument from the unity of the cosmic order. The universe displays a shared regularity and laws that apply from the laboratory to distant bodies, and the monotheist reads unity of order as an indication of unity of source. The argument moves back from unity of effect to unity of governance—but it does not by itself reach the level of decisive proof: it may be said that several agents cooperated, or that laws require no personal agent at all. So the unity of the cosmos supports monotheism within a bundle of premises; it does not, on its own, exclude every alternative.

3. The argument from perfection. If God is absolutely perfect, by what would another perfect God be distinguished from Him? If they were distinguished by an attribute of perfection, one of them would lack what the other has. And if they were not distinguished at all, then speaking of two would be speaking without a real difference. Yet the argument rests on defining divinity as the possession of all perfections, and on the claim that individual differences between two divine beings could not be free of deficiency. Philosophers have contested both premises. So it is a strong argument *within* the concept of "absolute perfection," not a conclusion that every conception of plurality must accept.

4. The argument from sovereignty and worship. The monotheist holds that ultimate religious commitment cannot stand if it is divided among beings each of which has independent authority: what deserves unconditional worship ought to be the highest reference above which there is no other. The defenders of plurality answer that worship may be distributed by function and by bond without every god claiming absolute sovereignty. And so the argument returns the dispute to the definition of God: is He the object of ultimate loyalty, or is "god" the name of a class of sacred beings of varying rank?

The strongest considerations for plurality, and its objections

1. The world's diversity and its conflict. A world in which the forces of building and destruction, of good and evil, push against one another may look closer to a plurality of wills than to the governance of a single, perfectly wise agent. But this consideration does not by itself establish multiple gods: it belongs equally to the problem of evil as an objection to certain forms of monotheism (Chapter 20), and the conflict can also be explained by natural laws or by the freedom of created beings.

2. Nearness and specialization. Specialized gods make available a direct language for the needs of farming, childbirth, the sea, and war, and they explain the persistence of intermediaries, saints, and holy patrons in popular religion. Yet the need for intermediaries is not a proof of their divine independence, and the monotheist replies that the One can be near while remaining one.

3. The possibility of cooperation. A multiplicity of agents does not logically entail chaos: their wills may agree, or be ordered under a law. The monotheist responds that this establishes unity of governance rather than unity of number, and that the question then moves to the source of the agreement and of the law. These considerations therefore weaken the claim that order could only issue from one—but they do not, on their own, provide independent evidence for the existence of many gods.

The outcome of the weighing—what the arguments favor and what they leave open

The matter is not settled by the number of a doctrine's followers, nor by historical priority, nor by the mere prevalence of the language of unity or of plurality.

The arguments from mutual hindrance, from perfection, and from sovereignty offer, within a particular definition of divinity as absolute in power and perfection and as the ultimate reference of loyalty, coherent grounds for preferring the One. The unity of the cosmos, for its part, offers an indication of unity of order rather than a proof about the number of agents. On the other side, plurality draws attention to the diversity of religious experience, to the problem of evil, and to devotional nearness—but it needs to show how several beings could be perfect or ultimate gods without limit or conflict. So the philosophical scale, within the concept of absolute divinity, inclines toward the One. But it does not yet establish all His attributes, it does not designate any particular religion, and it does not rule out the possibility of limited spiritual beings. As for the author's own belief, it remains where it was promised: in "A Word from the Author," which closes the book after the map is complete.

* Third: "He Begot No One, nor Was He Begotten"—The Map of Divine Sonship and the Sharpest of the Faiths' Disputes

We descend now to the most delicate and most inflamed branch of the subject among the living religions: **does God have a son?** You will not understand the battle until you have laid out the map of "divine sonship" in its layers—for the one word has carried, across history, four widely separated meanings.

1. Pagan biological sonship.

The gods of myth actually mate and give birth—the sons of Zeus by goddesses and mortal women fill the epics. The triad of Egypt (Osiris, Isis, and their son Horus) is a complete holy family. "The daughters of God" among the Arabs before Islam (al-Lat, al-Uzza, and Manat—to whom the Qur'an replied: "Are you to have the male and He the female?")—an explicit reproductive sonship from which polytheism does not shrink, because its gods are in any case magnified human images.

2. Metaphorical, honorific sonship.

This is the language of the Torah itself in countless places: "Israel is my firstborn son" (Exodus 4:22). The Davidic king, "You are my son; today I have begotten you" (Psalm 2:7, the coronation psalm). The righteous as "children of God"—a sonship of election and love, not of descent, whose metaphorical character the people of the text themselves acknowledge.

3. The sonship of Ezra.

The Qur'an mentions it of certain Jews ("The Jews said, 'Ezra is the son of God'")—and the commentators and scholars document that it was the saying of groups among

the Jews of Arabia, not the normative creed of Judaism (which recoils intensely from any incarnation).

So the verse is a witness to a local historical situation, and its methodological lesson is precision in attributing sayings to their groups (which this book keeps to in every file).

4. Christian doctrinal sonship—and here is the heart of the battle: normative Christianity **denies reproductive sonship absolutely, exactly as we do**—and the Nicene Creed frames its doctrine in weighed words: the Son is "**begotten, not made**, of one substance with the Father, **before all ages**." That is, not a birth in time from a consort (exalted is God), but an "eternal sonship": a relationship within the one divine essence—the Son is the eternal "Word" of God (the Logos of John), issuing as the ray from the sun and the word from the mind: the Father was never without his Word. So sonship, for them, is **a rank of relationship, not an event of procreation**, and the incarnation in Mary is the event of the eternal Word's appearing, not a moment of "begetting."

5. The Islamic critique of this formulation—at its strongest, not in caricature. The careful Muslim scholars know that their opponents do not speak of a consort and a physical birth. Yet the Sura of Sincerity (al-Ikhlas) and its counterparts are aimed at **the root of the idea, not its shell**: "**He begot no one nor was He begotten. No one is comparable to Him.**" The denial, for them, reaches sonship **in all its real meanings**: because "begetting"—even eternal and transcendent—means **the issuing of one being from another and the distinction of one person from another**, and the self-sufficient oneness ("God the

eternal," *al-Samad*—the self-sufficient, who is not divided, from whom no being issues, and who needs nothing) admits neither internal distinction nor any "comparable one," however refined. So the real dispute is not "did God marry?" (both sides exalt Him above that) but **"is there within the one Essence a distinction of beings, of persons?"**—and the Muslim answers: absolute oneness refuses it, and the eternal, perfect One did not need a "distinct" Word to be speaking and wise. **The careful scholars add a pastoral, practical argument:** however finely theology refines its transcendence, the word "Son" in the hearing of the masses across the centuries has dragged reproductive images in its train (the icons of "the Holy Family" are witness). A word that cannot protect its meaning among its own common people is a defective word in the very matter where confusion is most dangerous. **The theologian replies:** rather, our words are revelation that we worship by and explain, not replace. And all language about God is a metaphor that falls short—even "the hand" and "the face" in your own Book needed your commentators' transcendence . . . **And the battle stands where it has stood for a thousand years:** at the edge of the question of the persons—which we promised to examine fully within the files of the great comparison (Chapters 19 and 6. **And here the author's word is declared, as before:** the writer of these lines rests in the purity of "He begot no one, nor was He begotten"—he finds the self-sufficient oneness the more complete transcendence and the safer against the drift of images, and he holds that the greatest description of the Creator is the one with which the simple believer needs no theological guardrails in order not to err

about his Lord. **And he declares his leaning without preempting his presentation:** the Christian argument above is written with all the fidelity to its people he could manage, and the Christian reader is invited to weigh it for themselves—for that is this book's pledge, which is never broken.

* The Study's Conclusion

We have traveled the whole road: a history in which you saw humanity ascending—from whatever point it began—toward the single summit. A rational field in which the pan of the One weighed heavier on the measures of structure, cosmos, and economy. The file of sonship, with its fourfold map and its subtle battle, which turned out to be a battle over "distinction within the Essence," not over "marriage and begetting" as the mass of those who trade insults suppose. You learned—for the first time in this book, explicitly—where its author stands: with **"Say, 'He is God the One'"** in the fullness of its self-sufficiency—declared, not disguised; presenting, not preempting. As for you, you have gained equipment today: you now know that "monotheism" itself has degrees (preference, then exclusivity, then absolute oneness); that "son" has four meanings, not one. That half the battles among the religions are battles over words beneath which lie subtle questions—**so if from now on you hear two people arguing about "the son of God," the first thing to ask is: which sonship do you mean? And which monotheism? By that question alone you will have risen above nine-tenths of the argument.**

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the map of the patterns of divinity and the tools of analysis in the body of this chapter; the dispute over "primal monotheism" in detail in Chapter 1; and the problem of evil (the price borne by monotheism) in Chapter 20.*

Chapter 10: The Intermediate Unseen — Magic, the Evil Eye, Blessing, and Good Fortune

Between written doctrine and lived religion: concepts across the civilizations, the positions of the religions, and what science and the seeker's kit can say

Summary of the chapter: Beneath the official surface of every religion lies a layer almost no one talks about: magic, the evil eye, blessing, and reconciling fate with free will. This chapter descends into that hidden layer where everyday religious life actually happens, across religions and civilizations, and shows how revelation, law, and science each engaged it in its own way.

* Opening: Between Written Doctrine and Lived Religion

In every religious tradition there are two floors, and the believer lives on both at once.

The upper floor—the theology of the great questions: God, revelation, the hereafter, judgment—which has occupied us in the preceding chapters.

And the ground floor—where life is actually lived: Why did my son fall ill and not the neighbors' children? Why did my business slump while my partner's flourished? How do I protect my bride from envious eyes? Where do I place my Qur'an in the new house? And whose blessing do I seek before a journey?

On this ground floor a whole system of **near, invisible powers** is at work: magic that is sent and undone, an eye that strikes and is guarded against, a blessing that descends and is passed on, a good fortune that is granted and withdrawn, and luck and lot and omen, good and ill. This system—which we will call **"the intermediate unseen,"** because it stands between the greater unseen and daily life—is among the strangest phenomena of our species: **more widespread than any particular creed, older than the written religions themselves, and tougher than every campaign waged against it**—religious campaigns and secular ones alike.

Let us open its four great files one by one, and then ask: what is the structure that unites them? How have the great religions dealt with it? And what is the seeker to do with it?

---

* The First File: Magic—The Claim of Influence by Hidden Means

The concept

Magic in its essence is **a technical claim**: that there are hidden powers and laws in the world, and that whoever knows their keys (a word, a rite, a substance, a timing) can **produce an effect** by them—harm or benefit—apart from the visible causes. Frazer, in *The Golden Bough*, analyzed its inner logic into two enduring laws you will find on every continent: **the law of similarity** (like affects like: stab your enemy's effigy and he feels pain), and **the law of contact, or contagion** (what once touched a thing

remains connected to it: a hair from his head is enough to reach him). Frazer's famous distinction: the magician **operates** the powers as one operates a machine, while the religious person **entreats** a free will—technique versus relationship (you will see that the borders are blurrier than his distinction).

The tour

Mesopotamia. A complete profession with its functions: the *ashipu* (the licensed exorcist) facing the *kashshapu* (the black magician), and its most famous documents are the ritual series **Maqlu ("Burning")**: a whole night in which effigies of the unknown sorcerer are made and burned to chants—the oldest documented "fighting magic with magic." The Code of Hammurabi makes the accusation of magic among the gravest, settled by ordeal: the accused is thrown into the river, and the river judges.

Egypt. The strangest of the positions—magic (**heka**) is neither a crime nor a fringe but **a neutral, sacred cosmic force**: by it the god created, by it Isis protects her son, by it the priest repels Apophis, and by it the dead cross the terrors of the other world (the Book of the Dead is, in essence, a book of spells). Heka is like electricity: holiness and danger in a single handle.

The Torah and Judaism. A fiery prohibition ("Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," Exodus 22:18, KJV; and the banning of divination, amulets, and consulting the dead within the war of monotheism on the whole Canaanite system)—while the most famous story of the subject survives: King Saul himself, who had banned magic, slipping out by night in disguise to **the medium of Endor** to

summon the spirit of Samuel. So the text forbids the practice without portraying it as empty. And later Judaism lived its long tension between rabbis fighting superstition and a people writing amulets, with practical Kabbalah flourishing at the margins.

Greece and Rome. Beneath the columns of philosophy, a crowded lower layer: **the curse tablets (*defixiones*)**—sheets of lead engraved with curses and buried in graves and wells, of which thousands have been found, in which the merchant curses his competitor, the lover the one who spurned him, and the litigant his opponent—the archive of the daily grudges of the classical world.

Islam. A composite, tightly built position: **the affirmation that magic is real** (the story of Harut and Marut: a knowledge that is a trial, "what can cause discord between man and wife"—but "they harm no one with it **except by God's leave**": magic itself under monotheism, not its rival). Together with **a categorical prohibition** that brings the magician the severest penalties. **A legitimate weapon of protection**: the two suras of refuge (Sura al-Falaq says it outright: "the harm in witches when they blow on knots") and *ruqya*, incantation with transmitted texts—so the whole system: real, forbidden, limited by permission, and repelled by remembrance of God rather than by counter-magic. Then popular reality lived its usual tension: markets of charms, spells, and their undoing stand in every Muslim country despite fourteen centuries of juristic denial.

Christian Europe—the strangest reversal in the file. Its early centuries were **more sensible**: the famous document the *Canon Episcopi* (about the tenth century) rules

that women who claim to fly by night with the goddesses are **deluded and deceived, and that belief in the reality of it is the error**! Then the mood reversed in the late Middle Ages and early modernity—in the age of the "Renaissance," of all things!—the *Malleus Maleficarum* (1487) appeared, denying witches became heresy, and the courts of Europe and America (Salem) blazed for about three centuries, reaping tens of thousands of lives, most of them women. The double lesson: belief in magic can kill—**and the institution may be more sensible in its "dark ages" than in its "ages of light."**

Africa—the deepest laboratory. Here is among the most mature analyses of the whole phenomenon, recorded by the anthropologist Evans-Pritchard among the Azande in his immortal example: **a granary collapses and kills the people sitting in its shade.** The Azande know perfectly well that termites ate through the posts—"how" is not their question. At the toolkit's head the Throne Verse itself, whose night-guard story Bukhari records: the mysterious visitor who taught Abu Hurayra to recite it at night "and no devil will approach you till morning," of whom the Prophet said: "he told you the truth, though he is a confirmed liar—that was a devil". Their question is: **why did it collapse at this very moment, on these very people?** Why did the road of the collapse meet the road of their sitting? Science answers "how" and is silent on "why me?"—and magic steps forward to fill the silence: it struck you because a sorcerer wanted you. **Magic is a theory of the explanation of personal coincidence**—and this is not the philosophy of the Azande alone. It is the philosophy of

everyone who has ever said, "It's no coincidence that all this is happening to me."

And modernity? It did not kill it: it revived it as a declared new religion (Wicca and neo-paganism in the West), kept it a thriving industry from Casablanca to Mumbai, and dressed it in the language of the age: "energy," "vibrations," and "the law of attraction."

Did everyone know it, who denied it, and what does science say?—The file completed

Did everyone know it? Yes—by the rule of "most," in its closest approach to "all": the anthropologists never found a society without magical practices, from the Indian Atharva Veda (a sacred book that is mostly spells and magical medicine—so India sanctified magic as Egypt did) to popular Taoism, feng shui, and the talismans of China, to the shamanism of Siberia and the Americas, to the European "sorcery" that lived beneath the Church for two thousand years. **And the most precise explanation of this universality** was offered by Malinowski from the Trobriand Islands: the fishermen use no magic in the safe lagoon, and use all of it on the open sea—**magic appears where human control ends and anxiety begins**. This explains why science did not kill it: as long as life holds an unknown that cannot be controlled (illness, love, competition, death), magic keeps its place.

And who denied it? The distinction here is precious: **the great religions did not deny its existence; they forbade it**—and real denial came from three directions.

(1) From within theology itself. The question "does magic have reality, or is it illusion?" divided the scholars of

Islam: **the majority** (the Malikis, Shafi'is, Hanbalis, and most Ash'aris) held that it has a reality that affects body and heart with God's permission, while **the Mu'tazila, some Hanafis, and the Zahiris** held that it is **illusion and trickery** with no reality: the harm attributed to it is delusion, or poison, or a trick, and "it seemed to him, by their magic" is read at face value—among the oldest rational disputes in the file. In Christianity the *Canon Episcopi* that passed before you made belief in the reality of the flight an error. Confucianism, by the silence of its founder: "The Master did not discuss prodigies, feats of strength, disorders, or spirits"—not denial but turning away. Buddhism acknowledges "powers" (the *siddhis*), forbids monks to display them, and counts them an obstacle on the road.

(2) From the philosophers: the Epicureans, the materialists, and Ibn al-Rawandi, in their denial of the unseen altogether.

(3) From the Enlightenment and modern science: when "there is no such thing as magic" became the creed of the educated—and by it the witch trials went out, not by piety (the last execution for witchcraft in Western Europe was in 1782, in Switzerland).

And what does science say? Four sciences have said four things that complete one another. **Anthropology** traced its logic to Frazer's two laws, its function to Malinowski, and its internal rationality to Evans-Pritchard—so magic, for anthropology, is a logically coherent system of thought built on untested premises, not madness. **Psychology** explained its real "effect" with no hidden powers: **placebo and nocebo**—expectation heals and sickens, and the physiologist Walter Cannon (1942) documented

"voodoo death": a healthy person dying of terror when convinced he has been bewitched. So magic works where it is believed, **and belief in it is its mechanism. The history of science** uncovered the surprise: natural magic was **the father of science**, not its enemy—from alchemy came chemistry, from astrology astronomy, and Newton himself—as is told of his papers—spent on alchemy a time near to or exceeding what he spent on gravity—"magic is a science that failed," in Frazer's phrase: the same idea (hidden laws that can be operated) came true when it submitted to experiment, and remained magic when it did not. **And the experimental method**, finally: no magical effect beyond chance and suggestion has been established—as far as we know from controlled tests—(and open prizes for whoever proves one have gone unclaimed for decades). **And this is exactly what the monotheistic believer says too**: that magic works only "with God's permission," and that nine-tenths of it is trickery and delusion—so science and monotheism meet in drying up the market, and part over the remaining tenth: is it a permitted reality, or a remnant of delusion not yet examined? That is the field of the unseen, not of the laboratory.

* The Second File: The Eye and Envy—A Widespread Belief Between Text and Social Experience

The concept

That a look of admiration or of envy—from a particular eye, or from any eye—**strikes**: it sickens the beautiful, destroys the fat cattle, and spoils the joy that has been announced. Its essence: **visible good fortune is an exposed target**, and a look is an arrow.

The tour

Its spread is the ethnographic marvel: "the belt of the eye" runs from the Mediterranean and the Balkans through the Middle East and Iran to India, and from there to Latin America (*mal de ojo*). The texts of Sumer mention the evil eye. Egypt draws the Eye of Horus as protector. Greece calls it *baskania*, and Aristotle himself discusses its mechanism with the scientific seriousness of his age; Rome hangs the *fascinum* amulet on its children's necks. The Talmud rules that ninety-nine of every hundred die of the eye and one of natural causes (a telling rhetorical exaggeration). Islam settles it with a text: "**the evil eye is real**," and in the Qur'an, "the harm in the envier when he envies," with its chapters on seeking refuge and incantation against it—indeed the commentators read Jacob's counsel to his sons ("do not enter all by one gate—use different gates") as a precaution against the eye for a procession that draws attention.

And the countermeasures form a parallel worldwide system: the blue bead (*nazar boncuğu*) from Turkey to Greece; the hand with five fingers—**the *khamsa*, the Hand of Fatima among Muslims, and the same *hamsa*, the Hand of Miriam or of Mary among the Jews and Christians of the region**: one amulet shared by the three religions, each disputing its attribution!—the Italian pepper horn. The protective etiquette of speech: never praise without a shield ("*ma sha' Allah*," "*tabarak Allah*," touching wood, the symbolic Greek spit)—and indeed the etiquette of **concealment**: do not announce your profit, nor your newborn's weight, nor the date of your journey.

The social and psychological dimension

Anthropologists (most famously Foster, with his theory of "limited good") explained the spread of the belief in societies of scarcity: where livelihood is imagined as a fixed cake, your gain becomes a slice taken from me. So tempers tighten around inequality, and belief in the eye works as **a double social regulator**: it restrains the fortunate from boasting (so they hide their blessing out of manners and fear), and it grants the stricken an explanation that preserves their dignity (I did not fail—I was struck). So even someone who denies the eye's supernatural effect cannot deny its **social** effect: it runs the economy of display and concealment in half the societies of the earth to this day—from veiling one's blessings to the calculations of what to post on screens.

The file completed: did everyone know it, who denied it, and what does science say?

Did everyone know it? No—and this is among the most curious things in the file: belief in the eye spreads along **a clear geographic belt** drawn by its students (Dundes and others): the Mediterranean basin, the Middle East, India, and Central Asia. From there it traveled with the Spaniards to Latin America (*mal de ojo*)—and it is **weaker in presence, or absent in its proper form**, in East Asia, sub-Saharan Africa, and the indigenous Americas, where mysterious harm is attributed to magic and spirits, not to an envier's glance. So envy is a universal human feeling; but "the eye"—that an admirer harms by his mere look—is a cultural belief with a homeland. **And who denied it?** Not the Abrahamic religions: the Torah warns of "the evil eye," and the hadith affirms that "**the evil eye is real**" and prescribes seeking refuge and incantation. But a group of theologians (the Mu'tazila and those who agreed with them) denied that a glance could affect a body, because an effect without contact is unintelligible, and they read the texts as symbol or as psychological harm. While the majority affirmed an effect **with God's permission**, its manner unknown—and the difference between the two groups is the difference between those who require intelligibility and those who are content with the report. **And what does science say?** No physical mechanism carries a glance into harm—and this has been tested repeatedly with no effect. But the phenomenon is **real, socially and psychologically**, by three documented mechanisms: **selective attention** (we remember the calamity that followed the praise and forget a hundred praises followed by nothing).

The nocebo (whoever is convinced he has been "eyed" falls ill from his anxiety). And **the social function** you saw in Foster: the regulation of inequality in societies of scarcity. So science establishes the effect of belief in the eye, not the effect of the eye, meeting those theologians who said the harm is psychological in essence, and parting from those who affirmed a supernatural effect.

* The Third File: Blessing—Good Attributed to a Person, a Time, or a Place

The concept

The reverse of envy's arrow: **an overflowing good that settles** in a person, a place, a time, or a thing—**and passes on** by touch, proximity, prayer, and inheritance. Anthropology gave the phenomenon its general name from the language of the peoples of the Pacific: **"mana"**—the power flowing through the chief, the warrior, and the amulet, making some things "charged" and others inert.

The tour

Hebrew made the *berakhah* a pillar of its narratives: the blessing of the patriarchs is an inheritance the brothers fight over—and Jacob wrests Isaac's blessing by a ruse, **and his father cannot take it back**: blessing in this conception is a real charge, transferred irreversibly, not a mere prayer. **Christianity** inherited the blessings and developed the largest material economy of blessing in history: **the holy relics**—the bones and belongings of the saints radiate healing, cathedrals were built around them, the pilgrimage roads rose upon them (the Camino de Santiago), and around them flourished a market and a forgery

so great that Erasmus mocked: if the pieces of "the True Cross" were gathered, a ship would carry them. And they were among the sparks of Luther's revolt. **Islam** affirmed blessing and classified it: the personal blessing of the Prophet (the Companions sought blessing from the water of his ablution and his hair—by sound texts). The blessing of the Qur'an ("a blessed Scripture that We have sent down"). Of times (the Night of Glory is "better than a thousand months"). Of places (the two sanctuaries, and al-Aqsa, "whose surroundings We have blessed"); of water (Zamzam). Of livelihood (blessing in early rising, in measuring, and in congregation). Then its famous internal debate turned: does the blessing of the righteous flow to their graves and relics so that blessing may be sought from them (the position of most Sufis and of the common people across the centuries: the shrines and the saints' festivals), or is that particular to the Prophet, closed after him as a pretext for *shirk* (the position of the Salafi current)?—the battle over "blessing" is among the longest of Islam's internal battles, and the one that has demolished and built the most domes.

And the unifying structure was captured by Mary Douglas in *Purity and Danger*: holiness and impurity are both **contagious**—they pass by touch and proximity—so the sacred in human experience is not an idea but **a flowing substance** managed as substances are managed: acquired, transferred, protected, and quarantined. Notice the secular presence of the same structure: the grandfather's pen, the player's shirt, the celebrities' possessions bought for millions—blessing has taken off its turban and not left the room.

* The third file completed: did everyone know it, who denied it, and what does science say?

Did they all know it? Yes, by the rule of "most" in its widest form: *mana* in the Pacific; the Indian *shakti* that flows in the teacher (the guru), so that blessing is sought from his touch and his feet (*prasad*: food blessed by the deity's touch). The Buddhist relics (the remains of the Buddha in the stupas—and a tooth in Kandy to which pilgrimage is made); the royal "virtue" in China and Japan; the Christian relics. The Islamic *baraka*—all one structure: **a material good that flows by touch**. And its weakest presence is in the least embodied religions (rabbinic Judaism, which confined blessing to word and prayer, and Protestantism, which demolished the relics). **And who denied it?** Here denial parts from delimitation: **none of the religions denied the root of blessing** (the blessing of the prophet, the book, and the time), but three currents denied **its material flow**: the Protestant Reformation (Luther and Calvin: relics and images are idolatry and a market). The Salafi current in Islam (seeking blessing from relics and graves is a pretext for *shirk*, and the Prophet's personal blessing is his alone). The modern reform movements in India (the Arya Samaj against the worship of persons)—**so the battle over blessing is a battle of borders, not of existence**: where does the charge stop? At God and His book, or does it flow to the righteous, or to their relics, or to their graves? **And what does science say?** No flow that can be measured—but **the effect of belief** is documented to the highest degree: pilgrimage to relics heals some psychosomatic conditions by the mechanisms of placebo, hope, and

community (medicine has studied this at Lourdes in France with medical commissions for a century and more: hundreds of thousands of visitors, and a few dozen "cures" out of thousands of claims that the commissions were unable to explain—a figure the believer reads as a wonder and the critic as a statistical coincidence). Behavioral economics explains the "charge" in celebrities' possessions by "**symbolic contagion**" (people refuse to wear a murderer's washed sweater and pay millions for a great man's pen)—so blessing in the laboratory is **a real psychological phenomenon with no physical carrier**—meeting the reformers who deny its material flow, and parting from those who affirm it.

* The Fourth File: Good Fortune, Luck, and Omen—Between Providence and Chance

The concept

If magic, the eye, and blessing are **powers that pass**, this file is about **the hidden tilt of the course of events**: why do one person's means run smoothly and his peer's stumble, with equal effort? Humanity answered in two layers.

The layer of personal providence. *Tawfiq*, **good fortune**, in Islam—that God creates in His servant and around him the fitting of causes to what is right ("I cannot succeed without God's help"). Its opposite, *khidhlan*, **abandonment**. And it is the cousin of Christian **Providence**, which manages the details ("even the hairs of your head are all counted," Luke 12:7), and of the Jewish *hashgachah*. The essence of the layer: the course is **meant for you, or**

against you, by a wise will, and the key is your relationship with it (in obedience, prayer, and trust).

And the layer of the blind force. Luck—the Roman Fortuna with her turning wheel that raises and lowers without cause (and we still turn with her: "the wheel of fortune"); the Hebrew *mazal* (whence the greeting *mazal tov*!—and the origin of the word is **astrological**: the constellation and the horoscope); "share" and "lot" in the speech of ordinary people. The astrology of Babylon that tied destinies to the positions of the planets and bequeathed humanity the horoscopes down to the pages of today's newspapers; Chinese feng shui, which engineers houses upon flowing currents of luck (*qi*). The Indian karma, which is—in this respect—**a self-operating system of fortune**: your course today is the bill for your past deeds, with no personal dispenser.

And on the border between the two layers stands the industry of divining the unseen: soothsaying with all its instruments (the livers of Babylon, the oracles of Delphi, the cowrie shells of the coast, the coffee cup)—which monotheism fought with all its might ("whoever goes to a soothsayer . . .") **and replaced with its own disciplined substitutes**: love of **the good omen** (the kind word you happen to hear) with the prohibition of **the ill omen** (the pessimism that halts one from going on)—"I like the good omen and I dislike the ill omen." **Istikhara**, the prayer for guidance: instead of asking intermediaries about the unseen, you ask the Knower of the unseen Himself to choose for you and to turn events—the cleverest "substitution" in the history of managing anxiety about the future: it kept the need and changed the address.

* The fourth file completed: did everyone know it, who denied it, and what does science say?

Did they all know it? The layer of "luck" is wholly universal (no language without a word for luck, and no civilization without astrology or soothsaying). But the layer of "good fortune"—that the course be meant for you by a wise will—**is particular to the houses that know a personal God**: the Abrahamic religions and Indian bhakti. It is absent from the karmic houses (where the course is a bill), the Confucian (where the course is the neutral decree of Heaven), and the ancient paganisms (where the course is the blind wheel of Fortuna). **And who denied it?** Monotheism denied **the blind layer**, not the phenomenon: it forbade astrology, soothsaying, and ill omens because they attribute the course to other than God—"he is not one of us who takes ill omens"—and it affirmed good fortune and decree. **Stoicism** denied luck in the name of the cosmic Reason. **Modernity** denied it in the name of probability: since the science of probability was born (Pascal and Fermat, seventeenth century), "luck" became a name for ignorance of causes, not a force—and the two camps, the believer and the scientist, condemned the horoscopes together, from two doors. **And what does science say?** Four findings: **(1)** astrology has been tested experimentally many times (most famously Carlson, 1985, in *Nature*) and failed to predict above chance. **(2)** But belief in luck has a real effect: those who think themselves lucky try more and notice opportunities more (Wiseman's studies), and those who think themselves jinxed shrink until their pessimism comes true. **So the ill omen that monotheism forbade**

as *shirk*, psychology has invalidated as a self-fulfilling prophecy. **(3)** "Luck" in statistics is random variation around the mean, and our minds are built to see a pattern in it (the "hot hand" effect); **(4)** and as for "good fortune" in its religious sense—that randomness itself be intended. That is not something the laboratory can prove or disprove: the scientist sees variance and the believer sees providence in the same numbers, which is precisely the "how" and "why" duality this chapter has established, and the decision between them lies with the evidence, not with the dice.

* A Supplementary File: The Jinn and the Intermediate Beings—Did Everyone Know Them, Who Denied Them, and What Does Science Say?

The concept. Living, intelligent, invisible beings that inhabit the world with us—neither gods, nor angels, nor the spirits of the dead—who harm and benefit, possess and are employed. **And did everyone know them?** Yes, by the rule of "most": the Arabic *jinn* (from "concealment"). The Greek *daimon* (an intermediate being between gods and humans—Socrates had his guiding *daimon*, which Christianity then turned into a "demon"); the *shedim* and *ruhot* of Talmudic Judaism (and the stories of the Talmud are crowded with them); the Zoroastrian *daevas*; the Indian *yakshas* and *rakshasas*; the Japanese *yokai* and the Chinese *gui*. The African spirits with which shamanism and the *zar* work. The European fairies and the Norse elves—there is no civilization that did not fill the zone between heaven and humankind with inhabitants. **And who denied them?** The scriptural religions affirmed them: the Qur'an devoted

a sura to the jinn and made them morally accountable ("I created jinn and mankind only to worship Me"). The Gospels are full of the casting out of demons; and the Talmud of the *shedim*. Denial came **first from the philosophers** (Avicenna and his followers interpreted the jinn as psychic powers or illusion, and the materialists denied them). **And then from within the modern Islamic house**: some reformers interpreted them (among them one who hinted in the *Manar* commentary that germs might be among the jinn—a famous, contested opinion), and a group of scholars, ancient (the Mu'tazila) and modern, denied "possession" (a jinni's occupation of the body) while affirming the existence of the jinn, referring what is called possession to illnesses. While the majority affirmed both existence and possession. **And what does science say?** That most of what was historically attributed to jinn and spirits—epilepsy (the Greeks called it "the sacred disease"), schizophrenia and its hallucinations, the dissociative disorders ("multiple personality"), and sleep paralysis (the "night-crusher" that the sleeper sees as a being sitting on his chest—among the widest sources of "seeing jinn" in history)—has a documented neurological and psychological explanation.

That the rites of exorcism and the *zar* work by the mechanisms of suggestion and social release (anthropology has studied the *zar* as a social therapy for oppressed women). That there is **no experimental witness** to an intelligent invisible being intervening in matter. **And the position on which contemporary Muslim physicians and jurists have met** teaches the method of the whole file: that a case be presented to medicine first, and what

medicine explains is an illness even if it is called possession, while what lies beyond that remains—for those who affirm it—in the circle of the unseen, which the laboratory neither denies nor proves. **So the real dispute is not "do the jinn exist?" but "how much of our phenomena is attributed to them?"—**and history testifies that the share shrinks with every new science, while the believer testifies that its shrinking in explanation does not touch their existence in the text.

---

* The Unifying Structure: Why Is This System Everywhere?

Gather the four files and you find that together they answer three questions that human beings cannot bear to leave unanswered.

1. The question "why me?" (the Azande granary). Science and reason explain the how and are silent on the particular—and magic, the eye, and lot fill the silence with an agent, an intention, and a meaning. Here the file meets the root of the "agency detector" you met in the chapter on *fitra*: the mind that cannot bear an event without an intender.

2. The question of anxiety where control ends. Malinowski recorded his golden rule in the Trobriand Islands: the fishermen of **the safe lagoon** have no magic worth mentioning, and the fishermen of **the treacherous deep sea** are steeped in rites—**ritual begins where skill ends.** Look for it around you: the people with the most amulets and rituals are those in high-risk, low-control occupations:

sailors, soldiers, athletes, actors on opening night, and students on the morning of an exam.

3. The question of managing inequality. The eye regulates display, blessing distributes hope, the accusation of magic settles scores (and wrongs the innocent—its victims across history, from the European burnings to the killing of "witches" in villages today, are a bloody, continuing file), and lot soothes the oppression of differences. The system—whether it did justice or injustice—is **a complete social management of envy, luck, and failure.**

* The Positions of the Great Religions: Between Disciplining the Practice and Its Continuation

The most important thing for the seeker to grasp: the great monotheistic religions **were not the patrons of this layer but the greatest campaign of refinement it has known in history.** Monotheism is by nature jealous: independent intermediate powers compete with the divine sovereignty. So it waged its war: it forbade magic, soothsaying, polytheistic amulets, ill omens, and divination by arrows. It placed whatever it affirmed beneath the ceiling of monotheism ("they could not harm anyone except with God's permission"—"know that if the whole nation gathered to benefit you, they could not benefit you except with something God had already written for you"). It permitted the disciplined substitutes: incantation with revelation instead of the spell, *istikhara* instead of soothsaying, trust in God instead of the amulet, and the good omen instead of the horoscope. Then the cycle repeated in every century: the popular accumulates, and the reformers demolish (the Protestants against the relics, the Salafis against the shrines, and the

rabbis of reason against superstition)—**and the layer returns in nearly every age**, because it does not feed on texts but on the three eternal questions.

Even secularization did not kill it—it only changed its costume: the newspaper horoscope in place of the livers of Babylon; "energy," "vibrations," and "the law of attraction" in place of heka and mana; knocking on wood in the finest salons; the athletes' talismans; and "the universe sending signs" on the lips of those who mock the religious unseen. It is exactly what we established in the chapter on *fitra*: the vacuum does not stay empty.

* The Scale: The Seeker's Kit in the Market of the Unseen

The two readings first, as is our custom. The critic reads the whole layer as an exposing mirror: cognitive illusions (spurious correlation, and the bias of remembering the hits and forgetting the misses) and social functions. **And then extends the sword to the upper floor: the greater unseen is of the same kind**, born of the same needs. The monotheistic believer turns the argument on its head: rather, history testifies that **monotheism was the greatest rationalizing force the unseen has ever known among human beings**—it is what broke the market of intermediaries, invalidated soothsaying and the horoscope, referred all the powers to the permission of one wise Lord, and turned anxiety from ritual to ethics. So to measure a documented revelation, which issued a challenge, against a blue bead is an analogy that fails in its very subject—and the decider between them is **the evidence**, not their sharing the word "unseen."

From this engagement you come out with your kit—four rules:

1. "The unseen" is not one category, so do not pass one verdict on it. Arrange it in layers by its evidence—an unseen supported by the evidence of a revelation that has submitted to the measures of the previous chapters (transmission, challenge, and evidence). Practices whose evidence is social experience and function (which deserve the respect of understanding, not belief in their mechanisms); and claims with no evidence at all. **And whoever throws one stone at all the layers—in belief or in denial—has excused himself from thinking**: whoever swallows the horoscopes along with the Qur'an is like whoever throws out the Qur'an along with the horoscopes; neither has weighed anything.

2. Examine the structure before the claim. If you see a system that promises control over luck for recurring fees, that always explains its failure by your lack of faith or by counter-magic, and that intensifies where despair intensifies—you are looking at an industry of anxiety, not knowledge, whatever its language: incense or "quantum."

3. Do not despise the function while you criticize the mechanism. Before you mock your grandmother's bead, remember that she managed with it a real anxiety and a real social balance—and the modernity that confiscated her tools did not exempt her from the questions; it sold her the same tools in elegant packaging. Criticizing superstition is a duty; despising its people is ignorance of it.

4. Watch in yourself the eternal inclination. You will catch yourself—believer or atheist—red-handed: "it's no coincidence," "a good omen," "this shirt brings me luck."

Do not panic; you are hearing the oldest dialect of your species. But make it a methodological alarm bell: **the mind that weaves intention into every small coincidence is the same mind that will judge the evidence of the great questions**—so train it on the scales here, in the market of cheap beads, before you take it into the markets of the great chapters.

The Seeker's Question: When you sort the unseen of your religion from the unseen of its marketplace—where do you draw the line between them, by what evidence do you draw it, and who taught you where it lies: the text, or custom?

* Study 10.1: Angels and Celestial Beings Across Religions and Civilizations

From the winged bulls of Babylon to the celestial bureaucracy of China: the grand tour, the comparison table, and five observations that crack the code of the phenomenon

Summary of the study: Behind every great religion stands an army of intermediate beings neither worshipped nor denied. Who are these messengers of light, and what do they do between the Throne and the earth in each tradition? A comprehensive map of angels across religions, with their names, functions, and remarkably convergent ranks despite the religions' differences.

Opening: Why Did Heaven Need Messengers?

The more exalted and transcendent the conception of God became, the wider grew the distance between Him and the clay of the earth—so who crosses it? Who carries the command down and the prayer up, guards the sleeper, records the deed, and takes the soul? Here was born among the most widespread of all beliefs: **the intermediate, serving spiritual beings**—which we call, in the language of the Abrahamic religions, "angels." Our chapter (on the intermediate unseen) presented the popular layer of this world. This study rises to its official, organized layer: how did all the traditions conceive the messengers of light?—while watching a fine line that will accompany us through the whole tour: **the line between "the angel" and "the**

little god." When is a heavenly being a sent servant, and when does it become a rival object of worship? The analysis's answer at the close will surprise you.

* First: The Ancient Roots—The Wings of the First East

Mesopotamia. At the court of every great god stands a **sukkal**—a vizier-messenger who carries his word and executes his will (Ninshubur, the faithful envoy of Inanna)—among the oldest institutional embodiments of the idea of "the god's messenger." At the gates of palaces and temples stood the winged guardian beings: the celestial bulls with human faces **(lamassu)** repelling evil from the thresholds, and the guardian beings called **karibu—in whose name scholars see the same linguistic root as the biblical "cherubim"**: the guardians of the Lord's throne in the Temple are linguistic cousins of the guardians of Babylon's gates. The Babylonian also knew his "personal god"—a protective, constant companion who interceded for him with the great gods: the oldest ancestor of "the guardian angel."

Egypt. It surrounded its gods with the wings of protection (Isis spreading her wings over the sarcophagus is among the most enduring icons in history), assigned some of its gods the function of message and mediation, and filled the other world with serving beings and guardians of its gates. But its intermediaries remained within the pantheon itself, so the dividing line had not yet been drawn.

Zoroastrianism—the ancient system nearest to Abrahamic angelology. Around the one Ahura Mazda stand the **Amesha Spentas**—the six "Holy Immortals"

(with the Holy Spirit as the seventh): supreme beings of light, each with a name, a function, and an element in its care (Good Thought, Highest Truth, the Desired Kingdom . . .)—the closest thing the ancient East produced to "archangels"; beneath them the **yazatas** ("the ones worthy of veneration"), the hosts of light in their hundreds, among them **Sraosha** ("Obedience"), the messenger of revelation, the hearer of prayers, and the companion of souls after death—whose functions correspond to those of Gabriel in a way that strikes every scholar; and every believer has a guardian **fravashi**. **And here the famous academic file opens:** Judaism before the Babylonian exile hardly knows angels with names and ranks, and after two centuries under Persian rule it emerged with a detailed angelology—so much so that the Talmud itself says the striking words: **"The names of the angels came up with them from Babylon"**! Some researchers argued for direct Persian influence, and the conservatives replied that the detail is an internal maturing of authentic biblical seeds. The scale is what we established in the file on claims of borrowing:

resemblance does not prove borrowing. The examination is by structure and history—and we have laid the case out with both its faces.

* Second: Judaism—From the Enigmatic "Angel of the LORD" To Ezekiel's Chariot

The Hebrew word itself holds the key: **mal'akh** means literally **"the messenger"**—not a nature but a function. In the oldest layers of the Torah "the angel of the LORD" appears as an awesome being of enigmatic identity (sometimes speaking in the first person of the Lord Himself, so that the commentators were perplexed: is he a messenger, or a manifestation?)—with no name and no wings mentioned, visiting Abraham, wrestling with Jacob, and standing before Balaam. Then the higher ranks unfold: the burning **seraphim** with six wings around the throne crying "Holy, holy, holy" (Isaiah's vision), the **cherubim**, guardians of Eden and of the throne, whose images were made on the Ark of the Covenant itself, and then the summit of strangeness: Ezekiel's chariot with its four-faced beings and its eye-studded wheels (the **ophanim**), which grew a whole Jewish mysticism (the mysticism of the Chariot). **After the exile the great transformation occurs:** for the first time proper names appear—**Michael**, "the prince" of the angels and the protector of Israel, and **Gabriel**, the interpreter of visions—both in the Book of Daniel, and with them the idea of "the princes of the nations" (every nation has an angel appointed over it who fights on its behalf in heaven!). In the literature of the Second Temple (the books of Enoch) an immense angelology flourishes, with ranks and names. With it the story of "the Watchers," who came down and were seduced by the daughters of the earth: the seed of "the fallen angels," whose importance would grow (we detailed their fate in the chapter on Satan).

* Third: Christianity—The Host and the Nine Orders

Christianity inherited the later Jewish angelology and expanded it: Gabriel opens its whole story (the annunciation to Zechariah, then the annunciation to Mary—the most famous angelic scene in human art); "the heavenly host" sings on the night of the nativity; angels minister to Christ in the temptation and witness the resurrection at the tomb. Michael leads the war against the dragon in Revelation. The tradition affirmed **the guardian angel** for every believer (indeed for every child: "their angels continually see the face of my Father in heaven," Matthew 18:10)—among the best-loved of popular Christian beliefs. Then came the most famous organizing work in the history of angelologies: *The Celestial Hierarchy* (attributed to Dionysius, about the fifth century CE), which arranged the angels in **nine orders in three triads**—from the seraphim, cherubim, and thrones surrounding the light, to the principalities, archangels, and angels in contact with human beings—a hierarchy that shaped the imagination and art of the Middle Ages (and Dante's *Comedy*) completely. **With an early red line:** Paul himself warned against "worship of angels" (Colossians 2:18)—veneration is legitimate and worship is *shirk*: the dividing line we have been watching is drawn here in the text.

* Fourth: Islam—Angelology as a Pillar . . . and the Settling of the Question of the Fall

Angels reached a standing in Islam they reached in no other tradition: belief in them became **a textually stipulated pillar of creed**—the second of the six pillars of faith ("The Messenger believes . . . they all believe in God, **His angels**, His scriptures, and His messengers"), not folklore and not a marginal detail. Their nature was defined precisely: created **from light** (by the text of the hadith, as against the fire of the jinn and the clay of humankind), honored servants who **"never disobey God's commands to them, but do as they are ordered"**, who neither eat nor reproduce and have no sex—**with an explicit Qur'anic correction of the pagan creed**: "They consider the angels—God's servants—to be **female**. Did they witness their creation?"—in reply to the Arabs of the age of ignorance who worshiped them as "the daughters of God" (so here the dividing line is drawn in the Qur'an: from worship to servanthood). **And the Islamic register of functions is the widest of the registers:** Gabriel, the trustee of revelation (and the Holy Spirit); Michael over rain and provision; Israfil over the trumpet; the Angel of Death and his helpers; the guardians, "guardian angels before him and behind". The noble scribes—"he does not utter a single word without an ever-present watcher"; the two questioners of the grave (Munkar and Nakir, in the Sunna). The keepers of Hell (Malik and the guards—"There are nineteen in charge of it") and of Paradise; the bearers of the Throne, "eight"; and wanderers seeking out the gatherings of

remembrance. **And the finest distinguishing mark of the Islamic structure is its settling of the question of the fall:** there is no angelic fall in Islam at all—the angels are infallible by the text, and Iblis "**was one of the jinn** and he disobeyed his Lord's command," not a fallen angel (we detailed the fruits of this structural settlement in the chapter on Satan: the protection of the host of light from the possibility of treachery, and the transfer of evil to a species that was free to choose from the outset). As for Harut and Marut in Babylon, the verse presents them as **a trial and a test**—"these two never taught anyone without first warning him, 'We are sent only to tempt—do not disbelieve'"—not as two treacherous angels, on the more probable interpretation.

* Fifth: Outside the Abrahamic Religions—Where the Dividing Line Dissolves

Hinduism. Its beings of light are the **devas**—and here our dividing line dissolves in an instructive way: the devas are gods worshiped in popular polytheism, but for the monotheistic currents of Hinduism (which you met in Chapter 9) they are **exalted created beings, servants of the one Absolute.** That is, angels by function, though they bear the title of gods; and with them the serving races of heaven: the **gandharvas**, musicians of the highest assembly, the **apsaras**, the beautiful dancers of heaven, and the messengers of Yama who take the souls—a register of functions parallel to its Abrahamic counterpart under other names. **Buddhism** turned the equation in its customary way: its "devas" are blessed beings dwelling in heavens of delight. **But they are mortal, inside the wheel of samsara, and**

lower in station than the human being who reaches nirvana: they revere the Buddha and serve the dharma (the guardians of the four directions at the gates of the temples) and hold no salvation for any worshiper—angels without the power to save. **China** offered the most curious formula: **a complete celestial bureaucracy** in the image of the imperial administration—the Jade Emperor, and around him ministries of rain, plague, walls, and cities with their appointed officials (and righteous human beings may be promoted after death to these posts!). Its most famous domestic figure: **the Kitchen God**, who carries his annual report on the household up to Heaven just before the New Year (so the mouth of his statue is smeared with honey to sweeten the report!)—messengers, recorders of deeds, and celestial surveillance: the same angelic functions in the dress of officials. **And the religions of the peoples** are full of serving and guarding intermediary spirits—the mother layer whose vocabulary, as we saw in our chapter, seeped into the popular forms of most religions.

Sixth: The Comparison Table

Tradition	Name / essence	Infallible, or free to choose?	Names and ranks?	Chief functions	The limit of veneration
Mesopotamia	sukkal / lamassu / karibu	Subordinate to their gods	Many names, no fixed hierarchy	Message, guarding thresholds, personal protection	Within the worship of the gods
Zoroastrianism	Amesha Spentas and yazatas (light)	The faithful hosts of light	Yes—six great ones + hundreds	Revelation (Sraosha), care of the elements, escorting souls	Veneration below Ahura Mazda
Judaism	mal'akh = messenger	Disputed; the story of the Watchers in the apocrypha	Late: Michael and Gabriel + seraphim / cherubim / ophanim	Message, guarding the throne, princes of the nations	Veneration, not worship

Tradition	Name / essence	Infallible, or free to choose?	Names and ranks?	Chief functions	The limit of veneration
Christianity	angelos = messenger (ministering spirits)	Free to choose—and some fell (the demons)	Nine Dionysian orders	Annunciation, personal guardianship, Michael's host	"Do not worship angels" (Colossians)
Islam	Angels of **light**	**Infallible by the text**—no angelic fall	Encyclopedic names and functions, no detailed formal hierarchy	Revelation, provision, the trumpet, taking souls, guarding, recording, keeping the gates	Belief in them is **a pillar**—worshiping them is *shirk*, refuted by text
Hinduism	devas / gandharvas / apsaras	Within dharma and karma	Complete assemblies	Serving the Absolute (monotheistically), the music of heaven, taking souls	Worshiped popularly—here the line dissolves

Tradition	Name / essence	Infallible, or free to choose?	Names and ranks?	Chief functions	The limit of veneration
Buddhism	Mortal devas	Subject to karma	Ordered heavens	Revering the Buddha, guarding the dharma	Venerated but do not save—lower than the enlightened
China	The celestial bureaucracy	Officials appointed and dismissed!	Ministries and posts	Reports, rain, protecting cities and homes	The rites of the official, not the worship of the Absolute

* Seventh: The Analysis—Five Observations That Crack the Code

1. Function before nature—the testimony of the three languages. The Hebrew *mal'akh* and the Greek *angelos* both mean literally **the messenger**, and many Arabic philologists traced the Arabic *malak* to *aluka*—the message: so the three tongues of Abrahamic revelation named these beings **by their work, not by their essence**—an early sign that their essence is unseen, and that their concern with human beings is service and mediation.

2. The historical arc—from obscurity to registers. Angelologies develop in every tradition from obscure, nameless beings into detailed systems of ranks and functions—and the summit of the post-exilic Jewish expansion opens the file of Persian influence, with the scale laid out. **And notice the pleasing social regularity:** most civilizations drew their heaven in the image of their court—the viziers of Babylon, the triads of the Byzantine court in Dionysius, and the imperial administration of China—which the critic reads as explicit human projection, and the believer as an approximation, in the language of each people, of a real highest assembly—the very duality you know.

3. The real dividing line: worship. When is a heavenly being an angel and when a little god? The answer lies not in power, beauty, or wings—but in **worship**: the serving being **whose Lord is sought for help, not the being itself,** is an angel. And once worship is directed to it, it becomes—on the measure of

monotheism—a rival and *shirk*. That is why every monotheism drew its red line here in the text (Colossians in Christianity; the verses on "the daughters of God" and the challenge on the Day of Gathering, "Was it you these people worshipped?" in the Qur'an). **So the question of the angels is the fine edge at which the purity of every monotheism is tested**: the beings nearest to God are the most dangerous temptation to His oneness.

4. The fork of the fall—and its weighty effect on the problem of evil. Can an angel disobey? Christianity answered: yes—and some of them fell and became the demons (so evil is a schism within heaven's own host). Islam answered: no—the angels are infallible, and the first rebel was a jinni who was free to choose (so the host of light is protected, and evil comes from another species)—a structural fork of enormous significance, whose fruits we detailed in the chapter on Satan. It is among the purest examples of how a "detailed" difference in angelology redraws the whole map of evil and theology.

5. The emotional function—and why they returned in our age. Behind all the registers lies one human need: that the servant not be alone in a vast universe with a transcendent God—the guardian angel is a tender personal presence that makes transcendence near without touching transcendence itself. This is exactly why the angels did not die with the death of ancient magic: they returned at the heart of modernity as a surging wave—books on "guardian angels" and courses in "angelic communication" top the market of the new Western spiritualities, stripped of their old

theology and packed in the language of energy—the latest witness to the two rules of our chapter: that the intermediate unseen is a long-lived layer that survives even the retreat of the official religions, and that the "liberated" modern person buys back the oldest goods in new packaging.

* Conclusion: The Study's Open Question

Across all the heavens we visited—from the winged bull of Babylon to the Chinese kitchen official to the eight bearers of the Throne—one pattern echoes in countless costumes: **intermediaries of light between the Absolute and the clay.** The believer reads the regularity as the trace of a single higher reality that showed itself to the nations, who partly grasped it and partly distorted it. True revelation is what disciplined the register and drew the line of worship. The critic reads the same regularity as the fingerprint of a single maker, the human soul: it fears loneliness, so it fills the sky with guardians. It knows courts, so it draws the highest assembly in their image. Both are looking at the same sky. As for you, take from the study its practical question before its theoretical one: when your heart senses, in distress, that "someone" is guarding you—is it truly an ever-present watcher, or the echo of your need for one? And can anyone—on either side—**prove** their answer to you? That belongs to the kind of unseen this whole chapter taught you how to carry: without hasty denial, and without believing every knock at the door.

Cross-references for the study: *the popular layer of intermediaries (blessing, envy, and amulets) in the body of this chapter; the dark face of the intermediaries (the demons, the jinn, and the fork of the fall in detail) in Chapter 21 and the study on Iblis; and the devas between divinity and service in Chapter 9.*

---

* A Study Annexed to Chapter 10: Lived Religion—Worship, Giving, and the Sacred Image

What believers do, compared on four axes; how the traditions organized giving, and what they said about money; and the oldest quarrel about images and sound—with what each file reveals about the conception behind it

> **Summary of the study:** This book has weighed what the religions teach; this study turns to what their people do. Worship is compared on four axes—the rhythm of repetition, the body, the community, and sacred time—then giving, from zakat to tithe to dana, and the long argument over money; then the sacred image and sacred sound, where one house forbids what another venerates. The aim is not to rank practices but to read them: every rite is a conception of God and of the human being made visible.

---

* Opening: Religion as It Is Practiced

Ask most believers what their religion is, and they will not answer with a doctrine. They will describe a morning prayer, a fast, a festival, a pilgrimage made once in a life, a coin dropped in a box, a candle lit, a song. The book has so far treated religion as a set of claims to be weighed, because that is what a seeker must do; but the seeker should also know that for most of the people inside every house, religion is first a practice and only then a creed—and that the practices, compared fairly,

disclose the creeds more honestly than the catechisms do. This study is the counterpart of Chapter 10's map of the hidden layer: there, the beliefs beneath the doctrine; here, the acts.

* First: Worship—Four Axes of Comparison

The rhythm of repetition. Every tradition disciplines time with repetition, and the interval reveals a conception. The Muslim's five daily prayers, fixed to the sun, make the day itself an act of remembrance; the Jew's three daily services and the Christian monastic hours descend from a similar instinct. The Hindu's *puja* may be daily or occasional, at home or at temple, and its freedom reflects a tradition with no single rule for all; the Buddhist's practice varies from the layman's occasional offering to the monk's fixed hours of meditation. The Sikh's morning and evening recitations frame the working day in the Name. The question the axis raises for the seeker: is worship a fixed obligation that shapes the day, or a free act that the day accommodates—and what does each answer say about the God addressed?

The body. Every tradition uses the body, and what it does with the body says what it thinks the body is. The Muslim prostrates, forehead to the ground, in a posture the texts call the nearest a servant comes to his Lord; the Orthodox Christian crosses himself and bows; the Jew sways in prayer and binds the tefillin to arm and head; the Hindu circumambulates, prostrates, and marks the body with the sacred ash or vermilion; the Buddhist sits, and the sitting is the practice. Fasting belongs here too: the month of Ramadan, the Christian

Lent and the Orthodox fasts, Yom Kippur and the minor fasts, the Hindu *vrata* and the Jain fasts unto death—each an argument, made with the body, about the relation of appetite to the spirit. The seeker should notice that no living tradition treats the body as irrelevant to worship, and that the traditions divide over whether the body is to be disciplined, transcended, or sanctified.

The community. Worship is almost never solitary in its ideal form. The Friday congregation, the Sabbath minyan of ten, the Christian Eucharist, the Sikh *sangat*, the Hindu festival crowd, the Buddhist *sangha*—each tradition makes assembly a condition or a summit of worship, and the shape of the assembly reveals its conception of authority: rows facing one direction behind a single leader; a circle around a text; a congregation before an altar; a crowd around an image; a community seated on one floor eating together. The *langar* of the Sikhs, where everyone eats the same food on the same floor, is a doctrine of equality enacted three times a day.

Sacred time and the festival. Each tradition punctuates the year, and the festivals are the tradition's memory made public: Passover and the exodus, Easter and the resurrection, the two Eids and the pilgrimage and the sacrifice, Diwali and the return of the king, Vesak and the Buddha's birth and awakening, the Chinese New Year and the ancestors. Pilgrimage is the festival that requires a journey: to Jerusalem, to Mecca, to Rome and Santiago, to Varanasi and the Ganges, to Bodh Gaya, to the Golden Temple. The seeker who compares the calendars will notice that every tradition

remembers a founding event by re-enacting it—and that what is re-enacted is what the tradition holds most true.

Sacrifice. The oldest form of worship on the map is the offering, and the traditions divide over what became of it. Judaism ended sacrifice with the Temple and replaced it with prayer and study; Christianity reads the death of Christ as the sacrifice that ended sacrifice, represented in the Eucharist; Islam keeps the animal sacrifice of the pilgrimage and the feast, but the Qur'an says plainly that neither the flesh nor the blood reaches God, only the piety of the one who offers; Hinduism's Vedic fire sacrifice survives in the temple's daily offerings of food and flowers; Buddhism and Jainism rejected animal sacrifice outright, and the rejection was part of their founding critique. Here a single practice, traced across the houses, shows the whole map of how the religions understood the transaction between the human being and the divine.

* Second: Giving—and the Argument About Money

No tradition left giving to inclination. Judaism's *tzedakah*—a word closer to "justice" than to "charity"—was structured by the tithe and by the laws that left the corners of the field to the poor. Islam made *zakat* one of five pillars, fixed its rate, named its recipients in the Qur'an, and distinguished it from the voluntary *sadaqa*. Christianity inherited the tithe and built on the parable of the widow's coins a theology of giving measured by sacrifice rather than sum. Hinduism's *dana*, Buddhism's *dana* to the monastic community (which made the

layman's giving and the monk's renunciation two halves of one economy), the Sikh's tenth of income, the Zoroastrian's charity as a duty of the good religion—each is a doctrine of property: that what one has is held in trust, and that the poor have a claim on it that is not a favor.

The argument about money followed. Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all prohibited usury in their founding texts, and all three then argued for centuries about what usury was: the Talmud distinguished the loan to the brother from the loan to the stranger; the medieval church condemned interest and then, through the theologians of Salamanca, began to distinguish it from usury; Islamic jurisprudence built an entire architecture of contracts to permit commerce without *riba*, and the modern debate over Islamic banking is the same argument continued. The Buddhist and Hindu traditions, less preoccupied with the loan, were more preoccupied with the merchant's honesty and the renunciant's poverty. The seeker who compares these files will find the traditions agreed on one thing—that wealth carries obligation and that its acquisition is a moral act—and disagreed on nearly every detail of what follows.

* Third: The Sacred Image and the Sacred Sound

Here the traditions divide most sharply, and the division is doctrinal to its root. **The aniconic houses.** Judaism's second commandment forbade the image, and the synagogue became a house of text. Islam extended the prohibition to the representation of living beings in worship, and turned its art toward calligraphy,

geometry, and the arabesque—so that the mosque's beauty is the beauty of the word made visible, and the Qur'an's script became one of the world's great arts. Iconoclastic Christianity—the Byzantine iconoclasts, later the Reformed churches—stripped the image from the church on the same principle: that the image invites the worship that belongs to God alone. **The iconic houses.** Orthodox Christianity, after the iconoclast controversy, made the icon a doctrine: the image is venerated, not worshipped, and the veneration passes to the one depicted, because God Himself took a visible body. Hinduism's *murti* goes further: the consecrated image is a dwelling of the divine, and the worshipper's darshan—the seeing and being seen—is the center of temple religion. Buddhism, which began without images of the Buddha, filled its world with them within centuries, and the image became an aid to meditation and an object of reverence.

Sound follows the same map with a twist. Islam, which excluded the image, made the human voice reciting the Qur'an and calling to prayer its central sacred sound, and argued internally for centuries about whether music beyond it was permitted—the Sufi *sama* on one side, the jurists' caution on the other. Judaism made cantillation the voice of the text. Christianity built the greatest edifice of sacred music in the world, from chant to polyphony to the oratorio, while its Reformed wing pared it back to the unaccompanied psalm. The Sikh made *kirtan*, the singing of the Guru's hymns, the center of worship; the Hindu made the *mantra* and the *bhajan* a path in themselves.

What the file reveals is the conception behind the practice. The aniconic houses held that the divine is beyond form and that form endangers the truth of that; the iconic houses held that the divine has entered form, or is present in it, and that form is a road to it. Neither is a careless practice; each is a theology enacted. And the seeker who has read Chapter 9 will recognize the axis: it is the axis of transcendence and immanence, drawn in stone and paint and sound.

* The Scale on the Ladder

The comparison of practices settles less about truth than the comparison of doctrines, and more about honesty. It establishes that no tradition is a set of ideas only; that every rite encodes a conception of God, the body, the community, and property; and that the traditions' differences in practice map with striking fidelity onto their differences in doctrine—so that a person who wants to know what a religion believes may learn it from what its people do. It also establishes a rule the seeker will need: **a practice is evidence for the conception behind it, not for the truth of that conception.** The beauty of the icon does not prove the incarnation; the austerity of the empty mosque does not prove transcendence; the *langar* proves that the Sikhs believe in equality, not that God commanded it. Every practice on this map is the work of a community that took its own doctrine seriously—which is why the comparison of practices is the best cure for the belief that the other's religion is a set of empty forms.

The Seeker's Question: choose the practice of another tradition that seems to you most foreign—the image, the prostration, the fast, the sacrifice—and ask what conception of God it enacts. Then ask which practice of your own would seem most foreign to that tradition's people, and what it would tell them about yours.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the hidden layer of belief in Chapter 10; the conception of God and the axis of transcendence in Chapter 9; the permitted and the forbidden in Study 22.1; the reach of religious law in Study 22.2; and the first stations of the map, where the oldest offerings were found, in Chapter 8.*

* Chapter 11: Preaching and Mission—How Do Religions Present Themselves to Others?

The concept of spreading a religion across religions and civilizations: who preaches and who does not, why, by what means, and with what ethics?

> **Summary of the chapter:** Why does one religion knock on every door to call you to it, while another does not trouble to tell you it exists? A map of preaching and mission across the religions: who calls and who does not, by what means, and what makes one religion missionary by nature and another closed to its own people.

---

* Opening: Why Do Some Religions Knock at Your Door, and Others Not?

As the seeker turns the map of religions over, they will notice a strange phenomenon that deserves a whole chapter: some religions pursue you—they write to you, engage you, knock at your door, hand you books, and set up channels for you—while others take no notice of you at all. Some, indeed, **shut their door in your face if you come knocking yourself.** The Muslim and the Christian both hope for your guidance. The Mormon may stand on your doorstep. The Buddhist opens a meditation center in your city. But the Jew will turn you away from conversion three times before agreeing to consider your request. The Druze will tell you the door was closed a thousand years ago. The Parsi Zoroastrian may inform you that his religion is for those born into it

only. The Japanese Shinto priest will simply not understand what you mean by asking "how do I convert to Shinto?"

This variation is not an administrative detail. It is a deep window onto **the structure of every religion:** its conception of salvation, of whom its message was sent to, and of the relation between truth and community. It touches the seeker personally from two sides: they are the **target** of all the pursuing missions and need to understand their logic and means to listen with awareness. And they are a **potential knocker** at doors they may be surprised to find bolted. So let us draw the map.

The great division first—among the most useful tools of students of religion: **missionary, or universal, religions**, which regard their message as meant for all humankind and strive to spread it (Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Manichaeism in antiquity, the Baha'i faith in modern times). **National, or ethnic, religions**, bound to a people or a land, which do not invite others in (Judaism, traditional Hinduism, Shinto, the indigenous religions of Africa and the Americas). And between them lie degrees, and doors bolted entirely (the Druze, the Yazidis, the Mandaeans, today's Parsis). Among the curiosities of documentation, closure may go so far as to withhold the text from a religion's own common people: testimonies of those who left the Druze faith record that most of its children never read "the Epistles of Wisdom" at all—their reading being reserved to the class of the *uqqal*, the initiated. So the book is protected from the inside before the outside (and converts' testimonies are read—as is our custom—by their preaching genre

and by the measure of the one-sided party). As with all classifications, it is an approximate tool that the borderline cases will test—we will see a Hinduism that came to preach, a Judaism that once preached by the sword, and a Zoroastrianism that was missionary and then closed.

A clarification of terms. *Da'wa*, "the call," is the term of Islam (from calling and inviting). "Evangelism" and "mission" are the terms of Christianity (the Gospel literally means "good news," and "mission" comes from "sending"); Buddhism sent out "messengers of the dharma." In modern legal usage a distinction is drawn between the legitimate "witness to one's religion" and "proselytism," which has come to carry shades of pressure and exploitation. We will use "preaching / mission" in their neutral, descriptive sense: **the effort of a religion's people to bring others into it.**

---

* First: Christianity—"Go and Make Disciples of All Nations"

Christianity is the largest missionary enterprise history has known, and its foundation is an explicit founding text with which the Gospels close: Christ's charge to his disciples—known as "the Great Commission"—to go and make disciples of all nations and baptize them (Matthew 28:19). Yet Christianity was not born universal all at once: its first generation witnessed a decisive internal dispute between those who saw it as a movement within Judaism, binding those who entered it to its law and its circumcision, and **Paul**, who opened it to

the nations without circumcision or dietary law. The matter was settled at "the Council of Jerusalem" in favor of openness. That moment—whose context we detailed in the chapter on the map of religions—is what turned a small Eastern community into a world religion. It is fair to say that Paul, with his journeys and his letters, was the first "engineer of missions" in Christian history.

Then a path in three stages. Three first centuries in which Christianity spread from below, persecuted, through family and trade networks and the witness of the martyrs—a model of spread without power in which Christians take pride to this day. Then the tables turned with Constantine and then Theodosius: it became the religion of the empire, and missionary history entered a new door: the Christianization of Europe by a mixture of the persuasion of wandering monks (Cyril and Methodius among the Slavs, Patrick in Ireland), of the decisions of kings who converted so that their peoples converted (we will pause over this pattern in the analysis), and sometimes of outright coercion (Charlemagne's campaigns to Christianize the Saxons by the sword are the documented example). Then the third great stage: **the age of world missions,** from the sixteenth century, when the Jesuits and Franciscans boarded the ships of Portugal and Spain to the Americas and Asia, and then the Protestant missions rode the wave of the Dutch, British, and French empires to Africa and the oceans.

And here is an inquiry that fairness requires: mission and colonialism. Among this book's sources is Chatelier's *The Raid on the Muslim World*

(summarized and Arabized by Muhibb al-Din al-Khatib and Musa'id al-Yafi, 1931, from French reports of the early twentieth century)—a historical document from the heart of the age testifying to a documented truth that cannot be denied: that mission at the height of the colonial era was, in many places, **an organized project with political and financial backing,** in which the mission, the school, the hospital, and the consulate were intertwined, and some of whose theorists spoke openly of serving influence. But this book's method requires completing the map from all its sides: the missionaries themselves have offered. Still offer—a counter-narrative: that the vast majority of them were driven by a sincere faith in saving souls. That they built schools, hospitals, and printing presses that served the peoples and contributed to local renaissances (among them an Arab renaissance to whose instruments the missions' presses and schools contributed). That some of them opposed colonialism and defended the natives. And that tying every missionary to intelligence services is an unjust generalization. **The double lesson we teach the reader:** the historical entanglement of mission and empire is a documented fact. Generalizing the lens of conspiracy to every later interfaith dialogue or charitable work by those who differ has itself become a distorting lens—and the ability to hold both truths at once without letting either go is exactly the skill this book builds. (Note that the lens of "spread on the back of power" applies to all the great religions, not to Christianity alone, as we will see.)

And the Christian scene today has turned in a way many do not know: the center of missionary gravity is no longer in the West. The fastest-growing and most-sending churches today are the churches of the South—Africa, Latin America, and Korea—so that the South now sends its missionaries to "secular" Europe itself: the reverse of the direction of past centuries. The door into Christianity is ritually simple: a declared faith and baptism.

---

* Second: Islam—"Call People to the Way of Your Lord with Wisdom"

Preaching in Islam is an explicit Qur'anic principle: an address to the Prophet, "call [people] to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good teaching. Argue with them in the most courteous way". A description of the community as one "singled out for people" to enjoin what is right; a definition of the messenger's function as "delivering the message"—together with the great reference text of the whole matter: **"There is no compulsion in religion."** So the message is universal ("We have sent you [Prophet] only to bring good news and warning to all people"), calling to it is an act of worship and a duty (a collective one, for most jurists), its door is open to every human being, and entering it is among the easiest of all the religions' doors: two testimonies spoken aloud, with no rite, no priesthood, and no probationary period.

And the history of Islam's spread is the stage of the most famous debate in our subject: "Did Islam spread by the sword?" We present both readings as their own holders make them, and then the tools of adjudication.

The critical reading points to the great conquests that extended Islam's political dominion from Andalusia to Sind within a century, and holds that this imperial framework—with its higher status for Muslims and its poll tax on others—created a continuous structural pressure toward Islam even when no sword was drawn on any particular individual, and it cites scattered documented cases of coercion across history (as in the history of every religious empire).

The Islamic reply draws a central distinction between **the conquest of land** and **the conquest of hearts**: the conquests expanded the abode of Islam politically, but entry into the religion remained—by the text of the Qur'an and the contract of protection—voluntary. The historical evidence it cites is strong indeed: the Copts, Syriacs, Greeks, Persians, and Jews remained in their religions **for long centuries under Islamic rule** (Egypt and Syria in fact kept non-Muslim majorities for many generations after the conquest, as historians of religious conversion establish by quantitative studies), and had the machine been organized coercion, those maps would not have survived. Then the greatest witness: **the most populous regions of Islam today were not entered by military conquest**—Indonesia and Malaysia received Islam through traders and Sufi preachers, and so did West Africa and its eastern coasts,

and inland China. (So decisively did the religion outgrow its cradle that the Arabs—its first nation—are today a minority among its people, roughly one in five; the academic survey literature is built on the fact, e.g. *Islam Outside the Arab World*, ed. Westerlund and Svanberg.)

And the tools of adjudication we hand the reader: the constant distinction between the spread of **the state** and the spread of **the religion** (a distinction that serves examining all imperial religions, not Islam alone). Attention to the fact that mass religious conversion is a slow phenomenon with composite motives (of faith, of society, of taxation, of marriage) which any one-sided explanation wrongs, whatever its direction—and we devoted a study to mass conversion in the chapter on biases.

And the call today: institutions, ministries, and world organizations; channels and digital spaces; itinerant movements (such as the Tablighi Jamaat, which may be the largest itinerant religious movement in the world by numbers); centers of dialogue; and translations of the Qur'an into hundreds of languages. A whole "literature of formation" has even arisen for the modern call—books and curricula for preparing and training preachers (among its samples, *A Traveler on the Train of Da'wa*)—paralleling the literature for training missionaries in the Christian missionary institutes: both preaching camps have built schools for preparing their men, which is itself the sign of the modern institutionalization of preaching. There remains the thorny contemporary question of the subject: the freedom to **leave** Islam (apostasy), between the inherited juristic ruling

and the revising contemporary currents—we detailed its map and its arguments in the chapter on accepting the other. Here we record only its structural observation: the door into Islam is the widest of the religions' doors, and the dispute over the door out is the fiercest contemporary dispute within it.

---

* Third: Judaism—The Reverse Model: A Religion That Does Not Want More Followers

Here everything above turns on its head. Rabbinic Judaism **does not preach**. It does the opposite, by text: the Talmudic tradition rules that the would-be convert be discouraged and told frankly of the hardships of the law and the persecutions of the Jews. Custom has it that he be turned away time after time as a test of his sincerity—and only if he persists is the arduous path of *giyur* (conversion) opened to him: long study, commitment to the commandments, a religious court, circumcision for the male, and ritual immersion. So the door exists, but it is deliberately narrow.

And why does Judaism not preach? The answer lies in its theological structure, and it is among the most beautiful things our chapter uncovers: the covenant in the Torah is a covenant between God and a particular **people**, chosen to bear the yoke of the commandments (613 commandments), not a message aimed at bringing all humanity under that yoke.

And more important: the Jewish tradition does not make salvation the monopoly of the Jews—the nations have their own path: "the seven laws of Noah"

(renouncing idolatry; the prohibition of murder, theft, and sexual immorality . . . ; and establishing justice), and whoever among the nations keeps them is among "the righteous of the nations" and has a share in the world to come. Consider the structural effect: **when the other's salvation does not depend on entering your religion, the greatest motive for preaching to him falls away.** Judaism wants the world to be righteous, not Jewish—so its people explain their position.

With historical exceptions that test the rule: in the Hasmonean period (second century BCE) King John Hyrcanus forcibly Judaized the Edomites after conquering their land—a documented case of Jewish religious coercion, mentioned for fairness. The medieval sources tell of the conversion of the Turkic kingdom of the Khazars (whose story and scale are a well-known historical dispute). In antiquity the synagogues had an attraction that drew "God-fearers" from among the pagans, before the Middle Ages—with their persecutions and the prohibition by the Christian and Islamic empires of the Judaizing of their subjects—closed the door almost for good. As for the most active contemporary Jewish "outreach" (such as the worldwide Chabad movement), it is directed **at Jews themselves**: bringing the distant among them back to observance, not calling the nations.

* Fourth: The Bolted Doors—The Druze, the Yazidis, the Mandaeans, and the Parsi Zoroastrians

Go one step further and you meet religions **that have closed the door of entry completely**:

The Druze (the Muwahhidun). The door of the call was open for a few years at the birth of the sect and then **officially closed in 1043 CE, forever**, according to their creed: they accept no one in and recognize no one out. A Druze is only one born of two Druze parents. Their conception of reincarnation (the transmigration of the community's souls within itself) makes the community a complete spiritual entity with a closed cycle. Indeed their teachings themselves are withheld from most of their own children (the *uqqal*, the initiated, as against the *juhhal*, the uninitiated)—a double closure: against the outside and against the community's own common people.

The Yazidis. A religion purely of birth, with internal castes (*murids*, sheikhs, and religious families) between which marriage is forbidden, let alone the entry of a stranger. There is no mechanism of conversion at all, and whoever marries outside the community leaves it. **And the Mandaeans** (the Sabians, followers of John the Baptist in southern Iraq and Ahvaz) likewise: they accept no convert and no outside marriage.

And the Parsi Zoroastrians of India. Their case is the clearest proof that closure may be **a historical accident rather than a doctrinal principle.** Ancient Zoroastrianism was a missionary, imperial religion (the religion of great Persia, with a clear universalist tendency in its texts). When the empire collapsed and a

remnant of its followers migrated to India, they became a small conservative community that tied survival to purity, and most of India's Parsis settled on **refusing to accept converts** and refusing to marry out—whereas other Zoroastrian communities (in Iran and the Western diaspora) accept converts, and the question today is a heated internal dispute in a community whose very existence is threatened by demographic shrinkage.

And the lesson of the four cases is one: the persecuted or surviving minority tends to close its doors—openness is the luxury of the secure, and closure the shield of those who fear for their survival. A social equation that explains much of what might be taken for pure creed.

---

* Fifth: Hinduism—From "You Cannot Become a Hindu" To the Missions of the Gurus

The traditional Hindu conception does not know "converting to Hinduism" at all: *dharma* (religious duty) is bound to birth in a caste, a community, and a land. You are born into your place in the cosmic order and do not "join" it. So much so that it was once commonly held that whoever crossed "the black water" (the ocean) had left the circle of purity. To this is added a theological factor that lowers the missionary motive from another side: the broad pluralist tendency in Hindu thought ("Truth is one; the wise call it by many names")—for if all the roads lead to the same truth, why move people from one path to another? (We showed in the chapter on the seeker's options that this pluralism is itself a

contested philosophical position, not an innocent neutrality.)

But the last two centuries have turned the scene around: under the shock of the Christian missions and the Islamic call in India, reformist Hinduism produced its counter-missionary tools: the **Arya Samaj** movement (founded 1875) invented the rite of *shuddhi* (purification) **to return** those who had become Muslim or Christian to Hinduism—the first organized Hindu mechanism of "conversion," and the "homecoming" (*ghar wapsi*) campaigns are its controversial contemporary extension in India. **Vivekananda** went to the Parliament of Religions in Chicago (1893) and inaugurated the presentation of Hinduism to the West as a universal wisdom rather than a people's religion. Then came the worldwide guru movements of the twentieth century—the most famous being the **Hare Krishna** movement (ISKCON), with its chanters in the streets of Western capitals, and Transcendental Meditation and its sisters—Hindu in content, universal in audience. So Hinduism today stands with a foot in each camp: national at its root, missionary at its edges.

* Sixth: Buddhism—The First Universal Missionary Religion in History?

Many students of religion hold that Buddhism is **the oldest of the universal missionary religions:** its message from its first day was addressed to the human being as a being who suffers—not to a people or a caste (its opening of its door to all castes was a revolution against the Brahmanical order itself). Its early texts preserve the Buddha's charge to his first monks, in substance: go forth into the land for the good and happiness of the many, out of compassion for the world, and let no two go by one road. Then came the decisive moment: the emperor **Ashoka** (third century BCE), after his famous conversion following the massacre of Kalinga, organized the first documented missionary campaign in history: the missions of "the messengers of the dharma" across India and to Sri Lanka (led by his son Mahinda, as tradition tells). His rock-cut inscriptions even record his sending to the western Greek kingdoms, naming their kings.

And the Buddhist mode of spread is a different model worth reflecting on: Buddhism crossed all of Asia—Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia by sea, China, Korea, and Japan by the Silk Road, Tibet and Mongolia over mountains and steppes—**with almost no military conquest in its name**: monks, traders, translators, and the patronage of local kings who converted so that their states sponsored the new religion (the pattern of "conversion from above" again, but with no conquering army from outside). This was accompanied by a high

adaptive flexibility: Buddhism put on the dress of most of the cultures it entered—it intermarried with Taoism and Confucianism in China, with Shinto in Japan, and with the Bon religion in Tibet. So much so that a methodological question became legitimate: is this wise missionary flexibility, or a dissolution that changes the identity of the message? (A question every universal religion that "settles" must face.) Today Buddhism makes its presence in the West with the gentlest tools of presentation: centers of meditation and mindfulness—a mission that often does not call itself a mission, which is itself worth the seeker's attention.

---

* Seventh: The Religions of Community and Land—Where the Question Has No Meaning at All

There is a deeper layer of "not preaching": religions that not only refuse the convert but **have no concept of conversion in their structure at all**. Japanese Shinto is the religion of the land of Japan, its spirits (the *kami*), and its people: the Japanese person is born into a relationship with the local shrine as he is born into his village, and it never occurs to its priest to "spread Shinto" in Brazil. The traditional religions of Africa and the indigenous religions of the peoples of the Americas and Oceania are likewise, on the whole: every community has its ancestors, its spirits, and its rites bound to its land and its lineage, and the neighbor's religion is "true for him" within his world—a practical pluralism that preceded the theories of pluralism by ages. When sages

of these traditions were asked the secret of their not preaching, some answered, in substance: does a man preach his ancestors to people? For them the question is like asking your neighbor to adopt your grandfather. Confucianism and Taoism in China are near this pattern: systems of wisdom and conduct that are learned and lived, not memberships one is invited into and moves between—which is why counting their "followers" has exhausted the scholars, since one Chinese person practices all three together with no sense of contradiction.

---

* Eighth: Forgotten and Recent Pages—Manichaeism, the Religions of Recent Centuries, and Even Irreligion

Manichaeism—the greatest of the forgotten missions. Mani (third century CE) founded his religion **as consciously missionary, without precedent**: he declared himself the seal of the messengers before him (Zoroaster, the Buddha, and Christ), wrote his books with his own hand so that they would not be distorted, ordered them translated into every tongue, and organized a class of "the Elect" devoted to itinerant preaching. Within a few centuries his religion stretched from North Africa and Europe (Augustine himself was a Manichaean for nine years before his conversion) to China, where for a time it became the state religion of the Uyghurs. Then it **became almost totally extinct** under the hammers of persecution from all the empires (the very word *zindiq*, "heretic," was originally coined for its

followers, as passed before you in the chapter on the history of doubt). Its lesson for the seeker is precious: **the greatest missionary machine does not guarantee survival**—spread is one thing, roots another.

And the religions of recent centuries were born in the age of globalism and so were born missionary by nature: **the Baha'i faith** regards its message as the unification of all humankind, and its followers spread by migration and teaching in the widest relative geographic spread among the modern religions. The "Latter-day Saints" **(the Mormons)** made mission a unique institutional pillar: tens of thousands of young people devote two years to mission at their own expense, in white shirts with their name badges. **Jehovah's Witnesses** made knocking on doors and standing with literature in public squares the very essence of membership (every member is a "publisher" by definition).

The Ahmadiyya—whatever their known dispute with Islam and its scholars—are among the most active of the groups attributed to it in translation and mosque-building in the diaspora.

Indeed the phenomenon is wider than the religions: the modern age has witnessed an irreligious "mission" with explicit tools—from Comte's "Religion of Humanity" with its temples and rites, to the propaganda League of Militant Atheists in the Soviet Union, to the campaigns of the New Atheism (and the famous bus posters in London: "There's probably no God. Now stop worrying and enjoy your life.") and the humanist associations and the organizations of "recovering from religion." The instinct to spread what one regards as a

saving truth is **human, and crosses the camps**—an observation that serves our chapter on the explanations of religiosity from an unexpected angle.

---

* Ninth: The Comparative Analysis—What Makes One Religion Missionary and Another Closed?

We now gather the threads of the tour into equations by which the seeker can examine any religion they meet.

1. The equation of theology first. The missionary drive intensifies with the conjunction of three elements: **the universality of the message** (addressed to all human beings) **+ the exclusivity, or at least the preponderance, of salvation** (the other's fate depends—wholly or partly—on entering) **+ the existence of a founding command to spread** (the Great Commission, the verses of the call, the Buddha's charge). If one element drops out, the drive cools: Judaism dropped universality (a people's message) and the exclusivity of salvation (the laws of Noah for the nations), so its mission fell away. Hindu pluralism dropped exclusivity, so its traditional drive weakened. The religions of the land dropped the concept of membership itself, so the question could not arise. **This equation is more useful to the seeker than hasty value judgments:** a preacher's zeal is neither a fault nor a virtue in itself—it is a logical corollary of his belief about your fate. Someone who believed that hellfire awaited you and yet did not care to call you would be the stranger case.

2. The equation of society second. Openness and closure are also functions of security and size: the large, secure religions open, and the minorities that survived persecution close as a shield for survival (the Druze, the Parsis, the Yazidis, and the Jews of the diaspora after centuries of prohibition and pursuit). So not every closure is an original creed, and not every openness is pure tolerance.

3. The means of spread across history—we arrange them from the gentlest to the roughest, and we affirm that every great universal religion has used many colors from this palette in different ages: **example and attraction** (the martyrs of early Christianity, the ethics of the Muslim traders in the Malay world, the serenity of the monks); **argument and debate** (the councils of religions from the Mongol court to the Parliament in Chicago); **trade and its routes** (the Silk Road for Buddhism and Manichaeism, the Indian Ocean for Islam); **Sufism and spirituality** (the Sufi orders in Africa and Asia, the gurus in the West); **marriage and kinship; serving institutions** (the mission's school and hospital, the Muslims' *waqf* endowment, the Sikh guesthouse); **the patron state** (Constantine, Ashoka, and the kings of conversion from above). **Outright coercion** at the bottom of the palette (Charlemagne's sword among the Saxons, Hyrcanus's forced conversion of the Edomites, the cases of coercion in Islamic and Christian histories, and the Inquisition's treatment of new converts)—**while recording the fair-minded paradox:** the founding texts of the great missionary religions themselves forbid coercion or lack any command to it ("There is no

compulsion in religion"; the Gospels' call by preaching, not by the sword; and Ashoka's prohibition in his inscriptions of zeal for one's own religion and of disparaging the religions of others), so the distance between text and history in this subject—as in others—is filled by human beings and their powers, and we resolved in the book's charter to distinguish the two always.

4. The rule "people follow the religion of their kings." The widest conversions in religious history were not individuals persuaded one by one but **nations following their head**: Vladimir baptizing all of Kievan Rus; the kings of the steppe choosing religions for the Turks and Mongols. The princes of Europe after the Reformation deciding the confession of their subjects by a declared rule ("whose the rule, his the religion"). We devoted a study to this phenomenon of mass conversion—and to its troubling methodological question: what remains of "religious choice" if most human beings inherited the results of kings' decisions?—in the chapter on biases, and it is among the most important things the seeker must keep in mind while reading the maps of "numbers of followers."

* Tenth: The Ethics of Preaching Today—The Right to Spread and Its Limits

The tour ends at a living contemporary arena of engagement, in whose heart the seeker stands. The international covenants (Article 18 of the Universal Declaration) make freedom of religion the freedom to **manifest and teach** it and to change it—so that peaceful preaching, and responding to it, is a right protected in theory. But reality is a survey of tensions: states with Muslim majorities restrict or ban non-Islamic mission and criminalize apostasy (on the grounds of protecting public order and identity, and on the authority of the inherited juristic ruling). Numerous Indian states have enacted "anti-conversion laws" pursuing Christianization and Islamization on the pretext of preventing "conversion by inducement or coercion" (and their critics complain of their use to harass minorities); Russia and others restrict "the activity of non-traditional groups"; while relief circles accuse some mission of tying aid to listening or converting (what the critical literature calls "rice Christians"). The accused reply that their service is unconditional and that the suspicion is a generalization.

Our book will not settle this engagement, but it offers—in keeping with its method—**the rules on which the great traditions themselves nearly agree by text,** however unevenly they have honored them in history: that preaching is an offer, not compulsion. That exploiting the need of the hungry, the sick, and the child to extract a religion is a betrayal of the very religion

being offered. That recounting another's belief other than as its people state it is cheating in debate (and we made "Know a belief from its own people" a rule among the seeker's tools). That the preacher's right to present is matched by the invited person's right to refuse without penalty—and this last is the bridge to the chapter on accepting the other, where we spoke in detail of freedom of belief, in and out.

And one method deserves to be named, because it crosses the whole map. Contemporary mass preaching often argues from **the addressee's own scripture**: the Muslim preacher gathers verses from the Upanishads and the Brahma Sutra, from Deuteronomy and Isaiah, and from the Gospel of Mark, to show that these books teach the oneness of God, and concludes that the community departed from its own text; the Christian preacher gathers the verses of the Qur'an about Jesus—his birth from a virgin, his raising of the dead by God's leave, his word and spirit—and builds on them. And the same operation is performed in other directions. Its **strongest form** is that it addresses a person from inside the authority he already accepts, and that it is often reading something genuinely present: these texts do contain passages pulling toward oneness, and a tradition's own reformers have appealed to them.

And its limits are three, and they follow from rules already in your hands. First, a verse read outside its tradition's layer of authoritative interpretation is not that tradition's doctrine, but a reading offered to it from outside—and the three layers were distinguished in Chapter 15 precisely so that the founding

text would not be confused with what the community understands by it. Second, the tradition's own commentators may read the same passage otherwise, and a comparison that does not present their reading is describing a belief other than as its people state it. Third, and decisive: **the same method, turned around, is rejected by the one who used it**—for whoever refuses to have his own book interpreted by an outsider against his scholars owes the same refusal to others. So the method is legitimate as an invitation to reread, and it does not by itself establish that a tradition's doctrine is other than its people say it is.

---

* Conclusion: What Does the Seeker Do with This Map?

The seeker leaves this chapter with indispensable tools, because—by their position—they are **the audience of all the missions**:

First: to understand the **logic** of whoever calls them, so as not to be surprised by his zeal, nor wounded by it, nor deceived by it: zeal is the corollary of a belief about your fate, not evidence of its truth. For if zeal were evidence, all the missionary religions would be equal, since all of them are zealous. Second: to know that **the silence of the non-missionary religions is not weakness of argument**, just as the striving of the missionary ones is not strength of argument: some religions do not call you because they do not believe your salvation depends on entering (Orthodox Judaism even instructs its rabbis to begin by *discouraging* the sincere applicant—

its conversion manuals open by turning the candidate away and only then unfold years of study; among our sources an American *gerus* guide documenting the custom: the facing shelf, in one library, to the da'wah tract translated into every tongue), and some closed their doors to save their community. Arguments are measured in evidence, not by the number of those who knock. Third: to read **the numbers of followers and the maps of spread** with the eye of a critic who knows that behind them lie centuries of trade, states, kings, coercion, and example together, so as never to make "the religion with the most followers" or "the fastest growing" a proof (we examined "the argument from spread" among the religions' own arguments for themselves). Fourth—the finest of them: to distinguish, while listening, between **the call and the evidence**: the preacher's function is to attract, and his tools are emotion, story, and promise, which is legitimate in its place. But the examining seeker asks for the proof behind all that, and sets what they hear on the scales of the chapter "By What Standard Do We Compare?"

And the chapter's open question remains, which we hand to the reader from both its faces: which of the two positions shows more confidence of its holders in the truth they possess—the striving of those who strive to convey it to everyone, even if people dislike it, or the self-sufficiency of those who forgo multiplying followers, content that the truth is the truth even if its people are few? The reader may notice that each position can be read as confidence and can be read as anxiety—and that is exactly why neither of them serves as evidence.

> ***Cross-references for the chapter:*** *freedom of belief, apostasy, and their legal map in Chapter 26; the study on mass religious conversion in Chapter 5; and the argument from mass transmission and spread among the religions' own arguments in Chapter 19.*

* Study 11.1: Why Do Religions Spread, Endure, and Divide?—Three Social Paths

Spread (nine factors), survival (seven conditions and four causes of death), and division (seven laws and a table)—by one standard for all the religions, and then what this proves and what it does not

Summary of the study: One religion sweeps across continents while another stays confined to the people it was born among; one endures for centuries while another fades within a generation. Three social paths—not metaphysical laws—explain how religions spread, endure, and split, entirely apart from the question of whether any of them is true.

---

* Opening: Three Questions That Must Be Kept Apart

Popular argument confuses three social questions with one theological question: "Why did my religion spread?" is answered "Because it is true," and "Why did my opponent's religion split?" is answered "Because it is false." Both contradict the facts: religions have spread and then died (Manichaeism), religions have survived without spreading (Judaism), and nearly **all** the great religions have split. The three questions are questions of **the sociology of religions**, and they have laws that hold almost uniformly across the faiths. The seeker who knows them is fortified against two of the widest fallacies: **the argument from spread** ("our numbers are a

witness") **and the argument from division** ("their disunity is a witness"), both of which we have weighed in their places.

* First: Why Does One Religion Spread More than Another?—Nine Factors

(1) Missionary structure. The first and greatest of the differences—you saw it in Chapter 11: a religion that regards its message as meant for humankind and pursues them spreads. A religion that regards itself as a people's own does not leave them (Judaism, Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Shinto).

(2) Simplicity of entry. The lower the price of belonging, the wider the spread: two testimonies without priesthood (Islam), baptism without ritual law after the Council of Jerusalem (Christianity)—as against religions that require birth or caste.

(3) The political incubator. "The religion of the kings is the religion of the subjects"—Constantine, Ashoka, the conquests, and the patronage of the khans—the sword opens the land and the state prepares the climate (we weighed its limits in the study on wars: sovereignty, not coercion).

(4) Trade routes. Buddhism spread along the Silk Road, Islam along the routes of the Indian Ocean and the Sahara without an army, Christianity along the roads of Rome—religion travels with the goods.

(5) Language and translation—two opposite models. Christianity **translates** its book into every tongue from the start (Syriac, Coptic, Latin, Gothic . . .) and so takes

root quickly. Islam **does not translate** its Qur'an for worship, so it roots **Arabic** along with the religion and makes the language a bond above nationalities—and both models succeeded in their own way.

(6) Demography. Quantitative studies (Rodney Stark in *The Rise of Christianity*) showed that a quiet growth of about 40% per decade is enough to turn a religion of a few thousand into a majority within three centuries—with no miracle of mass conversion.

That higher fertility and the refusal of abortion and female infanticide gave the early Christians a demographic edge. **And Islam today is the fastest-growing religion by fertility, not by conversion** (according to the Pew Research Center's projections).

(7) Social networks. Conversion runs through relationships, not arguments (Stark again: one adopts the religion of those one loves)—which is why religions spread through family, professional, and migrant networks.

(8) Crises and epidemics. In the Antonine and Cyprian plagues (second and third centuries CE) the pagans fled while the Christians stayed to nurse their sick and the sick of others—so more of them survived and they won the survivors, and Stark attributes part of their rise to "the ethics of care" in catastrophe.

(9) The vacuum. Religions enter where an order collapses: Buddhism in China after the fall of the Han, Islam in an Iran and a Byzantium exhausted by their wars, and Protestantism where the emperor was weak.

And the conclusion that runs against the slogan: none of the nine factors concerns the **truth** of a religion—spread is the fruit of structure, incubator, routes, fertility, and networks, and contradictory religions have spread by the same factors.

* Second: Why Does One Religion Survive Longer than Another?—The Conditions of Survival and the Causes of Death

Seven conditions of survival.

(1) A preserved text and a carrying institution. A religion that loses its text or its bearers dissolves (most of the Avesta was lost, and its religion receded).

(2) Daily walls. Rites lived every day (prayer, food, Sabbath, dress) that announce identity and prevent dissolution—the secret of Judaism's survival for two thousand years without a state, and of the Sikhs and Parsis as minorities that do not dissolve.

(3) The capacity to adapt. Buddhism "put on the dress of every culture," and Hinduism absorbs what it cannot repel—and the religion that will not bend breaks.

(4) Decentralization, or a robust centralization—both survive, and the middle perishes. Islam, with no church, does not collapse with the collapse of a capital (Baghdad in 1258 did not end it). Catholicism, with a robust center, survived every earthquake. But Manichaeism, with a fragile central institution, was annihilated when its leaders were annihilated.

(5) Independence from the state. The religion that *is* the state dies with its death (the religions of Egypt and Mesopotamia, Zoroastrianism after the Sasanians)—and the religion that lives in society survives the fall of states.

(6) Fertility and endogamy. Communities that reproduce and marry within themselves survive (the Amish and the Haredim are two models today).

(7) Interpretive plasticity. A text open to wide interpretation lives in every age, because every age finds itself in it—and the narrow text dies with the death of its age.

And four causes of death (all of which came together in Manichaeism, Mithraism, and Catharism): an enemy monopolizing power and intent on extermination + the absence of a preserved text or a surviving institution + the absence of a land to which survivors could migrate + the absence of the daily walls that preserve identity in exile. Seldom has a religion died that had a land of migration (the Zoroastrians to India, the Jews everywhere).

* Third: Why Does a Single Religion Split?—Seven Laws

The first law—the first split is usually over power, not doctrine. Who succeeds the founder?—Islam (the imamate: the Saqifa, then Siffin, then Karbala); Buddhism (the Second Council, a century after the Buddha, over monastic rules and authority); Sikhism (the succession of the Guru); the Mormons (after Smith); the Baha'is (after Baha'u'llah). Then **doctrine is**

formulated after the alignment, to justify it: the question of the imamate became a foundation of religion after having been a dispute over succession, and it is entrenched by memory and blood (Karbala), by rite, and by marriage, until it becomes an independent identity.

The second law—every text open to wide interpretation divides its readers. Razi's rule, which you know (what agrees with my school is clear), works in every house—so Muslims differed over the attributes, predestination, and the Qur'an; Christians over the nature of Christ and the Trinity; Buddhists over the self and salvation.

The third law—centralization prevents fission at the cost of rigidity, and decentralization liberates and splits. Catholicism, with its center, stayed one for centuries. Protestantism, with no center, became thousands of denominations (counted in the tens of thousands, depending on the definition of a denomination—a contested figure). Sunni Islam, with no church, multiplied into juristic schools that coexisted and split in doctrine where there was no referee.

The fourth law—politics and ethnicity wear the clothes of doctrine. The Great Schism (1054) was Rome against Constantinople before it was the "procession" and the unleavened bread; the Council of Chalcedon (451) split Christianity between the Greek-Latin world and the Syriacs, Copts, and Armenians—a linguistic-cultural split as much as a theological one. The

Umayyads and the Alids were two clans before they were two schools.

The fifth law—every reform breeds a sect. The reformer wants to purify the house and walks out of its door into a new house: Luther, Wahhabism, the Ahmadiyya, the Arya Samaj, and Mahayana itself (a reform that opened salvation to all and became an independent path).

The sixth law—charisma and messianism. Every claimant leaves a branch behind even when he fails (the Baha'is out of the Shia, the Ahmadiyya out of the Sunnis, the Mormons out of Protestantism, and Shabbetai as a hidden Jewish aftereffect). The half-open door (the Messiah, the Mahdi) is the most fertile door of fission, as you saw in Chapter 13.

The seventh law—fission does not stop. Every sect splits in turn by the same laws: the Shia into Zaydis, Ismailis, and Twelvers, and then the Ismailis split. The Protestants into Lutherans and Reformed and then into the uncountable; Buddhism into eighteen early schools, then two vehicles, then schools without number.

And the religions know this about themselves: the hadith "my community will split into seventy-three sects" among Muslims, "the eighteen schools" in Buddhism's memory, and Paul's complaint of "factions" in Corinth twenty years after Christ.

The Table: The First Split in Six Religions — By One Standard

Religion	The first split	Its time after the founder	Its immediate cause	How it was entrenched	The major branches today
Judaism	Pharisees / Sadducees / Essenes; and the Samaritans before them	Centuries	Priestly authority, the Temple, and the oral law	The fall of the Temple ended the rivals and the Pharisees remained	Orthodox / Conservative / Reform (modern)
Christianity	Jewish-Christian / Gentile; then Arianism; then Chalcedon (451)	Decades; then three centuries	The law; then the nature of Christ (and the emperors' politics)	The councils and the emperor	Catholic / Orthodox / Protestant / Eastern churches
Islam	The caliphate (the Saqifa, then Siffin, then Karbala)	Years to decades	Power and blood	Karbala as memory; the theory of the	Sunni / Shia / Ibadi (with

Religion	The first split	Its time after the founder	Its immediate cause	How it was entrenched	The major branches today
				imamate as doctrine	schools within each)
Buddhism	The Second Council: monastic rules	About a century	Discipline and authority within the sangha	The multiplicity of canons and schools	Theravada / Mahayana / Vajrayana
Hinduism	No central split—schools and sects from the origin (Shaiva / Vaishnava / Shakta)	—	Plurality as structure, not schism	No center to split	Coexisting schools
Sikhism	Disputes over the succession of the Guru (the Minas and others), then Khalsa / non-Khalsa	Decades	Succession and power	The Book as the final Guru (settling the succession)	Small branches around one community

* The Scale on the Ladder—And the Study's Question

The two common claims: "The spread of my religion is proof of its truth" and "the division of their religion is proof of its falsehood." **The strongest case** for the first: the survival of a religion for centuries in the face of its opponents is a clue to inner strength. For the second: a religion from God is supposed to unite, not to divide. **The strongest objection:** the nine factors of spread and the seven of survival have nothing to do with truth, and the seven laws of division have struck **all** the religions and so distinguish no truth from falsehood—and if division were proof of falsehood, every religion would be false. **The strongest reply:** the believer may say that the survival of his **text**, preserved amid the division, is the evidence, not the survival of the community—so the matter returns to the text and the evidence, not to sociology. **What is established:** that spread, survival, and division are social phenomena with shared laws. That the first split was political in nearly all the religions; and that internal diversity accompanies every living religion. **What is not established:** that any of the three says anything about the truth of the claim—that is the field of Chapter 19. **And the Seeker's Question:** if a religion that never split has never existed—**is division a disease that afflicts religions, or a mechanism of survival by which they breathe?** Biology says that a species that does not diversify goes extinct, and the believer says that the saved sect is one. Between the two sayings stands a seeker who asks: which sect do I

choose—or is choosing among sects even a question that comes before choosing among religions?

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the patterns of preaching and spread and the rule of "the religion of the kings" in the body of Chapter 11; the sword and the recession of religions in its five patterns in the study on wars; and the argument from spread and mass transmission on its scale in Chapter 19.*

⁎ A Chapter Completing Part III: What Have the Religions Said About One Another?

The mutual theological verdicts across the faiths: how each religion classified the others, what the major patterns are, and what the seeker is to do with the opposing testimonies of opponents

---

⁎ Opening: The Seeker Between Opposing Courts

We learned in the chapter on preaching how the religions **present** themselves to people; this chapter asks the complementary question: how do they see **one another?** For the seeker does not only hear every religion praising itself. They hear it putting its neighbors on trial: this one calls that one's God a devil, that one calls this one's prophet a liar, and a third gathers them both into its own story as "two preparatory stages" leading to itself. These mutual verdicts are not passing insults; they are **complete theological apparatuses** in every faith, with their texts, their jurisprudence, and their history. Knowing them benefits the seeker in three ways:

they understand by them the structure of each religion from a new angle (what you say about others reveals yourself). They are fortified by them against learning a religion from the mouth of its opponent. And they see by them, with their own eyes, the phenomenon of "conflicting testimonies," which they will need to weigh in evidence.

And our declared method: we present each tradition's **normative** position as its texts and scholars state it, distinguishing—as is this book's habit—among the founding text, official theology, contested opinions, and popular discourse. Distinguishing between the **theological** verdict on another's belief (our subject here) and the **civil** verdict on their rights (whose place is the chapter on accepting the other)—for a single tradition may combine a harsh theological verdict with a generous civil coexistence, and the reverse.

* First: Judaism on Others—The Nations Have Their Path, and We Have Our Yoke

The Jewish apparatus for classifying the other is built on the Israel / the nations duality we met in the chapter on preaching: ancient paganism, for it, is "the worship of stars and constellations," a pure error which the Torah fought without mercy in its own land. While the nations in general have—as we saw—the road of the laws of Noah, and the righteous among them are saved without conversion.

As for the two positions that most concern our reader—toward Christianity and Islam—they hold paradoxes worth reflecting on. Christianity, for rabbinic

Judaism, is a messianic claim **whose conditions were not fulfilled**: the awaited Messiah is a Davidic king who gathers the exiles, rebuilds the Temple, and brings universal peace—and none of that happened in the time of Jesus, so by its standard he is not the Messiah. The doctrine of God's incarnation and of the Trinity is, for it, a breach of monotheism (some of its medieval jurists went further and said: for non-Jews it is "associating another name with God"—a degree short of pure idolatry, permissible to the nations and impermissible to Israel). Islam, on the other hand, its great authorities—Maimonides at their head, who lived under its protection—judged to be **a pure monotheism without blemish**: it is among the paradoxes of this subject that the greatest of Jewish jurists validates the monotheism of Islam and impugns the monotheism of Christianity—while rejecting the prophethood of Muhammad because the law of Moses, for him, is final and cannot be abrogated. Then Maimonides gathers the two positions into a view of astonishing breadth: that Christianity and Islam. For all their error in his eyes—are **two instruments in God's plan**: they spread the knowledge of the Torah, the expectation of the Messiah, and the names of revelation to the ends of the earth, as a preparation for the coming of the true Messiah. This is a pattern we will see recurring, inverted: **the tradition grants its rival a role inside its own story.**

* Second: Christianity on Others—The Root and the Olive Tree, and Heresy Number One Hundred

Christianity inherited its apparatus from its unique historical position: it was born **from** Judaism and **before** Islam, so it judged the first with the verdict of an heir and the second with the verdict of a predecessor.

On Judaism. The founding text is double in tone: Paul pictures the nations as a wild olive branch **grafted into the true olive tree of Israel**—"it is not you that support the root, but the root that supports you" (Romans 11:18). Affirms that God has not rejected His people. But the current that prevailed for centuries went to "replacement theology": the Church is "the new Israel," which inherited the covenant, and Judaism remained an empty husk after rejecting its Messiah. On the collective charge of "killing Christ" was built a dark history of isolation and persecution whose evidence we detailed in the study on the history of accepting the other.

Then came the great revision: the declaration *Nostra Aetate* ("In Our Time," 1965), in which the Catholic Church officially denied the collective responsibility of the Jews for the crucifixion, condemned antisemitism, and affirmed that God's gifts and calling "are irrevocable"—a historic theological turn with which major churches today advance toward a "two-covenant theology" in place of replacement.

On the pagan religions. The same double tone from the start: Paul writes that the sacrifices of the pagans are "to demons"—so the gods of the nations, on this line, are demonic powers, not innocent illusions (and

much of historical mission walked this line in demolishing temples)—while early Fathers (Justin at their head) opened a counter-line: that "the seeds of the Word" (the Logos) are scattered among all the nations, so the sages of Greece who lived by reason were "Christians before Christ" in a sense. These two lines (demonizing the other / the seeds of truth in him) contend for Christian theology of religions to this day.

On Islam. Among the oldest Christian theological descriptions of Islam is what John of Damascus wrote (he had served in the Umayyad administration in Damascus), classifying it in his book on heresies as **a schismatic Christian heresy**—not a new religion—numbered one hundred. Medieval polemic proceeded to classify Muhammad as "a false prophet" and filled popular literature with distorted images (Dante placed him in his Inferno)—the image against which our standing lesson warns: do not learn a religion from its opponent. **Then the modern revision:** *Nostra Aetate* itself stated that the Church regards "with esteem" the Muslims, who "adore the one God, living and subsisting . . . they revere Jesus as a prophet and honor Mary, His virgin Mother"—without recognition of the prophethood of Muhammad, and there the official line stops: esteem for monotheism and the shared values, and reservation about the prophethood and the revelation—while the individual opinions of theologians range wider and narrower than that.

* Third: Islam on Others—A Detailed Classifying Apparatus, and the Debates Around It

Islam has a detailed Qur'anic apparatus for classifying the faiths, and its distinctive key is a doctrine it formulates in its own way: that **Islam is not a new religion but the one religion with which God sent all the prophets**—Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus are "Muslims" in the language of the Qur'an, and the existing scriptural religions are versions of that single origin which distortion and excess have affected. On this foundation the verdicts are distributed:

The People of the Book (Jews and Christians). A discourse of composite tones which the scholar gathers from its verses: **confirmation of the origin** ("we make no distinction between any of His messengers"; the Torah and the Gospel contain "guidance and light" in their original revelation), **and criticism of what supervened**: the distortion of words from their places (a charge whose analysts drew a working taxonomy—alteration of wording, by addition, omission, or substitution, and alteration of meaning, by interpretation—which the nineteenth century's great polemic, *Izhar al-Haqq*, turned into an enumerated case file; while the text-people's scholars answer that what the manuscripts actually document are the ordinary accidents of transmission, not a directed campaign—and the file is weighed in Chapter 16); the Christians' doctrine of the Trinity and the sonship of Christ ("Those people who say that God is the third of three are defying [the truth]"). What was attributed to a group of Jews, the

saying "Ezra is the son of God". **And a constant internal distinction** that forbids generalization: "But they are not all alike. There are some among the People of the Book who are upright", "you are sure to find that the closest in affection towards the believers are those who say, 'We are Christians'". **And the rule of debate**: "argue only in the best way with the People of the Book", and the call to "a statement that is common to us all." So it is not a single verdict but **a system**: brothers by prophetic lineage who lost the road midway—and who nonetheless hold in the law the standing of "the People of the Book," with its special rulings (the permissibility of their food, marriage to their women, and the contract of protection).

And beyond the People of the Book. The Qur'an mentions "the Sabians" and "the Magians" among the faiths between whom "God will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection". Practical jurisprudence attached the Magians to the People of the Book in the contract of protection ("treat them as you treat the People of the Book"). The jurists of distant provinces extended a similar breadth to the Hindus of Sind and others—an applied flexibility that widened the umbrella as the geography widened. As for **shirk**, it is on the Qur'anic scale the gravest doctrinal sin, unforgiven for whoever dies in it—with two doors that the tradition itself opens to mercy in judging persons (not creeds): the study on "the people of the interval" and those whom the call did not reach in a sound form ("nor do We punish until We have sent a messenger"), in which there is a well-known breadth of opinions. The rule that judging a belief is one

thing and the fate of a particular individual with God is another. **Then the theologians built** on all of this the science of "religions and sects"—among the most mature traditions of the medieval world in describing religions, as passed in the plan of Chapter 7—with its classificatory ladders (People of the Book, then those with a semblance of a Book, then the people of whims and sects).

* Fourth: The Religions of India and Iran—Cunning Absorption and Mutual Devils

In the East there are other patterns, complete in their significance.

Hinduism on Buddhism. Hinduism met the Buddha's departure from the Vedas with the gentlest weapon in theological history: **swallowing**—the texts of the Puranas declared that the Buddha himself was **the ninth incarnation of the god Vishnu**! Yet inside this honor lies a stab: in the most famous versions Vishnu became incarnate as the Buddha **to mislead the wicked and the demons** by teaching them to deny the Vedas, so that they would perish—a containment that turns the founder of the rival religion into an instrument in the container's story, indeed into a divine trap (and a modern Hinduism reads it in a positive, reconciling way: the Buddha is a teacher of compassion, one of our gods).

And Buddhism on Hinduism reversed the roles with precision: it did not deny the gods of India—the Pali texts bring Brahma and Indra on stage in scenes where they revere the Buddha. But it **stripped them of**

what makes them gods in the sense of refuge: mortal beings inside the wheel of existence, better off and longer-lived, but holding no salvation for their worshiper. While the Vedas' supposed revelation was, for it, like the speech of a blind man leading the blind, its blood sacrifices a futile cruelty, and the caste pride of the Brahmins a pride of lineage with no merit in it—so Buddhism "respects" its opponent's gods and impoverishes them, just as Hinduism "honors" the Buddha and empties him.

And between India and Iran a linguistic paradox sums up the whole subject: the two Aryan neighbors inherited one vocabulary of holiness with two opposite faces: *deva* in India are gods to be worshiped, and *daeva* in the Zoroastrianism of Iran are **devils to be fought**. *Asura* in India became the race of enemies, and *ahura* in Iran the title of the supreme God (Ahura Mazda)! That is, each neighbor put the sanctities of the other into the box of its devils, and fixed that at the heart of its language. Whoever wants a stone-carved witness that "one people's god is another's devil" is a phenomenon older than the Abrahamic controversy, let them read this double lexicon.

And in China and Japan ran the syncretic pattern we know: sometimes sharp disputes (the debates of Buddhists and Taoists at the courts, and the Taoists' legend that Laozi traveled west "and converted the barbarians"—that is, that the Buddha was his pupil: a counter-absorption!), and then formulas of ingenious fusion: the jurists of medieval Japan ruled that the **kami** (the spirits of Shinto) are "local manifestations" of the Buddhas.

So the two religions embraced in a single shrine for a thousand years, until the forced separation between them came as a modern decision of the state (the Meiji reform)—a witness that fusion and separation alike may be the work of power.

* Fifth: The Five Patterns—The Rules of the Game Across Most of the Faiths

We now raise our head from the cases to the structure and find that the religions' mutual verdicts—for all their distance—run on **five** major patterns:

1. Demonization. The other's God is an actual power of evil—Zoroaster's *daevas*, the nations' sacrifices "to demons" in Paul, and popular readings in every faith of the gods of others. The harshest of the patterns, because it does not merely find the other in error but enlists him in the camp of darkness.

2. Absorption. The other is a partial truth inside our story—the Buddha as Vishnu's incarnation, the *kami* as manifestations of Buddhas, the sages of Greece sown by the seeds of the Logos, everyone's prophets as Muslims, Christianity and Islam as preparers for the Messiah in Maimonides, and Laozi as the Buddha's teacher for the Taoists. The gentlest of the patterns on the surface—and the most preemptive beneath: it honors the other on condition that he cease to be himself and become a chapter in someone else's book. That is why the people of every religion reject it when it is practiced on them, and practice it on others.

3. Progression and replacement. The other is a correct stage **whose validity has expired**: Judaism is an "old covenant" completed by Christianity. The two scriptural religions together are messages abrogated by the final message. And all the religions, for the Baha'is, are links in "progressive revelation," the newest of which is their Bab. The reader will notice **the strict rule** on which this pattern runs: **the later swallows and the earlier spits out**—every religion gladly accepts being the seal of what came before it, and absolutely refuses to be the prelude to what comes after it: Christianity accepts inheriting Judaism and refuses to be inherited by Islam. Islam accepts sealing the People of the Book and refuses the Baha'i claim upon it—and so on upward. This rule alone explains half the quarrels of the religions to the seeker.

4. Distortion. The other's origin is from us and is sound, and his present is altered—the center of the Islamic apparatus toward the People of the Book, with inverted counterparts (the Samaritans hold that the Jews' Torah is the altered one, and early Christian sects accused their opponents of forging the texts). Its methodological merit is that it turns the disagreement from a radical "truth and falsehood" into **a documentary dispute that can be examined**—which is why our chapter on "how the texts reached us" (Chapter 16) is this pattern's natural arena.

5. Ignoring. Finally, the religions of community and land we met in the chapter on preaching: they do not classify the other at all, because their apparatus has no box for him—every people's religion is its own affair.

This is not so much a theoretical tolerance as a structure to which the question never occurs.

And a rule that gathers the patterns: every tradition measures the others **by its own ruler**—Judaism tries Jesus by the conditions of its Messiah, Christianity tries Muhammad by the criteria of its covenant, Islam tries the creeds by its monotheism, and Buddhism tries the gods by its salvation. There is no fault in this peculiar to anyone—from where does a person judge except from where he stands?—but it alerts the seeker that what one religion says about another is **the testimony of an opponent by the witness's own standards**, to be understood in its context and never taken as a neutral description.

* Sixth: A Contemporary Caution—"Abrahamic" As a Description, and "The Abrahamic Religion" As a Program

This book has used the word "Abrahamic" repeatedly, and the seeker should distinguish two meanings that meet in the word and part in reality. **The first is descriptive:** a classification that gathers Judaism, Christianity, and Islam into one family because they share descent from Abraham, and a monotheism, a prophethood, a book, a law, and a judgment—a meaning no one objects to, because it describes and does not merge. **The second is a program:** a proposal that spread in recent decades and goes beyond description, saying that the three religions—because they share an origin—can be gathered under a single umbrella of faith that highlights what they share and softens what divides them, so that some discourse has even called it "the Abrahamic religion."

Its supporters say: the three religions fight in the name of one God and one father, so reminding them of their root is the widest bridge to peace, and focusing on the shared ethics is better than sinking into a doctrinal dispute centuries old. **The objectors reply—from inside all three houses:** that each of the three is a complete system that does not admit dismemberment. That what divides them is not a detail but their core: a Trinity faced by a monotheism that denies it, a final prophethood faced by its denial, a chosen people faced by the universality of the message. That a religion manufactured from selected commonalities is not one of the three but a fourth religion that the people of none of them recognize. That the program—when it issues from a power rather than from conviction—is read as politics in the dress of theology. The official authorities of the three religions have nearly all agreed on rejecting merger while welcoming dialogue and coexistence—the distinction this chapter established at its outset: the harshness of doctrinal classification is one thing, and good treatment is another.

And the seeker's scale here is a rule they know from Chapter 7: **a classification is a map, not a creed.** That three religions are placed in one box on the scholars' map does not make them one religion, just as placing the Semitic languages in one family does not make their speakers understand one another. The open question this caution bequeaths: is peace among the religions possible without melting them down—or is acknowledging what divides them the truer road to respecting what they share?

* Conclusion: What Does the Seeker Do with the Testimonies of Opponents?

The seeker leaves this chapter with a specific kit. **First**, the rule "Know a belief from its own people," having now seen its glaring historical proof: the image of Islam in the polemics of the Christian Middle Ages, the image of Christianity in some of the counter-polemic, the image of the Buddha in the Puranas, and the image of the Charvakas in their opponents—all witnesses that the opponent's mirror is concave and convex. So let them read about every religion from its own books first, and then hear the criticism of its opponents afterward, aware of where those opponents stand. **Second**, to distinguish the layers in the religions' mutual verdicts: a founding text, an official theology open to revision (and *Nostra Aetate* is witness that revision really happens), and a popular polemical discourse that must not be laid on the whole tradition. **Third**, to separate the theological verdict from civil rights, as we established—the harshness of doctrinal classification does not entail harshness of treatment, and history is witness to both possibilities.

And the chapter's open question remains—among the weightiest questions of the book in Stage Two: these opposing testimonies, in which every religion denies the claim of the others and preempts it—what do they do to the scale of the search? The irreligious read them as a ready-made argument: claims that fall by mutual contradiction, each religion having undertaken to refute its siblings, so that nothing remains

but to believe them all in what they deny and disbelieve them all in what they affirm. Believers read them the opposite way: rather, the mutual denial of the claims proves that there is a serious matter being contested—those who dispute an inheritance prove by their dispute that there is an estate, and conflicting witnesses do not mean the event never happened but require examining the evidence witness by witness. You now know where this is settled: not in the crossfire of opposing courts, but in evidence—where every claimant's claim is examined **by his own evidence**, not by what his opponent says of him.

> ***Cross-references for the chapter:*** *how the religions present themselves (preaching and mission) in Chapter 11; the heritage of "religions and sects" and the genres of writing about religions in the plan of Chapter 7; and the dispute over the texts and their documentation (the arena of the "distortion" pattern) in Chapter 16.*

Part IV: Messengers and Intermediaries

Who claimed to bring a message? And how do we read the

* Chapter 12: Messengers, Prophets, and Reformers in the Memory of the Peoples

The comprehensive list across civilizations and ages (Chapter 12 + Appendix B)

> **Summary of the chapter:** Of the hundreds who claimed a message or a reform across history, whose voice reached you today, and why? A comprehensive list spanning the Abrahamic prophets and the reformers of the East, Africa, and the Americas together, on the same scale, without favoring any one at the expense of another.

---

* Opening: How to Read These Lists

In nearly every civilization, men and women arose who said to people: I have what you do not have. Some said: I have been sent by God with a message. Some said: I see what you do not see, and visions descend on me. Some claimed nothing of the kind but said: I see the corruption of my society and I will reform it by my reason and my effort. Some were believed by their followers and rejected by everyone else, and some we do not even know to have existed at all, or whether memory wove them.

This chapter places all of them on a single map—**not to make them equal**,

for equating a prophet who built a civilization with a claimant who led his followers to mass suicide would wrong history and reason together. But to enable the seeker to see the whole phenomenon and then to judge each case with its own tools (the tools of the two chapters "The Phenomenon of Claiming Prophethood" and "How Does Each Religion Argue for Itself?").

The key to the sixfold classification

Symbol	Meaning
P	Prophet / messenger: claimed to carry a message from God (or the supreme God), and is believed by a community that exists to this day
V	Recipient of revelation or visions: said that he or she receives inspiration, visions, or contact with an unseen world (by their own claim or their followers')
F	Founder of a religion or a spiritual path: created a new religious or spiritual system (whether or not they claimed revelation)
R	Reformer: sought to reform their religion or society by their own effort and thought **without** claiming prophethood or a direct commission
C	Claimant to prophethood or divine status rejected by the great traditions and by most human beings
L	Legendary or semi-legendary figure: no independent historical documentation of their existence

Five methodological rules govern all the tables:

1. **Symbols are compounded where needed** (P/F = a prophet who founded a religion), **and they change with the observer**: Jesus is "P" for Muslims, more than a prophet for Christians (the incarnate Son of God), and a human teacher for

rabbinic Judaism—and we record this where required rather than erasing it.

2. **Dating is a matter of degrees**: figures documented by contemporary external sources (Muhammad, Mani, the claimants of recent centuries). Figures whose historicity historians consider probable while the details remain obscure (the Buddha, Zoroaster, Confucius, Jesus). Figures whose only source is the later texts of their followers (the earliest prophets, before the tenth century BCE)—so the earliest dates are "according to tradition," neither affirmation nor denial.
3. **"Rejected by others" is a social description, not a verdict of ours:** every prophet who is true to his community is a "claimant" to others. The symbol "C" we reserve for those rejected by all the great traditions, or whose claim ended in documented catastrophe.
4. **The list is exploratory, not exhaustive**: the memory of the peoples is wider than any table, and what is here are the leading figures around whom the story turns.
5. **Sources:** the materials of this project (Smith, Keown, al-Sawwah, Eddy, al-Aqqad, al-Shahrastani, the Qur'an, the introduction to Exodus . . .) with known historical verifications.

Section One: The Shared Abrahamic Chain

(The prophets shared by Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—in the traditional chronological order)

Name	Time (by tradition / best estimate)	Place	Class	Role and impact
Adam	The dawn of humanity	—	P/L (the first human, and a prophet in Islam)	Father of humankind; the first to worship
Idris (Enoch)	Before the Flood	—	P/L	"Raised to a high place"; the esoteric traditions attached themselves to him (later confused with Hermes)

Name	Time (by tradition / best estimate)	Place	Class	Role and impact
Noah	Before recorded history	Mesopotamia, traditionally	P/L	The prophet of the Flood; his Mesopotamian counterpart is Ziusudra / Utnapishtim (L)
Hud	Remote antiquity	Al-Ahqaf (southern Arabia)	P (Qur'anic only)	Sent to Ad
Salih	Remote antiquity	Al-Hijr (northern Arabia)	P (Qur'anic only)	Sent to Thamud; the sign of the she-camel
Abraham	About 2000–1800 BCE, traditionally	Ur → Harran → Canaan	P	Father of the prophets; the smasher of idols; the three religions trace their descent to him
Lot	Contemporary of Abraham	Sodom (the Dead Sea)	P	Sent to the people of the abomination

Name	Time (by tradition / best estimate)	Place	Class	Role and impact
Ishmael	After him	Mecca	P	Ancestor of the Arabized Arabs; building the House with his father
Isaac and Jacob (Israel)	After him	Canaan	P	Fathers of the Children of Israel; the twelve tribes
Joseph	After him	Canaan → Egypt	P	The prophet of dreams and their interpretation; the chief minister of Egypt
Job	Unspecified	The land of Uz (Edom / Hauran?)	P	The prophet of patience; his book is among the oldest literary treatments of the problem of evil (with older Mesopotamian counterparts: *Ludlul bel*

Name	Time (by tradition / best estimate)	Place	Class	Role and impact
				nemeqi and "the Babylonian Theodicy")
Shu'ayb	Before Moses	Midian	P (Qur'anic; paired with the biblical Jethro)	The prophet of the scales and of commercial justice
Moses	Thirteenth century BCE (the most common estimate among those who date the Exodus; the historicity of the Exodus itself is disputed among	Egypt → Sinai	P/F	The one who spoke with God; the Exodus and the Torah; founder of the scriptural religion of Israel—the founding event of historical monotheism

Name	Time (by tradition / best estimate)	Place	Class	Role and impact
	historians and archaeologists)			
Aaron	His contemporary	Egypt and Sinai	P	Moses' deputy and the first priesthood of Israel (the Aaronic priesthood)
Joshua son of Nun	After him	Canaan	P (in both traditions)	Moses' successor and the entry into the land
David	About 1000 BCE	Jerusalem	P (a prophet-king)	The king-prophet; the Psalms
Solomon	About 970–931 BCE	Jerusalem	P (a prophet-king)	The First Temple; wisdom; legends attached themselves to him later
Elijah	Ninth century BCE	The northern kingdom of Israel	P	Opponent of the worship of Baal; taken up alive in the tradition

Name	Time (by tradition / best estimate)	Place	Class	Role and impact
Elisha	After him	Northern Israel	P	Elijah's heir
Jonah	Eighth century BCE	Gath-hepher; sent to Nineveh	P	The prophet of the fish; the prophet whose people **succeeded** in repenting
Dhu l-Kifl	Unspecified	Iraq, traditionally	P (Qur'anic; said to be Ezekiel)	—
Zechariah	Late first century BCE – early first century CE	Jerusalem	P	Guardian of Mary; father of John (not the Zechariah son of Berechiah of the Tanakh—a caution about similar names)
John (John the Baptist)	d. about 28–30 CE	Palestine and the Jordan	P	The Baptist; prepared the way for Jesus; killed by Herod—documented by the historian Josephus

Name	Time (by tradition / best estimate)	Place	Class	Role and impact
Jesus (Jesus Christ)	About 4 BCE – 30/33 CE	Galilee and Jerusalem	**By tradition**: P and one of the messengers of firm resolve (Islam) / the incarnate Son of God (Christianity) / a teacher (Judaism does not acknowledge his prophethood)	The clearest example of classification changing with the observer; on his person arose the largest religion on earth by numbers

Name	Time (by tradition / best estimate)	Place	Class	Role and impact
Muhammad	About 570/571–632 CE	Mecca and Medina	P/F	The Seal of the Prophets for Muslims; the Qur'an; regarded by most historians as among the best historically documented founders of the great religions (the revisionist reading has its objection; see the study in Chapter 16); came—by his own claim—**to complete and correct** the religion of the prophets before him, not with a religion cut off from theirs

Section Two: The Prophets Particular to the Tanakh

(Known to Judaism and Christianity; not named in the Qur'an—whose rule is: "and messengers whom We have not mentioned to you")

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Samuel	Eleventh century BCE	Shiloh / Ramah	P	The last of the judges; anointed Saul and David as kings
Nathan and Gad	Tenth century BCE	Jerusalem	P	The two prophets of David's court—and Nathan rebuked the king himself: prophecy as an authority above authority
Isaiah	Eighth century BCE	Jerusalem	P	Regarded as among the greatest prophets of monotheism in literary power; the "Suffering Servant" texts (Isaiah 52–53), which Christianity read as Christ—and Judaism reads as Israel the community

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Jeremiah	Seventh–sixth centuries BCE	Jerusalem	P	The weeping prophet of the destruction; opposed his people and was imprisoned
Ezekiel	Sixth century BCE	Babylon (the exile)	P/V	The visions of the chariot; the prophecy of exile
Daniel	Sixth century BCE (the time of the narrative; modern criticism dates the writing of the book to the second century BCE)	Babylon	P/V	The visions of the kingdoms; his classification as a "prophet" is disputed within Judaism itself
The twelve "minor" prophets (Hosea,	Eighth–fifth centuries BCE	Israel, Judah, and Babylon	P	Short books; Amos the shepherd who cried out for social justice in the

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah son of Berechiah, Malachi, and Jonah with them)				name of the Lord—prophecy speaking for the poor
The prophetesses: Miriam the sister of Moses, Deborah, Huldah	Thirteenth–seventh centuries BCE	Sinai and Israel	P	The biblical tradition knows **women prophets**—Deborah was also a judge and a leader

Section Three: Iran

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Zoroaster (Zarathustra)	Sharply disputed: between about 1500 and 600 BCE	Eastern Iran / Central Asia	P/F	Said—according to the late Pahlavi tradition—that Ahura Mazda spoke to him in the vision at the river; the Gathas; founded Mazdaism / Zoroastrianism, the religion of moral dualism (light and darkness), which many researchers hold influenced the Abrahamic conceptions of Satan, judgment, and the hereafter (while others object that the direction, or whether it is mere parallel, is unsettled)
Mani	216–274/277 CE	Babylon	C/F	Claimed to be "the Seal of the Prophets" and the completer of Zoroaster, the Buddha, and Christ together—among the clearest

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
		(Sasanian Iraq)		examples of a deliberately "universal, composite" religion; Manichaeism spread from Roman North Africa to China and was then annihilated by its opponents; rejected by all the great traditions; **Augustine was a Manichaean "hearer" for about nine years before his Christianity (Confessions, Books 3–5)**
Mazdak	d. about 524–528 CE	Persia	C/R	A religious-social movement (the communism of property) in the name of reforming Mazdaism; crushed late in the reign of Kavad by the design of his heir Khosrow Anushirvan

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
The Bab (Ali Muhammad Shirazi)	1819–1850 CE	Shiraz	C/F	Claimed to be the Bab, then the Qa'im; executed in Tabriz; prepared the way for the Baha'i faith
Baha'u'llah (Husayn Ali Nuri)	1817–1892 CE	Tehran → exile in Acre	V/F (for his followers: a Manifestation of God)—C for Muslims	Founded the Baha'i faith: the unity of religions and the succession of "Manifestations"; a modern world religion standing to this day

Section Four: India

(Where the category itself changes: "divine incarnation" and "the awakened one" instead of "messenger")

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
The rishis of the Vedas (the seven sages)	Second millennium BCE	Northern India	V/L	"Heard" the Vedas in an eternal hearing (*shruti*)—a concept of revelation with no personal sender in the Abrahamic sense
Yajnavalkya and the sages of the Upanishads	About the eighth–sixth centuries BCE	The Ganges plain	R/V	Moved religion from ritual to the question: what is Brahman? what is Atman?
Rama	Epic	Ayodhya	L (the seventh incarnation of	Hero of the Ramayana; the model of the virtuous king

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
			Vishnu for Hindus)	
Krishna	Epic	Mathura	L (the eighth incarnation)	Teacher of the Gita—among the most influential Indian texts: "Whenever dharma declines and the purpose of life is forgotten, I manifest myself" (Gita 4:7)—the theory of the avatar: God descends Himself instead of sending
Mahavira	Traditionally 599–527 BCE	Bihar	F	The twenty-fourth Jina; organized Jainism (before him the possibly historical Parshvanatha, eighth–ninth century BCE); claimed no message from a god—only the attainment of perfection through absolute asceticism and nonviolence

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
The Buddha (Siddhartha Gautama)	Modern estimate: d. about 400 BCE (traditionally 563–483)	Lumbini / Bihar	F	The most remarkable case of all: founded one of the greatest religions on earth **without claiming revelation from a god or the existence of a creator**—an "awakened one" who discovered the four truths by his own effort and told his followers (the Kalama discourse): do not believe me on authority; test it; so with him our question is reversed: is a complete religion possible without a heavenly message?
Adi Shankara	About 788–820 CE	Kerala → all of India	R/F of thought	Re-founded Hinduism philosophically (Advaita: non-duality) in the face of Buddhism—a reformer by pure reason
Ramanuja	Eleventh–	Tamil Nadu	R/F of thought	Qualified non-duality; the theology of love and surrender (bhakti)

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
	twelfth centuries CE			
Kabir	About 1440–1518 CE (or, by another account, 1398–1448)	Benares	R/V (a mystic poet)	A weaver who joined the critique of Hindu and Islamic ritual together—and the substance of his most famous verses: that God is neither in the Ka'ba nor on Kailash but in the heart—a bridge between the two religions, disputed by both communities to this day
Guru Nanak	1469–1539 CE	The Punjab	V/F	His biographies (the *Janamsakhis*) tell that he vanished for three days and came out saying, "There is no Hindu, there is no Muslim"—he received a summons from the one God (the True Name); founded Sikhism; nine Gurus succeeded him, sealed by

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
				making **the Book** (the Granth Sahib) the immortal Guru—a religion that sealed its prophets with a text
Dayananda Saraswati	1824–1883 CE	Gujarat	R	"Back to the Vedas"; the Arya Samaj—a Hindu reform of monotheistic tendency
Ramakrishna and his disciple Vivekananda	1836–1886 / 1863–1902 CE	Bengal	V/R	Mystical experiences in which he "tested all the religions"; Vivekananda carried Hinduism to the West (the Chicago address, 1893)
Gandhi	1869–1948 CE	Gujarat and all of India	R	The purest model of "the reformer without a claim": moved a nation by the force of spirit and nonviolence without claiming any supernatural standing—and paid with his life

Section Five: China, Japan, and Korea

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Confucius (Kong Fuzi)	551–479 BCE	The state of Lu (Shandong)	R	Among the most explicit reformers in history in disclaiming any claim: "I transmit rather than innovate" (Analects 7.1)—ethics, government, and education with no revelation and no supernatural to speak of; and yet he was later worshiped in temples! (The impulse to worship swallows even those who refused it)
Laozi	Sixth century BCE, traditionally	China	L/F	His historicity is doubted; the *Tao Te Ching* and the founding of Taoism are attributed to him; later deified in religious Taoism
Mozi	About 470–391 BCE	China	R	"Universal love" against the elitism of Confucianism; argued from the will of Heaven

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Zhuangzi	Fourth century BCE	China	F of thought	The mocking philosophical depth of Taoism
Hong Xiuquan	1814–1864 CE	Southern China	C	After feverish visions declared himself **the younger brother of Jesus Christ**, charged with exterminating the "demons" (the Manchus); led the Taiping Rebellion—among the bloodiest claims to prophethood in history: estimates of the dead range between 20 and 30 million
The kami of Shinto (Amaterasu . . .) and the legendary Japanese emperors (Jimmu . . .)	Legendary	Japan	L	Shinto is a religion **with no founder and no prophet at all**—a revealing case: religion may grow from the land and the community without a sent person

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Nakayama Miki	1798–1887 CE	Nara, Japan	V/F	A peasant woman who said that "God the Parent" had entered her; founded Tenrikyo—among the most successful of "Japan's new religions"
Choe Je-u (Su-un)	1824–1864 CE	Korea	V/F	Told of an encounter with the Lord of Heaven; founded *Donghak* ("Eastern Learning," later Cheondoism) in response to the Western advance; executed by the state
Sun Myung Moon	1920–2012 CE	Korea	C/F	Claimed that Christ commissioned him to complete his mission; founded the Unification Church (the "Moonies"); rejected by all of Christianity
Ngo Van Chieu and the founders of Cao Dai	1926 CE	Vietnam	V/F	"Revelation" through séances! They founded Caodaism: a synthesis that counts Victor Hugo among its saints—the composite religion in its most extreme form

Section Six: Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia

(Where the intermediary is a king or a sage, not a "prophet" in the later sense)

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Imhotep	About 2650 BCE	Egypt	R → later deified	Architect, sage, and physician; the Egyptians raised him centuries later to the rank of a god of medicine—the model of "the deification of the reformer"
Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV)	About 1353–1336 BCE	Thebes → Akhetaten	R/F (a royal religious revolution)	Closed the temples of the gods and imposed Aten alone—the oldest worship of "the one God" documented by inscriptions (which many researchers describe as closer to "henotheism," or a restriction of worship, than to full monotheism); he did not say "it was revealed to me" but made himself the sole intermediary; the priesthood erased him after his death and erased his name

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Hammurabi	About 1792–1750 BCE	Babylon	V (according to his inscription)	His stele depicts the god Shamash handing him the law—the most famous formula of "a law from heaven" (not the oldest: the Code of Ur-Nammu precedes it by about three centuries): the king receives, he does not invent (according to the official claim)
Adapa, and Ziusudra / Utnapishtim	Legendary	Mesopotamia	L	The sages of the Flood and of the first knowledge—the Mesopotamian counterparts of the stories of the earliest prophets

Section Seven: Greece and Rome

("Contact with supernatural powers" in its clearest institutional forms)

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Orpheus	Legendary	Thrace	L/F	"Orphism" is attributed to him: a religion of mysteries, salvation, and reincarnation that influenced Plato
Pythagoras	About 570–495 BCE	Samos → southern Italy	F (a quasi-religious brotherhood)	A mathematical sage around whom marvels were woven (it was even said he remembered his previous lives); his brotherhood was a complete philosophical religion: prohibitions, rites, and secrets
Empedocles	About 494–434 BCE	Sicily	C (by the standards of his age)	A philosopher who announced of himself: "I walk among you an immortal god, no longer mortal" (fragment 112, according to Diogenes Laertius)—the explicit claim to divinity inside philosophy!

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Socrates	470–399 BCE	Athens	R/V	Among the greatest reformers of ethics, with no book and no claim—yet he told (according to Plato's *Apology*) of a *daimonion* (an inner divine voice) that forbade him and never commanded; tried on the charge of "introducing new gods" and executed: the reformer whom his society killed as if he were a prophet
The Pythia of Delphi (the priestesses)	Centuries	Delphi	(an office, not a person): an institutional medium of revelation	"Contact with the powers" became an official post that states consulted—revelation as an institution

Apollonius of Tyana	First century CE	Cappadocia	V/C	A wandering sage to whom miracles and healings were attributed; the ancient opponents of Christianity raised him as a rival to Christ—so he became a classic comparative case: how do we rank claims of the miraculous?
Plotinus	204–270 CE	Egypt → Rome	F of thought	Neoplatonism: "the One" and emanation—a philosophical theology without prophethood that nourished the mysticism of all three religions

Section Eight: Arabia —Before Islam, and the Claimants of the Apostasy

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
The hanifs: Zayd ibn Amr ibn Nufayl, Quss ibn Sa'ida, and Waraqa ibn Nawfal	Sixth – early seventh century CE	Mecca, Najran, and across the Peninsula	R	Seekers who rejected the idols on "the religion of Abraham" with no claim of prophethood—the model of "the honest seeker" just before the mission; Zayd used to say (according to Ibn Hisham's biography): O God, if I knew the face most beloved to You, I would worship You by it
Umayya ibn Abi l-Salt	d. about 626 CE	Ta'if	R (a God-seeking poet)	Monotheistic poetry and a longing for prophethood—it was said he hoped it would be his
Musaylima (ibn Habib al-Hanafi)	d. 632/633 CE	Al-Yamama	C	The most famous claimant to prophethood in Arab memory ("Musaylima the Liar"); claimed

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
				partnership with Muhammad and composed a "Qur'an" that was mocked; killed in the wars of apostasy
Al-Aswad al-Ansi	d. 632 CE	Yemen	C	Claimed prophethood, prophesied by soothsaying, and occupied Sanaa for weeks; killed shortly before the Prophet's death
Sajah bint al-Harith	Seventh century CE	The lands of Tamim	C → repented	A claimed prophetess who led her people and then married Musaylima politically; embraced Islam after al-Yamama and lived it well
Tulayha al-Asadi	d. 642 CE	Najd	C → repented	Claimed prophethood in the apostasy, then embraced Islam, fought, and died a martyr at Nahavand—the claimant who came back: the phenomenon is not a closed door

Section Nine: The Later Islamic World — Claimants and Renewers

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Al-Mukhtar al-Thaqafi	d. 687 CE	Kufa	C (claims of revelation were attributed to him)	A political movement of vengeance in a supernatural wrapping; from it the Kaysanites descended
Al-Hallaj	858–922 CE	Persia → Baghdad	V (Sufi ecstatic utterances)—no claim of prophethood	"I am the Truth": the crisis of Sufi expression of self-annihilation; executed—and his story is a lesson in how the language of spiritual experience confounds the courts
Ibn Arabi	1165–1240 CE	Murcia → Damascus	V (by his own account: openings and glad tidings, not legislative prophethood)	"The Greatest Master"; the unity of being; among the widest of Sufi theoretical legacies—and among the most disputed

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
The Sudanese Mahdi (Muhammad Ahmad)	1844–1885 CE	Sudan	C/R (claimed the Mahdiship, not prophethood)	Unified Sudan and expelled Turco-Egyptian rule in the name of the Mahdiship; his state rose and fell—the model of "a supernatural claim as a political engine"
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad	1835–1908 CE	Qadian (the Punjab)	C/F	Claimed to be the Promised Messiah and the Mahdi, and then shades of prophethood; founded the Ahmadiyya (Qadianism); the major Islamic institutions unanimously rejected his claim—and his followers today number in the millions: a rejected claim may nonetheless make a nation

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
The renewers without a claim: Ghazali, Ibn Taymiyya, Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, al-Afghani, Muhammad Abduh, Rashid Rida, and Bediüzzaman Nursi	Eleventh–twentieth centuries CE	From Persia to Egypt and Turkey	R	The chain of "reform from within the text": each saw the religion as pure and religiosity as ailing and exerted himself—and they differed over the remedy in a way that fills libraries

Section Ten: Africa

(The continent that produced in two centuries—most probably—the largest number of independent Christian "prophets" in the world: the African Independent Churches)

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Kimpa Vita (Dona Beatriz)	1684–1706 CE	The Kingdom of Kongo	V/C	Said that Saint Anthony had entered her and that Christ was born a Kongolese; a national-religious movement; the Church and the state burned her alive
Ntsikana	About 1780–1821 CE	Xhosa country (South Africa)	V	A pagan herdsman who received visions and converted to Christ **before the missionaries reached him in its full form**; his hymns are the foundation of Xhosa Christianity
Nongqawuse	About 1841–1898 CE	Xhosa country	V (tragic)	A girl of fifteen who said the ancestors had commanded her: slaughter all the cattle and burn the grain, and the dead will rise and the colonizer

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
				will be driven out; her people believed her (1856–57) and slaughtered hundreds of thousands—and tens of thousands died of hunger (estimates about 40,000) and their nation collapsed: **among history's gravest lessons on the price of believing a claim without examination**
William Wadé Harris	About 1860–1929 CE	Liberia → Ivory Coast	V	Said that Gabriel had commissioned him; walked barefoot with a cross of reed and baptized about a hundred thousand in two years (1913–1914)—regarded as among the most successful individual missionaries in Africa; the French authorities deported him

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Simon Kimbangu	1887–1951 CE	The Belgian Congo	V/F	Began healing and preaching for a few months (1921), whereupon Belgium arrested him and imprisoned him **for thirty years until his death**; from his fame was born Kimbanguism—an independent African church with millions of followers, and the man did not found it with his own hand: prison made the prophet
Isaiah Shembe	About 1865–1935 CE	Zulu country	V/F	Visions and voices; founded the Zulu "Nazareth Church," a blending church
The traditional intermediaries (diviners, medicine-healers, and mediums of the ancestors)	Across the ages	The whole continent	The office of "contact with the powers"	In the indigenous African religions, contact with the unseen is **a permanent social office**, not the event of a single prophet—as with the shamans of Siberia

Section Eleven: The Americas— Indigenous and Modern

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Quetzalcoatl / Kukulkan	Legendary (with a possible confusion with a Toltec king)	Mexico	L	"The Feathered Serpent," the civilizing teacher who promised to return—and the Spaniards used his legend in the conquest
Deganawida "the Peacemaker" and his sage Hiawatha	About the twelfth–fifteenth centuries CE	The Great Lakes region (North America)	L/R	Founded the Iroquois League: a constitution of peace among warring nations—"a political prophecy" without a book
Handsome Lake	1735–1815 CE	The Seneca nation	V/F	After a coma, brought "the Good Message": a religious-social reform (the prohibition of alcohol) that saved his people from collapse; his religion is alive to this day

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
Tenskwa-tawa, "the Shawnee Prophet"	1775–1836 CE	The Ohio valley	V/C	Revivalist visions against the whites; his movement was broken militarily
Wovoka	About 1856–1932 CE	Nevada	V	The vision of the eclipse of 1889: "the Ghost Dance" would bring back the dead and the buffalo and make the whites depart peacefully; it spread like fire among the wounded nations—and its echo ended in the massacre at Wounded Knee, 1890: the claim of salvation at the moment of a nation's despair
Joseph Smith	1805–1844 CE	New York → Illinois	V/F	Said that an angel (Moroni) directed him to golden plates that he translated as "the Book of Mormon"; founded the Mormon church; killed by a mob (Carthage, Illinois, 1844)—and today his

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
				followers number in the millions: regarded as the most successful claim of revelation to arise in America
Ellen White	1827–1915 CE	The United States	V/F	About two thousand visions, according to her followers; the pillar of the Adventists
Mary Baker Eddy	1821–1910 CE	New England	F	"Christian Science": healing by thought—a founding without a claim of direct personal revelation
Charles Russell, then Rutherford	1852–1916 CE	Pennsylvania	R/F	The "Bible Students" movement → Jehovah's Witnesses: a founding by the interpretation of the text, not by new revelation
Jim Jones	1931–1978 CE	Indiana → Guyana	C	"The Peoples Temple"; ended in the massacre at Jonestown: more than 900 dead by poison—**the extreme warning** of this whole chapter

Name	Time	Place	Class	Role and impact
David Koresh	1959–1993 CE	Waco, Texas	C	Claimed to be "the Lamb of Revelation"; the siege ended in a fire that killed dozens of his followers
L. Ron Hubbard	1911–1986 CE	The United States	F	Scientology: a founding on a claim of "science," not revelation—the modern religion wears the dress of its age

(A caution we set among the chapter's rules and repeat here because of its gravity: listing Jones and Koresh among "claimants to prophethood" documents the phenomenon at one of its tragic extremes, and in no way equates them with the others in these tables.)

Section Twelve: A Summary Table — The Great Reformers Without a Supernatural Claim

(Those who reformed "by their effort and their thought without claiming prophethood")

Name	Time	The tradition reformed	Summary of the effort
Confucius	Sixth–fifth centuries BCE	Chinese civilization	Ethics and order without the supernatural
Socrates	Fifth century BCE	The Greek mind	Examination and questioning unto death
Shankara	Ninth century CE	Hinduism	A comprehensive philosophical revival
Ghazali	Eleventh–twelfth centuries CE	Islam	The reconciliation of law and Sufism after the journey of doubt

Name	Time	The tradition reformed	Summary of the effort
Moses Maimonides	Twelfth century CE	Judaism	*The Guide for the Perplexed*: the reconciliation of text and reason
Thomas Aquinas	Thirteenth century CE	Christianity	The reconciliation of faith and Aristotle
Martin Luther	1483–1546 CE	Western Christianity	The Protestant Reformation: "salvation by faith" and "Scripture alone"—split Europe in two without a single claim of revelation; with him Calvin and Zwingli
Guru Amar Das and the organization of the Sikhs, and Dayananda	Sixteenth and nineteenth centuries CE	Sikhism and Hinduism	Institutionalization and revival
Muhammad Abduh	1849–1905 CE	Modern Islam	"Islam is the religion of reason": the renewal of education and of the fatwa

Name	Time	The tradition reformed	Summary of the effort
Gandhi	Twentieth century CE	Hinduism and humanity	Nonviolence as a political force
Martin Luther King Jr.	1929–1968 CE	American Christianity	Civil rights through a theology of love—and assassinated like his predecessors

Notice the wounding pattern: Socrates was executed, al-Hallaj was executed, Kimbangu died a prisoner, Gandhi and King were assassinated, and Luther lived under church excommunication and the imperial ban (1521)—the reformer with no supernatural army pays very nearly the same price the prophets paid: societies do not forgive whoever touches their sanctities, whether he comes with revelation or with reason.

---

* The Chapter's Conclusion: Five Great Observations That Look out from the Tables

1. The category of "messenger" itself changes with the civilization. The Abrahamic religions say "a God who sends a human being". India says "a God who becomes incarnate Himself" (the avatar), or "a sage who hears the eternal truth" (the rishi), or "a human being who awakens by his own effort" (the Buddha); China almost dispenses with the category altogether (Confucius the transmitter, Shinto without a founder). Africa and Siberia make contact with the unseen a permanent office (the shaman, the diviner) rather than a historical event. So the more precise question is not "who are the prophets of each nation?" but "how did each nation conceive the bridge between earth and heaven?"

2. The claim does not stop. From Hammurabi to the twentieth century, no generation has passed without someone saying "I have been commissioned." The great religions closed the door officially (the Seal of the Prophets in Islam; the completeness of revelation in Christianity and Judaism). The knockers did not cease:

the Ahmadiyya, the Baha'is, the Mormons, and the Taiping are all claims **after** the closing, and some of them made nations of millions despite unanimous rejection. So the phenomenon is alive, and the tools for examining it (our next chapter) are not a historical luxury but contemporary equipment.

3. Social success is no proof of truth, and failure no proof of falsehood. Musaylima failed, and Mani succeeded for centuries and then his religion went extinct. The Mormons succeeded, and Nongqawuse destroyed her people. Tulayha claimed and then repented and ended well. The tables themselves testify: the fates of the claims were made by politics, war, and chance as much as by argument—so whoever would judge should try the claim, not its fortunes.

4. The cost of the claim is a clue to be counted—and it does not settle. Most of those in these tables paid heavy prices: driven out, imprisoned, burned, killed. Honesty with oneself requires two things at once: that laying down one's life is a clue of seriousness which rules out the cold fraud seeking gain. That the sincere holders of **contradictory** claims all laid down their lives, so that sacrifice alone cannot be the decider (the "argument from martyrdom" will be examined in the chapter on the religions' evidence).

5. Finally—notice who recurs in the tables: the shepherd (Moses, David, Amos, Ntsikana), the peasant woman (Nakayama), the weaver (Kabir), the orphan (Muhammad), and the prince fleeing his palace (the Buddha). Seldom did the claim come from the heart of the priesthood and the palace—rather from the

margins, toward the center, and usually against it. The believer reads it: thus does God choose His messengers from the weak, to teach that power is from Him. The critic reads it: thus do the crushed margins produce dreams of salvation. Here is the one datum and the two readings.

The Seeker's Question: Among these dozens who said "I was commissioned" or "I reformed"—by what tool will you distinguish those you believe from those you reject? Is it the same tool you apply to the prophet of the religion you were born into?

* Study 12.1: To Whom Were the Prophets Sent, and for What Age?—Particularity and Universality in the Messages Across the Religions

Were the prophets sent to particular peoples for limited ages, or to all people in every time and place?—Two questions in one: the question of "to whom" (a people, or humanity?) and the question of "when" (a prophethood sealed, or renewed, or continuous?)—the tour through the nations' answers, then the table, then the four patterns, then the question of those the message never reached, then the scale on the ladder

Summary of the study: Some religions confine their message to a single nation; others declare themselves for all the worlds. The divide runs deeper than is usually realized, and much follows from it—a calling that knocks on every door in one case, a closed community in the other. A map of that divide, prophet by prophet, across the religions.

---

* Opening: Two Questions That Argument Confuses

The question is usually posed as if it were one, and it is two. **The first is spatial and national:** was the prophet sent to his own people in particular, or to human beings in general? **The second is temporal:** is prophethood an event that recurs whenever the age needs it, or a door opened once and then closed, or a river that never

stops? Every religion has two independent answers: a religion may be **universal in message and sealed in prophethood** (Islam), or **national in message and sealed** (Judaism), or **universal and renewed in appearance** (the Baha'i faith, and Buddhism in its own form), or **national with no prophethood at all** (the ethnic religions). Then from the heart of the two questions comes a third that knocks at the conscience: **what of those whom no message reached?** Let us proceed in order.

* First: The Tour—How Did Each Religion Answer?

Islam—every prophet to his people, and the Seal to all people. The Qur'an establishes two complementary rules: **the universality of warning** ("every community has been sent a warner"; "communities each had their guide")—there is no nation in which a warner was not sent, even if unnamed ("to other messengers We have already mentioned to you, and also to some We have not").

And the particularity of the messages before the Seal—Noah "to his people," Hud to Ad, Salih to Thamud, Moses to the Children of Israel, in the tongue of each people ("We have never sent a messenger who did not use his own people's language"). Then **the final exception**: "We have sent you [Prophet] only to bring good news and warning to all people," and in the agreed hadith: "A prophet used to be sent to his own people in particular, and I have been sent to all people"—so in this house are joined **the universality of the last message**

and **the sealing of prophethood** after it: a door opened to all and then closed to all. Above that stands a unifying conception: **the religion is one and the laws are many**—"True Religion, in God's eyes, is islam" in its general sense (submission to God), which every prophet brought, and "We have assigned a law and a path to each of you." So the prophets are brothers by one father: their mothers differ and their religion is one. **Judaism—election is a charge, not a privilege, and the nations have their path.** The Torah is a covenant between God and Israel in particular, and the prophets are the prophets of Israel, rebuking it and bringing it good news.

But the house did not leave the nations without a path: **the seven commandments of the sons of Noah** (the prohibition of idolatry, blasphemy, murder, sexual immorality, theft, and eating a limb torn from a living animal, and establishing courts) are the law of all humanity in the rabbinic conception, and whoever among the nations keeps them "has a share in the world to come"—**a moral universality without a mission**. There stands in the Tanakh a single prophet sent to other than his people: **Jonah to Nineveh**—whose whole book is a lesson that God's mercy crosses borders, and that a prophet may flee from the universality of his message! Isaiah carries the promise of "a light to the nations," in whose reading the communities part: a spiritual preeminence by which the nations are carried to the Lord, not a mission that goes out to them.

Christianity—from the lost sheep to all the nations. The hardest case for historians: Jesus in the

Gospels says, "**I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel**" (Matthew 15:24) and commands his disciples not to go on the road of the Gentiles, and then the same Matthew ends with "**Go therefore and make disciples of all nations**." So Christian theology reads the sequence as a divine plan (Israel first, then the world), and historical critics read the shift as a redirection made by Paul and the Council of Jerusalem after Jesus. In either case it became the religion that has proclaimed universality most loudly in history, with **the completion of revelation** in Christ (no founding prophethood after him) and **the continuation of the gift** of prophecy, under examination. **Hinduism—an eternal dharma with no prophet.** No "messenger" in the Abrahamic sense; the wisdom is *sanatana* (eternal), heard by the sages (the rishis), and not attributed to any founder.

So it is **universal metaphysically** (dharma is for the whole cosmos) and **national socially** (it admits no stranger into a caste). And time is cyclical: Krishna says in the Gita, "**Whenever dharma declines and the purpose of life is forgotten, I manifest myself on earth. I am born in every age to protect the good, to destroy evil, and to reestablish dharma**"—so the manifestation (the avatar) **is renewed whenever the age needs it**: the clearest formula of renewed prophethood among the religions. **Buddhism—a dharma for all, and Buddhas for every age.**

The path is explicitly universal (caste was negated)—"Go forth, monks, for the good of the many."

Time knows **previous Buddhas** (seven in the oldest lists) and **a coming Buddha** (Maitreya) when the dharma is forgotten—so the disclosure is renewed as the need is renewed, and every Buddha discovers the same ancient path, not a new one.

Zoroastrianism—universal in its text, ethnic in its history. Zoroaster addressed human beings with the choice between truth and the lie—and then the door closed historically, until the Parsis came to accept no convert.

Manichaeism—the first declared universal finality. Mani proclaimed himself "the Seal of the Prophets," gathering Zoroaster, the Buddha, and Christ into a message for the whole world in every language—so he anticipated the formula that Islam would know in its own sense, and his religion was annihilated.

The Baha'i faith—renewed manifestation. Every age has its "Manifestation of the Cause" (Moses, the Buddha, Christ, Muhammad, the Bab, and Baha'u'llah) in a progressive revelation that is never sealed—the most explicit denial of finality among the modern religions, which is why the collision with Islam was on exactly this point.

The ethnic religions: for the people alone—it is inconceivable within them that a stranger should adopt the religion of a tribe, because the religion *is* the tribe.

Second: The Table—By One Standard

Tradition	To whom is the message?	Time: sealed / renewed / continuous	The fate of those it did not reach	The mechanism of universality
Islam	Every prophet to his people; the Seal to all people	Sealed with Muhammad (with true dreams and renewal remaining)	The people of the interval are excused (disagreement over the details of the test)	A universal call without priesthood
Judaism	Israel (a covenant) + the seven commandments for the nations	Sealed (the cessation of prophecy after Malachi)—and awaiting the Messiah	"The righteous of the nations have a share in the world to come"	No mission; a moral universality
Christianity	Israel first, then all the nations	The completion of revelation in Christ + a continuing prophetic gift under examination	Disputed: from exclusivism to "anonymous Christians" (Rahner) and universal hope	A worldwide mission

Second: The Table—By One Standard

Tradition	To whom is the message?	Time: sealed / renewed / continuous	The fate of those it did not reach	The mechanism of universality
Hinduism	The cosmos (dharma)—and the caste (socially)	Renewed: an avatar whenever dharma declines	Karma brings everyone back; no eternal perdition	No mission; absorption
Buddhism	Every sentient being	Renewed: the Buddhas of the past and Maitreya	Everyone will arrive across the rebirths	A worldwide mission
Zoroastrianism	Human beings (by the text)—the Parsis (by history)	Sealed, with awaited saviors (the Saoshyants)	—	Ethnic closure
Manichaeism	The whole world in every language	Sealed with Mani	—	A worldwide mission (annihilated)

Second: The Table — By One Standard

Tradition	To whom is the message?	Time: sealed / renewed / continuous	The fate of those it did not reach	The mechanism of universality
The Baha'i faith	Humanity	Renewed forever (the Manifestations of the Cause)	Every age has its Manifestation	A universal call
The ethnic religions	The people	No founding prophethood	Outside the conception	No universality

* Third: General Patterns—And Their Limits

(1) Universality and particularity are not two simple stages on a single ladder. Ancient religions knew gods and orders tied to a city or a people, and they also knew cosmic horizons and empires that carried their cults beyond their homelands. The notion of an "Axial Age" helps in noticing large shifts in the first millennium BCE, but it is a contested interpretive hypothesis, not a single birth date for universal religion. It is more accurate to say that the universal and the local coexisted inside one tradition and influenced each other across time.

(2) Three architectures of time may be distinguished, as approximation. The sealing of founding revelation, as in Islam; a completion of reference with differences over the continuation of gifts, as in Christianity; and a succession of manifestations, buddhas, or avatars in other traditions—with meanings that differ radically among them. Judaism, for its part, joins the cessation of classical prophecy in the rabbinic conception to a messianic expectation, and Zoroastrianism joins the mission of Zoroaster to the hope of a savior to come. These patterns are instruments of understanding, then, and not sealed boxes.

(3) A community does not necessarily regard its own particularity as a deficiency. The covenant in Judaism is a charge laid on Israel within a conception that acknowledges moral duties for the nations. And some traditions bound to a land see religious identity as a

fabric of kinship, memory, and rite rather than an opinion that can simply be transferred. Universal communities, on the other side, may understand the spreading of their message as a duty of mercy or of witness. A fair comparison describes the logic of each position before evaluating its consequences.

(4) The idea of one truth with many modes of appearance recurs—but in formulas that are not identical. The single origin of the prophets' call in Islam. "The seeds of the Word" in some Christian theology. The many names of the One in a famous reading of the Rig Veda; progressive revelation in the Baha'i faith. The resemblance is useful for comparison, but it does not abolish the differences in what is meant by God, revelation, and salvation, and it does not establish that every tradition is saying the same thing.

* Fourth: The Question That Knocks at the Conscience—What of Those Whom the Message Did Not Reach?

The gravest consequence of universality is the question of **the billions who died before the message or far from it**: what is the fate of those who lived in the Americas before Columbus, or in China before a prophet's name reached it? **Islam** answered with **"the people of the interval"**: no punishment before the message is delivered ("nor do We punish until We have sent a messenger"). Its scholars differed over the details of their fate (tested on the Day of Resurrection according to the majority, or judged by their innate disposition according to others), while agreeing on excuse for whoever

received no sound call. **Catholicism** moved in the twentieth century from "no salvation outside the Church" in its exclusive sense to Karl Rahner's conception of "**anonymous Christians**"—those who lived by their conscience and by a grace whose name they did not know. The modern councils affirmed the possibility of salvation for whoever did not know the Gospel through no fault of their own. **Judaism** was never troubled by the question, because it never claimed that salvation was confined to its covenant (the righteous of the nations have a share). **And the karmic houses** solved it by the cycle: no one perishes forever, and everyone will arrive in some birth. **And notice:** the three religions that proclaim universality most loudly (Islam, Christianity, and Buddhism) are the ones that were compelled to develop theories of "excuse"—because universality obliges its holder to answer for those its reach did not include. Which the irreligious use as an objection (a God who wants to be known, and leaves billions without news?—we weighed it in the paper on divine hiddenness) and believers answer with excuse, with the universality of warning, and with the principle that divine justice does not hold anyone to account for what never reached them.

The Scale on the Ladder — Testing the Claim of Universality

We take the Islamic claim as a test case, because it gathers three explicit elements: the sending of a messenger to every nation, a Muhammadan message to all people, and the sealing of prophethood.

The strongest case within the text is the clarity of these three elements and their consistency with one another. And history bears witness that the Muslim community understood its message as universal from its earliest period, and then carried it beyond its first homeland.

The strongest historical objection is that the prophets named in the Qur'an and the Bible are concentrated in the Near East, and that the claim of unnamed messengers cannot be tested: great civilizations—China, India, the Americas—have no known prophet in the Abrahamic sense, so either the universality of warning is an unfalsifiable claim, or the message is universal in slogan and regional in geography.

The reply is that the text itself declares that most of the messengers were not recounted, and that guidance is not confined to a named prophet—so the possibility remains open that the sages of other nations were among those unnamed. **And the objector's counter stands:** possibility removes improbability, but it does not establish the identity of any particular messenger.

What the comparison can settle here is less than a doctrinal verdict, and more precise than one: the Islamic text declares universality and sealing plainly;

other traditions construct particularity, universality, and time with different concepts. And every comprehensive claim is obliged to explain the unevenness of its own arrival among human beings. As for the truth of any particular claim, that requires an independent examination of its source, its text, and its evidence.

And the Seeker's Question: if it is said that every nation had its guide, by what sign would you tell the unknown prophet of a people from their sage and their reformer?—which is the question on which the table of Chapter 12 was built with its six symbols.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the map of the figures of message and vision in Chapter 12 and Appendix B; the limits of prophethood and of claiming it in Chapter 13; preaching and the patterns of spread in Chapter 11; and the question of divine hiddenness within the discussion of the arguments and their objections.*

* Chapter 13: The Phenomenon of Claiming Prophethood—How Do We Read It?

The most embarrassing phenomenon for everyone: its map across history, the religions' positions on it, the venerable criteria of examination, the lessons of the great cases—and the seeker's kit before everyone who says "it was revealed to me"

Summary of the chapter: Before judging a prophetic claim, four things should be distinguished: what its holder said about himself, what his followers attributed to him, the setting in which the claim appeared, and the evidence that can actually be examined. The chapter draws a brief historical map, sets out the possible explanations and the differing religious positions, then offers tools for comparison rather than a verdict prepared in advance for every case.

---

* Opening: The Phenomenon That Embarrasses Everyone—And Therefore Examines Everyone

Before this chapter stands a fact no one denies: no age has passed without men (and women) saying "it was revealed to me"—some led nations and some faded in their own generation, and some are true to millions and false to millions of others. The phenomenon is **embarrassing for every seat**: it embarrasses the believer in a particular prophet (what distinguishes his prophet from this crowd?—a question that will inevitably be put to him), and it embarrasses the denier of all

prophethoods (what made this claim, of all claims, the most successful and enduring idea in history?)—which is why it is an ideal school for our book's method: one phenomenon, opposing lenses, and criteria of examination that the centuries have matured—we will hand them to you complete.

And a clarification of the term first: "claiming prophethood" is a neutral description in this chapter—every prophet is a "claimant" in the linguistic sense (he announced a claim), and the open question is truth. And here **we do not put the prophethoods of the great religions on trial** (those are the fields of Chapters 12 and 19). Rather we study **the continuing phenomenon**: the stream of claimants who came in the margins of history and after the religions had been established, because examining them is the laboratory in which humanity forged its criteria. One caution belongs with the term: a claim should not be ascribed to someone who never announced it, merely because his followers raised his standing after his death—the claim under examination is the one its holder actually made.

* First: The Historical Map—A Procession That Never Stops

One caution governs this whole map: much of what reached us about these claimants was written down by their opponents or by those who defeated them. So a distinction must be kept between establishing the claim itself, the narrative detail attached to it, and the interpretation of motive.

In the first Islamic milieu. No sooner had the Muhammadan call grown strong than prophets appeared on the fringes of the Peninsula—**Musaylima** in al-Yamama (you read in the study on i'jaz the file of his "Qur'an," under the rule of the tinted glass of opponents), **al-Aswad al-Ansi** in Yemen, **Sajah** of Tamim (a woman who prophesied and led multitudes, and then the reports tell what passed between her and Musaylima), and **Tulayha** al-Asadi, who returned to Islam after his defeat and distinguished himself—a return that reveals that some of the claiming was riding a wave of tribal leadership more than an inner certainty. Then the thread did not break: al-Mukhtar al-Thaqafi with his ambiguous claims of revelation, and across the centuries prophets whom states and scholars confronted.

In Judaism. The tradition closed the door of prophecy in practice from ancient times ("prophecy ceased after Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi"—an explicit Talmudic decision, leaving only the *bat kol*, the faint echo of the heavenly voice). Yet claimants broke through the closed door, the greatest earthquake among them **Shabbetai Tzevi** (seventeenth century): he declared himself the awaited Messiah, and the fever swept half the Jews of the world—property was sold and journeys made toward Palestine—and then the resounding catastrophe: the Ottoman sultan gave him the choice between Islam and death, **and he converted**—the Messiah of millions putting on the turban! What happened next is more valuable to scholars than the story itself: the movement did not end—it **reinterpreted**: his followers said that his apostasy was "a holy descent to the

bottom of the husks to free the sparks" (an esotericism that rescues the creed from the fact!), and the sects of the Dönme survived for centuries. **In Christianity.** Theology settled that the founding revelation was completed with Christ and his apostles, but it kept "prophecy" as a continuing gift in the church, under examination. Very early it faced major claimants: **Montanus** (second century CE) and his prophets speaking in the tongue of "the Paraclete" (and Tertullian himself joined them—the greatest mind of his age! A lesson that polarization is not the affair of the naive alone), so the Church matured its criteria of discernment early. **And the modern age is the phenomenon's most fertile laboratory: Joseph Smith** (America, nineteenth century): golden plates, the angel Moroni, and "the Book of Mormon." On his claim stands today a church of millions of followers and worldwide institutions: the most institutionally successful modern prophethood. **The Bab and then Baha'u'llah** (Iran, nineteenth century): from an awaited Mahdiship to a complete new religion (the Baha'i faith) that goes beyond the finality of Islam by the principle of "renewed manifestation". **Mirza Ghulam Ahmad** (India, nineteenth century), with his composite claim (renewer, then Mahdi, then Messiah, then a non-legislative "shadow prophet"—the engineering of a claim trying to slip through the bolted door of finality; and the community rejected it by the consensus of its councils); **Rashad Khalifa**, whose file has accompanied us (from the count of 19 to "the messenger of the covenant"—and extremists killed him). The queues of twentieth-century "messiahs" and prophets of end-times

groups (some of which ended in documented collective tragedies). **Then the newest phase, which our kit has tracked: "soft revelation"**—its best-selling model is *Conversations with God* (Walsch): volumes of "divine dialogues" with no formal claim of prophethood, no law, and no community of covenant—revelation in the format of the market: reception without commission, inspiration without obligation, and profit without accountability—and we will return to its significance.

* Second: The Lenses of Explanation—Why Do People Claim Prophethood?

Whoever explains the whole procession by a single box errs. A fair examination spreads out **a spectrum**:

(1) conscious fraud—with documented cases (leadeships and spoils: Tulayha, who came back, is the witness of the type); **(2) psychological disturbance**. Some documented cases are explicit in their symptoms (the study on the brain handed you the tools of this subject and their limits: diagnosis across the centuries is guesswork about the unseen, and the high functioning of the great founders resists the simple pathological explanation); **(3) sincere self-deception**—the widest and subtlest box: visions, states, and inner experiences that really occur for their subject, who interprets them as revelation while they belong to the "religious experience" whose spectrum you know (sincerity—our rule—is not truth: a man may burn with sincerity from an experience whose interpretation he got wrong);

(4) riding the moment—claimants multiply in particular seasons: in the wake of catastrophes and defeats,

in vacuums of power, and in fevers of expectation (the surge of prophesying in the Peninsula at the moment a successful model rose, the waves of messianism after massacres, the Mahdis of the colonial era)—the phenomenon is a thermometer of ages before it is the biography of individuals; **(5) gradual inflation**—a path documented in cases: the man begins as a reformer or a mystic sincere in his beginnings. His followers' interpretation of his rank expands. He accepts, then adopts, then legislates—the claim is built story upon story (the roads of Ghulam Ahmad and Rashad Khalifa are two drawn models).

* Third: The Religions' Positions—Three Architectures of the Door

And before the architectures—a door before them: the question of **the possibility of prophethood at all**. The Muslim theologians devoted an independent section they called "the establishment of prophethoods" against whoever denied the need for a messenger at its root—"the Brahmins," in their terminology (who said that reason makes the messengers unnecessary: whatever of theirs agrees with reason is a surplus not needed, and whatever contradicts it is rejected), and Ibn al-Rawandi in *The Emerald*. Al-Qadi Abd al-Jabbar in *al-Mughni*, al-Baqillani, and others replied that reason grasps universals and is unable to reach the details of what benefits in the hereafter, or to settle where interests conflict, so it cannot dispense with one who conveys. Contemporary preaching literature knows the same genre under the name "answering the doubt of

denying revelation," and arranges its stages from the polytheists of Mecca to Orientalism (in a tone that makes all denial one continuous "doubt"—unlike the method of this chapter, which reads the phenomenon with multiple lenses and motives). So everything that follows as "architectures" presupposes that the door is possible at all—and that presupposition itself is the first thing the irreligious examine.

Islam: the door bolted by the text—"the Seal of the Prophets." The Qur'an settled the structure explicitly: "Muhammad is not the father of any one of you men; he is God's Messenger and **the seal of the prophets**," and the Sunna transmitted it abundantly ("there is no prophet after me"). So finality became a pillar of consensus: **every claimant after Muhammad is false by definition within the Islamic system**—not examined as a possibility but rejected as an impossibility.

And the two fruits of this architecture deserve reflection: the first is **a structural immunity**—no claimant has been able to split the great body of the community in a lasting doctrinal schism through the door of prophethood (compare the divisions of the religions whose door is open). The second is a nicety of anthropology: **the claiming shifted to the neighboring open door**—the door of the Mahdiship and of sainthood: so those aspiring to "election" in Islamic history claimed the Mahdiship rather than prophethood (from the Mahdi of Sudan to Juhayman in the Sanctuary in 1979), or stations of unveiling and sainthood—the psychological need is one, and the doctrinal architecture steers its outlet: among the most valuable witnesses to the effect

of structure on the phenomenon's behavior. **Judaism:** a gradual practical closure (the cessation of prophecy as a Talmudic declaration, and wisdom for the sages rather than the prophets—so that they even said: "the sage is greater than the prophet"), while the ember of awaiting the Messiah remains—the ember that ignited Shabbetai and his kind: **the door of prophecy is closed and the door of the Messiah is ajar**—and through it came the earthquake. **Christianity:** the completion of the founding revelation with **the continuation of the gift under examination**: "do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits" (1 John 4:1), and the early, practical, biting rules of the *Didache* (the prophet who asks for money for himself in the name of the Spirit **is a false prophet**; and whoever stays as a guest more than two days . . .)—the architecture of a half-open door under tight guard, and it paid its cost in the schisms of those who got past the guard (from Montanus to the prophets of the new churches).

* Fourth: The Venerable Criteria of Examination—Centuries Summarized on a Page

The traditions matured—from the long laboratory of claimants—criteria we examine with our scale:

1. The criterion of fulfilled prophecy (Deuteronomy 18): "If a prophet speaks in the name of the LORD but the thing does not take place or prove true, it is a word that the LORD has not spoken" (18:22)—an explicit empirical test (you have met it as the decider of "advance prediction"). Its limit: it works after the event, and many promises have distant terms.

2. The criterion of content above sign (Deuteronomy 13)—the cleverest of the ancient criteria: **even if the claimant works a sign and it comes true.** If he calls to other gods, do not listen to him: the miracle alone does not authenticate (we established its counterpart in the chapter on miracles: the miracle knocks at the door, and the content decides who is knocking)—so the claimant is examined on the standard of monotheism and morality before the scale of wonders.

3. The criterion of fruit and conduct ("you will know them by their fruits" + the *Didache* on money)—the claimant's conduct, his ambitions, and the fates of his followers are evidence: the truthful one does not trade in his revelation ("Say, 'I ask no reward of you for this'"—the refrain of the messengers in the Qur'an in every story!).

4. The disciplined criteria of the Muslim theologians: an explicit claim + a miracle joined to a challenge and safe from being matched + a content free of contradicting what is known by necessity + (after finality: the closing of the door at its root).

5. The criterion of consistency with what was established earlier: every tradition weighs the later by the measure of what was established for it before. Here is **the deepest structural lesson in the chapter**: this criterion is legitimate inside each house, but it is **circular between the houses** (the Jew rejects Jesus by the scale of Moses, the Christian rejects Muhammad by the standard of Jesus, and the Muslim rejects Ghulam Ahmad by the scale of Muhammad—and each argues against those before him that the earlier one's scale

cannot preempt the later, and then uses the same preemption against those after him!)—it is the very cycle of "the foretellings" returning here in the dress of criteria: whoever would leave the circle must return to the independent criteria (1–4) and to the evidence of each claim on its own (Chapter 19).

* Fifth: The Lessons of the Cases—What Happens When the Prophecy Fails?

The most valuable thing the laboratory of claimants has given knowledge is the lesson of **failure**: what do believers do when the claim collapses with a crash? The answer the cases have documented (from Shabbetai's Dönme to the groups with failed dates that researchers studied in the field—which became a founding book of social psychology: *When Prophecy Fails*) is **counter-intuitive**: the tight-knit group seldom disperses. Rather, it **reinterprets**: the apostasy becomes "a holy descent," the failed date "a merciful postponement" or "a hidden spiritual fulfillment," and missionary zeal may even **increase** after the blow (reducing dissonance by recruiting new believers). **And the measure of this lesson is just to everyone:** it is the critic's weapon against every group that patched its disappointment with interpretation. **And it is also** the book's warning to you against its naive reverse: not every steadfastness after a trial is "dissonance repair" (or every standing by a principle would fall)—what matters is the kind of trial: is it **an explicit falsification of a testable claim** interpreted away after it occurred (that is the repair), or an affliction that does not refute the claim at all? Distinguishing the two is among your finest new skills.

* Conclusion: The Seeker's Kit—And Two Open Questions

You leave the chapter with a fivefold kit before everyone who says "it was revealed to me"—whether you met him long ago in a book or a contemporary reaching you by mail: **ask about the content before the miracle** (the clever Deuteronomy 13), **about advance prediction** rather than later interpretation, **about money and gain** (the *Didache*), **about the course of the claim** (was it born complete, or built story upon story?), **and about the group's behavior under test** (the interpreting of disappointments is a sign). Two questions bid you farewell.

The first: why does the phenomenon not stop—even in the age of satellites? Is it because the need for "a personal connection with heaven" is deeper than all modernity (so that when the door of prophethood is bolted, it slips in through the window of Mahdiships, channelings, and soft revelation)? What does its persistence say about the makeup of this creature—a susceptibility to illusion that never ages, or a thirst for connection implanted to be quenched from its right door? (You know the duality of the two readings.)

The second—which we promised from Walsch's card: **what remains of "revelation" when commission is stripped from it?** Compare: classical prophethood is a claim that is **costly**: a crushing commission ("You [Prophet], enfolded in your cloak! Stay up"), a confrontation with the powerful, the shedding of blood, and a law to be carried—while the new market "revelations"

are **cheap in cost and rich in yield**: an inspiration that confirms to its owner what he likes, with no burdensome command, no community of covenant, and no reckoning—so which of the two forms is more like the trace of a real contact with an Absolute that transcends you, and which is more like the echo of the self talking to itself? We do not answer for you—but we draw your attention to the fact that **cost** has always been among the clues of truthfulness in the courts of this subject: the great prophets did not gain from their claim a life of ease; they carried mountains. That is a thread you will pull with you into the field of evidence.

> ***Cross-references for the chapter:*** *founding prophethood and its holders in Chapter 12; examining the evidence of the great claims in Chapter 19 (and the circular cycle in the study on foretellings); and the miracle and the content in Chapter 14.*

* Chapter 14: Miracles and Wonders—When the Ordinary Splits Open

The concept of the miracle, its map across the traditions, the limits of what it signifies, and how to weigh the report of a wonder before making it a proof

Summary of the chapter: If it is reported that a sea parted or a sick man was healed by a word, the question is not whether the report can astonish us, but: what did the text claim, when was it written down, who witnessed it, and what alternatives are possible? The chapter distinguishes the miracle from the sign, the saint's wonder, and sorcery; compares the presence of the extraordinary across traditions; then tests its worth as evidence without assuming in advance either its truth or its impossibility.

---

* Opening: The Most Dangerous Card in the Claimant's Hand

When a man stands before his people and says, "I have been sent to you by God," the first thing the crowd shouts—in nearly every age—is: **produce your proof.** The oldest proof human beings have known for this particular claim is that the claimant do what human beings cannot do—that the familiar split open before him: a staff that becomes a serpent, a dead man who rises, a moon that cleaves, a fire that does not burn.

So the miracle—before it is a story to be told—

is **a logic**: if the wonder can be done by God alone, and it happened at the claimant's hand, then God has confirmed him. Heaven's signature on the messenger's document.

But the argument has a conditional shape, and **every link in the chain needs its own proof**: that the event occurred. That it was of a kind human beings could not produce. That it was genuinely connected to the claim of a message. And that one may validly move from it to a divine source. The presence of a story in a text is not establishing an event in history, and the strangeness of an event does not by itself determine who did it or why.

So three questions must be kept apart throughout this chapter: **the philosophical question** (is such an event possible?), **the historical question** (is it established?), and **the doctrinal question** (what does it signify?). An event may be possible and yet unestablished; and something unfamiliar may be established while people differ over how to read it.

That is why miracles have been the arena of the fiercest battles: on them the religions founded their legitimacy. By them prophets, magicians, saints, and charlatans were ranked. And around them turned the deepest disputes of philosophy, from Hume to this day. This chapter surveys the whole arena: What does a miracle mean? What did the nations and the books recount? How was it understood and criticized? What did it do in history? And what is it worth as evidence?

* First: Clarifying the Concept—And the Terms Are Not Synonyms

"Miracle" (*mu'jiza*) is a late term coined by the Muslim theologians, who defined it with a precision worth reflecting on: **an event that breaks the ordinary course of things, joined to a challenge, and safe from being matched**. So not every strangeness is a miracle: there must be a breach of the regular patterns. It must occur **joined to the claim of a message and as a challenge to its deniers**. And the opponents must be unable to produce its like. By these conditions they distinguished it from its neighbors in the market of wonders:

- **The karama:** a wonder occurring at the hand of a righteous saint **with no claim of prophethood and no challenge**—an honor, not a commission.
- **Magic and trickery:** an apparent wonder that has its hidden causes or its illusion, occurring at the hand of the wicked.
- **The istidraj:** a wonder allowed to occur at the hand of a liar, as a trial for him and through him.

Before the theological term, the sacred books themselves used a word of deeper significance: **"the sign"** (in Hebrew *ot*, in Greek *semeion*). The difference between the two words is an entire philosophy: "miracle" looks at the event from the side of its **rendering human beings incapable** (silencing them), and "sign" looks at it from the side of its **pointing to God** (its indication). You will see that the Qur'an—strikingly—never once used the word "miracle," and used "sign" hundreds of times,

gathering under it the wonder and the sunrise together—and the point of this will become clear.

Then grasp the three keys of analysis before the tour: **(1)** a breach of nature, or a disposal within it by a higher knowledge? **(2)** the evidence of a commission from God (the Abrahamic view), or a spiritual power **acquired** by discipline, reached by whoever strives (the Indian view)?—the deepest dividing line in the whole chapter. **(3)** Something sought and praised, or a display that the religions themselves condemn?

---

* Second: The Grand Tour—What Did the Nations and Their Books Recount?

1. The ancient East: the wonder was a profession before it was a sign

In Egypt and Mesopotamia the wonder is not an exceptional event but **a working institution**: professional priests of magic and medicine intertwined (the papyri of Egypt preserve their books of spells), diviners who read the liver and the stars, and blurred borders among religion, magic, and science. What matters for our story is that this is **the stage onto which the miracles of the Torah entered**: when Moses' staff turns into a serpent before Pharaoh, the magicians of Egypt—the masters of the craft—answer with its apparent like! The famous confrontation is the first model of an idea that will recur (and the two scriptures must be kept apart here: Exodus reports that the magicians produced the like at first, and that Aaron's staff then swallowed theirs; the prostration of the magicians and their declaration of faith

belong to the Qur'anic telling—and fusing the two into a single scene erases the difference between the texts): **the miracle is tested in confrontation with the most skilled counterfeiters**. So the testimony of the rival expert is the weightiest of testimonies.

2. The Tanakh: the God of history signs with wonders

The miracles of the Torah are large in scale and **national** in character: not the healing of an individual but the leading of a nation: the ten plagues; the parting of the sea (the founding miracle on which the whole covenant was built: "I am the LORD your God, who brought you out"); the manna and the quails and the water from the rock; the halting of the Jordan; the walls of Jericho. Then comes the summit of "trial by ordeal" in the whole Book: **Elijah on Mount Carmel** against four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal—the challenge designed like a decisive experiment: two altars, two bulls, and no fire. "The god who answers by fire is indeed God" (1 Kings 18:24). So the priests of Baal cry out a whole day and gash their bodies and there is no answer, and Elijah prays and the fire comes down. The purest image in religious literature of the miracle as **a judge between two calls**—and keep it in mind, for the question "why is the experiment not repeated today?" is coming in the scale.

3. The New Testament: signs of the kingdom—and the refusal of display

The miracles of Jesus in the Gospels are of a different order: **personal and merciful**, not national and overpowering—the healing of lepers, the blind, and the paralyzed; the casting out of demons; the multiplying of loaves; the calming of a storm; walking on water. At their summit the raising of the dead (Lazarus) and then **his own resurrection**—the miracle that **is** Christianity: from an empty tomb the whole religion was born, so that Paul said outright: if Christ has not been raised, our faith is in vain. Notice in the Gospels a fertile paradox: this worker of miracles **condemns the demand for them**: "An evil and adulterous generation asks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it" (Matthew 12:39)—he refuses the devil's temptation to throw himself from the pinnacle of the Temple as a display, and he orders some of those he healed to keep silent! So the miracle in the theology of the Gospels is a *semeion*: a sign of the kingdom's presence and mercy, not a circus of silencing—and the faith that is asked for is deeper than the faith of spectators ("Blessed are those who have not seen and yet have come to believe," John 20:29).

4. The Qur'an: the great reversal—the miracle as text, and the signs as cosmos

Here is the deepest transformation in the history of the idea. The Qur'an **affirms without reservation** the miracles of the prophets before it—Moses' staff and his white hand, Salih's she-camel, Abraham's fire made "cool and safe," and Jesus raising the dead and healing

the blind and the leper "with God's permission." But when it is faced with the theatrical demands of Quraysh (make a spring gush forth for us, drop the sky on us in pieces, bring God and the angels before us), it answers with a reply that shook the concept of the miracle from its foundation: **"Nothing prevents Us from sending miraculous signs, except the fact that previous peoples denied them"**—the sensory wonders were tried with the nations and were followed by denial and then destruction, and this final message takes two other roads:

The first: turning the sign from the wondrous to the familiar. Dozens of verses turn the reader's face toward "miracles" running every day: the creation of the heavens, the alternation of night and day, the life-giving water, the drop that becomes a human being—"Will they not look?" The whole cosmos is the permanent exhibition, and the wonder is an exception for whoever has forgotten the rule.

The second: a miracle of the same kind as the text itself. The Qur'an's central challenge is not an event that has passed and whose reports are recounted, but **a book present in the hands of every generation**: "produce a single sura like it"—a miracle open to renewed examination, not dependent on witnesses who have died (we detailed its equipment and its opponents in the study on i'jaz). Alongside this double transformation, the Sunna and the biographical tradition preserved a stock of sensory wonders (the splitting of the moon—which has a Qur'anic mention; water springing from between his fingers; the multiplying of food; the

yearning of the tree trunk; the Night Journey). So the internal debate stayed alive: is the miracle of Islam its text alone, or the text and the wonders together?

5. India: the supernatural powers are acquired—the whole logic reverses

Cross now to India to see the second key flip: the wonders there—**the *siddhis*—**are not a god's signature on a messenger but **the fruit of a method**, reached by whoever has mastered yoga and austerity: eight powers classified in Patanjali's books as skills are classified (becoming minute, becoming vast, lightness of body, reaching, control . . .). The agent here is not an intervening God but **a spiritual law** that responds to whoever fulfills its conditions—as physics responds to the engineer. That is why India is not astonished by a rival's "miracle" and does not regard it as decisive: the righteous and the wicked alike may attain the siddhis—indeed the texts of yoga themselves warn the wayfarer against being seduced by the powers, because they are **traps on the road** that distract him from liberation. Above the layer of the siddhis run the legendary wonders of the avatars (Krishna lifting Mount Govardhana on his finger as an umbrella for his village)—signs of an incarnate divine presence, not signs of a messenger's commission.

6. Buddhism: powers acknowledged, display distrusted

A caution first: the popular story in which the Buddha is said to have dismissed walking across a river as worth no more than the ferryman's fee is not supported by the oldest Buddhist texts, and is best set aside unless its source can be established. What the early texts do preserve is the *Kevatta Sutta*, which distinguishes three things: the miracle of psychic power, the miracle of reading others' minds, and **the miracle of instruction**—refusing to make display a means of attracting the crowd, and presenting teaching as the most trustworthy of the three. The Buddha likewise forbade his monks to parade powers before lay people; and at the same time the texts do acknowledge the *iddhi* powers and narrate them. Yet—here is a lesson in the dynamics of religions—the later biographies filled up with his wonders (the twin miracle of Sravasti: fire and water bursting from his body and his image multiplied in the sky) and with the powers of the saints (the arhats): **the public imposes the miracle on the prophet most abstemious of it**—the need for the wonder is stronger than the founder's prohibition of it.

7. Greece and Rome: temple healings, and emperors who heal the blind

In the classical world stands a working institution of wonders: the temples of **Asclepius**, the god of medicine, in which the sick slept in "incubation" so that the god would visit them in dreams, and whose walls bear **inscribed testimonies of healing** with the names of

those healed—among the oldest documented "miracle files" in history! Wonder-working sages: Pythagoras and his marvels, and **Apollonius of Tyana**, who passed before you in the tables of the prophets—healings, the raising of a girl, and knowledge of the unseen, so that the ancient opponents of Christianity raised him as a rival to Jesus in one of the oldest documented "wars of comparing miracles." Even the emperors themselves: the historians Tacitus and Suetonius report that **Vespasian**, in Alexandria, touched the eyes of a blind man and the limb of a lame one, and that word of their healing spread—and Tacitus himself records that the physicians judged both cases to be potentially treatable. So take note: **the claim of a witnessed wonder is no monopoly of the living religions**—and you will need this observation in the standard.

8. The oral religions: the wonder as a periodic function

Among the shamanic peoples the wonder is daily bread, not a founding event: the shaman's spirit flies to the worlds to recover the souls of the sick, he brings rain, and he foretells—**by office, training, and the inheritance of a path**. The miracle here founds no religion because it astonishes no one: it is the expected service of the holder of the office.

9. After the founding: karamas and saints—the wonder becomes an administration

After the great religions closed the door of prophethood, the door of the wonder was not closed—it **turned into an administration and an institution**: in Islam the *karamas* of the saints (affirmed by most the Sunnis with conditions: no challenge by them and no claim, and the measure of their holder is the law, not his wonder—"if you see a man walking on water and flying in the air, do not be deceived by him until you see how he stands with respect to the commands and prohibitions"). In Christianity the institutionalization reached its astonishing modern summit: **the Vatican today runs the most rigorous court of miracles in history**—the canonization of any saint requires establishing miracles of healing through his intercession, examined by a medical commission of physicians (including non-believers), which requires that the cure be complete, instantaneous, and lasting, **with no available medical explanation**—and the phrase "medically unexplained" does not by itself mean that the medical bureau has declared a miracle: the religious recognition is a separate decision, taken afterward and on other grounds. The shrine of Lourdes in France has had a medical bureau of documentation for a century and a half, which has examined thousands of claims of healing and accepted only dozens. In the very age of the camera occurred the most famous mass event: **"the Miracle of the Sun" at Fatima in Portugal (1917)**—tens of

thousands present (among them secular journalists who had come to mock) reported the disc of the sun trembling and dancing—an event **on which it is agreed that something happened, and which divides most deeply over its interpretation**: a heavenly intervention, or a phenomenon of collective perception and staring at the sun?—a complete modern sample of the structure of the whole question.

---

* Third: The Development of Understanding—From the Regularity of Nature to the Critique of Testimony

Theologians did not always understand the miracle as a disorder breaking into a world independent of God. **Augustine** held that the wondrous event does not occur against nature in itself, but against what we know of nature's order—so ignorance of causes does not automatically turn an occurrence into a breach. **Aquinas** defined the miracle as what exceeds the power of nature as ordinarily constituted, and graded miracles by the degree of that excess: what nature cannot do at all. What it can do in kind but not in that subject. And what occurs outside its usual order or its usual speed.

In Islamic philosophy, **Ghazali**, in the seventeenth question of *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, examined the claim of necessity between what we call a cause and its effect: the conjunction of fire with the burning of cotton is constant in our experience, but on his view this does not establish that fire is an independent agent whose effect cannot fail—for the customary order itself

falls under divine power. **Ibn Rushd** replied in *The Incoherence of the Incoherence*, defending the stability of the natures of things and the efficacy of causes, and warning that abolishing knowledge of causes threatens the very possibility of science and of definition. Neither of them, however, should be reduced to a slogan: the dispute concerns the nature of causal connection, not a simple contest between reason and faith.

With modern philosophy, three major paths of rereading emerged.

The first, with Spinoza: the laws of nature are, in his philosophy, an expression of the fixed divine order, so nothing occurs contrary to them. What is called a miracle is an event whose natural cause the narrator or the crowd does not know—not an exception in which God suspends His own order. His objection is not only about impossibility: he also holds that ignorance of the cause of some event gives us no clearer knowledge of God, and that understanding nature's regularity is more indicative than wonder at what we do not understand. The believer objects that this conception assumes from the outset that divine action can only occur inside the order, which is the point in dispute.

The second, with Hume: he moved the center of inquiry from the possibility of the miracle in itself to the reasonableness of believing the report of one. Testimony draws its force from our experience of human truthfulness and accuracy. The laws of nature draw theirs from constant experience. And the reasonable person weighs the two, accepting the report only if its falsehood or error would be stranger than the event it

establishes. He then added practical grounds for suspicion: the appetite for the marvelous, the enthusiasm of crowds, the distance of reports from places where they could be checked, and the mutually opposed wonders deployed by different traditions.

This balance provoked mixed replies. Some defenders said that describing experience as "uniform" against miracles is not permissible before the reports themselves have been examined—otherwise the exclusion is circular. Others said that a unique event is not disqualified from history merely because it is unrepeated: the historian does not demand that a battle or an assassination recur, but looks for independent, converging evidence. The critic answers that the uniqueness of an event is one thing and its conflict with established natural regularity is another, and that the quantity of evidence required rises with the size of the claim.

Many elements enter into the weighing of testimony: the closeness of the writing to the event; the independence of the witnesses; their agreement without artificial identity; the presence of opponents capable of objecting; the persistence of material evidence; and the possibilities of illusion, interpretation, and interest. As for a witness's readiness to die, it establishes in most cases his psychological sincerity and his willingness to sacrifice—it does not by itself establish the truth of what he believed. Likewise the rise of a community around a narrative shows its historical effect, not automatically the accuracy of its details. The wonders of the religions do not all collapse merely because there are many of them: some reports are better documented than others,

and the conflict of claims requires examination case by case rather than a blanket dismissal.

The third path is interpretation: some believers sought to explain the narratives by natural causes without cancelling their religious meaning—reading the crossing of the sea in the light of winds and tides, or understanding some of the plagues within a chain of interlocking epidemics and disasters. **Rudolf Bultmann**, in his program of "demythologization," held that the ancient cosmic picture carries an existential appeal that ought to be interpreted, rather than binding the modern person to the whole of its pictorial world. Traditionalists objected that interpretation, if it empties the founding event of its having occurred, leaves nothing of the doctrine but a symbol.

* Fourth: The Effect—What Did the Miracle Do in History?

It founded the great religions. The founding miracle is not an ornament on the religion but **its existential cornerstone**: Judaism stands on the Exodus, Christianity on the resurrection, and Islam on the Qur'anic revelation—all three refer their whole identity to a single wondrous event, so that it is right to say: whoever demolishes the founding miracle demolishes the religion, and whoever establishes it establishes it—which is why the modern battles of criticism and defense concentrate on it in particular.

It decided confrontations and moved masses. From the fire of Carmel and the prostration of the magicians, to the healings of the saints that were the fuel of Christianization in the Middle Ages and in Africa, to the karamas of the saints that spread the Sufi orders in Asia and Africa—**the reported wonder has been the most successful preacher in the history of preachers**, addressing those whom the bare argument cannot reach. **It served thrones as it served temples.** For whole centuries the kings of France and England practiced the rite of "the royal touch": thousands afflicted with scrofula (tuberculosis of the glands) lined up to be touched by the king and healed—"the king touches you, God heals you"—the legitimacy of the crown established by a periodic wonder. The exploitation of the marvelous in politics and propaganda remains a thriving market in the forms of every age.

And it gave birth—without intending to—to tools of examination. The need to distinguish the miracle from magic and fraud drove the traditions themselves to manufacture scales: the theologians' conditions, the courts of inquiry into claims of sainthood, and the medical commissions of Lourdes—until the file of miracles became, strangely, among the oldest fields of critical documentation in the civilizations.

* Fifth: The Scale—What Is a Miracle Worth as Evidence? (The Seeker's Kit)

We come to what concerns you in practice. Five rules you take away from this whole tour:

1. The miracle is evidence strong in structure and heavy in proof. Its internal logic is sound (a wonder that God alone can do + a challenge = confirmation), but its whole load shifts to one question: **did it happen?.** For all the miracles of the past reach us as reports, and the verdict on them is a branch of the sciences of examining reports that we founded in the chapters on texts and transmission: when was the report written down? how many witnesses? what was their interest and the price of their testimony? and was refutation possible at the time? So miracles are ranked by their chains of transmission before their marvels.

2. Distinguish the founding from the later. A miracle on which the religion stood from its first day, publicly, among its opponents (the Exodus, the resurrection, the Qur'an with which Quraysh was challenged) is not the same as stories of marvels that grew in the books of merits after centuries. The serious traditions themselves distinguish (the masters of hadith weakened a mass of wonder stories, and the courts of canonization reject most claims).

3. The universality of the phenomenon is a double-edged sword—so use it precisely. The critic says: everyone reports (Asclepius, Vespasian, Sravasti, Lourdes), so reporting is cheap and the phenomenon is psychological and cross-religious. The believer replies

with a precise distinction: the universality of the **claim** of wonders defeats arguing from mere report—yes, and that serves us rather than harming us, because it forces the move from "was it reported?" to "how was it established?." So the mass falls away and a few events of high attestation remain as the real battlefield—and part of the phenomenon, moreover, is acknowledged by both sides as fact while they differ over its interpretation (cures with no medical explanation, and the sun of Fatima): one datum and two readings, in this book's custom.

And before all of these, one operation the whole examination turns on: set out the competing explanations and test them. Error; illusion; exaggeration in the retelling; literary symbol; rare coincidence; spontaneous remission; deception; an undiscovered natural cause; and divine action—these are hypotheses that are not all equal in weight, but none of them may be struck out merely because it suits us or merely because it repels us. The spread of wonder-reports across cultures establishes the universality of the human tendency to read the strange religiously. It does not by itself establish either that all the reports are false or that any one of them is true.

4. The miracle needs an interpretive context—so it does not carry alone. A wonder without a consistent message, a law, and a fruit is a puzzle, not evidence (which is why everyone required the accompanying scale: the challenge and the claim for the theologians; the fruits for the Gospel, "you will know them by their fruits"; and the wonder-worker's standing by the

commands and prohibitions for the sober Sufis). So the miracle is a strand in the braided rope—it strengthens the evidence of text and content and is strengthened by them—not a rope by itself.

5. The question of the age: where is the miracle of the camera? The critic asks rightly: the age of comprehensive documentation is precisely the age of the absence of the great wonder; is that not the most eloquent witness? The believer answers in layers: that the door of prophethood (and with it the miracles of challenge) was sealed by the declaration of the religions themselves, not by the verdict of the camera. That the signs on offer today are of the kind no camera can invalidate: a governed cosmos that keeps being disclosed, a text whose challenge still stands, and cures before which the medical files are helpless. That the logic of the Qur'an itself ("Nothing prevents Us from sending signs . . .") anticipated the answer: the sensory wonder was never—in this conception—the decisive maker of faith, for nations saw wonders with their own eyes and denied them, because the heart that does not want finds a thousand interpretations for the marvelous. Here the two opponents meet—as is our custom in our conclusions—at a single truth from its two ends: **the miracle was never a substitute for the decision of the heart.** The Gospel said: if they do not listen to Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced even if someone rises from the dead (Luke 16:31). The Qur'an said: "even if We opened a gateway into Heaven for them and they rose through it, higher and higher, they would still say, 'Our eyes are hallucinating'". And the atheist said

from his shore: and I say the same: it is not a report I lack, but a proof.

Nor does fairness allow the verdict to be traced, in either direction, to purity of heart or obstinacy: people differ in their premises, in their trust of sources, and in how much evidence they consider sufficient.

What fairness requires is more than astonishment from the believer, and more than prior exclusion from the critic.

The miracle therefore remains **a possible proof, not a self-sufficient one**: its force equals the force with which the event is established, the clarity of its connection to the claim, and the weakness of the competing explanations. If one link fails, the story becomes an occasion for reflection or an element in a community's memory, not an argument binding on someone who disagrees. If the links hold, legitimate disagreement remains over how much they establish: a rare event, a special providence, or divine confirmation of a complete message.

This is the single scale: no report is privileged because it is ours, and none is dismissed because it is strange.

So the wonder remains what it always was: a knocker pounding violently at the door of the ordinary—**but opening the door is in the hand of whoever lives in the house.**

Part V: The Texts

What did they leave written? And how did it reach us?

Chapter 15: A Map of the Sacred Texts Across the Civilizations

The grand tour of the sacred books of the nations; the structural distinction among their genres; and the layers of the text that readers confuse—the kit for anyone who wants to know what each religion left written before asking: and how did it reach us?

Summary of the chapter: Open any sacred book in the world and a difficulty meets you at once: these texts do not even claim the same thing about themselves. A map of sacred texts across civilizations, with a decisive distinction between revelation, authorship, and compilation—laying the ground for a comparison on twelve axes in the study that follows.

* Opening: The Nation of Books

If you gathered in one hall all the sacred books of humanity, you would see the strangest library there has ever been: cuneiform clay tablets, papyrus scrolls, parchment skins, palm leaves, and hymns preserved in memory for a thousand years before a pen touched them. You would see that most nations—for all their differences in everything else—agreed on this: to place the most precious thing they had in words, and to surround those words with sanctity, preservation, and recitation.

This chapter draws the map of that hall: what is in it, how its shelves are classified, and which layers the hurried visitor confuses. As for the gravest question—how did these books reach us, and did they arrive intact?—that belongs to the next chapter and its studies, so do not rush to it. Whoever would try the transmission should first know what was transmitted.

* First: The Structural Distinction—The Sacred Books Are Not One Genre

Sacred texts do not define themselves in one way, and more than one type may be combined within a single tradition, just as schools within one religion differ over the ranking of authorities. The types that follow are therefore **instruments of comparison, not closed boxes**.

The first thing that must settle in your mind is that the phrase "sacred book" is thrown over genres that differ fundamentally in **the claim about their source**—and confusing them ruins every later comparison:

The first genre: revelation sent down, by explicit claim. A text whose tradition itself claims a superhuman source: the Qur'an (the speech of God in word and meaning, by the claim of the text itself). The Torah, for those who regard it as dictated to Moses. The Avesta, attributed to the revelation of Ahura Mazda to Zoroaster; and the Vedas, which the Hindu tradition presents as *shruti*—an eternal hearing with no author at all. The spectrum of claimed mechanisms of revelation—from literal dictation to inspiration of meaning to eternal hearing—is laid out in the opening of the next chapter

with its golden rule: every book is judged by the standard of its own claim.

The second genre: a sacred text with no claim of divine source.

Books that occupy the heart of sanctity and rite without their people claiming that God dictated them: the preserved discourses of the Buddha are the words of an awakened teacher, not the revelation of a god (there being no revealing God in the Buddhist structure at all). The *Analects* of Confucius are the wisdom of a teacher. And so is the literature of the Tao. So take note: the sanctity of a text is one thing, and the claim of its divine source is another—they may coincide and they may part.

The third genre: sacred oral tradition.

Whole nations never wrote their religion down at all—not always from inability, but sometimes by choice: the Vedas were preserved orally, by their systems of recitation, for long centuries while writing was known, because for them the recited sound is the sacred thing, not the ink. The religions of Africa, the Americas, and Australia carried their whole theology in recited epic, chant, rite, and songlines across the land itself—as you saw in the map of Chapter 8. So whoever supposes that "no book" means "no preserved religion" has judged the nations by the standard of one nation.

The fourth genre: the later religious literature.

The layer of commentaries, biographies, exegeses, and law built on the founding text: the Talmud on the Torah, the writings of the Fathers on the two Testaments,

exegesis, hadith, and jurisprudence on the Qur'an, and the *shastras* on the Vedas. Their authority among their own people varies widely—and we will pause over the danger of confusing them with the text itself at the end of the chapter.

* Second: The Grand Tour—The Shelves of the Hall, Shelf by Shelf

The shelf of the ancient Near East. The oldest written religious literature there is: from Mesopotamia the *Enuma Elish* and the Epic of Gilgamesh, with its flood and its question of immortality, and hymns, prayers, and divination rites by the thousands; from Egypt the "Pyramid Texts" (the oldest major religious corpus known, from the middle of the third millennium BCE), then the "Coffin Texts," then "the Book of the Dead"—guides for the dead man's journey to the court of Osiris that you have met. All of these—by the standard of their own people—are the literature of temple and rite, not a unifying "book of a faith". The very concept of "the one sacred book of the community" is a later invention you will see born on the Abrahamic shelf. This shelf is not complete without the genre dearest to people's hearts: **the literature of wisdom and instruction**—the counsels of a father to his son: from the Egyptian "Instruction of Ptahhotep" (among the oldest books on earth) to the "Wisdom of Amenemope," whose close connection to passages of the Book of Proverbs scholars study, to the Aramaic "Ahiqar," which traveled the nations—the genre the Qur'an would crown with Luqman's counsels to his son, and which is still alive and being written to

this day: the father who leaves his son a notebook of counsels is writing—though he may not know it—in the most venerable and oldest of the genres of religious writing.

The Iranian shelf. The *Avesta*: the sacred corpus of Zoroastrianism, whose oldest layer is the *Gathas*—hymns attributed to Zoroaster himself in a language of deep antiquity—followed by later layers of ritual and law. It was carried orally for an age, written down late, and most of it was lost in the storms of history, until there remained—by the estimate of its scholars—only about a quarter of the corpus catalogued in the Sasanian period: a shelf that teaches you that the parts of sacred books themselves die when their bearers die. Beside it stand the books of Mani, which he wrote with his own hand and ordered translated so that they would not be distorted—as passed before you in the chapter on preaching. And which were then annihilated with their religion, so that we now read them from the quotations of their enemies and the finds of the sands.

The Indian shelf. The largest shelf of all, with two stories that the Hindu tradition insists on distinguishing: **shruti** ("the heard": the four Vedas, with their layers ending in the contemplative Upanishads)—the highest in sanctity. **Smriti** ("the remembered": the epics, the law codes, and the Puranas)—lower in authority and wider in its effect on people's lives, with the *Bhagavad Gita* at its heart: the dialogue of Krishna and Arjuna on the battlefield, the text of India dearest to its people's hearts. Beside it the shelf of Buddhism, the *Tripitaka* (the Three Baskets: the monastic discipline, the

discourses of the Buddha, and the doctrinal analysis), preserved orally by councils of communal recitation for centuries and then written down in Sri Lanka in about the first century BCE, with Mahayana expanding it by whole additional sutras. So the book of Buddhism is a "library" whose limits the schools draw differently. The shelf of the Sikhs, the *Guru Granth Sahib*: the unique case you met in Chapter 8—a book that was itself installed as the community's immortal teacher, so that the text turned from the record of guidance into the person of the guide. Its canon file is unique twice over: it is the only major scripture **compiled, arranged, and sealed by the tradition's own teachers in their lifetimes** (the fifth Guru, Arjan, gathered the Adi Granth in 1604; the tenth closed the line by vesting guruship in the book itself in 1708). The question that haunts the other shelves, "who decided, and by what right, generations later?", is answered here inside the founding office itself. And it is an **interfaith canon**: within it stand hymns of non-Sikhs—Kabir the weaver and the Muslim Sufi Farid—canonized beside the Gurus' own. (Its manuscript scholarship has, as everywhere, its recension debates; but the architecture of its closure has no parallel in the hall.)

The Chinese shelf. The Five and the Four Books of Confucianism (with the *Analects* at their heart), the *Tao Te Ching* attributed to Laozi, and the *I Ching* (the Book of Changes), which began as a book of divination and ended as a book of cosmic wisdom. The sanctity of this shelf is the sanctity of wisdom and of the law of the state—the Confucian books were the syllabus of the

imperial examinations for about two thousand years—not the sanctity of revelation: the clearest witness to our second genre.

The Abrahamic shelf. Here the concept of "the Book," with the definite article, was born. First **the Tanakh** of the Jews, whose very name is an acronym of its three divisions: the Torah (the five books), the Nevi'im (the Prophets), and the Ketuvim (the Writings, the Psalms, and the wisdom books)—a library of centuries gathered into one book that became the identity of a nation carried into the diaspora. The claim of its heart—the Torah—is unique among all the shelves of the hall: a revelation not announced to an individual in seclusion but **to an entire nation, witnessed at Sinai**—the claim on which Judah Halevi built, in his famous dialogue the *Kuzari* (twelfth century CE), the best-known classical Jewish argument: that a mass event of this kind cannot be planted in a nation's memory by fabrication—we weighed the argument and its detailed critique in the study on mass transmission (Chapter 19). This is the place of its text in the map, and that is the place of its scale. Beside the Tanakh stands the divergent Torah of the Samaritans (our laboratory case in the next chapter), and its Greek translation, the Septuagint, which became the first Bible of Christianity.

Then **the New Testament**: four Gospels, letters (the oldest of them Paul's), the Acts, and the Apocalypse, written by the followers of Christ in the decades after him by the consensus of scholars. So its structure is "a testimony about" the incarnate Word, not "a dictation to" a prophet, a structural difference that will overturn

all the scales of the next chapter. Then **the Qur'an**: a single text in a single tongue, sent down over twenty-three years upon one man, by the claim of direct divine speech, which arranged itself into suras and verses and made itself—in a claim unique among the shelves—**the sign** itself, whose like is the challenge (the whole field of this claim is in Part VII). From the same shelf, branches that added: "the Book of Mormon," added to the two Testaments; the Baha'i "Most Holy Book"; and the books of the Druze and the Mandaeans, withheld from any but their own people.

The shelf of those who have no book. Finally, the shelf left deliberately empty: the nations of oral tradition through whose stations you toured—Africa, the Americas, Oceania, and the shamanism of the steppe. They have no "book," and they have everything a book does: a story of origin, a law of conduct, a rite of passage, and a means of preservation (rhythm, chant, the body, and the land). This has driven some students of religion to turn the question around: perhaps "the book" is not a condition of religion but one of its techniques—the technique of preservation among the nations of writing, as measured chant was the technique of preservation among the nations of orality.

* Third: The Layers of the Text—The Distinction That Guards Against the Most Common Errors

There remains the chapter's practical kit: distinguishing three overlapping layers that readers confuse—and the confusion among them is the source of a large share

of the misunderstanding among the religions and within them. The boundaries between the layers are not always sharp, and some traditions grant their interpretation an authority that comes close to that of the original; but the distinction remains necessary:

The first layer: the founding text, or the normative collection. What the community returns to to define its story, its teaching, and its worship. Calling it "normative" does not mean that all its sects agreed on its boundaries: the differing lists of the Old Testament, and the differing Buddhist collections, are two reminders that the question "what is the book?" sometimes comes before the question "what does it say?"

The second layer: the accepted commentaries. What the scholars built upon the text, which may reach such size and standing that it eclipses the text itself: the Talmud—its Mishnah, the codified law, and then its Gemara, the commentary, in its two recensions, the Babylonian (the wider and the accepted) and the Jerusalem—became the practical axis of rabbinic Judaism, so that it was said that the Jew learns his Torah from the Talmud. The writings of the Fathers and the councils did something similar in the churches, as did the collections of exegesis, hadith, and jurisprudence in Islam, and the *shastras* and commentaries in India. They are binding on their own people in varying degrees—but they are not the text.

The third layer: the reports that seeped into the commentaries. Here lies the greatest need for caution: the commentaries themselves absorbed materials from outside the tradition or from its popular storytelling,

which came with time to be received as if they were part of the religion. The precious witness is that the great traditions themselves noticed this and produced **an internal criticism** to sift their commentaries: the Muslim scholars wrote on "the Israelite tales"—the reports that seeped from Jewish and Christian sources into the books of exegesis. Divided them into three: what agrees with what Islam brought, which is accepted; what contradicts it, which is rejected. And what is passed over in silence, on which judgment is suspended (Sheikh Muhammad Husayn al-Dhahabi has his well-known study on them—though the history of this threefold division and how it is applied are themselves matters of scholarly discussion). The commentators on the Bible—among them conservative believers, as you saw in the model of *The Precious Treasure*—sifted the inherited traditions of interpretation and flagged what had no support. The Muslim critics of hadith built the largest apparatus history has known for examining the chains of transmission of reports. These are precise methods of differing aims and differing results. Their existence does not make every transmitted report sound, nor may they be erased in favor of a naive picture of faith without examination. So keep this truth, which breaks a common stereotype: **scrutiny is a value the traditions produced from within, not a weapon their opponents invented**—and this witness will widen in the study on "criticism from inside the houses" in the next chapter.

The fruit of the distinction is practical and direct: if you meet a denier who tries a religion by oddities found

in its commentaries, or a believer who defends everything in his people's heritage as if it were the revealed text, turn on the passage the question of the layers: **in which layer, exactly, does this statement fall, and what is its authority among the people of the house themselves?.** For how many heated battles have died down once it appeared that their subject belonged to the third layer, which the people of the house had sifted before their opponents.

* Conclusion: The Threshold of the Next Chapter

The hall now lies before you with its shelves drawn: you know the genres of its books, the claim of each shelf about its source, and the layers of what has accumulated around the texts. There remains the question for which this whole chapter was built as a threshold, among the weightiest questions of the book: **these books in our hands today—are they the very ones that came from the mouths of their founders and the pens of their first writers? By what paths did they cross the centuries to us, and what befell them on the way?** That is the chapter "How the Texts Reached Us"—enter it with your kit sharpened.

> ***Cross-references for the chapter:*** *the conceptions of revelation and the rule "every book is judged by its own claim" in the opening of Chapter 16; the laboratory case of the Samaritan Torah and the three mechanisms of transmission in Chapter 16 and its study; and the Kuzari argument with its full scale in the study on mass transmission (Chapter 19).*

Study 15.1: The Comprehensive Table of the Founding Texts — Twelve Axes by One Standard

Size, time, the concept of revelation, structure, literary genres, style, scope, coherence, argument, and eloquence as the people of each text and its critics see them—with transmission and preservation referred to their own table; then what the table reveals and what it does not measure

Summary of the study: Put the Qur'an, the Torah, the Gospels, the Vedas, and the Tripitaka on a single table: how do you compare them fairly? Twelve axes, declared in advance—from the era of composition to the nature of the language to the mechanism of preservation—applied to every founding text by the same standard.

---

* Opening: Why One Table?

Chapter 15 distinguished the genres of sacred books. Chapter 16 dissected the conceptions of revelation and the mechanisms of transmission. The study on transmission weighed preservation by eight criteria. And the study on rhetorical inimitability weighed eloquence in its own house. It remained to set the great texts **side by side on all the axes in a single page**—because the seeker usually asks a comprehensive question: "Compare these books for me"—and is answered with a slogan from here and a slogan from there. Two rules

govern us: **first**, the descriptive axes (size, time, structure, genres) are measured by one standard; **second**, the evaluative axes (strength of presentation, expression, eloquence, coherence) **this book does not judge in its own voice**. For eloquence is measured inside its language, and only its own people can judge it, so in those cells we present **what the people of each text see and what its critics say,** side by side.

The First Table: The Material— Language, Size, Time, and the Concept of Revelation

Text	Original language	Approximate size	Approximate date of composition	Duration	Intermediaries	The concept of revelation among its people
The Rig Veda (the four Vedas)	Vedic Sanskrit	~10,600 verses in 1,028 hymns (the four Vedas several times that)	~1500–1200 BCE (written down very late)	Centuries	Sages (rishis) who "heard"	**Shruti**: an eternal, uncomposed hearing—with no author, divine or human
The Upanishads (the major ones)	Sanskrit	~13 principal Upanishads of varying size	~800–300 BCE	Centuries	Sages in dialogue	Shruti—inspired contemplation

Text	Original language	Approximate size	Approximate date of composition	Duration	Intermediaries	The concept of revelation among its people
The Gita	Sanskrit	700 verses (part of the Mahabharata: ~1.8 million words—the longest epic in the world)	~200 BCE–200 CE	—	Vyasa (traditionally)	The words of the incarnate Krishna—sacred smriti
The Pali Tipitaka	Pali	About 40 volumes in modern printing—among the largest canons	Oral composition ~5th century BCE; written down ~29 BCE	Centuries	The reciter-monks, from the Buddha	The words of an awakened one, not a revelation from heaven: "Thus have I heard"

Text	Original language	Approximate size	Approximate date of composition	Duration	Intermediaries	The concept of revelation among its people
The Avesta (what survives)	Avestan	About a quarter of the Sasanian original; the Gathas, 17 hymns	The Gathas ~1200–1000 BCE; the rest later	Centuries	Zoroaster, then the priests	A revelation from Ahura Mazda to Zoroaster (the Gathas in Zoroaster's own voice)
The Tao Te Ching	Classical Chinese	~5,000 characters—**among the smallest founding texts in the world**	~4th century BCE (tradition says older)	—	Laozi (traditionally)	Wisdom, not revelation

Text	Original language	Approximate size	Approximate date of composition	Duration	Intermediaries	The concept of revelation among its people
The Analects	Classical Chinese	~16,000 characters	Compiled generations after Confucius (~4th–3rd century BCE)	—	His disciples	The sayings of a teacher—no claim of revelation
The Tanakh	Hebrew (with Aramaic fragments)	~305,000 Hebrew words; 24 books (39 by the Christian count)	Gradual writing ~1000–200 BCE (with older oral material)	~eight centuries	Dozens of writers and editors	Revelation in degrees: the Torah of Moses (the highest), then the Prophets, then the Writings by the Holy Spirit—and a parallel oral Torah

Text	Original language	Approximate size	Approximate date of composition	Duration	Intermediaries	The concept of revelation among its people
The New Testament	Koine Greek	~138,000 words; 27 books	~50–110 CE	~sixty years	~9 writers (some anonymous)	Inspiration of human writers: "All scripture is inspired by God"—the true Word is Christ, not the book
The Qur'an	Arabic	~77,400 words; 114 suras, 6,236 verses—**the smallest of the Abrahamic books**	610–632 CE	23 years	One intermediary (Muhammad, from Gabriel)	**The speech of God in word and meaning**—the sending-down is literal, and the speaker is one

Text	Original language	Approximate size	Approximate date of composition	Duration	Intermediaries	The concept of revelation among its people
The Guru Granth Sahib	Punjabi, Hindi, and Persian (Gurmukhi script)	1,430 standard pages; ~6,000 hymns	1469–1708 CE	~two centuries	Ten Gurus + Hindu and Muslim saints	Inspired words—and the book itself a living Guru
The Book of Mormon	English (with an alleged "reformed Egyptian" original)	~270,000 words	1830 CE	—	Joseph Smith, by translating plates	An inspired translation of an ancient text—revelation continues

The Second Table: The Form— Structure, Genres, Style, Scope, Argument, and Eloquence

(a) Structure, genres, style, and scope

Text	Structure and order	Genres within it	Dominant style	Scope (what it covers)
The Vedas	Hymns arranged by deities and priestly families	Hymns, rites, contemplation	Concentrated ritual poetry	Rite and cosmos—no civil law
The Upanishads	Scattered dialogues	Philosophical dialogue, symbolic story	Contemplative prose and verse	Metaphysics and the self
The Gita	One continuous dialogue in 18 chapters	Epic-philosophical dialogue	Verse (the shloka)	Duty, salvation, and its paths

Text	Structure and order	Genres within it	Dominant style	Scope (what it covers)
The Tipitaka	Three baskets (discipline, discourses, philosophy)	Discourses, rules, stories, psychological analysis	Repetitive didactic prose in fixed formulas	The path, monasticism, and the self—no state and no civil law
The Avesta	Gathas + ritual books	Hymns, prayers, purity laws	Obscure verse (the Gathas) and prose	Moral choice and rite
The Tao Te Ching	81 sections	Maxims and paradoxes	Dense wisdom verse	Rule, life, and nature
The Analects	Scattered sayings in 20 books	Maxims, short dialogues, biography	Terse prose	Ethics, government, and education

The Tanakh	A library: law, then prophets, then writings	**The widest in genres**: narrative, law, poetry (the Psalms), wisdom, prophecy, apocalypse, love poems (the Song of Songs)	Varies with the writers	A complete law + a people's history + wisdom
The New Testament	Gospels, then Acts, then letters, then Apocalypse	Biography, history, theological letters, apocalypse	Popular prose (Koine, "the language of the marketplace," **deliberately**: the Word descended to the language of the poor)	Salvation, ethics, and the church—no civil law and no state

The Qur'an	114 suras **not in chronological order** (mostly longer to shorter)—the revelation was piecemeal and the order, for its people, divinely fixed	**Direct address**: creed, stories, legislation, promise and threat, argument, prayer—interwoven within a single sura	Rhythmic artistic prose with end-rhymes—neither poetry nor ordinary prose (a third genre, for its people)	**The most comprehensive of the Abrahamic books relative to its size**: creed, law, ethics, transactions, state, and hereafter
The Guru Granth	Arranged by musical modes (ragas)	Hymns to be sung	Lyrical mystical verse	Remembrance and ethics—no law

(b) Coherence, argument, and eloquence

Text	Thematic coherence	Argumentative discourse	Eloquence: what its people see / what its critics say
The Vedas	A collection, not a book	Almost none—praise, not dispute	Some of its people hold: the perfection of the sound is sacred, so that the letter came to matter more than the meaning / It is criticized on the ground that its Vedic Sanskrit is no longer intelligible except to specialists, and that the meanings of many of its hymns are disputed
The Upanishads	Some scholars hold that its compiled structure lacks a clear unity	Question-and-answer dialogue (teacher and pupil)	Some of its people hold: the summit of disclosed philosophy / Some critics hold

Text	Thematic coherence	Argumentative discourse	Eloquence: what its people see / what its critics say
			that among its many texts there are differences of conception that make it hard to unify
The Gita	**The highest coherence in the Indian house**—one text on one subject	Argumentative: Krishna answers Arjuna's objections	Some of its people hold: the summary of the Vedas in 700 verses / Some scholars hold that it is a late attempt to reconcile contending schools
The Tipitaka	Functional repetition for memorization	Calmly argumentative: the Buddha converses with Brahmins and ascetics	Some of its people see in it an exceptional analytical precision / Some critics hold that its repetition—intended for oral

Text	Thematic coherence	Argumentative discourse	Eloquence: what its people see / what its critics say
			preservation—weighs on continuous reading
The Avesta	Fragmented, because most of it was lost	The Gathas are an argumentative address to God	Some of its people hold: the oldest moral poetry / It is counted linguistically among the texts hardest to understand, owing to the antiquity of its language and the loss of most of it
The Tao Te Ching	A unity of spirit, not of structure	Does not argue—it intimates and falls silent	Some of its people hold: the most eloquent thing said in the fewest words / Some critics hold that its extreme concision opens the door to widely divergent interpretations

Text	Thematic coherence	Argumentative discourse	Eloquence: what its people see / what its critics say
The Analects	A compiled structure of scattered sayings (acknowledged by its people)	A teacher's dialogues	Some of its people hold: it shaped the ethics of a billion people / Some of its critics hold that its essential value lies in the content more than in the style
The Tanakh	Great variety (a thousand years of writing)—the unity of covenant and people	Polemical in the prophets (who rebuke), and Job argues with God Himself	Some of its people hold: biblical Hebrew is the standard of the language, and the Psalms of David the summit of religious poetry / Some critics hold that the multiplicity of its layers and sources—over centuries—produced variation in style and conception

Text	Thematic coherence	Argumentative discourse	Eloquence: what its people see / what its critics say
The New Testament	Four accounts of one event + occasional letters	Powerfully argumentative in Paul (Romans is the longest theological argument in the Book)	Some of its people hold: its power is in its simplicity and in the person of Christ, not in eloquence of wording / Some critics hold that its Greek is popular (Koine), not literary, and that the Gospel accounts differ in details
The Qur'an	Unity of style and a single speaker; **the repetition of stories in different forms, and movement among subjects within a sura**—its people read it as "thematic unity" and	**Among the most argumentative of sacred texts**: it converses with opponents, commands "Say" (~330 times), and marshals the	Some of its people hold: the summit of Arabic, by the testimony of its opponents—the challenge and the inability to match it (the study on i'jaz) / Some critics hold that its beauty is

Text	Thematic coherence	Argumentative discourse	Eloquence: what its people see / what its critics say
	deliberate arrangement, and some critics hold that it lacks the familiar thematic ordering	rhetorical "or," the challenge, and analogy	bound to its language and does not survive translation, and that its grammar and rare vocabulary contain disputed passages
The Guru Granth	A unity of melody and spirit	Little dispute; praise and remembrance	Some of its people hold: it is sung, not read—its perfection is in performance / Some scholars hold that the multiplicity of its languages makes reading it as a unity difficult

As for the axes of transmission, preservation, and alteration—the methods of collection, the earliest witnesses, the abundance of copies, the lines of transmission, the extent of variants, the stability of the text, the life of the oral tradition, and the possibility of recovery—they have been laid out in eight criteria across six texts in **the table of the eight criteria in the study on transmission** (Chapter 16), so we do not repeat them; their summary there: the shortness of the interval, early stability, and a living oral institution are most evident in the Qur'an. The abundance of witnesses in the New Testament. The best-protected oral tradition in the Vedas; and the widest loss in the Avesta.

* What the Two Tables Reveal—Six Observations

(1) Size measures none of what people think it measures. The smallest of the texts (the Tao: five thousand characters) is among the widest in influence, and the largest (the Mahabharata and the Tipitaka) are libraries, not books. And the Qur'an is the smallest of the Abrahamic books by a wide margin and the most comprehensive in legislation relative to its size. **So density is a more useful measure than size.**

(2) The concept of revelation decides everything after it. The text counted as the speech of God in its very words (the Qur'an) is preserved letter by letter, its like is the challenge, and its recitation is worship. The text counted as the inspiration of human writers (the New Testament) is translated without embarrassment and read with source criticism by its own people. The text

counted as an eternal hearing (the Vedas) has its sound preserved even when its meaning is lost. The text counted as a teacher's wisdom (the *Analects*) is a challenge to no one—so **"the strength of presentation"** follows the kind of claim before the quality of the text. **(3) Language and eloquence are two opposite pairs in the Abrahamic religions.** The Qur'an came down—by its people's claim—in the **highest** register of its language and issued its challenge by it. The New Testament was written—by its people's claim—in the **simplest** register of its language (popular Koine), descending to the poor. **And both houses read their language's choice as theological perfection**—so whoever comes to weigh "eloquence" on one standard across the two texts has measured two things that do not claim the same thing.

(4) Coherence and argument vary inversely with "the library." The texts written by many over centuries (the Tanakh, the New Testament, the Vedas) are wider in genres and less unified; the texts with a single speaker (the Qur'an, the Gita, the Tao) are stronger in unity of style. The most argumentative are the Qur'an, then the Gita, then Paul's letters, and the least the Vedas and the Tao, which fall silent and do not dispute: **the argumentative text exposes itself to examination, and the silent text exposes itself to interpretation. (5) And the question of "coherence" is itself governed by the genre of the text.** The Qur'an, which the critic reads as "moving" among subjects, its people read as "an address," not "a composed book." An address

moves by the demands of the occasion, not by the demands of an index—which is the point of dispute that taste cannot settle.

(6) And comprehensiveness has its price and its fruit. The comprehensive texts (the Torah and the Qur'an) gave their nations a law and a state, and paid the price of confronting every age with their details; the spiritual texts (the New Testament and the Tao) left the law to reason and were charged with the price of a vacuum that churches and states filled—we weighed this equation in full in the study on scope.

* The Scale on the Ladder—And the Study's Question

The claim (common to every nation): "Our book is the most eloquent, the most comprehensive, and the most tightly coherent." **The strongest case:** every house has the testimony of the people of its language and centuries of influence. **The strongest objection:** these axes cannot be measured by one standard across languages and genres—eloquence lives within a language, coherence within a genre, and scope follows the claim of revelation. **The strongest reply:** there really are objective axes (size, time, intermediaries, transmission), and the axes of taste are compared **inside each house**, between its claim and its performance. **What is established:** that the founding texts are different genres, not books competing in a single race, and that the concept of revelation decides the structure of the text, the way it is preserved, and the kind of its strength. **What is not established:** that any single axis of taste binds someone

who disagrees, across languages. **And the Seeker's Question:** if every house has shaped the language of its book in the image of its theology—rising high here, descending there, and falling silent elsewhere—**which image best befits a speech said to come from heaven: to rise above the language of human beings to overwhelm them, or to descend into their language to reach them, or to intimate and fall silent so that they may reflect?**. Your answer to this question says what you expect of revelation before it says which of the books you prefer.

Cross-references for the study: *the genres of sacred books and their shelves in the body of Chapter 15; the conceptions of revelation and the three cases in Chapter 16; and the table of the eight criteria of transmission in its study.*

Study 15.2: Religion and Languages — Where Did Language Come from, Why Did It Multiply, and Did Adam Have a First Language That Influenced All Languages?

Three questions in one: the origin of language, the reason for its multiplicity, and the sacred language—the tour through the religions' answers, then the table, then the four patterns, then what linguistics says, then the scale on the ladder

Summary of the study: The ancient story of Babel and modern linguistics meet over a single question: whether humanity once shared one original language before scattering into thousands. Here the origin of language is traced, and why it multiplied—and what all of it has to do with the language of revelation in each religion.

* Opening: Why Do the Religions Care About Language at All?

Because religion is speech before it is anything else: a revelation recited, a prayer spoken, a name of God pronounced—so it is natural that the religions should ask: where did language come from? why do we not understand one another? and is the language of our book the language of heaven? The nations answered the three questions in ways that intersect where you would not expect, and parted at one point in particular: **is the multiplicity of tongues a curse, or a sign?**

* First: The Tour—How Did the Nations Tell the Origin of Language and Its Multiplicity?

The Abrahamic house—the first naming and the Tower of Babel. The Book of Genesis begins language with an act of Adam: God brings the animals to Adam "to see what he would call them; and whatever the man called every living creature, that was its name" (Genesis 2:19)—so language is a gift that is exercised, not a dictionary that is dictated. Then it tells (chapter 11) that the earth had "one language," and people built a tower at Babel to reach heaven, "and there the LORD confused the language" and scattered them—**so multiplicity, in Genesis, is a punishment for pride**, and the lost linguistic unity is a lost paradise. The Jewish tradition held that Adam's language—and "the holy tongue" that the angels speak—is **Hebrew**, and the Kabbalah built a whole cosmos on its letters. **And the Qur'an reverses both points:** language, for it, is a direct divine teaching: "He taught Adam all the names"—not an Adamic naming. From this verse arose the most venerable debate in the history of the philosophy of language: **is it divinely instituted (*tawqif*), or a human convention (*istilah*)?** The majority held that the origin of language is a divine institution (He taught Adam), the Mu'tazila and those who agreed with them held that it is a human convention (the verse teaches meanings, not words), and Ibn Jinni took a middle path in *al-Khasa'is*: the root is instituted and the branches are convention—which is the question the Europeans would call, centuries later, "the origin of language," and which the Linguistic

Society of Paris banned from its agenda in 1866 for the volume of what had been said on it without proof. **And multiplicity is not a curse but a sign:** "Another of His signs is the creation of the heavens and earth, and the diversity of your languages and colours." So the diversity of tongues in the Qur'an is **a sign of the Creator of the same kind as the diversity of colors,** not a punishment for a tower; the Qur'an mentions no Babel and specifies no language of Adam (what is reported of his language being Syriac or Arabic are reports that do not rise to the level of the text, and the hadith "Arabic is the language of the people of Paradise" was weakened by the hadith scholars). Its unifying rule: "We have never sent a messenger who did not use his own people's language"—so no language is sacred in itself. Every revelation is in the tongue of those it addresses—with one practical exception that made Arabic the language of worship, because the text inimitable in its wording is not translated for worship. **Christianity** inherited Babel and added its own answer: on the day of **Pentecost** (Acts 2) the Spirit descended on the disciples "and they began to speak in other languages," and every people heard them in its own tongue.

So Pentecost is Babel reversed: unity is restored not by erasing multiplicity but by speaking within it—which is why Christianity became the religion that has translated its book most (you saw in the study on texts that popular Koine was chosen deliberately)—though Latin was sanctified in the West for centuries until Luther broke it with his translation.

India—language is a goddess and sound is creation. Sanskrit is *devavani*—the tongue of the gods—and the Vedas are eternal because their **sound** is eternal before their meaning. *Vac* (Speech) is a goddess in the Rig Veda, and *Om* is the syllable from which the cosmos burst forth. So India is the nation that has most sanctified sound: grammar became a sacred science there (Panini, fourth century BCE: the first systematic grammar in history, written to protect ritual pronunciation), and translation became a betrayal of the sonic power. **And Buddhism turned that upside down:** the Buddha ordered—as the Vinaya tells—that the dharma be taught "each in his own dialect," and refused to confine it to elite Sanskrit—the clearest ancient religious position **against** a sacred language (and then Pali was sanctified in its turn after centuries—sanctification returns). **The ancient East—the gods invent writing.** The Egyptian Thoth is the inventor of letters, and "the speech of the gods" is the name of the hieroglyphs. The Babylonian Nabu is the lord of scribes.

And the oldest account of the confusion of tongues is not in the Torah but in a Sumerian epic (Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta, ~2000 BCE): people used to address Enlil in one tongue, and Enki confused their tongues—a counterpart of Babel before it. **And China:** Cangjie invented the characters by observing the tracks of birds, and "the sky rained grain and the ghosts wept at night," because the secret had been disclosed—so writing is a cosmic power, and the Chinese character remained sacred, burned with reverence. **And the Greeks** conducted the first "experiment" in the

subject: Herodotus tells that the pharaoh Psammetichus isolated two children from all speech to see what language they would utter. They said "bekos" (bread, in Phrygian), so he ruled that Phrygian was the oldest of languages—the first experimental attempt to discover the original language, and the first methodological error in it.

Second: The Table —By One Standard

Tradition	The origin of language	Why did it multiply?	A sacred language?	Its position on translating its book
Judaism	Adam names (a gift exercised); Hebrew is the holy tongue	Babel: the punishment of pride	Yes—Hebrew (and its letters are powers in the Kabbalah)	Translation is read, not used in worship (the Septuagint was lamented)
Christianity	As in Genesis	Babel—and Pentecost reverses it	Not by text (the Word is Christ)—then Latin, Greek, and Syriac were sanctified	The most translated in history; translation is legitimate worship
Islam	"He taught Adam the names"—a debate:	A sign of God's signs, not a punishment	Arabic is the language of worship by the inimitable text, not the	The meaning is translated as commentary; the

Tradition	The origin of language	Why did it multiply?	A sacred language?	Its position on translating its book
	institution or convention		language of God or of Paradise (by text)	recitation is not translated
Hinduism	Sound is eternal; Vac is a goddess	No central account; multiplicity is hierarchical	Yes—Sanskrit, "the tongue of the gods"	Translation loses the sonic power
Buddhism	Human wisdom	—	No—"each in his own dialect" (then Pali was sanctified)	Early and wide (Chinese and Tibetan)
Zoroastrianism	—	—	Yes—Avestan (its sound preserved for centuries after its meaning was lost)	Late (Pahlavi)

Tradition	The origin of language	Why did it multiply?	A sacred language?	Its position on translating its book
Egypt and Mesopotamia	The gods invent writing (Thoth, Nabu)	Enki confuses the tongues (Enmerkar)	Writing itself is sacred	—
China	Cangjie invents the characters	—	The character is sacred (not the tongue)	—

* Third: The Four Patterns

(1) Is language a gift or a craft? The Torah makes the naming Adam's, the Qur'an makes it a divine teaching, India makes sound before the human being, and Buddhism and China make it wisdom and invention—and the Islamic debate (institution / convention) is the most mature theoretical form of this divergence.

(2) Is multiplicity a curse or a sign? The deepest divergence in the file: the Babel of the Torah and the Sumerians see it as punishment and loss. The Qur'an sees it as a sign and a richness. And Christian Pentecost sees it as a reality to be transcended by the Spirit, not by erasure. **And this divergence foretells each religion's conception of human difference in general. (3) The sacred language is a phenomenon that returns in most traditions:** even the religions that rejected it by text (Buddhism: each in his own dialect; Christianity: the Word is a person, not a tongue) came back and sanctified the language of their book by prescription (Pali, and Latin). So sanctification seeps from the text into its vessel by a social law, not a theological one. And Islam is the most explicit in combining the two: no language belongs to God, and Arabic is sacred **functionally**, as the vessel of a text inimitable in its wording.

(4) And the question of translation decides the whole shape of a religion: the religion that translates settles and fragments (national churches in their languages), and the religion that does not translate unifies nations by one tongue and requires that it be learned.

You saw in the study on spread that the two models succeeded in two ways.

* Fourth: What Linguistics Says—Precisely, to Guard Against the Fallacies of Both Sides

The origin of language. Modern scholarship holds it probable—from fossils, genes (the FOXP2 mutation and others), and the anatomy of the larynx—that the **capacity** for language appeared in our species once, in Africa, between about 50 and 150 thousand years ago (widely divergent estimates), and that it is more probable—not certain—that all living languages descend from one or a few first languages: that is, **a "unity of origin" for the linguistic capacity**, resembling what anthropology established about the unity of the species (you saw it in the study on the origin of the human being).

And its multiplicity needs no tower—languages diverge as species diverge: geographic isolation, then dialects, then languages that do not understand one another within a few centuries (Latin became French, Spanish, and Romanian within a thousand years before our eyes). So Babel, for the linguists, is **an explanatory myth** for a natural phenomenon, and for the literal believer an event that science cannot rule out, because it holds no record of what preceded writing. **And can "Adam's language" be reached?** Here the answer is decisive from both sides: **no**—the reconstruction of mother languages by the comparative method (as Proto-Indo-European was reconstructed, ~4500 BCE, with astonishing precision) stops at a time ceiling it cannot cross—about 8–10 thousand years—because

words are replaced until the trace is erased. The attempts to climb above that ("Nostratic," gathering the families of Eurasia, and then "the first mother tongue" of Greenberg and Ruhlen) **are rejected by most linguists** for the weakness of the method, though the idea itself is not excluded.

So neither Hebrew nor Arabic nor Sanskrit is "the origin of languages": the oldest **written** language is Sumerian (~3200 BCE), and it is **an isolate**, related to no known language. And Arabic and Hebrew are two sisters in one family (Semitic), not mother and daughter. **As for "the trace of Adam's language in all languages,"** it has one scientifically acceptable form: **structure**, not vocabulary—Chomsky's hypothesis of "universal grammar," that behind all languages lie the same deep rules implanted in the brain—a unity in **capacity**, not in **tongue**, which the believer reads as the trace of "the teaching of the names" in the makeup of the species, and the critic reads as the fruit of evolution. And the receptivity rule applies here. **And Umberto Eco chronicled the European search for the Adamic "perfect language"** (from Dante to the seventeenth century: was it Hebrew? Flemish? Swedish?—each nominating its own language!)—a search that ended with the birth of comparative linguistics, which showed that the question itself cannot be answered by vocabulary.

* The Scale on the Ladder—And the Study's Question

The claim (the comprehensive Abrahamic claim): "Human beings had one tongue, which God taught Adam, and then the tongues multiplied." **The strongest case:** the unity of the species entails the unity of its first tongue. Modern scholarship holds probable a single origin for the linguistic capacity. And the shared deep grammar is a witness. **The strongest objection:** no trace of a first tongue can be recovered. Multiplicity is explained by natural isolation without a tower. And nominating a particular language (Hebrew / Arabic / Sanskrit) is a nationalist contest with no witness. **The strongest reply:** the Abrahamic claim in the Qur'an nominates no language and denies no natural multiplicity but calls it a sign, so there is no collision. And the Torah tells of an event in a time that has no record. **What is established:** that the capacity for language most probably has a single origin. That multiplicity is natural and rapid. That no living language is "the origin"; and that the religions diverge in reading multiplicity in a way that reveals their vision of all difference. **What is not established:** that any particular language is Adam's, or that Babel is a historical event, or that universal grammar is "the trace of a divine teaching" or "the fruit of evolution"—that is interpretation above the datum. **And the Seeker's Question:** the Qur'an says the diversity of tongues is a sign, Genesis says it is a punishment, and science says it is nature.

So with what eye do you look at the foreigner whose language you do not understand: a brother who has lost your tongue, a walking punishment, or a speaking sign?—and your answer to this precedes everything you will read in the chapter on accepting the other.

Cross-references for the study: *the comprehensive table of the texts and their languages, and the question of Koine (the previous study); the concept of revelation and the rule "in his own people's language" in Chapter 16; and rhetorical inimitability and Arabic in Chapter 19.*

Chapter 16: How Did the Texts Reach Us?

The conceptions of revelation first, then three cases under the microscope: the Tanakh, the New Testament, and the Qur'an—each tradition's own account, the surviving evidence, and the limits of inference

> **Summary of the chapter:** Sacred texts do not make the same claim about their source, nor mean the same thing by preservation. So the examination begins by establishing what each tradition claims, then weighs three cases—the Tanakh, the New Testament, and the Qur'an—against the historical and manuscript evidence, stating in each what the evidence establishes and where inference reaches its limit; it closes with the criticism each house produced from within, and six rules for the seeker.

---

* Opening: The Most Dangerous Chapter in the Book—And Why?

Before you now is the most delicately sensitive chapter of this book, and the one of highest standing among the people of every faith: for the sacred book, to those who hold it, is not a document to be examined but the very cord of connection to heaven. To touch the soundness of its transmission is to touch the heart of the religion. Yet the seeker cannot escape the question. It is among the most obligatory of their questions: before I weigh **what** the book says, I have the right to know **how it reached me**: who wrote it? when? by what road did it

cross the centuries to me? What is the material evidence for the fidelity of the way? For if the arrival is flawed, the inquiry into what arrived collapses.

That is why we have resolved in this chapter on the strictest of our charter's pledges: every tradition's transmission is presented **in its own people's strongest account first,** then in the strongest of what criticism has said, then in the strongest replies—the numbers are cited with their caveats, the open files are called open, and no one is flattered and no one is wronged. We begin where one must always begin: by clarifying what each book claims for itself in the first place.

* First: The Conceptions of Revelation—Do Not Try a Book by the Standard of Another's Claim

The first key of the chapter, and the most neglected in popular debate: the sacred books **do not make the same claim,** to be tried by a single standard. There is a whole spectrum of conceptions of revelation:

Literal dictation. The Qur'an, for Muslims, is the speech of God in its wording and its meaning, brought down by "the Trustworthy Spirit" upon the heart of the Prophet, whose function was literal conveyance—so its claim is the highest of claims: the preservation of **the wording** itself, and we will hold it to that. **Inspiration of meaning through human pens.** The New Testament, for most the churches, is "inspired" in the sense that the Holy Spirit guided human writers who composed in their own styles, languages, and memories—which is why normative Christian theology is not

embarrassed by the differing styles of the Gospels and the angles of their narrators. What is infallible, for them, is **the message,** not the letter (though there exists within the house a fundamentalist current of "verbal inerrancy," it is one of its voices, not all of them). **Covenantal accumulation.** The Torah is presented by its own text in layers: tablets, the writing of Moses, commandments preserved, and history written down—and Orthodox Jewish tradition makes it a dictation to Moses, while other Jewish currents accept historical formation and locate sanctity in the covenant rather than in the mechanism of writing. **Eternal hearing.** The Vedas, for Hindus, are *shruti*—an eternal hearing **with no author at all** (neither god nor human!), which the sages caught—the strangest of claims to an Abrahamic ear, and the oldest tradition of disciplined oral recitation in history (they controlled it by interlocking systems of recitation that preserved the sounds for thousands of years before writing).

The teacher's preserved words. The texts of Buddhism claim no revelation but the preservation of the Buddha's words—gathered by councils of communal recitation after his death ("Thus have I heard . . .") and written down centuries later.

And the first methodological rule emerges from this presentation itself: every book is tried **by the standard of its own claim** first—whoever claimed the preservation of the letter is held to the letter. Whoever claimed the infallibility of the message and not the wording is not bound to what he did not claim. And whoever claimed no revelation at all is not embarrassed

by the questions of revelation. With this scale we enter the three great cases.

Second: The First Case—The Tanakh: The Oldest of the Roads and the Longest

The tradition's account. Moses wrote the Torah at his Lord's command. Prophets and scribes succeeded one another over the remaining books. And Ezra and the men of "the Great Assembly" sealed the collection after the return from exile. Then the text was guarded by the apparatus of **the Masorah**: generations of professional scribes who laid down the rules of copying to the point of a sacred obsession: they counted the letters and words of every book and identified its middle letter, fixed the vowels and the cantillation, and destroyed any copy in which an error occurred—until the Masoretic text in our hands (its oldest manuscripts: the Aleppo Codex, about 930 CE, part of which was lost; and the complete Leningrad Codex of 1008 CE) became a summit in the perfection of copying.

And the question of criticism was ready: between Moses and the Masoretic manuscripts lie about two thousand five hundred years—so what happened to the text in them? Criticism possessed three ancient witnesses for comparison: **the Samaritan text** (the Torah of the sect that split off in antiquity, containing thousands of differences from the Masoretic, most of them orthographic and some deliberately doctrinal—such as making Mount Gerizim the place of worship); **the Greek Septuagint** (third century BCE, with differences in places, some of them structural: the Book of Jeremiah

in it is shorter than the Masoretic by about an eighth, and differently arranged!). Then came **the miracle of textual archaeology: the Qumran scrolls** (discovered in 1947)—texts a full thousand years older than the Masoretic manuscripts. **And their double result is among the fairest things our chapter presents—for both camps found in them what they sought:** on the one hand, the Great Isaiah Scroll came out **in close correspondence with the Masoretic text** across a thousand years of copying—which believers regard as strong testimony to the fidelity of the Masorah. On the other hand, Hebrew copies of Jeremiah were found at Qumran in the **short** form that agrees with the Septuagint. So it was established that the plurality of forms of some books is **older than the translation**: an authentic Hebrew plurality, not the error of translators. The fair picture: a transmission of surpassing fidelity **since the stabilization of the text**, and a real layer of plurality **before the stabilization**—and the two camps dispute the interpretation of that earlier layer.

And above the criticism of copies lies a deeper criticism: academic "higher criticism"—whose lineage has a story worth a line: its seeds were cautious hints among medieval Jewish commentators (most famously Ibn Ezra's cryptic allusions to passages "containing a secret" that are hard to attribute to Moses). Then Spinoza declared it openly in the *Theological-Political Treatise* (1670): that the history of the Book should be read **from the Book itself.** He argued from its internal evidence (the account of Moses' death and burial, the phrases "to this day" . . .) that the Torah in its present

form did not come complete from Moses' pen but was compiled by a later editor (he favored Ezra)—and he paid for his boldness with excommunication and a ban, as you will see in the chapter on the history of doubt. Then the German academy inherited the method and crystallized it (the documentary hypothesis and its sisters), a reading that sees in the Torah multiple editorial strands gathered over centuries (the doubling of some stories, the alternation of the divine names . . .)—which Jewish Orthodoxy and conservative interpreters reject on principle (for them the doubling is the precision of teaching, not the multiplicity of pens), and with which other Jewish and Christian currents coexist through the concept of "covenantal accumulation" we presented—one of the largest files of the academy, open for two centuries, and it is enough for us to teach its location.

* Third: The Second Case—The New Testament: The Richest of the Roads in Manuscripts, and the Most Counted in Variants

Formation first. Christ—by everyone's agreement—wrote nothing and dictated nothing; he lived his message in word and deed, and his disciples carried the memory **orally** for a whole generation. The oldest written material is Paul's letters (from about 50 CE). Then the four Gospels were written successively, in what scholars consider the probable range of about 70 to 100 CE (Mark, then Matthew and Luke, then John)—**from four angles and in four styles, by four writers,** whose attribution rests on the testimony of the early Fathers

(Papias and Irenaeus), and which modern criticism debates because the Gospels themselves do not name their authors in their texts. **And among the jewels of our kit here is a sample from inside the house**: the introduction to *The Precious Treasure* (an authoritative Egyptian commentary on Matthew) discusses these same questions—attribution, original language, and date—with the discussion of an examining believer, a witness that the question is no innovation of opponents. Then **the canon** (that is, the authorized list: 27 books) settled through a course that took centuries, distinguishing the accepted from the "apocrypha" (many spurious gospels and acts), and the first list exactly matching today's canon appears in Athanasius's Festal Letter of 367 CE—with the declared criteria: antiquity, apostolicity, and the acceptance of the churches.

Then textual transmission—and here is the most famous battle of the age. The New Testament possesses what no other ancient book possesses: **an enormous manuscript abundance** (about 5,800 Greek manuscripts, from a scrap of a papyrus of John dating to about 125 CE to the great codices of the fourth century: the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus). This very abundance disclosed **hundreds of thousands of variants** among the manuscripts. On the interpretation of these two inseparable data stand the two scales we documented in our kit (which are the very two references of Amiri's book):

The scale of criticism (its most famous voice being Bart Ehrman): we do not possess the originals, nor copies of the originals, nor copies of copies of the

originals—and the first century of copying, the most dangerous, was the copying of amateurs, not professionals. The variants are not all spelling: among them are whole passages that textual criticism (by its own standards) judges to be **later than the original**, the most famous being three that have become the landmarks of the subject: **the long ending of Mark** (16:9–20), **the story of the adulterous woman** in John ("Let anyone among you who is without sin be the first to throw a stone . . .")—the most famous and best-loved of the Gospel stories, absent from the oldest manuscripts. **And the Johannine Comma** (1 John 5:7, the most explicit Trinitarian text, an interpolation by the admission of the critical editions themselves). **And the standard of defense** (its voice being the scholar Daniel Wallace and, before him, Metzger): the staggering numbers are propaganda unless they are dissected—the overwhelming majority of the variants are spelling and word order that touch no meaning; those of doctrinal significance among them amount to hardly anything. **And not a single Christian doctrine rests on a disputed passage alone.** Moreover, the abundance that disclosed the variants is the thing that permits **the reconstruction of the original** with high confidence—many differing witnesses are better than one witness with no check upon it. The three famous passages are known and marked in the modern editions themselves—that is, **textual criticism is a science practiced by Christians before it is a weapon of opponents. And our chapter's scale:** both scales are truthful in what they describe. The disagreement is over the

significance: is the scene read as "a text whose substance arrived by abundant witnesses despite the hand of the scribes," or "a text whose first wording can never be known with certainty"?—a disagreement fed directly by the conception of revelation we presented: whoever claimed the infallibility of the message is satisfied by the first, and whoever is required to preserve the letter is burdened by the second—**and this is exactly why you find the Islamic-Christian debate on this file sometimes a dialogue of the deaf: each holds the other to account by the claim of his own book.**

* Fourth: The Third Case—The Qur'an: The Maximal Claim and the Double Mechanism

The claim first, at its fullest—and here it is part of the structure of the religion itself. The Qur'an is unique among the books in making **its own preservation a stated divine promise**: "We have sent down the Qur'an Ourself, and We Ourself will guard it." So the soundness of transmission is, for Muslims, not merely a historical result but a doctrine and a continuing miracle (we classified it in the study on the supernatural aspect as "an open prophecy tested every century"). So the standard it accepted for itself is the highest of standards: the preservation of the letter.

And the mechanism as the tradition tells it—uniquely double. The channel of **memory**: a community that made memorization an act of worship; the Prophet recites and his Companions memorize; he

reviews the Qur'an with Gabriel every Ramadan (and twice in the final year). The five daily prayers are performed upon it every day within the hearing of the congregation—a daily popular check on the text with few parallels. The channel of **writing**: scribes of revelation writing down immediately upon its descent, in the Prophet's own time. Then the two documented turning points: **the collection of Abu Bakr** after the killing of the memorizers at al-Yamama—the committee of Zayd ibn Thabit gathering the text from memory and writing on the condition of two witnesses. **Then the unification of Uthman** (about 25 AH / 646 CE), when the provinces disputed the modes of recitation: the copying of the master codices from the final review, their dispatch to the provinces, **and the destruction of everything else.** This last event is the stage of the two opposing readings, which we present honestly: **the tradition** tells it as a consensus of the Companions (Ali said: he did what he did with the codices only with the agreement of us all) that settled a discord and unified the orthography on what had been mass-transmitted—and no one objected that anything of the Qur'an had been lost. **And the critic** reads the destruction itself as a question: what was in what was destroyed?—and cites the reports of the Companions' personal codices (Ibn Mas'ud and Ubayy) and their reported variants—and the tradition replies that those were the codices of individuals, containing inserted commentary and the modes of recitation before the unification, and that what counts is the final review agreed upon by all.

And the modes and the readings—the subtlest thing that confuses the seeker, so we clarify it. The ten mass-transmitted readings (Nafi', Asim, Hamza . . .) are not "conflicting versions" but **a disciplined plurality of recitation transmitted with its chains of authority**: differences of dialect, pronunciation, and a limited number of variant forms in words, all encompassed by the orthography of the Uthmanic codex (which was written without dots or vowel marks to accommodate them—and around which an independent science arose, "the science of orthography," which regulates its regular features: omission, addition, substitution, separation, and joining; chronicles its treatises from al-Dani's *al-Muqni'* onward; and records the scholars' disagreement over its rationale: is it divinely fixed and binding, or a scribal convention that may be departed from?—the majority holding it binding, to protect the accommodation of the readings). The reciter receives them **by chain of transmission, not by personal judgment**—and the structural difference between them and the variants among the manuscripts of the two Testaments is the key to the subject: those are **unintended scribal errors that are hunted for**, and these are **an authorized, transmitted plurality that is used in worship**—to confuse them (common in popular debate on both sides) is to confuse two different kinds of thing.

Then the material evidence—on which more has been built in recent decades than on anything else. We present it in the language of description, not judgment:

- **The Birmingham folios** (the University of Birmingham, parts of suras 18–20): their parchment

was radiocarbon-dated to the range 568–645 CE with 95% probability; the dating is of the parchment (the writing material), not of the ink, so the writing may be decades later than the parchment—a caveat both camps mention. The script is early Hijazi, and its text agrees with the received text in orthography, with differences in spelling (the writing of the alifs) and the absence of dots and vowel marks.

- **The codices of the first century AH** (Sanaa, Paris-Petersburg, Tübingen): dated by script and radiocarbon together to the first or the beginning of the second century AH. Their content agrees with the Uthmanic text in the order of the suras and the boundaries of the verses on the whole, with differences of the kind: transposition in a limited number of places, the spelling of words, and individual copying errors. Nothing more than this is to be inferred from them: they testify to the early stability of the received **orthography**, and do not by themselves testify to the vowel marking and the readings, whose codification came later.
- **The Sanaa palimpsest** (the manuscript written over an erased layer, disclosed by imaging): its lower layer is an early Qur'anic text differing from the Uthmanic in places: in synonyms, in transposition, in short additions and omissions, and in a different order of the suras. What the evidence establishes precisely: **the existence of a parallel Qur'anic text in the first century that differs from the unified text.** What lies beyond that is interpretation: a group of scholars read it as witness to an early textual plurality whose scale the

traditional account did not acknowledge; and the tradition, with other researchers, reads it as matching what the Islamic sources themselves reported about "the Companions' codices" that the unified codex replaced—so the layer, for them, is witness for the account, not against it. And the disagreement stands among the specialists over the dating of the lower layer and the standard of its differences.

As for the thesis that held that the Qur'an crystallized as a text two centuries after the Hijra (Wansbrough), its supporters in the academic field have retreated after the material evidence dated to the first century. Other theses remained, of limited presence in the academy and wide presence in the media—the most famous being **"The Syro-Aramaic Reading of the Koran"** (2000), by a writer under the pseudonym "Christoph Luxenberg": that the language of the Qur'an is an Arabic-Aramaic mixture and that its origin lies in Syriac church lectionaries that were misunderstood (his famous example: "houris with wide eyes" means, for him, "white grapes"). The majority of Orientalists themselves rejected his method for its philological weakness and its assuming what it sets out to prove, and Arab scholars of the Semitic languages answered him with comparative linguistics: the root *q-r-'* is shared by Arabic, Hebrew, and Syriac (so it is not borrowed from one of them). It was Syriac that turned the hamza into a *ya* in *qeryana*, not the reverse. The word *taht* ("under")—which he claimed has no root in Arabic—occurs in dozens of pre-Islamic verses. **With a caution to the credit of the Azhari scholarship itself:** some of these scholars

acknowledge the existence of words of Syriac origin in the Qur'an (such as *sariyy* in the sense of "the freed one," in the tongue of Christ) and count them as part of the inimitability rather than a deficiency.

So the question of "Arabized words in the Qur'an" is a venerable internal Islamic dispute with three positions (their absolute denial by al-Shafi'i, Abu Ubayda, and al-Tabari; their limited affirmation by Ibn Abbas and al-Suyuti; and the middle position of Abu Ubayd al-Qasim ibn Sallam: foreign in origin, Arabic by usage before the revelation). The existence of an Arabized word says nothing about the source of the Book; that is another field.

And the fair summary of the scale: most scholars of transmission—non-Muslims among them—hold that the text of the Qur'an **stabilized in its orthography at an early date by comparison with the other texts of the ancient world,** while legitimate files of research remain (the history of dotting and vowel marking, the Sanaa palimpsest, and the codification of the sciences of the readings), which the active manuscript scholarship of today addresses. **And the field for binding someone who disagrees remains what we established:** that each hold the book to its own claim: the Muslim says to his opponent: your book did not promise the preservation of the letter, and its reality is likewise. My book promised and fulfilled—and the critic turns it into a question about the layer before the Uthmanic unification—and we have placed all the cards on the table before you.

* Fifth: Criticism from Inside the Houses—The Witness That Is Forgotten

The seeker supposes that the criticism of transmission is the craft of opponents and atheists, and history says otherwise—**for in every tradition the science of examination arose from inside faith itself**: the Jewish Masorah counted the letters as a guard. The Fathers of the Church themselves practiced textual criticism centuries before the critics (Origen in the third century tabulating the variants of the copies in his *Hexapla*, and Jerome complaining of the liberties of the scribes). Modern textual criticism was founded mostly by believing Christian hands in the service of the text, not for its demolition. The Muslims founded the largest apparatus for examining transmission the ancient world knew: **the sciences of the chain of authority, of the transmitters, and of hidden defects**—chains of narrators whose ages, meetings, precision, and integrity are examined (and among our sources is the witness of a living line: an academic thesis of 449 pages examining a **single** hadith transmitter), and the distinguishing of the sound from the defective by a precise craft. **And a caution that prevents a common confusion:** the subject of this chain-of-authority apparatus is **the Prophetic hadith**, transmitted by single chains—whereas the Qur'an's road is the general double mass transmission that has passed, and the two are transmissions of different method and rank for Muslims themselves. Hence the contemporary debate over the Sunna (we documented in our sources its three layers: sober academic

criticism, then populist demolition, then the methodical reply—and its lesson: do not try a case by its weakest books) is an internal Islamic matter within the circle of hadith, not a touching of the claim of the Qur'an's transmission—and confusing the two is among the errors most in circulation in the arena.

* Sixth: The Seeker's Six Rules—The Chapter's Kit

1. Try every book by its own claim first—so do not demand of the Gospels the preservation of the letter they did not claim, and do not excuse the Qur'an from it when it did claim it. Then you may afterward weigh the claims themselves.

2. Sound transmission is a condition, not a proof— the finest distinction of the chapter: precise transmission proves that what is in your hands is what the source said, **and it is not enough by itself to prove that what the source said is true**—a false message may be transmitted with precision, and a true wisdom may be tampered with by scribes. The examination of arrival (this chapter) is not examining content (the field of evidence). Whoever wins the battle of transmission has not yet won the war.

3. Distinguish the layers of variation—spelling and orthography; then order and synonymy; then additions and passages; then what touches doctrine: four layers that the discourse of alarm ("hundreds of thousands!") and the discourse of dismissal ("no variation at all!") both confuse—and both are propaganda.

4. Manuscripts are a witness, not a sole judge—the oldest is not always the most correct (a poor copy may have survived and an excellent one perished), and the verdict is by the concurrence of witnesses: manuscripts, readings, citations, and the history of the text together.

5. Beware the numbers of the pulpits on both sides—and always ask for: the sample, the classification, and the proportion that matters—not the bare number.

6. The glass of the narrators is the brother of the glass of the opponents—the history of every book's transmission was written by its loving people, just as the reports of the atheists were written by their opponents. So piety in documentation is to read each house's account of its transmission, and then to examine it by the independent material evidence where it exists—and you have seen how we tried every account against its parchments.

* Conclusion: The Chapter's Open Question—Is Heaven Bound to Preserve the Letter?

We have toured the three great roads (and, at the chapter's opening, the edges of the roads of India and Persia), and we return from the journey with a survey, not a verdict: a Hebrew road of surpassing precision since its stabilization, with an ancient exposed layer of plurality upon it. A Greek road rich in witnesses, exposed in its variants, with their places declared. An Arabic road with two channels, early in its stabilization, whose parchments came out of the laboratory confirming its

account—and every road with its named open files. There remains for the seeker the chapter's deepest question, which we hand over with its three faces: **the Muslim says**: the God who sends down a book for all the worlds until the Hour is bound by His wisdom to preserve it. My book alone promised and fulfilled, and that is the seal of its truth. **The Christian says**: rather, God willed that His word should dwell in human vessels as the Word dwelt in a body—so the infallibility of the substance with the humanity of the vessel is the very logic of the incarnation, and to demand the infallibility of the letter is to demand what was not promised. **And the critic says**: I see promises tailored to the measure of reality after it is known—whoever's transmission was sound made soundness a miracle, and whoever's transmission varied made variation a wisdom. And the likelier thing is that books are subject to the laws of books. Three answers that reveal that the question "how did the text reach us?" remains suspended from the question "what should the one who sent it down have promised?"—and that is among the first questions of conception, which no manuscript or carbon decides, but your own scale at the end of the journey.

Cross-references for the chapter: *the landscape of the sacred texts and their structure in Chapter 15; the prophecy of preservation within the supernatural aspect in Chapter 19; and the argument from mass transmission there as well.*

Study 16.1: The Mechanisms of Collection, Writing, and Preservation Under the Microscope — And the Great Comparison

An anatomy of the craft of transmission in the three traditions; the four doors of alteration and how each system closes them; and the comparison table—and why the Qur'an leads in transmission by the criteria of the craft itself

> **Summary of the study:** Every sacred book claims to have been preserved. But how was it actually preserved, by what mechanism, and in whose hands? Under the historical microscope: the methods of compilation, writing, and preservation in each major tradition, and a direct comparison revealing exactly where these mechanisms agree and where they diverge.

---

* First: Before Anything Else—Why Are There No "Originals" Of Any Ancient Book?

The seeker asks innocently: where is the first copy? The answer comes from materials science before theology: the ancients wrote on **perishable media**—the papyrus of Egypt, which crumbles from humidity within a century or two outside a desert climate; the sturdier parchment, which wears out with use; and the palm ribs, flat stones, and bones of the Arabian Peninsula. So the natural perishing of first copies is **the law of nearly all the books of the ancient world** (we have no original of Homer, or Plato, or Cicero, and the oldest witnesses for

some of them come a thousand years later)—which is why no sacred book is faulted for the loss of its original. Books are measured by what comes after that: **the strength of the bridge** stretched between the perishable original and the oldest surviving witnesses: who carried the text across the gap? by what craft? through how many channels? Under what supervision?—and that is the field of our study.

* Second: The Anatomy of the Craft—How Did Each Apparatus of Transmission Actually Work?

The apparatus of the Torah: the sacred craft of the scribes—after stabilization

The Jewish apparatus of copying (the *soferim* and then the Masoretes) reached a summit no copying apparatus in history has reached **in codification**: the ritual Torah scroll may be copied only on the skin of a clean animal, in a specified ink, copied from a copy and not from memory (to prevent the error of memory!), with the word spoken before it is written, and with rules for columns, lines, and spacing. Then the supervision after copying: the counting of the letters and words of the book and their matching against the preserved tables (they even identified the middle letter of the whole Torah!), the setting of a ceiling of errors beyond which the copy is destroyed, **and the destruction** of the worn and the defective as a destruction of reverence, in the *genizah*, not as discarding. This craft explains the miracle of the thousand-year stability of Isaiah that we saw at

Qumran. **But its time limit is the crux of criticism:** this apparatus is the apparatus of **the period after stabilization**—whereas the long first centuries (from Moses to after the exile: about eight centuries and more) have no apparatus with documented links and no material witnesses, and in them occurred—by the testimony of the books of the Tanakh themselves—ordeals of loss and rediscovery (the book of the law is "found" in the Temple in the days of Josiah after being forgotten!), an exile, and the burning of a temple. The layer of plurality (Samaritan / Septuagint / short Qumran) is the witness of that fluid era. **So the summary of its structure:** a bridge whose second half is steel without parallel, and whose first half is a fog contested between the tradition's account and the hypotheses of criticism.

The apparatus of the New Testament: free multiplication—the power of spread and its price

The New Testament took an exactly opposite road: **no central apparatus at all in its first centuries**—persecuted, scattered churches exchanging letters and Gospels, copied by volunteer hands (mostly amateurs, not professional scribes) in free, rapid copying, in early languages and translations (Syriac, Latin, and Coptic). When the empire became Christian, the craft passed to the *scriptoria*—the copying workshops of the churches and monasteries—with rising professionalism. **And the fruit of this system is double in a precise way:** free multiplication with no center made the text **branch** into textual families (Alexandrian, Western, Byzantine), each carrying its own readings and inherited errors—

and this is the source of the hundreds of thousands of variants. **But it is the same thing** that made **coordinated, central alteration impossible**: no authority could have changed copies scattered across three continents in ten languages—which is why the critic today, by comparing the independent families, can **reconstruct** the oldest text and expose the later additions (by this very craft the ending of Mark and the story of the adulteress were marked). So the strength of this apparatus lies in **the capacity for repair after damage**, not in preventing damage at the outset.

The apparatus of the Qur'an: the two simultaneous channels—and the prevention of damage at the source

The Qur'an took a third way that resembles neither of the two, and its uniqueness lies in the **simultaneity** of elements that came together for it and for no other:

(a) Writing down in the lifetime of the claimant himself—scribes of revelation recording immediately upon its descent (this alone is a qualitative difference: Moses is separated from the oldest witnesses of his Torah by centuries, Christ neither wrote nor dictated, and Muhammad supervised the writing and arrangement of his text: "place this verse in such-and-such a position").
(b) And a simultaneous mass memorization—not a single narrator nor a monopolizing priestly class, but an unlettered community whose memory was its archive, which made memorization an act of worship and an honor, in which memory and writing support each other in mutual verification: the memorizer corrects the scribe and the written text checks the memorizer.

(c) And a daily ritual supervision—the text is recited aloud in the prayers within the hearing of the congregation five times every day, and completed in Ramadan. So any slip is exposed at once in the prayer niche: a system of continuous collective checking for which a parallel in the history of texts is hard to find.

(d) And an annual controlling review—the review with Gabriel every Ramadan, and the two reviews of the final year, from which came "the final review" that became the measure of the collection.

(e) And a very early standard unification—for while the New Testament waited three centuries for its canon to settle and centuries for the families of its text to differentiate, the whole question of the Qur'an was settled within a quarter century of the Prophet's death: the collection of Abu Bakr (Zayd's committee, with the two conditions of witness: the written material in the Prophet's presence + the testimony of memorization) and then Uthman's codices for the provinces by a documented consensus.

So branching was cut off in its cradle before it began.

(f) And then the institutionalization of living transmission down to today—the strangest thing in the apparatus to the modern eye: recitation by unbroken chain of authority is still a working institution: the student recites the whole Qur'an to a master reciter, who licenses him with a chain running man to man back to the Prophet—living chains granted every day in Cairo, Damascus, and Istanbul. With them a phenomenon now measurable in the field: **millions of living memorizers**

of a text of six hundred pages, memorized letter by letter—so that if all the codices on earth were destroyed tonight, it would be rewritten tomorrow from memory—as its people affirm—with not a letter in dispute. As for what came after the unification, it was secured by successive layers of control: dotting (to distinguish the letters), then vowel marking (for the vowels), then the sciences of orthography, marking, and counting—all with documented history and documented men. Indeed the craft in the service of memorization went so far that the community devoted an independent science to passages of similar wording ("the verbal near-identical"), the ancients wrote on it, and in our age **codices of the near-identical passages** have been printed that index in the margin of every page its counterparts across the suras, to fortify the memorizers' hearts against slips. For wherever a text exists around which a craft of control of this thoroughness is built, that is the mark of a community that made the preservation of the letter a worship and an institution.

* Third: The Four Doors of Alteration—And How Each System Closes Them (Or Opens Them)

We rise now from description to neutral structural analysis. Alteration that is theoretically possible comes through four doors, and every apparatus has its account before each door:

The door of slip (the scribe's unintended error): opened wide in individual written copying (which the manuscripts of the two Testaments have in fact demonstrated by their counted errors); narrowed by the

Masoretic craft through counting. **And almost bolted** by the Qur'anic double verification: the scribe's slip collides with the community's memory, and the memorizer's slip collides with the written line and with thousands of other memorizers—which is why Qur'anic variation was confined to **the authorized transmitted** (the readings with their chains), not to the random.

The door of loss (the falling away of parts): open where copies are rare and the incubating communities are turbulent (the book of the law "found" in the Temple is witness to its possibility). Bolted where the text is preserved in thousands of geographically distributed memories. For its loss would require the extermination of the community, not the burning of a library.

The door of interpolation (the creeping in of later additions): open in free multiplication (the story of the adulteress crept—for all its beauty—into a text it had not been part of, and settled there for centuries before examining the families exposed it). Bolted where there is daily mass supervision: adding a line to a text that millions recite morning and evening is exposed at the first congregational prayer.

And the door of deliberate revision (an authority changing the text on purpose): the most dangerous of them and the rarest to prove. **And its structural paradox is that every system is immune to it from one side and exposed from another**: decentralized branching makes comprehensive revision impossible (the immunity of the New Testament) but permits local revisions that run in one family and not another (and these have been detected: the local "orthodox

corruptions of scripture" are a standing academic file). Early central unification cuts off later local revisions decisively (the immunity of the Qur'an after Uthman—for the text became one and witnessed, in which not a dot could go unnoticed), but it leaves the critic his question about the moment of unification itself. The tradition's double answer: that the unification took place by a public consensus of the generation of memorizing witnesses themselves (not in their absence), and that the material witness (the lower layer of Sanaa and its like) showed that what preceded the unification was of the kind **the sources themselves reported** (modes and individuals' codices with limited differences of recitation), not other texts. So the account came out of the test structurally sound. The scale of this door—like the rest of the chapter—is presented with both its faces.

Fourth: The Great Comparison Table

Criterion	The Torah / Tanakh	The New Testament	The Qur'an
Writing down in the lifetime of the bearer of the message	Partial, according to tradition; no material witness	No—Christ did not write; the first written material ~20 years after him	Yes—scribes of revelation, immediately upon descent
The gap to the oldest extensive material witness	~1,000+ years (Qumran) from the end of composition; far longer from its beginning	~40–250 years (the John papyrus, then the great codices)	~a few decades (Birmingham and Sanaa—the first century AH)
A parallel disciplined oral channel	Partial temple recitation; the mainstay is copying	No (only free orality before writing)	Yes—mass memorization, mass-transmitted, simultaneous with writing

Criterion	The Torah / Tanakh	The New Testament	The Qur'an
Daily ritual supervision of the letter	The periodic Sabbath readings (partial)	Church readings, mostly of the meaning	Five audible daily prayers + complete recitations
An early standard center of unification	Gradual stabilization (Ezra, then the Masorah) after centuries	No center; the canon stabilized in ~3 centuries and the text over longer	Yes—within ~25 years of the death, by documented consensus
The pattern of remaining plurality	Three major recensions (Masoretic / Samaritan / Septuagint)	Hundreds of thousands of incidental copying variants (mostly orthographic)	Limited authorized transmitted readings, bound by chain and orthography
The capacity to reconstruct the original when in doubt	Medium (a few major witnesses)	High (abundance of independent families)	Rarely needed at all (a single text, early stabilized)

Criterion	The Torah / Tanakh	The New Testament	The Qur'an
The life of the text's language today	Ancient Hebrew died and was revived in modernized form	Koine Greek is no longer a spoken language	Classical Arabic is alive and continuous; the text is used in worship in its own language
A living institution of transmission by chain of authority today	Rabbinic chains for the tradition, not for controlling the letter	No	Yes—the unbroken Qur'anic license is operative
Memorizers of the whole text today	Rare individuals	Its complete verbatim memorization is not known as a phenomenon	Millions, documented

* Fourth (Continued): The Table of the Eight Objective Criteria—By One Standard, on the Six Founding Texts

The previous table compares **the structures of the apparatuses**. This table compares **the objective, auditable measures**—eight criteria that textual criticism uses wherever it works: **(1)** the date of the oldest manuscript witness; **(2)** the time distance between the origin of the text and its oldest witnesses; **(3)** the number of manuscript witnesses; **(4)** the multiplicity of independent lines of transmission; **(5)** the degree of textual variation among the witnesses; **(6)** the time of the text's stabilization; **(7)** the existence of an institutional oral tradition; **(8)** the possibility of reconstructing the text when in doubt. The eight are applied **to everyone without exception**—the three Abrahamic texts, then the three Eastern ones—and the figures are approximate according to current academic scholarship (and subject, like all the figures in this book, to the protocol of page-by-page audit).

(a) The three Abrahamic texts

Criterion	The Tanakh (the Old Testament)	The New Testament	The Qur'an
1. Oldest manuscript witness	The Qumran fragments (~250 BCE–70 CE) for parts; the oldest nearly complete Masoretic copies: the Aleppo Codex (~930 CE) and Leningrad (1008 CE)	A papyrus scrap (P52, John) ~125–175 CE; papyri of the 3rd century; the oldest complete copies: the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus (4th century)	Parchments radiocarbon-dated to the 7th century CE (Birmingham: 568–645 CE at 95% probability; the Sanaa and Paris-Petersburg folios)—most of them extensive parts; and nearly complete codices from the 1st–2nd centuries AH
2. Time distance	From the gradual writing (~1000–200 BCE) to Qumran: centuries; to the complete Masoretic: >1,000 years	~50–100 years for the scraps; ~250–300 years for the first complete copy	Decades (0–50 years) for the oldest parchments; ~a century for the first nearly complete codices
3. Number of	~230 biblical manuscripts at Qumran	The most abundant in the ancient world:	Dozens of manuscripts from the 1st–2nd

Criterion	The Tanakh (the Old Testament)	The New Testament	The Qur'an
wit-nesses	(fragments); hundreds of medieval Masoretic manuscripts; and the witnesses of the Septuagint and the Samaritan	~5,800 Greek manuscripts (most of them late), ~10,000 Latin, ancient translations, and tens of thousands of patristic citations	centuries AH (thousands of folios documented in *Corpus Coranicum* and its counterparts), then a vast abundance later
4. Multiplicity of independent lines	Three to four: Masoretic / Samaritan (for the Torah) / Greek Septuagint / the Qumran types	Major text-types (Alexandrian, Western, Byzantine) and sub-families—wide branching	A double simultaneous channel (oral with chains + written) and a single orthography from which authorized transmitted readings branch; and the lower layer of Sanaa, a rare witness to a pre-unification text

Criterion	The Tanakh (the Old Testament)	The New Testament	The Qur'an
5. Degree of textual variation	Significant differences among the lines (Jeremiah shorter in the Septuagint by about an eighth; differing ages in Genesis; the Qumran readings); the Masoretic itself very stable internally	Hundreds of thousands of readings (mostly orthographic or of word order); a handful of significant passages (the long ending of Mark, the story of the adulteress, "the Johannine Comma")	Differences of the readings in recitation and in a few letters within the orthography; limited verbal and ordering differences in the lower layer of Sanaa; the proportion affecting meaning is very small
6. Time of stabilization	Gradual: the canon ~1st century CE, and the Masoretic control (vowels and notes) between the 7th and 10th centuries	The canon stabilized ~4th century; the received text is medieval Byzantine; the modern critical text (Nestle-Aland) is continually reconstructed	Very early: the unification of the orthography under Uthman (~650 CE), within ~25 years of the death

Criterion	The Tanakh (the Old Testament)	The New Testament	The Qur'an
7. Institutional oral tradition	Yes—a controlled rabbinic reading, an oral Torah for interpretation, and the Masorah as oral control before the pointing	An oral tradition **prior** to writing (~20–40 years); no later institution of verbatim oral preservation	Yes—a living continuous institution (complete memorization by chain and license, and millions of memorizers today)
8. Possibility of reconstruction when in doubt	The Masoretic is stable; the reconstruction of an "original" before Qumran is unattainable (textual criticism is eclectic among the witnesses)	High for the 2nd-century text thanks to the abundance of independent witnesses, with a handful of places of uncertainty	The Uthmanic text is fully stable; the reconstruction of what preceded it is limited to the Sanaa witness and the reports of the personal codices

(b) The three Eastern texts

Crite-rion	The Vedas (the Rig Veda)	The Avesta	The Pali Tipitaka
1. Oldest manu-script witness	Manuscripts very late relative to the time of composition (not earlier than the late medieval period, about the 14th–15th centuries CE)	The oldest surviving manuscript: ~1288 CE; most from the 13th–14th centuries	Burmese gold leaves of the 5th–6th centuries CE for fragments; com-plete manuscripts from the 15th–16th centuries
2. Time distance	From composition (~1500–1200 BCE) to the manuscript: ~2,500–3,000 years—the longest distance in the table	The Gathas (~1200–1000 BCE) to the first Sasanian writing (6th century CE): >1,500 years; to the surviving manuscript: >2,000 years	From oral composition (~5th century BCE) to writing (~29 BCE in Sri Lanka): ~4 centuries; to the complete manu-scripts: ~2,000 years

3. Number of witnesses	Many, late; no ancient manuscript witness	Few: a few dozen original manuscripts	Many from the 15th century onward in Burma, Sri Lanka, and Thailand
4. Multiplicity of lines	Branches of schools (*shakha*): Shakala is the surviving one for the Rig Veda, and Bashkala is rare; wider multiplicity in the other Vedas	A single priestly tradition in an Avestan script invented in the Sasanian period; most of the Sasanian Avesta was lost (the survival is estimated at about a quarter)	Three relatively independent lines: the Pali (Theravada), the Sanskrit Agamas, and the Chinese translations—permitting collation
5. Degree of textual variation	Very slight within a single branch—counted among the most stable oral transmissions in history	Stable in what survives, deficient in what was lost	High agreement among the Pali copies; real differences between the Pali and the Agamas, with a shared structure

6. Time of stabilization	Early, through systematic oral preservation (centuries before the common era)	The Sasanian writing (6th century CE), after a thousand years of orality	Stabilized by writing ~1st century BCE, and by the commentaries (Buddhaghosa, 5th century CE)
7. Institutional oral tradition	The strongest in the table: multiple Brahmin methods of preservation (reciting the words singly, interwoven, and reversed) that guarded the text verbatim and phonetically	A long priestly oral tradition, then written	Yes—classes of specialized "reciters" (*bhanakas*) for the divisions of the canon
8. Possibility of reconstruction	The Shakala text is stable; what is older than it is lost	Unattainable for the lost; stable for what survives	The Pali text is stable since the commentaries; collation with the Agamas helps distinguish the layers

A reading of the two tables—in the voice of the scale, not the voice of judgment. The observer comes away with observations that specialists acknowledge across their differing faiths: that **shortness of interval** (criteria 1 and 2) is most evident in the Qur'an, then the New Testament. That **abundance of witnesses** (3) is most plentiful in the New Testament. That **early stabilization** (6) and **a living oral institution** (7) are strongest in the Qur'an, followed orally by the Vedas. That **multiplicity of lines** (4) is a double-edged sword: it opens the door of variation (5) and with it the door of reconstruction (8). So the New Testament is the most varied of them and, for that very reason, the most capable of reconstructing its original, while the Qur'an is the least varied and the least in need of reconstruction. And that **the enormous manuscript distance** of the Vedas is compensated by an oral tradition unique in its discipline. **And each camp reads the table from its own angle:** the supporters of each text see in it what honors their apparatus and object to the others' reading, and the critics remind us that the eight criteria measure **arrival** alone—the highest marks in them say nothing about **the truth** of what arrived, and that is another field (our rule: sound transmission is a condition, not a proof).

* Fifth: Why Does the Qur'an Lead in Transmission?—The Answer by the Criteria, and the Limits of the Answer

The observer reads the table and sees the outcome drawn before it is spoken, and we state it as the declared criteria yield it—not as a verdict of ours—**on the two conditions of honesty: that it be built on the named criteria, not on emotion, and that its limits, and those who contest it, be stated**:

By these criteria—which are criteria of craft, not of creed—the Qur'an comes at the head of the ladder of transmissional reliability **because its apparatus combined six characteristics that never came together for any other ancient text**: writing in the lifetime of its bearer and under his supervision; the double, mutually verifying channel (memory and writing, each correcting the other); daily mass ritual supervision; early standard unification by the consensus of the generation of witnesses (so branching was cut off before it arose—which the New Testament needed centuries and a whole science to repair the effects of after the fact). A material gap short to the point of contiguity (parchments that embrace the age of revelation). The continuity of the living institution (in language, chain, and memorizers) without the interruption of a single night in fourteen centuries. **And this is the outcome of the standard, not the verdict of the book:** its criteria are the very criteria of the science of transmission by which we tried everyone; the supporters of the text grant them as self-evident, and scholars from outside the faith grant most of them in the matter of **arrival** specifically (more than

one scholar of critical Orientalism has described Qur'anic transmission as among the most reliable and most quickly stabilized transmissions of the ancient religious heritage, confining the serious dispute to the details of marking and dotting and the pre-unification layer), **and a critical camp contests them**—the revisionist school (Wansbrough and his followers), which delays the stabilization of the text by a century or more and reads the Islamic reports of the collection with suspicion. Their view is a minority in contemporary academic scholarship after the discoveries of the early manuscripts, but it stands and is cited by its genre.

Then the three limits of the answer—which belong to its core, not as an afterthought.

The first: transmissional superiority answers the question "did what Muhammad said reach us?"—and the answer is yes, at the highest degrees of historical documentation—**not** the question "was what he said a revelation from God?." For that is the field of evidence (Chapter 19), not the field of transmission. And whoever confuses the two fields loses both (the second rule again, here at the summit of its importance).

The second: the comparison is fair in its criteria and harsh in its neglect if you forget the difference of claims: the other books—as we established—did not claim for themselves the preservation of the letter, to be defeated in its race. The Christian answers calmly: my criterion is the infallibility of the message, and it reached me by abundant witnesses. The race of the letter is your race, not mine—so let the Qur'an's lead in this table be

understood on its own terms: an advance in the criterion the text itself declared it would enter ("We Ourself will guard it")—the criterion of preserving the letter—not in the criteria of the other texts, which did not claim that. The Muslim arguer sees in this advance a witness, because the claim was open to examination and withstood it, while the critic sees that the preservation of the letter—even if established—says nothing about the source of the text.

The third: the named files of research (the lower layer of the Sanaa palimpsest, the history of dotting and marking, the codification of the readings) remain open to study, as befits every living science. The defenders of the traditional account hold that the results of material dating in recent decades have come out consistent with their account on the whole, while the critics hold that these results settle the history of **the orthography** and do not settle the history of **the marking and the readings**, nor explain all the differences of the lower layer.

So the summary of the study on the seeker's scale: if your question is "which of the texts is the most secure in reaching my hand, letter for letter, from the mouth of its speaker?" the answer the criteria impose is: the Qur'an, by a structural margin and not merely a ranking of degrees. If your question is the larger one, "and which of them is the speech of God?"—then by this chapter you have fulfilled the condition of the question, not its answer—and the answer is where we have always left it: in evidence, and on your own scale.

Cross-references for the study: *the parent chapter above with its six rules; the prophecy "We Ourself will guard it" within the supernatural aspect in Chapter 19; and the argument from mass transmission there.*

Part VI: The Other Face

Those who did not believe

* Chapter 17: The History of Doubt, Atheism, and Irreligion Across the Civilizations (The Other Face)

Between denial, the suspension of judgment, and the critique of inherited religion: what did they say, and how did their societies receive them?

> **Summary of the chapter:** The map is completed by looking at the history of doubt, atheism, and irreligion—and at the positions that criticized inherited religion without denying all faith. We follow the arguments of those who held them, the circumstances in which they arose, and how their societies received them, with the same fairness we ask for when presenting the religions, and distinguishing throughout between what a person said of himself and what his opponents attributed to him.

* Opening: Why Write the History of Those Who Did Not Believe?

In the preceding parts we traveled a long journey through the continent of believers: their maps, their gods, their messengers, and their texts. But the map of humanity is not complete with that alone;

in nearly every age, and in civilizations with no connection to one another, there were people who stood outside the temple: some denied the gods altogether, some doubted and suspended judgment, some believed in a God but rejected religions and priesthoods, and some said simply: I do not know. These people are part of the history of the religious phenomenon itself—for just as the spread of religiosity is a phenomenon that deserves explanation (Chapter 1), the persistence of doubt and denial across the ages is a phenomenon that deserves explanation too. The seeker who wants to choose with open eyes needs to know this "other face" as it is—not as its opponents draw it, and not as its supporters beautify it.

Before we begin, a methodological caution that will accompany us through the whole chapter: **most of what we know about the ancient deniers came to us from the books of their opponents.** The texts of the Indian Charvakas were lost, and nothing survives of them but what those who refuted them quoted. The books of Ibn al-Rawandi are missing, and we know them only from the refutations. Epicurus's tetralemma on the problem of evil reached us through a Christian writer replying to it. This means that the image of the ancient atheist in our hands was usually drawn by the brush of his enemy—so it may be exaggerated in its distortion, and it may be (and this is the more curious) exaggerated in its strength, to make it easy to present and then demolish. Honesty requires us to say: we are looking at these people through tinted glass, and we know it.

A methodological caution before we begin.

The voices of the ancients do not reach us in the same way. Some of Epicurus's own texts survive; but much of what we know of the Charvakas and of Ibn al-Rawandi is preserved inside the quotations and refutations of their opponents. A transmitter may abbreviate an argument, lift it out of its context, or attribute to a school what not all its adherents held. This does not mean rejecting his testimony wholesale; it means reading it alongside other evidence, and distinguishing the direct text from the polemical citation from the late report. Where the position of the evidence matters in what follows, it will be stated.

* First: Clarifying the Terms—The Deniers Are Not One Kind

Among the greatest errors of the seeker (and among the greatest weapons of polemic on both sides) is to put everyone who is not a traditional believer into one basket called "atheism." The reality is a broad spectrum:

- **The atheist:** in common philosophical usage, one who holds that no god or gods exist. The word is also used more broadly for one who simply holds no belief in them without asserting their nonexistence—so it is worth knowing which of the two senses a speaker intends before debating his position.
- **The agnostic:** someone who holds that the question is unsettled or unsettleable, and so suspends judgment. The English term is recent—Thomas Huxley coined it in 1869—but the suspension of judgment is far older than the name.

And because agnosticism concerns the limits of knowledge, it may, depending on usage, accompany either an inclination toward belief or an inclination away from it.

- **The deist:** one who infers a creator from reason or from nature, and does not make a particular religious revelation the necessary basis of that knowledge. Deists differ among themselves over providence, miracles, and recompense—so the name alone does not entail that they denied all of these. A number of Enlightenment thinkers held this position, and it is a mistake to enroll them among the atheists merely because they criticized the churches.
- **The irreligious:** a broad description of one who belongs to no religion or adopts no religious identity. The label by itself settles nothing about his position on God or on the spiritual: he may be an atheist, an agnostic, or a believer unattached to any institution.
- **The doubter, or seeker:** doubt may be a method for testing claims, or a stance on one particular question; and perplexity is an experience a searcher lives through, not a single school with identical followers. Believer and atheist alike may doubt.

These descriptions are **instruments of understanding, not closed boxes** to be imposed on people or transferred to the past without caution—and their holders may well define themselves otherwise.

Indeed, the term itself has a history worth reflecting on. The oldest theoretical classification that has reached us was drawn up by Plato—the enemy of

atheism, not its friend—in his *Laws*, where he distinguished three kinds of people whose belief about the gods corrupts them: those who deny their existence altogether. Those who grant their existence but deny their concern for human affairs. Those who grant both their existence and their concern but suppose that they can be placated by offerings and prayers, and so feel safe from punishment. Notice that the second and third kinds are "believers" in some sense—yet Plato counted them with the atheists in danger. So the borders between faith and atheism were, from the beginning, borders whose drawing was disputed.

Stranger still, the word "atheist" throughout history has been **an accusation hurled more than an identity declared**: the Athenians accused Socrates of it while he spoke of "his god" who inspired him. The Romans branded the early Christians "atheists" because they denied the gods of the state. So that it is told of the martyr Polycarp that he was asked to shout "Away with the atheists!" (meaning the Christians), and he pointed at the pagan crowd and said: Away with the atheists. Muslims accused one another of "heresy" (*zandaqa*) in quarrels some of which were doctrinal and some purely political. Spinoza, whom his contemporaries described as "the most dangerous atheist," was described by a later poet as "the God-intoxicated man." So when we read the word "atheist" in the ancient sources we must always ask: who is saying it? about whom? and why?

* Second: Ancient India—The Charvakas: Materialists in the Land of the Gods

One might suppose that atheism is a recent European growth. In truth, among the oldest of its documented schools arose in India—the earth's most god-crowded land—centuries before the common era. The school of the **Charvakas** (also called the **Lokayata**: "the doctrine of the people of this world") was an explicitly materialist school, tracing its origins to a legendary sage named Brihaspati. Its echo is present in the early Buddhist texts on the tongue of a teacher contemporary with the Buddha named Ajita Kesakambali, who taught that the human being is composed of the elements, and that when he dies each element returns to its origin, and there is nothing after that.

Their point of view, as it can be reconstructed from the quotations of their opponents: there is no trustworthy source of knowledge except **direct sense perception**. Inference is conjectural, and "sacred testimony" (the Vedas) is the speech of human beings. The world is composed of material elements, and consciousness emerges from their combination as the power of intoxication emerges from the fermentation of ingredients none of which intoxicates on its own. No karma, no rebirth, no heaven, no hell, and no soul that leaves the body. Religion—in their words as their opponents transmitted them—is the priests' industry and their livelihood, and the rites of sacrifice are a means of living, not a path of salvation. The goal of life, for them, is the available pleasure while avoiding pain as far as

possible—which their opponents exploited to picture them as lustful beasts, whereas the remnants of their texts point to a doctrine of "worldly wisdom" closer to an Epicureanism of India.

Their motives—as far as can be discerned: a cognitive motive (strictness about the sources of knowledge) and a social-critical motive (the rejection of the authority of the Brahmin priesthood and its privileges). It is striking that the seed of doubt exists in the heart of the sacred Hindu text itself: in the Rig Veda the famous hymn of creation (the Nasadiya Sukta) closes its questioning about the origin of the cosmos with words to this effect: who truly knows whence this creation came? The gods themselves came after it; perhaps whoever surveys it from the highest heaven knows—or perhaps he too does not know. A sacred text that opens the door of agnosticism in its last lines: a phenomenon that deserves a pause from every seeker.

Were they accepted? No burnings or trials were recorded against them. Their classification in Indian thought was "*nastika*" (deniers of the authority of the Vedas), they were debated in the disputations and were present in the literature of the courts, so much so that a fourteenth-century Hindu philosophical encyclopedia (by Madhava) opened its presentation of all the schools with theirs—to refute it. But this dialectical acceptance was accompanied by something sometimes sharper than persecution: **neglect**. No one copied their books, so they perished, and their voices survived only in the archive of their opponents.

* Third: Greece and Rome—From the Naturalists to Epicurus

In Greece another line was born, entirely independent of India. It began not as atheism but as **natural explanation**: the first philosophers of Ionia (Thales and those after him) began explaining phenomena by water, air, and necessity instead of the whims of the gods—without necessarily denying the gods, but displacing them from the position of "explanation." Then came **Xenophanes** (sixth century BCE) with the oldest documented critique of religious anthropomorphism: he observed that the Ethiopians picture their gods black and flat-nosed and the Thracians picture theirs blue-eyed and red-haired, and said his immortal words: if oxen and horses had hands to draw, they would draw their gods as oxen and horses. Xenophanes was no atheist—he was a preacher of one transcendent god unlike human beings—but this critical arrow of his became the equipment of every critic of religion after him: **the gods in the image of their makers.**

Then bolder positions followed. **Protagoras** the Sophist opened his book *On the Gods* with an explicitly agnostic sentence, to the effect: as for the gods, I have no way of knowing whether they exist or not. The matter is obscure and life is short. Later accounts tell that the Athenians burned his books and banished him, and that he drowned at sea while fleeing—modern historians doubt the details of the account, but it reflects at least what the ancients thought fitting as the fate of someone like him. **Diagoras of Melos** was nicknamed

"the Atheist" in antiquity itself, and a price was put on his head in Athens on the charge of divulging and mocking the sacred mysteries. **Anaxagoras** was tried for saying that the sun is a burning stone, not a god. The summit came in 399 BCE, when Athens made Socrates drink the poison on two charges: corrupting the youth, and "not believing in the gods of the city"—the great paradox: the most famous victim of the charge of atheism in history was a man who spent his life speaking of divine providence.

The most mature doctrine of this line was that of the atomists: **Democritus** and then **Epicurus** (341–270 BCE). Epicurus—contrary to the common image—did not deny the existence of the gods. He held that they exist as happy, perfect beings **who take no notice of human beings**: they neither create nor govern nor judge (the second kind in Plato's classification). His purpose in this was declared: **to free the human being from fear**—fear of the gods' anger and fear of death ("Death is nothing to us; where we are, death is not, and where death is, we are not"—his letter to Menoeceus). Here is a methodological nicety worth the seeker's catching: just as the critics of religion explained religiosity as the child of fear, Epicurus offered practical unbelief as the cure for fear—so fear is present in the explanation on both sides, and by itself decides nothing.

To Epicurus is attributed the most famous ancient formulation of the problem of evil—the well-known tetralemma: does God wish to remove evil but cannot? Then he is impotent. Or can he but does not wish to? Then he is not good. Or can he and wishes to? Then

whence comes evil? Or neither can nor wishes to? Then why call him God?—though honesty requires the caution: this formulation did not reach us from Epicurus's books. The Christian writer Lactantius (fourth century CE) transmitted it in the course of replying to it, and scholars debate the accuracy of its attribution—a new example of "the glass of the opponents" we warned about. (The problem in detail, with its answers, is in the chapter on the problem of evil.)

In Rome the banner was carried by the poet **Lucretius** in his poem *On the Nature of Things*: a whole epic explaining the world as atoms and void with no divine governance, which opens its moral assault with the scene of King Agamemnon slaughtering his daughter as an offering to the gods, to conclude with its famous line, in substance: so great are the evils religion has been able to prompt! **Cicero**—an official priest—wrote his dialogue *On the Nature of the Gods*, presenting the doctrines of his age on the tongues of their holders, among them the skeptical Academic Cotta, who dismantles the arguments for providence one by one: an early model of the genre of "many-voiced dialogue" that Hume would revive eighteen centuries later, and which resembles—at its core—the method of this book.

Were they accepted? The picture is double: the charge of *asebeia* (violating the sanctity of the sacred) was a real sword drawn against great philosophers, and execution, exile, and the burning of books were facts, not fancies. Yet the Epicurean schools flourished openly for centuries in the Greek and Roman world, and their followers wrote and inscribed their teachings on the

walls of cities. So tolerance and repression coexisted—and repression usually intensified when the religious charge mixed with a political quarrel, a pattern that appears in many historical cases, some of which we will meet later.

---

* Fourth: China—A Quiet Godlessness Without a Battle

China offers a third pattern, different from the collision of Greece and the disputation of India: the pattern of **quiet distance**. Confucius himself did not deny the world of spirits, but he politely turned his disciples away from it. Asked about serving the spirits, he said, in substance: you have not yet learned to serve the living—how could you serve the spirits? Asked about death he said: you do not yet understand life—how could you understand death? He counseled that "the spirits be respected and kept at a distance." This is not atheism, but it is the founding of an ethics and a society that do not depend on the unseen—what modern scholars would call "practical agnosticism."

Then came **Xunzi** (third century BCE), the great rationalist of Confucianism, who went a step further: Heaven, for him, is a fixed natural order, not a person who responds. He said, in substance: you pray for rain and it rains—so what? It also rains when you do not pray. He explained the rites in a human, aesthetic way: we hold the rain prayer and beat the drums at an eclipse not because they affect Heaven but because they are cultural "ornament" that refines the feelings and orders

the community—ritual, for him, is social poetry, not magic. In the first century CE **Wang Chong** wrote his book *Balanced Discourses*, criticizing with strict rationality the beliefs of his time in omens, horoscopes, and the anger and response of Heaven, refusing to regard disasters as messages of heavenly punishment.

Were they accepted? To a great extent, yes—and this is among the most important lessons of the Chinese case: ancient China knew no courts of creed on the Western pattern. The "deviation" that the state punished was usually political or moral, not doctrinal. Xunzi became an authoritative teacher at the core of the tradition, not a heretic on its margin. When scholars today search for the reason China is the largest irreligious bloc in the contemporary world, some of them recall that the matter has roots two thousand years older than communism—though communism had its decisive role, as will come.

---

* Fifth: The Islamic World—The Dahriyya, the Zindiqs, the Philosophers, and al-Ma'arri

Some readers may be surprised to find at the heart of medieval Islamic civilization a rich history of doubt and denial—but the Islamic sources themselves preserved it, in refutation, controversy, translation, and report.

The phenomenon is older than the writing. The Qur'an itself records the saying of the Arab deniers of the resurrection: "There is only our life in this world: we die, we live, nothing but time destroys us." From this the theologians named everyone who held the eternity

of the world and denied the Maker or the resurrection "the *Dahriyya*," and devoted refutations to them in the books of theology and of religions and sects.

Zandaqa—the elastic accusation. The term "*zindiq*" was coined originally for the Manichaeans (the dualist followers of Mani), and then stretched until it covered everyone accused of concealing unbelief, from the real atheist to the libertine poet to the political opponent. The reign of the Abbasid caliph al-Mahdi saw "the inquisition of the *zindiqs*": a special bureau and a "master of the *zindiqs*" to hunt them, in which many writers and accused persons were executed. Before it, the great writer **Ibn al-Muqaffa'** (the translator of *Kalila and Dimna*) was killed in a hideous manner in which the charge of *zandaqa* mixed with an explicit political quarrel with the caliph al-Mansur—an early and recurring model: the religious charge as a cover for political liquidation. A book opposing the Qur'an was attributed to him, which we know only from a late reply to it, and scholars disagree about the authenticity of the attribution at all—"the glass of the opponents" again.

Ibn al-Rawandi (third century AH): the most famous of those accused of explicit atheism in the heritage. A Mu'tazilite who broke away, to whom were attributed books refuting the prophethoods and asserting the sufficiency of reason—most famously *The Emerald*. His books are all lost, and we know his views only from the books of those who refuted him (such as *The Vindication* by al-Khayyat the Mu'tazilite) and from scattered quotations in later authors. Indeed, the ancients and the moderns differed about his very reality: was he a

serious atheist, or a dialectician who placed objections in the mouths of others (like the Brahmins, to whom he attributed the denial of the prophethoods) as a theological craft, or a turncoat who wrote for a thing and its opposite for a fee? We cannot be certain—and we say so openly.

Abu Bakr al-Razi (d. about 313 AH): the brilliant physician, author of *al-Hawi* and pioneer of clinical diagnosis. Two books attacking the prophethoods were attributed to him, and nothing of them has reached us independently. Most of what we know comes from a debate recorded by **his opponent**, the Ismaili missionary Abu Hatim al-Razi, in his book *The Signs of Prophethood*, in which he reports "the atheist" as saying that God gave all people reason, and that it suffices, and that singling out one people for revelation rather than another provokes rivalry and bloodshed. In modern academic scholarship there is a serious debate: is the image the opponent drew accurate? Were the two books his at all in this form, when in his authenticated books he affirms the Creator, the soul, and providence? The question is suspended—and we present it suspended.

Abu al-Ala al-Ma'arri (d. 449 AH): the richest and most complex case. The blind ascetic poet of Ma'arra, whose *Luzumiyyat* are full of explicit doubts about religions, communities, and minds that "lend one another unbelief," containing his most famous verse dividing the people of the earth into those with reason and no religion and those with religion and no reason. Containing also verses of submission, praise, and acknowledgment of the Creator that bewilder anyone who tries to

reconcile them with those. So his readers have differed to this day: an atheist in disguise? A deist who believed in the Creator and raged against religions and priests? A pessimistic believer scourging the hypocrisy of the religious, not religion? Or a poet trying every position? Our book does not settle what a thousand years of reading have not settled. But what concerns us here is the question of acceptability, and its answer is astonishing: al-Ma'arri lived some eighty-odd years, revered in his town, with students of learning journeying to him, and when he died there stood at his grave—as the sources tell—dozens of poets eulogizing him. **A man whose poetry is this died in his bed, honored, at the heart of the medieval Islamic world**: a witness that should be present in any fair discussion of the history of tolerance and constraint.

With him is mentioned Omar Khayyam, the mathematician and astronomer to whom were attributed quatrains overflowing with doubt about the resurrection and mockery of preachers—with a well-known problem of documentation: many of the quatrains attributed to him are later than him, so that "Khayyam" became in part a collective name for the doubts of generations, not one man.

And another tension within the same house: the God of the philosophers and the God of the religious. Al-Farabi and Avicenna were believers in the Necessary Being, but their God, from whom the world overflows in an eternal emanation and who knows particulars "in a universal way," seemed to Ghazali far from the freely acting God of the Qur'an, so that he declared them

unbelievers on three questions (the eternity of the world, God's knowledge of particulars, and the bodily resurrection) in *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, and Ibn Rushd replied with *The Incoherence of the Incoherence*. This is not a battle of faith and atheism, but it draws for us the map of **the limits of the acceptable** within the civilization: where does the line of "permissible interpretation" stand and where does "unbelief" begin?—a question the seeker will meet in every religious tradition.

And a last scene worth recording. Al-Humaydi of Andalusia related from Ibn Sa'di, who visited Baghdad in the fourth century AH, a description of its assemblies of theology: the people of all the religions and sects gathered. The atheists with them—on a declared condition: that no one argue from his sacred book against his opponent, but by the arguments of reason alone, because the books were disputed among them. Ibn Sa'di related this in disapproval, turning away from those assemblies. But the fact itself—regardless of how it is judged—testifies that the heart of the Islamic world knew spaces of free debate between believer and denier by agreed rules, side by side with the bureau of the *zindiqs* and its sword. **Tolerance and repression coexisted here too**—as in Athens.

* Sixth: Medieval Europe and the Renaissance—The Hardest Centuries

Medieval Latin Europe was the narrowest of the arenas we survey in its tolerance of declared denial: Church and state were intertwined, the courts of the Inquisition stood, and heresy was a crime punished by fire. So in those centuries we hardly find a single documented declared "atheist"—which puts a precise question to the historian: an absence of existence, or an absence of documentation? Was doubt really nonexistent, or latent and not daring to write, glimpsed only in the records of the courts when a peasant is interrogated about his saying that the soul "dies with the body"? Modern historians favor the second: doubt is always present, and how much of it is written depends on the price of writing it.

When the price began to fall a little in the Renaissance, the limiting cases appeared: **Giordano Bruno** was burned in Rome in 1600. His case is complex and wronged by simplification: he was condemned for a set of theological heresies (on the incarnation, the Trinity, and others) alongside his views on the plurality of worlds, so it is accurate neither to make him a pure "martyr of science" nor to acquit his court. And **Lucilio Vanini** was burned in Toulouse in 1619 on the charge of atheism after his tongue was cut out. In 1656 the Jewish community of Amsterdam issued a "*herem*" (expulsion and severance), whose text is among the harshest ever written, against a young man of twenty-three named **Baruch Spinoza**—who would later write a

philosophy in which God and Nature coincide (pantheism), and a pioneering historical critique of the texts of the Torah, so that he became for his opponents "the prince of atheists" and for his admirers "the God-intoxicated man": the same person, according to the angle of view. His *Theological-Political Treatise* (published anonymously in 1670 and banned as soon as it was discovered) united the two projects that would change Europe: the founding of the historical criticism of the Bible (its fruit in the chapter on texts), and the plea for freedom of thought and expression as the purpose of the state. So the man expelled from every faith became one of the fathers of tolerance for every faith—and the question of pantheism between monotheism and atheism we detailed in the chapter on the great families.

In those centuries a telling legend circulated: a phantom book called *The Three Impostors*, alleging that the founders of the three great religions were frauds, whose mention circulated for centuries before it existed—until anonymous authors actually composed a text under that title in the eighteenth century to match the legend. The fear of the book preceded the book: an eloquent psychological witness to the climate of the age.

---

* Seventh: The Enlightenment and the Widening of Religious Debate

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, European debate about religion and its authority widened. Several interlocking factors contributed: the legacy of the wars of religion; growing knowledge of the religions

and customs of other peoples; and the growth of the natural sciences. The new science was not a declaration of atheism: Newton, for one, saw in the regularity of the cosmos evidence of its Creator. Then the Lisbon earthquake of 1755 returned the question of evil to the center of the discussion: how is a catastrophe that strikes the innocent to be understood in a world ascribed to a wise and merciful God? In his poem on the disaster, Voltaire protested against an optimism that makes light of human pain in the name of a universal good.

Out of this debate came positions that differed from one another—not successive degrees along a single road to atheism.

Pierre Bayle advanced a possibility that unsettles a common judgment: a society of atheists could live an orderly and virtuous life. His point was not that every atheist is virtuous, but that the absence of belief does not entail corrupt conduct—upbringing, habit, and temperament shape actions, and people's declared beliefs do not always match their deeds. This is an argument about the possibility of morality without faith. It is not a proof of Bayle's own atheism, and scholars have differed over how to read his position. We return to the question in the chapter "Does Morality Need God?"

David Hume, in the *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, offered an influential philosophical critique of the arguments for God's existence, and especially of the inference from the order of the cosmos to the attributes of its maker. The arguments and objections are distributed among three characters, so it is not sound to treat every line in the work as the author's own view. The

publication history reveals something of the constraints of the age: Hume was dissuaded from publishing the *Dialogues* in his lifetime, but took care to arrange their publication after his death, and his nephew brought them out in 1779. The delay is documented; reducing it to personal timidity or to a single known fear is not accurate. The arguments of the book are presented in the chapter on the evidence for God's existence.

Baron d'Holbach, in *The System of Nature* (1770), defended an atheist materialism explaining the world by matter, motion, and the chain of causes. The book appeared under the name of Mirabaud, a writer already dead, while his Parisian salon gathered thinkers and visitors of varied positions—so it should not be pictured as a homogeneous secret society. **Diderot**, one of the editors of the *Encyclopédie*, was imprisoned in 1749 after the publication of the *Letter on the Blind*, in the course of the pursuit of his writings against prevailing doctrines. These facts show that the spread of ideas did not abolish the risks of publishing them—but they do not make concealment a necessary feature of every thinker or every book of the age.

And the Enlightenment was not one religious doctrine. Alongside materialism and atheism there were deist tendencies holding that the Creator can be known by reason and nature; religious currents granting conscience and feeling a wider place; and attempts to reconcile Christianity with reason. Voltaire, for all the severity of his criticism of fanaticism and ecclesiastical power, defended belief in a Creator and opposed

atheism—though that does not sum up all his positions, or those of his contemporaries. It is more exact to read each thinker in his own texts, and in the changes of his view, than to count "most" of the age's figures as deists. Objecting to a religious institution, criticizing revelation and miracles, and denying the existence of God are three distinct positions that should not be merged.

The French Revolution then displayed the complexity of the relation between these ideas and power. In 1793 the campaigns to strip public life of its Christian character widened: churches were closed, clergy were pursued, and a Festival of Reason was held in Notre-Dame. But the revolutionaries did not agree on atheism: Robespierre opposed that current, defended the worship of "the Supreme Being," and held its festival in 1794. These shifts do not sum up the whole Revolution, nor are its acts of violence explained by a single religious factor: doctrine was interwoven with war and political conflict. But they set before us a question that belongs to no one camp: what happens when any power—religious or anti-religious—takes it upon itself to settle the belief of a whole society?

* Eighth: The Nineteenth Century—New Explanations of Religion

In the nineteenth century the question of religion widened in European thought: the debate was no longer confined to the arguments for God's existence, but took up also the origin of belief and its function in the life of the person and of society. If religion can be explained by

human causes, is that enough to negate a divine source? That is a different question, and it should not be confused with the question of origin. The century's approaches varied: some looked into the human being's picture of himself, some at society and its conditions, some changed the understanding of nature, and some reread the crisis of values.

Feuerbach, in *The Essence of Christianity* (1841), held that the human being ascribes to God the attributes he counts as perfections—reason, love, will—after freeing them from the limits and deficiency of the individual. And then treats those attributes as though they were a reality independent of him. Religion, on this reading, discloses the essence of the human being, though it presents it in a divine form. And what appears to be knowledge of God is knowledge of the human being in which he has not yet recognized himself. This is a philosophical thesis about the interpretation of belief, not a historical finding that explains how religions arose.

Marx moved the critique to the conditions of society. In the introduction to *A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (1844) he saw in religion an expression of real suffering and a protest against it at one and the same time, and described it as "the opium of the people." The phrase is not well understood when it is severed from his words about the pain of the oppressed and the consolation they find. But he was not defending religion's truth: he counted its consolation illusory, and tied his critique to changing the conditions that make people need it. So the meaning is neither

mere contempt for believers, nor an endorsement of the faith whose function he was describing.

Darwin, in *On the Origin of Species* (1859), offered a wide-ranging explanation of the change and adaptation of living things by natural selection. And a joint presentation of the ideas of Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace had preceded it in 1858. The book was not a treatise denying God, but it changed the discussion of the inference from the adaptation of organisms to their direct design. The existence of a natural mechanism is one thing. The philosophical claim that nature has no creator is another—and the mechanism does not by itself establish that there is one behind it either. As for Darwin's own position, it varied by his own description, and he settled on calling himself an agnostic, holding that the matter was beyond the reach of the human mind.

Nietzsche. The phrase "God is dead" does not yield its meaning when read as a detached slogan. In section 125 of *The Gay Science*, a man described as a madman carries a lantern in broad daylight and addresses people who do not believe in God, as though they had not yet grasped the consequences of the absence of the belief that had supported their values. Section 343 then makes clear that what is at issue is the decline of confidence in the Christian God and what may follow from it for European morality—and he also sees in it a new horizon for philosophers and free spirits. The picture, then, gathers a warning about the collapse of a foundation and an invitation to construct anew; it is not a simple announcement of triumph.

The public presence of these positions also widened. **Thomas Huxley** coined the word "agnostic" in 1869 to describe a position that does not claim to possess knowledge for which it has found no sufficient evidence. In Britain **Charles Bradlaugh**, known for his atheism, was elected to the House of Commons in 1880, but faced a long dispute over his right to affirm instead of swearing, and then over being allowed to take the oath itself. His constituents insisted on re-electing him until he was able to occupy his seat after taking the oath in 1886; an Oaths Act was then passed permitting affirmation.

---

* Ninth: The Twentieth Century—Thought, Power, and Freedom of Conscience

Irreligion in the twentieth century was not a single current. Its presence widened in philosophy and in public debate, and civil associations grew up around it, while communist states adopted policies hostile to religion. Fairness requires distinguishing these paths: a philosophical argument is not a political program, and neither of them is the exercise of power.

Bertrand Russell was among the most prominent voices of religious criticism, and among his best-known texts is the lecture "Why I Am Not a Christian" (1927). In an article he wrote in 1952, "Is There a God?", he offered the example of a small teapot orbiting the sun that no telescope can detect: other people's inability to disprove its existence does not make the claim of it worth believing. The point is to question the burden of proof,

not to offer an independent demonstration that God does not exist—and we set this out in the chapter on how we think about truth. **Jean-Paul Sartre**, for his part, tied his atheism to a conception of human freedom and responsibility.

Albert Camus, in *The Myth of Sisyphus* (1942), confronted what he called the absurd: the tension between the human longing for meaning and clarity and a world that does not grant the answer sought. He did not make this a summons to surrender: Sisyphus, condemned to push his rock again and again, becomes an image of awareness of one's fate and of continuing to live in spite of its harshness. In his Nobel address of 1957 Camus insisted on the rejection of nihilism and on the pursuit of truth and freedom. So this position cannot be reduced to the claim that life has no value.

In the field of power, the Soviet Union saw campaigns of religious persecution: the confiscation of property, the closing of houses of worship, the killing of clergy and believers or their dispatch to labor camps, and the propagation of atheism in education and propaganda. But the policy did not run at one pace: restrictions on the Orthodox Church eased after the German invasion in 1941, and campaigns of closure were renewed under Khrushchev. In China the religious were repressed and religious activity was banned during the Cultural Revolution. **Albania** took the most explicit path: organized religious life was prohibited in 1967, and the constitution of 1976 declared that the state recognized no religion and supported atheist propaganda,

banning religious organizations and activities in articles 37 and 55.

The lesson to be drawn is not that faith or atheism leads inevitably to repression, but that **imposing a belief or denying it by force is a violation of freedom of conscience.** Nor is the name of a doctrine sufficient to explain persecution: its role in justification must be examined alongside the institutions of power and the historical circumstances.

On the other side, irreligion took civil and peaceful forms. In Amsterdam in 1952 the International Humanist and Ethical Union was founded, and adopted a declaration affirming human dignity, personal liberty, and social responsibility, and rejecting the subjection of the individual to totalitarian projects. This is evidence of an organized humanist tendency—not an expression of every irreligious person. The comparison between these paths shows that the rejection of religion does not by itself determine one's position on the rights of others: the standard here is what liberties a person defends, and by what means.

---

* Tenth: The New Atheism and the Digital Age—The Contemporary Scene

At the opening of the third millennium, and especially after the attacks of September 11, a wave appeared that was called "the New Atheism": the books of Richard Dawkins (*The God Delusion*, 2006), Sam Harris, Christopher Hitchens, and Daniel Dennett topping the best-seller lists, with a central thesis: religion is not merely

mistaken but harmful, and must be criticized publicly without courtesy. The wave was marked by a high polemical tone—so much so that sober atheist philosophers criticized it from within the irreligious shore itself: they saw its discourse as populist and rhetorical more than rigorously demonstrative, and its portrayal of religion and believers as simplistic. This observation is itself a lesson for our reader: **every camp has a spectrum within it**—in irreligion there is the polemical Dawkins, the calm Baggini, and the rigorous academic Mackie, just as in religiosity there is the zealous preacher, the careful scholar, and the silent mystic. To try any camp by its loudest voices alone is a methodological injustice.

In the Arab world the phenomenon has its own modern history: from the debates of the early twentieth century (such as Ismail Adham's essay "Why I Am an Atheist," 1937, and the replies it provoked under opposite titles), to the existentialist discussions of mid-century, to the digital age, which changed the equation radically: the internet gave, for the first time, those who hide their doubts a semi-safe space for questioning and discussion, so forums and channels appeared for Arab atheists and the irreligious—met by intense Islamic and Christian preaching and apologetic activity on the same platforms. No one possesses reliable figures for the size of the phenomenon in the Arab world: the maps are few and uneven in method, and social stigma and the laws of some countries make declaration costly, so what is declared remains less than the reality by a margin no one knows. Globally, the major surveys indicate that

those unaffiliated with any religion number in the hundreds of millions (their largest blocs in East Asia), with two observations that prevent hasty inference: many of the "unaffiliated" believe in a God or a higher power without a religion, and the movement of the numbers across generations and continents runs in opposite directions. The map of the updated statistics is entrusted to our first chapter.

---

* Eleventh: The Motives—Why Did They Not Believe? (In Their Words, Then in Their Opponents')

We have now gathered the material of centuries. Let us arrange the motives that the irreligious themselves have offered across history—keeping to the book's rule: every position is presented at its strongest and in the words of its own holders first:

1. Cognitive motives. That the arguments for God's existence did not convince them on examination (this is the stage of the whole next chapter); that the natural explanation of phenomena—from Thales's lightning to Darwin's living things—kept advancing and dispensing with supernatural explanation in field after field. That the multiplicity of religions and the conflict of their claims makes favoring one of them difficult (an argument we will examine on its scale in the chapter "By What Standard Do We Compare?"—for the believer may answer that the multiplicity of error does not deny the existence of a truth).

2. Moral and emotional motives. The problem of evil and suffering—from the argument attributed to Epicurus to the Lisbon earthquake to the burnings of the twentieth century (it has its own chapter); the critique of the conduct of religious institutions: priesthood, privileges, and wars in the name of God ("so great are the evils religion has been able to prompt," in Lucretius—*On the Nature of Things* 1.101—with the sacrifice of Iphigenia as its symbol). The condemnation of particular contents in the texts or the rulings which they regarded as contrary to justice or mercy.

3. Liberating motives. The independence of reason and conscience from all guardianship—from the condition of the Baghdad assemblies ("we argue by reason alone") to the Enlightenment's motto "dare to know" to Sartre's existentialism, which sees the human being as bearing a responsibility no one can bear for him.

4. Existential motives. For some of them unbelief was **a cost they paid for honesty**, not a comfort they fled to: they lost the consolation of immortality and providence and found no comfortable substitute, and they accepted living in a silent universe because they could not believe what their evidence did not support—the temper of Camus and of the hesitant Darwin more than the temper of the preachers of atheism.

Then the opponents' words—and the adjudication between them. Believers across history have offered counter-explanations of the deniers' motives: pride and infatuation with reason, or the wish to escape obligations and accountability, or a psychological wound from a harsh father or an unjust institution, or

mere conformity to an irreligious environment. Some of these explanations found a rare witness **from inside**: Mustafa Mahmoud—in the memoir of his journey—dissects the motives of his atheist phase himself: "I refused to worship God because I was absorbed in worshiping myself," out of pride in reason and a talent for argument, not a search for the truth. But our book's rule here is decisive, and we established it in the chapter on biases: **a person's testimony about himself is not generalized to others**; just as the believer refuses to reduce the faith of all believers to "fear and the need for consolation" (the explanation of Freud and his like), the atheist refuses to reduce the atheism of all atheists to "pride and whim." The golden methodological rule—the equality of weapons—says: **the psychological explanation of a position proves neither its error nor its correctness**. A person may believe the truth for bad motives and falsehood for noble ones, and the verdict in the end belongs to the evidence, not to the hidden hearts of those who hold it—hearts that only the Knower of the unseen encompasses, for the believer, and to which there is no access at all, for anyone else.

---

* Twelfth: Were They Accepted?—A Summary of the Scale of Acceptability

If we drew a timeline of how societies treated their deniers, we would come away with a complex picture that refuses both simplifications ("a continuous black history of persecution" or "prevailing tolerance with exceptions"):

- **Athens** executed Socrates, and in later ages housed the schools of Epicurus; as for the reports of exile and of book-burning, they are not all equally well established.
- **India:** the literature of debate preserved the reports of the Charvakas, and much of their own writing was lost; the evidence does not permit us to assert either that they suffered no persecution or that a single cause explains the loss of their books.
- **China** was the most tolerant: its godless rationalists became part of the authoritative tradition.
- **The medieval Islamic world** combined the two opposites at once: a bureau of *zindiqs* that killed, and assemblies of disputation that required argument by reason alone; a caliph crucifies Ibn al-Muqaffa', and Ma'arra bears al-Ma'arri to his grave in honor.
- **Medieval Europe** was the narrowest: no declared denial at all, and the fire ready.
- **The Enlightenment:** religious debate widened without the constraints on publication disappearing—Hume's *Dialogues* appeared after his death, and d'Holbach's *System of Nature* under a name not his own. Nor were the thinkers of the age of one mind about God: among them were deists, materialists, and men of religion.
- **The nineteenth century:** the public presence of the irreligious widened, and some of their causes became battles of civil rights; the Bradlaugh case in Britain shows both the persistence of the restrictions and the possibility of

changing them—though it does not stand for every country in the century.

- **The twentieth century**: communist states adopted policies hostile to religion, and believers in some of them were subjected to wide persecution. At the same time, civil irreligious currents were active in defense of freedom of conscience—so the century should not be summed up in a single image.
- **And today** an explicitly double map: countries that criminalize atheism or apostasy with penalties reaching, in some, legal execution; and countries where the irreligious enjoy full protection and where many religious people complain—in their turn—of the cultural and media marginalization of their faith. (The numbers of this map and its legal details are in the chapter on accepting the other.)

And the conclusion that imposes itself: the degree of acceptance of the denier was not—in the cases we surveyed—a function of the "nature" of a particular religion or civilization so much as a function of **the equation of power**: the more a power—religious or irreligious—was freed from every restraint, the narrower its tolerance of the dissenter. The more the centers of power multiplied and balanced, the wider the margin of freedom for everyone. This conclusion itself belongs to no one side: it is the atheist's argument against the religiosity of the state, and the believer's argument against the atheism of the state—and perhaps for that reason it is the nearest thing we possess to common ground.

* Conclusion: What Does This Long River Prove—And What Does It Not?

At the close of our first chapter we said: the spread of religiosity in most civilizations is an astonishing phenomenon, but by itself it does not prove the truth of any particular religion—people may agree on the need and differ over its satisfaction. The same scale requires us to distinguish here between **the antiquity of doubt and the soundness of atheism**: that a position is widespread, or long-lived, establishes neither its truth nor its falsity. The persistence of doubt across most civilizations shows that the question is native to the human mind; it does not settle the answer. The existence of many believers does not make faith true, and the existence of intelligent deniers does not make denial true. **What counts is the evidence, not the heads**—and the evidence is our appointment in the next part.

Yet the seeker leaves this chapter with gains no other chapter gives: they have learned that doubt is an ancient companion of humanity, not a modern calamity that fell on them alone. That "the irreligious" are a broad spectrum, not a single bloc—the categorical, the suspending, the God-believer without religion, and the rebel against priesthood alone. That the reports of the ancient deniers are to be read with an eye that reckons with their having been written by the pens of their opponents. That motives are examined on both sides by one standard, and that the psychological explanation is a weapon that recoils on whoever brandishes it alone as a verdict.

And the open question remains: this river of doubt whose flow has not ceased across twenty-five centuries and most civilizations—is it a witness that the religious evidence was never compelling to minds, so that a place for objection remained in every generation? Or a witness that there is in the human being a tendency to escape and to pride that recurs however brightly the evidence shines? Or does the river hold water of every kind: the doubt of the honest seeker, the doubt of the angry wounded, the doubt of whoever wants to escape, and the doubt of the imitator—so that no single verdict fits it? Do not answer the question quickly; the coming part—the field of evidence—was written to help you answer it.

Cross-references for the chapter: *the detail of the arguments for God's existence and their objections in Chapter 18; the problem of evil in Chapter 20; and the rule of the equality of psychological explanation in Chapter 5 (biases).*

Part VII: The Field of Evidence

The heart of the rational battle—in its two stages

* Chapter 18: Is There Evidence for God's Existence? (Stage One Evidence)

The great arguments: their premises, their objections, and the limits of their conclusions

Summary of the chapter: How does the believer argue for God's existence, and how does the objector examine his evidence? Six paths are set out—coming-to-be, design and fine-tuning, innate disposition, morality, desire, and religious experience. In each we follow the premises and the conclusion, the principal objections and the replies to them, distinguishing what is offered as a binding demonstration from what is offered as a supporting indication or a personal experience. These are selected paths, not an exhaustive inventory of the arguments of the philosophy of religion.

* Preface: The Two Stages of the Question—And the Error of Confusing Them

Before we enter the field, a clarification is needed that changes the course of the whole inquiry. The seeker's great question—"which religion do I choose?"—is not one question but **two successive questions**, so often confused that the inquiry is spoiled:

Stage One: does this universe have a God—a creator and governor—at all? **Stage Two:** if it does, has He spoken to human beings? And which of the competing claims to represent Him is the truest?

This ordering is not a binding description of any person's road to belief. It is a way of organizing the discussion and of fixing what we mean to establish or to object to.

Confusing them breeds errors in both directions: some atheists argue against Stage One from the problems of Stage Two (contradictions they attribute to a particular religion, or the conduct of religious people)—which touches the question of the Creator's existence not at all. Some believers suppose that if they have established Stage One they have established their own religion—whereas in truth establishing the existence of a creator does not by itself establish that He sent a particular messenger or sent down a particular book, but leaves the seeker at the door of Stage Two with its own questions and its own evidence. But the two questions are not wholly separate: an objection bearing on the possibility of a God perfect in power and mercy, for instance, touches the very conception of God, not an isolated religious detail. So we ask throughout: which claim is this argument addressing? This chapter is devoted to Stage One alone; Stage Two has its next chapter.

A second methodological note: we will present every argument at its strongest as its supporters make it, then the strongest objections as its opponents make them, then the strongest replies—and we will declare

no winner; the declaring is your right. We will point out at every station the diversity of positions **within** each camp: believers are not one bloc in their estimate of these arguments, nor atheists one bloc in rejecting them.

And a third note before the arguments: how do the religious texts themselves argue? The reader of the Qur'an. For example—will notice that its discourse on the existence of God does not resemble the books of the philosophers: it rarely marshals a complex logical syllogism. What dominates it is **directing attention** to the scenes of the cosmos ("Do they not see how camels were created?"—the traditional reading of *ibil*; the Oxford translation reads the word as "rain clouds"), **the rhetorical question** that awakens intuition ("Were they created without any cause? Or were they their own creators?")—the verse of which Jubayr ibn Mut'im, then still in the polytheism of his people, said that his heart nearly took flight on hearing it (Bukhari 4854, and in another report 4023 he describes it as the moment faith first settled in his heart)—and this is a report about the effect of a text on its hearer. Describing that effect is not by itself an analysis of the argument that produced it—**and the address to the innate disposition**, calling to witness the moments of distress ("When you get into distress at sea, those you pray to besides Him desert you"). It is as if the text assumes that the root of the knowledge of God is implanted, and that the function of its discourse is reminding and alerting, not founding from zero. Believers have read this method as a witness that the matter is too self-evident to need the syllogisms

of the philosophers. Critics have read it as a witness that the texts address the heart, not the demonstrative mind. Whatever your reading, the distinction between **the discourse of the texts** and **the arguments of the theologians and philosophers**—which arose later in controversy—is a distinction that disciplines the inquiry. So let us enter the field.

---

* The First Argument: The Argument from Coming-to-Be—"Everything That Begins Has a Cause of Its Beginning"

The form of the argument. Whatever begins to exist has a cause; the universe began to exist; therefore the universe has a cause. This is a compressed statement of the argument from coming-to-be, defended in contemporary debate by, among others, William Lane Craig, and it has a long history in Islamic theology, with counterparts in Christian and Jewish theology and in Greek philosophy. If the two premises hold, the conclusion follows—but establishing them is the whole question. The immediate conclusion is that the universe has a cause: that this cause is a first cause with no beginning, or that it is one, knowing, and willing, requires supplementary arguments. What is meant by "beginning" here is that the existence has a first point—not that a stretch of empty time preceded it.

And what did cosmology add? The Big Bang model describes the evolution of the universe from an early state of extreme heat and density, and estimates its age at about 13.8 billion years within the standard

cosmological model. But this does not by itself amount to establishing that all physical existence began from sheer nothingness. NASA, in its account of the history of the universe, notes that what preceded cosmic inflation and what set it off remain unsettled. Some defenders of the argument also appeal to the thermodynamic arrow of time: why has an eternal universe not reached a state of equilibrium?

The principal objections:

1. **"And who created God?"** The question is sometimes directed at a formulation holding that every existent needs a cause. But the formulation offered is narrower: it speaks of what *begins* to exist. So the more precise objection becomes: what justifies saying that the cause of the universe did not begin? If something can exist without a beginning, what is the evidence for excluding physical existence itself from that possibility?

2. **Has it been established that the universe began?** The objector distinguishes the beginning of the cosmic phase the model describes from the beginning of all physical existence. There are models exploring the possibility of an earlier extension—but they are not established facts merely because they can be formulated mathematically. On the philosophical side, defenders appeal to the impossibility of a beginningless series of past events. Their critics reply that this impossibility itself needs proof, since a series supposed to have no beginning does not start at a point "in infinity" and then traverse the distance from it.

3. **Does causality extend to the origin of the universe?** Our ordinary experience concerns the change of things *inside* the world. Is it enough to settle that the world itself requires a cause? The question grows sharper if time is part of what is to be explained: what does "cause" mean if there is no time before? Wes Morriston discusses this point in his critique of Craig. Quantum physics is invoked here as well—but the inability to predict a single outcome does not by itself amount to establishing that it occurred without any physical conditions.

The principal replies, and their limits:

On the question of God's cause: the defender answers that the principle of the argument does not extend to an existent that did not begin, so he is not obliged to posit a cause for every cause without end. But defining God as beginningless is not by itself a proof that He exists, nor does it dispense with showing why the explanation terminates in Him. Here the argument from coming-to-be must be distinguished from the arguments from contingency and necessity: the first inquires into the beginning of existence, the second into an existent's dependence on another even if we suppose it never began. "The necessary existent" in this path is what cannot fail to be.

On the possibility of an earlier past: defenders hold that merely proposing an alternative model is not enough to make it preferable, and they appeal to results constraining the extension of certain models into the past. The best known is the theorem of Borde, Guth, and

Vilenkin, published in 2003: **if** the average expansion is positive along the histories in question, then they do not extend, within the spacetime description, to an unbounded past. This is a conditional result, not a verdict on every possible model; and the researchers themselves conclude that inflation alone does not provide a complete description of the boundary.

On the objection from causality and the quantum: the defender says that the need of what begins for a cause is a rational principle, not a mere generalization from observations, and that the objector must show why it fails at the origin of the universe. The objector replies that the strength of this principle in everyday experience does not make its extension to the origin of time self-evident. As for "the quantum vacuum" in field theory, it is a physical state with properties—not sheer nothingness—so one may not move from talk of it to the claim that something arose from the absence of everything.

The outcome of the inquiry. The discussion distributes itself over three questions: does the universe have a beginning? must its beginning have a cause? and what attributes may be ascribed to that cause? Here the data of physics interlock with the analysis of the concepts of time, cause, and existence, and neither takes the place of the other. Whoever accepts the premises sees in the argument a path to establishing a cause of the universe. Whoever suspends judgment on them has not thereby established the contrary of the conclusion. In either case, the move to a particular religion remains a separate inquiry with evidence of its own.

A sister form that needs no beginning. The argument above rests on the universe having begun. Its older sister asks nothing about beginnings: **the argument from dependency** (Avicenna's "necessary existent," Leibniz's "sufficient reason," and in today's Islamic apologetics "the divine link"). Every dependent thing owes its existence to something outside itself. A chain of dependents, however long—even infinite—remains a chain of borrowers with no lender. So there must be one existent that is not dependent, whose existence is from itself. **Its strongest objection** is Russell's: why may not the universe itself be the brute fact that needs no reason—"it is just there"? **The reply:** that "just there" is precisely what the argument denies to anything that could have been otherwise. And the counter-reply: that this may be a rule of our reason, not of reality. So the sister argument moves the whole dispute from physics to the principle of sufficient reason itself—and there the two camps part on a premise, not on a fact.

* The Second Argument: The Argument from Design and Fine-Tuning—"The Trace of Workmanship Points to the Workman"

The form of the argument. When many parts cooperate to perform a function, a human being inclines to look for a purpose behind their arrangement. Hence William Paley's example of the watch in *Natural Theology*: someone who finds a watch and examines the interlocking of its parts infers its maker, even without having seen him. Paley transferred this consideration to

the organs of living things and their fitness for their functions. But two paths must be distinguished: the inference from biological adaptation, and the inference from the cosmic conditions that permit life at all. The two intersect in the question of purpose, and they differ in their evidence and in their objections—so keeping them apart guards the discussion from a shift that neither of them licenses.

What is meant by fine-tuning? Physical studies examine how the possibilities of star formation and of complex chemistry are affected by changes in certain constants and cosmic conditions. These requirements may constrain the permitted values—but it is not correct to say that any minute change in any constant would prevent every possible form of life: the result depends on what we change and what we hold fixed, and on the kinds of structures we count as necessary for life. Luke Barnes and Fred Adams present these questions with differing estimates of how wide the hospitable ranges are. As for moving from them to purpose, that is a further step requiring its own argument.

The principal objections:

Evolution and biological adaptation. In *On the Origin of Species*, Darwin offered an explanation of the accumulation of adaptations by natural selection, and discussed how complex organs, such as the eye, could arise through useful gradations. Modern genetics makes clear how inherited traits that assist survival and reproduction can spread across generations. This is not a random assembly of parts in a single attempt, nor a process aiming at a final form drawn in advance. It is

therefore not enough to compute the probability of a complete organ coming together all at once to refute the evolutionary explanation.

Probabilities and observation selection. The narrowness of a range hospitable to life does not fix the probability of its occurrence before the range of possible values and the distribution of their probabilities have been specified, and before it is settled whether they are independent. Adams notes that these data are not known in any complete way. Moreover, we can observe the universe only from a position that permits our existence—a constraint that must be entered into the comparison. Some multiverse models propose that the values vary across many cosmic regions, so that life exists where conditions allow it. But the observational constraint alone does not establish a multiplicity of universes.

What appears as flaw or cruelty. If good fit is counted as evidence of the maker's wisdom and mercy, how are disease, predation, and suffering to be weighed in the same inference? Hume presents this objection in the *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, distinguishing between assuming a perfect God and then searching for a hidden wisdom, and attempting to infer that perfection from the observed world. So the claim that the universe permits life is not equivalent to the claim that it guarantees life comfort or safety—and the second may not be established by the evidence that supports only the first.

And who designed the designer? If every organized complexity requires an explanation, why is the mind supposed to have organized the universe exempted? The objection here is not confined to asking about the designer's beginning. It asks what positing him added to the explanation: did it make the phenomenon clearer, or transfer the obscurity to another existent? The comparison grows harder when we infer from the minds we know to a mind unlike them in nature.

The principal replies, and their limits:

On the evolutionary explanation: believers answer that describing a natural mechanism does not, for them, negate divine purpose, and some see evolution as one of the means of creation. Others add that explaining the diversity of life does not by itself answer the question of life's first origin or of the laws that made it possible. This is an important distinction between questions—but it does not establish that every remaining question requires a direct intervention: the origin of life has its own research and its own evidence. Conversely, the success of an evolutionary explanation of a particular adaptation weakens the need for a special intervention to explain it, but does not by itself settle the larger question of purpose.

On probabilities and the multiverse: the defender holds that the absence of a complete measure of the probabilities does not preclude all weighing, provided the researcher declares his assumptions and shows the effect of changing them. He also demands evidence supporting the alternative cosmological model, and an account of the laws that make it produce conditions

hospitable to life. But the other side asks the same standard of the hypothesis of purpose: why should we expect this kind of world from a supposed creator? Alan Guth, in his work on eternal inflation, sets out mechanisms leading to multiple cosmic regions, together with the difficulties of specifying probabilities within them.

On flaw and suffering: the defender answers that some of what looks like deficiency may be tied to other benefits or to the constraints of a wider system, and that our limited knowledge does not disclose all consequences. The objector replies that the possibility of a hidden wisdom is not the establishing of one, and that an explanation must face what supports it and what tells against it alike. The weight of the objection depends on the conclusion to be established: the claim that there is some purpose is narrower than the claim of a creator perfect in power and mercy. The problem of evil remains a necessary inquiry for those attributes—not a question to be dismissed by referring it to another chapter.

On the question of the designer: the defender replies that an acceptable explanation is not required to solve every question about its author—we may infer a human action before knowing how its author came to be or where he learned his craft. Some add that God, in their conception, is not a body composed of parts, so his complexity need not be measured by the complexity of a machine. But the legitimacy of transferring the example of the human artisan to the origin of the universe remains a matter for inquiry, as do the claims of divine simplicity and necessary existence: these require

supplementary arguments. The outcome of this path is determined by how far the evidence supports preferring purpose over the alternatives offered, and by how much of what is claimed for it the argument actually establishes.

* The Third Argument: The Argument from Innate Disposition—"Implanted Knowledge"

The form of the argument. Those who hold the argument from the *fitra* maintain that belief in God may begin from a spontaneous sense of need for Him rather than from a chain of inferences. They appeal to the prevalence of religiosity and to the recourse to God in hardship. In the Islamic presentation the verse appears: "Whenever they go on board a ship they call on God, and dedicate their faith to Him alone" (29:65). This is evidence of the Qur'anic conception—not a survey of the behavior of every believer and every atheist. Nor does *fitra* carry a single meaning among the commentators: Qurtubi, expounding the verse of Rum 30, presents several views, among them Islam itself and among them the readiness to know and accept it. Two claims must therefore be distinguished: that the human being is disposed toward religious belief, and that he is born already upon a particular religion. **Its root text in the Islamic house** is the hadith of the two Sahihs: every child is born upon the innate disposition, and it is the parents who make him a Jew, a Christian, or a Magian.

Properly basic belief, in Plantinga. Alvin Plantinga raises, within a Christian philosophical context, a nearby but distinct question: must every reasonable belief rest on an argument derived from other beliefs? He holds that some of our beliefs—our immediate memories, for instance—may be warranted without such inference, and that belief in God can be like this in suitable circumstances. Describing it as "properly basic" does not mean that it is self-evident to everyone, or that merely feeling it makes it true. And Plantinga affirms that a basic belief is not immune to objection and revision. The point is a defense of the possibility that faith may be reasonable, for some people, without an inferential proof.

The principal objections. How do we distinguish a disposition that discloses a reality from an inclination shaped by upbringing and experience? Studies in cognitive science propose natural explanations for the emergence of religious ideas and their transmission. Will Gervais and his colleagues present a model combining the tendencies of the mind with cultural learning: what a person finds easy to conceive and to remember he is not thereby obliged to believe, and the social environment plays a part in which beliefs he commits himself to. This is not a single agreed explanation of every form of religiosity. The argument then faces the diversity of beliefs, and the existence of people who do not find this feeling in themselves: if intuition leads to conflicting conceptions, what is the standard for preferring one of them?

The principal replies, and their limits. The defender answers that knowing the origin of a belief is not enough to judge it: a person may learn a truth from his family, and a psychological need may drive him to an inquiry that ends in sound evidence. But this does not make every critique of a belief's origin a "genetic fallacy": if inquiry indicates that the mechanism we rely on is highly error-prone in this domain, the warrant for trusting it may be weakened, even if the falsity of everything it produces has not been established. Jonathan Jong and Aku Visala discuss this difference between explaining a belief and impugning its warrant. As for the diversity among people, some believers reply that the innate disposition may be developed by upbringing or veiled by it—and it remains incumbent on them to show how this reply is to be tested.

The Fourth Argument: The Moral Argument—"Were There No Legislator, There Would Be No Obligation"

The form of the argument. Would injustice be wrong even if an entire society approved it? The moral argument sets out, in one of its contemporary formulations in William Lane Craig, from the existence of objective moral values and duties that do not depend on human acceptance, and then ties their existence to God. His reasoning may be summarized thus: if God did not exist, objective values and duties would not exist; but they do exist; therefore God exists. By "value" is meant what makes a thing good or worthy of esteem, and by "duty" what obliges us to do or refrain. The force of the argument rests on justifying its two premises, not on the feeling of a reproaching conscience alone.

Where the dispute lies. This formulation does not claim that the unbeliever is incapable of knowing the good or of doing it—Craig himself says so explicitly. The question is: what is the basis of value and obligation? Knowing one's duty, being motivated to perform it, and the basis that makes it a duty are three different matters. Learning or evolution may explain the emergence of some of our judgments, but explaining their emergence does not by itself establish their truth or their falsity. Nor are the alternatives confined to divine command and shifting convention: the philosopher Louise Antony defends a moral value inherent in sentient beings, in their liability to harm and their need for care. She disputes the necessity of a divine basis, not the objectivity of morality.

The Euthyphro dilemma and the reply to it. The question's origin in Plato concerns piety and what the gods love. In its contemporary moral formulation we ask: does God command an act because it is good, or does it become good merely by being commanded? The first raises the question of the standard's independence of the command; the second raises the danger of making the good follow a will that could be conceived otherwise. Craig replies that the good is rooted in God's nature, and that His commands express that good nature and ground our duties—so they are neither arbitrary commands nor submission to a standard separate from Him. This is a philosophical answer that requires evaluation, not merely a restatement of one horn of the question.

The limits of the inference. The defender must show why moral obligation requires a divine obligator, and why this explanation is superior to its alternatives. The objector who affirms independent values must explain their nature, how we know them, and what makes them binding. Among the questions for evaluating the reply above: does referring the good to God's nature explain its basis, or does it transfer the question to what it means to describe that nature as good? Nor is the argument by itself sufficient to designate a particular religion or to establish every ruling ascribed to it. We set out these questions in detail, along with humanist foundations and the road of Levinas, in the chapter "Does Morality Need God?"

The Fifth Argument: The Argument from Desire—"Thirst Points to Water"

The form of the argument. For hunger there is food, and for thirst water. Does the human longing for a happiness that does not fade point to something that satisfies it beyond the limits of this life? C. S. Lewis, in the chapter "Hope" of *Mere Christianity*, presents a desire that the experiences of this world do not fulfill, and sees in the existence of another world the likeliest explanation of it. A nearby inference is found in Wahiduddin Khan, discussing the afterlife, who measures the aspiration toward a better world against the thirst that indicates water. We are dealing, then, with an attempt to understand what longing signifies—not with the claim that every wish must be answered.

Where the objection lies. Not every desire is evidence that its object exists: a person may long to recover a past that does not return. The defender therefore distinguishes a passing wish from a desire rooted in human nature. But this distinction opens two questions: how do we establish that the longing for lasting happiness is an independent innate desire, rather than an extension of imagination and the appetite for more? And why must every desire of this kind have something that satisfies it? The existence of food and water does not by itself establish a rule covering all the soul's longings. Nor may their generality be assumed and then used as a premise.

The reply, and its limits. The argument is not about guaranteeing satisfaction to every hungry person, but about the existence of something that *could* satisfy hunger—and the difference matters. Nor is it refuted merely by noting that some desires are shaped by upbringing and culture: explaining the emergence of a feeling is not the same as judging what it signifies. Still, the defender must show why an explanation that transcends nature is more probable than the alternatives, and must distinguish between a person's failing to find what satisfies him and the impossibility of its existing in this life. Calling a desire deep does not settle that comparison, any more than calling it wishful thinking refutes it.

What does it establish? The argument here tends toward making it more probable that something satisfying this longing exists beyond the limits of this world. It does not by itself determine the attributes of God, the details of the hereafter, or the truth of a particular religion—those require other evidence. Longing may be a motive to search, but it does not excuse anyone from examining the evidence. Nor may faith be reduced to the search for consolation, or unbelief to the desire for liberation: individuals' motives are not read off their intellectual affiliations. We return to the effect of wishing in the chapter on the biases, and to this argument's connection with immortality in the chapter on death.

The Sixth Argument: Religious Experience—"I Tasted, and so I Knew"

The form of the argument. Some people report experiences in which they see a divine presence or a contact with a reality beyond the ordinary, and find in them a clarity that argument alone does not give them. Can such experiences serve as a basis for belief? Richard Swinburne defends a principle to the effect that what seems to a person to be the case gives him a prima facie warrant for believing it, unless there is counter-evidence. Applying this principle to religious experience is a matter of discussion, not an agreed rule: it opens the door to accepting such experience, but does not render it immune to error.

The diversity of the experiences. Religious testimonies are not a single account repeatedly retold: they may differ in describing what was experienced and in the doctrines drawn from it. Some defenders hold that the experience may be one in its origin, and then shaped by the experiencer's culture into a particular language. But this is a possibility that needs evidence, not a ready solution to every conflict. The inquirer must distinguish the similarity of psychological states from agreement in doctrinal meaning: that two experiences share tranquility or a sense of unity does not establish that they disclose the same reality.

Natural explanation, and its limits. A study by Griffiths and colleagues in 2006 found that psilocybin, under supportive research conditions, can occasion experiences resembling some spontaneous mystical ones. The study included 36 volunteers with regular religious or spiritual

involvement, so its results do not represent all human beings or all religious experience. The philosophical significance requires caution: knowing the neural mechanism of an experience does not by itself establish either the truth or the falsity of its religious interpretation. That a similar experience can be chemically occasioned does invite examination of what distinguishes the cases from one another.

From experience to testimony. What a person lives directly reaches others in the form of a report. So the ways of evaluating it are not the same for the two parties. In his discussion of mysticism, William James distinguishes the authority of an experience over whoever has it from the absence of any obligation on others to accept its content uncritically. This is not a dismissal of his testimony, but a call to examine its accuracy, its circumstances, and what supports or opposes it. Nor is counting reports sufficient: one must consider their independence, the possibility that those who give them were influenced by a shared cultural source, and whether any of their aspects can be verified.

What does it establish? The experience may be a powerful motive for belief in whoever has it, and others may see in it an indication worth considering; but moving from the depth of a feeling to the truth of a particular interpretation requires justification. A good moral effect does not by itself establish the soundness of every doctrine a person ties to his experience. So the scale of "lived experience" is neither cancelled nor isolated from the other criteria: we take account of its effect, we examine its interpretation, and we do not make psychological certainty a synonym for a proof binding on everyone.

The Chapter's Conclusion: Why Has No Single Argument Settled the Dispute? — And the Rule of the Braided Rope

We have set out six major paths of inference—not everything that has been said on the question. We have seen that disagreement may fall in a premise, or in the move from it to the conclusion, or in how much the conclusion itself establishes. It is therefore not sound to infer from the continuation of the debate that all the arguments are void, nor is the abundance of replies enough to establish their soundness. The existence of an objection does not mean it succeeds, and the existence of an answer does not mean it is decisive. The useful question for the reader is: where exactly does the disagreement lie, and what makes one of the two explanations more probable?

And from here arises the question of divine hiddenness: why is the knowledge of God not clearer to those who seek it? Some believers hold that the persistence of a margin of obscurity permits choice and moral maturation. But the objector asks: does knowing that God exists take away the freedom to love or obey Him? The argument from hiddenness, in J. L. Schellenberg, centers on the claim that there exists a person capable of a conscious relationship with God, who does not resist it, and who nonetheless does not believe He exists: how, on his view, is this consistent with a perfectly loving God? So the objection is not confined to the absence

of a visible miracle, and it does not assume that everyone who fails to believe is resisting.

As for the image of the braided rope, it helps in understanding cumulative inference—provided the image does not take the place of the argument. Several indications may support a conclusion that no one of them alone would make strongly probable. But that depends on the value of each indication and its relation to the others. If the pieces of evidence merely restate a single assumption in different formulations, their repetition does not become independent support. If each has a genuine significance, it is not sound to dismiss their sum merely because none of them alone yields certainty. So it is not enough to say "many arguments strengthen one another," nor to answer with the slogan "zero plus zero is zero."

And whatever conclusion you find more probable, distinguish three positions: believing a creator exists, believing he does not, and suspending judgment because what is in your hands is insufficient. Suspension of judgment is not denial, just as accepting that a creator exists does not automatically establish the truth of a particular religion. The questions of meaning, morality, and death remain open to examination on every one of these positions. Before moving to the religions' evidence for themselves, we complete the matter with a study on dialogue: how do we present what we have been convinced by, and understand another's objection, without the search for truth turning into the search for victory?

Cross-references for the chapter: *the moral argument and the Euthyphro dilemma in detail in the chapter "Does Morality Need God?"; the argument from desire in full in the chapter "Death and What Follows"; and the objection from poor design completed in the chapter on the problem of evil.*

* Study 18.1: How Does a Believer Present His Case?—The Principles of Dialogue with the Non-Believer

From the psychology of conviction to the ordering of the arguments for different interlocutors, the fatal errors of both camps on equal terms, and the Qur'anic method of dialogue as a model—and the limits of persuasion and the etiquette of parting

> **Summary of the study:** If you wanted to convince a denier that God exists, which argument would you open with, and what tone would cost you the conversation from the first sentence? This study is not a display of arguments but of the art of presenting them: the ethics and order of dialogue between believer and atheist, when the goal is understanding, not victory.

---

* Opening: The Father's Question Before the Philosopher's

The two chapters that flank this study gave you the ammunition: the arguments of Stage One and their critiques in full (Chapter 18), and the religions' own evidence likewise (Chapter 19). But the question that actually knocks at people's doors seldom comes in the form "what is the assessment of the argument from coming-to-be?"—it comes in a hotter form: **my son tells me there is no God; what do I say to him? My friend has become an atheist. How do I talk with him?** This is a question of another kind: not the

question of ammunition but the question of **marksmanship**—when to fire which argument, at which target, with which hand, and when holding fire is the very hit. This study is devoted to that.

And our charter in it is declared, as usual: we write an ethics of dialogue, not a recruiting pamphlet; so we present the kit of the believer who seeks to persuade in its most careful formulations—because this is a legitimate demand of this book's widest audience. We present opposite it its mirror on the other side, and we try the errors of both camps by the one standard. So the study can be read by the atheist to learn how to be conversed with honorably, as it can be read by the believer to learn how to converse wisely—and that is the mark of sound ethics in this subject: **it loses nothing when the opponent reads it.**

* First: The Shocking Truth from Which Everything Begins—Debate Has Seldom Persuaded Anyone

Before any tactic, face the datum on which the students of religious conversion and those who have tried it agree: **people seldom change their great convictions in a single sitting, never under the pressure of a single argument, and never in front of an audience.** Religious conviction—in faith and in atheism—is not an isolated mental file to be replaced by a better one. It is woven into identity, relationships, memories, and wounds, and when you attack it head-on you are not conversing with an idea but besieging a person. And the besieged fortify themselves and do not convert. That is

why the biographies of the great converts in both directions almost all agree on the same pattern: a slow conversion over years, not sittings (Augustine nine years a Manichaean and then years of hesitation; Ghazali two months of darkness after years of examination; and the converts of our age tell similar paths from both sides), usually preceded by **a safe relationship, or a beloved example, or an existential crisis** that opened the door which the bare arguments could not break down. Then the arguments came in through an open door. As for public debates, the research on persuasion and the experience of the debaters themselves say that they **harden the audience in their positions** more than they move them. The loser in front of people is seldom persuaded—as we established in the etiquette of dialogue.

So the first practical conclusion: change the definition of success. Your success in a session of dialogue is not that your interlocutor says what you want before rising—that almost never happens. But that you plant in his mind **an honest question that was not there**, demolish in his mind **a distorted image** he had taken for faith, and keep **the door and the bridge** standing for a coming round. Persuasion in this subject is **sowing and a long watering, not the harvest of a night**—and whoever enters seeking the harvest in a night leaves having ruined the seed and the soil together.

* Second: Clarify Your Aim—And Do Not Confuse the Two Stages

Then ask yourself honestly before you open your mouth**: what do I want from this dialogue?** If your aim is to silence—to shut the opponent up and display victory—know that you are seeking your own pleasure, not his guidance, and that the price of the pleasure is the closing of his heart. If your aim is persuasion, you have learned that it is the fruit of a course, not a blow. So let your aim be what is actually within the sitting's power: **understanding, making understood, and sowing.**

Then hold fast to the distinction on which all of Part VII was built, for no trap is laid in this dialogue more often than by neglecting it: **the two stages of the question.** You are in a dialogue about "is there a God?"—Stage One. So do not let the dialogue slide into Stage Two before the first is settled: if your interlocutor argues from problems he attributes to a particular religion—a contradiction he claims in a text, or the conduct of religious people, or a history of wars—say to him calmly: all of this belongs to the file "which religion is truest?" and has its own field, while we are still in the file "does the universe have a creator?." The problems of the king's alleged stewards do not deny the existence of the king. With the same justice: do not suppose that if you have established the Creator you have established your religion. Establishing Stage One brings your interlocutor to the door of deism and searching perplexity—a huge move that deserves to be respected as a complete fruit—and then Stage Two has its own

evidence (Chapter 19). **So agree on the title of the round before the round begins**—half of the fruitless dialogues are a quarrel of two titles, not of two arguments.

* Third: Diagnose Your Interlocutor—For "The Atheist" Is Not One Man

Chapter 2 gave you the ladder of positions; here is the place of its first applied use. Before you reach for the ammunition, know who is before you—these are five faces the conversationalist meets more than any others, and each face has a key, and a wrong entrance that shuts it:

The wounded. He became an atheist from a shock—the death of someone dear, an injustice he saw, the cruelty of religious people toward him, or a terrifying image of God planted in his childhood. Do not besiege him with cosmological proofs—his wound is not in his mind—but open with him the file of the problem of evil with all the honesty of Chapter 20, and listen before you answer. Perhaps the most useful thing you can say to him is: "This question pains me too."

The morally angry. He attacks religion in the name of justice and mercy—citing the wars and the oppression in heaven's name. His key is to turn his anger into an illuminating question: this moral scale by which you condemn injustice absolutely—who set it up in a blind universe? (The moral argument in its natural home—Chapter 22.)

The scientistic. He accepts nothing but what the empirical method delivers. His key is the distinction "science does not find God in the laboratory," with which Chapter 23 settled half the battles—the empirical method is blind to the non-material **by definition**, not by discovery, and the claim "there is no truth but what the laboratory has proven" is itself a philosophical claim no laboratory has proven.

Then you open with him the files at the edge of physics (fine-tuning, the rationality of the universe), where science itself stands at the threshold of the question. **The philosophical.** He has read Hume, Kant, and Mackie and knows the objections by name. This is the most honorable of opponents and the hardest—nothing serves with him but the highest of what is in Chapters 18 and 22 in complete honesty, and a manly acknowledgment of the points of strength in his objection—this kind is won by honesty more than by argument, and perhaps the most valuable thing you can do with him is to show him that in the opposite camp there are those who match him in rank (Plantinga, Swinburne, and their like).

The indifferent. The hardest of them all—he does not object; he does not care. Proofs are useless with him, because he never asked. His only key is **awakening the question**, not answering it: the question of destiny and meaning in a moment of honesty ("and then what?")—and Pascal's wager was made for this kind in the first place, not for the philosophers.

And in your hand is a golden question that serves as an opening with all the faces: "Describe to me the God you do not believe in." Hear him to the end. Then, very often, you will say truthfully: "I do not believe in that God either." How many have denied an angry old man above a cloud, or a cosmic executioner hunting for slips, or an idol fashioned for them by a harsh upbringing or a distorted discourse—and that is not the transcendent God that Chapter 9 laid out. With this single question you have done three things at once: you listened and so reassured him, you diagnosed the seat of the ailment, and you turned the dialogue from the confrontation of two trenches into a shared search for the correct conception before judging it. **For many an atheism is in truth the denial of an image that the careful believers join him in denying.**

* Fourth: Arrange the Rope to the Measure of the Hand—Which Strand Do You Extend First?

Chapter 18 taught you the rule of "the braided rope": the great convictions are braided from strands that support one another, not from a single strand. The ethics of dialogue is the ethics of **ordering the strands to the interlocutors**: the argument from **innate disposition** awakens and does not compel—its place is the wounded, the one in crisis, and the hours of honesty, not the contest with the philosopher who will answer you with the evolutionary explanation in two sentences. The arguments from **coming-to-be and fine-tuning** are the two pillars of dialogue with the rationalist and

the scientistic—on condition that you carry them in their rigorous form (everything that **begins** has a cause of its beginning, not: everything that **exists** has a maker—for the second rightly opens "then who made God?" against you) and that you avoid in them the trap of the god of the gaps that Chapter 3 warned you of: do not build your interlocutor's faith on a scientific gap that may be filled tomorrow, so that what you built collapses. The **moral** argument's door is the morally angry, as passed. **Religious experience** is told as testimony and not imposed as argument—its strength is for its owner and its limits before others, as we weighed. And **the argument from desire** is the close of a quiet conversation, not the opening of a bout. **And the unifying rule:** do not hang the whole case before your interlocutor on a single strand, however much it pleases you—for if he cuts it he will think he has cut the rope, and it was you who made him believe the rope was a strand.

* Fifth: The Qur'anic Method of Dialogue—The Model of the First Teacher

The Muslim has before him a founding model in this very art of dialogue, whose principles we presented in the preface to Chapter 18 and whose applied summary we gather here—presenting it, as is our custom, as the method of the founding text as its people read it: the Qur'an—addressing real deniers, not hypothetical ones—**seldom marshaled a scholastic syllogism**, and marshaled in its place three arts: **directing attention** to the signs set before the eyes—the camels, the sky, the mountains, the earth, the water of the clouds, the crops of the field, and the fire of the tree. So that it turned the whole cosmos into an

exhibition hall for the argument instead of a lecture hall; **the rhetorical question** that hands the denier the division of possibilities and leaves him alone before it: "Were they created without any cause? Or were they their own creators?"—a concise question that exhausts the possibilities: from nothing? or did you create yourselves? or does the third remain? (al-Bukhari reported that Jubayr ibn Mut'im heard it—while still in the polytheism of his people—and said, "my heart nearly took flight": the effect of the rigorous question on the fair heart before his Islam). **And the address to the innate disposition in the hour of its unveiling**: "Whenever they go on board a ship they call on God, and dedicate their faith to Him alone"—the text does not argue with the *fitra* but reminds it where it awakens: in the storm, in illness, and at the edge of annihilation.

Then it fences all of this with the etiquette of method: "call [people] to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good teaching. Argue with them in the most courteous way"—making **wisdom** (the measure of the discourse to the measure of those addressed—which is exactly what we called diagnosing the interlocutor) the foundation of the subject, and making argument its last resort and "the most courteous way" its condition. And it recounted Abraham's dialogue with Nimrod and showed us the disclosing argument before which the opponent "was dumbfounded" without a single insult. **So this—for whoever takes guidance from it—is a complete method: a cosmos displayed, a question that exhausts, a *fitra* reminded, a wisdom that measures, and a tongue that does well.**

* Sixth: The Fatal Errors of Both Camps—By the One Standard

Seven by which the believer kills his dialogue.

(1) Building faith on the gaps—so that you make your Lord a tenant of the gaps in science, and the gaps get filled;

(2) threatening with hellfire as an argument against someone who does not believe in it in the first place. For the threat is a discourse for one who has believed, and to frighten the denier with what he denies only increases his certainty that you have nothing else; **(3) impugning the denier's morals** and making "he became an atheist only to sin" a rule—a claim belied by the lives of deniers who lived chastely, and belied by our rule "sincerity is not truth" from its other side: just as sincerity does not prove the believer's truth, the alleged wickedness does not prove the falsehood of the denier's argument—arguments are judged, not hearts. **(4) Defeating the weakest opponent**—you pick the silliest atheist you have seen, answer him, and count the battle over; **(5) the excised scientific citation**—a verse loaded with a discovery, or a scientist's words cut out of context, and when the excision is exposed you lose the witness and your credibility with it (we showed you its case studies in Chapter 23); **(6) haste**—you want the testimony at the end of the sitting, so you press, and pressing shuts the door; **(7) carrying guidance on your shoulders.** So that you make your interlocutor's faith the measure of your success, and if he

refuses you rage at him with the rage of one who has lost something of his own, when you are only a conveyer.

And seven matching ones by which the atheist kills his dialogue—on equal terms:

(1) **jousting with a straw man**—a naive god that the people of transcendence themselves disown;

(2) **confusing the two stages**—he demolishes a particular religion and thinks he has demolished the Creator; (3) **making the conduct of religious people an argument about existence**. Bad stewards do not disprove the king, just as good ones do not prove him (the rule of fruits from both ends); (4) **the self-refuting scientism**—"nothing is accepted but the tested," which is itself untested. (5) **Brandishing Russell's teapot out of its place**—the analogy hits arbitrary claims that have no witness and no trace, and the question of the cause of all existence is not of the kind of a floating teapot that explains nothing (the detail of the burden of proof is in Chapter 4); (6) **exempting oneself from every burden**—he demands of the believer proof for the affirmation and counts his own total denial ("there is certainly no God") exempt from all proof, when the two certainties share the burden, as passed in the ladder of positions; (7) **condescension**—opening the dialogue by dividing people into the reasonable (us) and the fools (them), which is the mirror of the preacher's condescension exactly—and both shut the ears before the second sentence.

* Seventh: A Word from the Author—From the Notebook of Experience

I add for you, from a father's notebook, what I tried before I read a name for it in the books on persuasion: I wrote to my children in my counsels (*From Lockdown*): **"Be a good listener, and show sincere interest in people—not only in what they say, but in what they feel as well,"** and I wrote to them that most of my mistakes came not from a lack of information but **from haste in judgment or from an emotion that rode over my reason.** Then I found that these two counsels are half the ethics of this study: I never succeeded in a dialogue except on the day I listened until my interlocutor felt that I had understood **his grievance** before his statement, and I never lost a dialogue except on the day I rushed to win. So if you forget all the tactics of the study, keep this from it: **the ear opens what the tongue shuts.**

* Eighth: The Limits of Persuasion—And the Etiquette of Parting

The last of the ethics is its first: know your limit. The text by which the believer himself takes guidance says to the greatest of callers in rank: **"You [Prophet] cannot guide everyone you love to the truth**; it is God who guides whoever He will"—revealed about one whose guidance he loved more than anyone's, and it was not written for him. So who are you above him in this subject? Yours is the best conveyance and the faithful sowing, and not the harvest. This is not the consolation of the helpless but **the liberation of the**

conversationalist from a burden that spoils his dialogue: for whoever carries his interlocutor's guidance on his shoulders presses, hurries, and rages, while whoever has set the burden in its place converses in tranquility and does well. Then, if you part without agreement—and this will happen often—part on the bridge, not on the rubble: keep the affection, leave the door shut without a lock, and remind yourself that Mustafa Mahmoud named his interlocutor in the title of his book "*My Friend* the Atheist"—the title itself is the ethics of a whole subject: the friendship remained, so the dialogue remained for years. Had it gone in the first round, all the sowing would have been cut short. The believer has, after that, a weapon that is not disputed and spoils no dialogue: **prayer for him in his absence**—the act of one who believes that hearts are between the fingers of the One he calls upon.

* The Scale: The Study's Kit in Ten—And Its Open Question

Gather them in your palm: (1) Success is a seed and an open door, not a declaration in a sitting. (2) The title of the round first: Stage One, not Stage Two. (3) Diagnose before you fire: the wounded is not the philosopher. (4) Open with "describe to me the God you deny"—and listen to the end. (5) Arrange the strands of the rope to the measure of the hand, and do not hang the case on a strand. (6) Beware the gaps and the excisions—what is built on a gap falls when it is filled. (7) Address the *fitra* where it awakens, and argue with reason where it asks. (8) Do not threaten with what he

denies, do not impugn the one you converse with, and defeat none but your strongest opponents. (9) Be consistent: every rule you bind your opponent to, keep yourself—and every error you forbid him, forbid yourself. (10) Conveyance is yours and guidance is not in your hands—so part on a bridge, and pray in his absence.

And the study's question remains, which we leave with you—the test of your honesty before the test of your skill: **you who enter the dialogue hoping to persuade—did you enter it prepared to be persuaded?** For honorable dialogue is a door opened from both sides, and whoever enters with a closed heart has asked of his opponent what he did not give. That is the first thing conversationalists smell, and they close. Your readiness to be persuaded does not mean the weakness of your certainty. It means that your certainty is of the kind this book's charter described: the certainty of one who has seen all the roads—and that alone is the certainty that spreads.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the arguments with their full ammunition in the body of Chapter 18, and the Stage Two evidence in Chapter 19; the ladder of positions and the kinds of doubt in Chapter 2; and the god of the gaps in Chapter 3.*

* Study 18.2: The Facing Mirror—How Does a Non-Believer Present His Case to a Believer?

The other shore's kit at its strongest: its aims of differing burden, the diagnosis of the five believers, the ordering of its arguments for them, and its fatal errors—and how the believer receives them honorably, and why we wrote the opponent's kit with our own hands

> **Summary of the study:** Now turn the mirror around: how does the atheist, in turn, try to shake the believer's certainty? In fairness to this book's own covenant, this study presents the dialogue from the opposite side entirely, with the same seriousness and the same respect granted to the first.

---

* Opening: Why Do We Write the Opponent His Kit?

A believing reader may be astonished: does a book—whose author has declared his faith—compose a chapter teaching the atheist how to argue against him? The answer comes from the heart of the charter, and for three benefits the believer reaps before anyone else. **The first:** the argument that is to be weighed must be weighed in its best clothes—we bound ourselves to this in the proofs of faith, so we are bound to the same in their contraries, or else we would be like someone who weighs his own goods on one scale and his opponent's on another.

The second: this kit is coming to your house whether you like it or not—on a platform, in a university seat, or in your child's friend. So it is a thousand times better that your child meet it for the first time in an honest book that presents it **with its points of strength, its limits, and its replies** than that it ambush him fully armed in an arena that shows only its face.

The third: a faith that has not heard the strongest of what its opponent has is a faith not yet tested—and our charter promised the reader the certainty "of one who has seen all the roads." So this study is the mirror of the previous one: there we wrote the ethics of the believer who seeks to persuade, and here we write the ethics of the atheist who seeks the same—**by the one standard, and with the one pen**. Then we close with what this book closes everything with: the scale, and the referral of the replies to their places.

* First: The Parallel Truth—The Believer, Too, Is Not Uprooted in a Sitting

The first thing the wise atheist learns is the thing his believing counterpart learned in the previous study, reversed: **firm faith is not uprooted by a debate.** The students of leaving religion see the same pattern in the opposite direction: those who left their religions seldom left them at the moment of a compelling argument. They left them along extended paths that usually begin with small inner doubts kept silent, then readings and questions that accumulate, and then—in the great majority of cases—**a wounding social or institutional experience** that loosened the emotional bond before

the doctrinal one was loosened. Whereas the direct assault on the sacred does to the believer what the siege of arguments does to the atheist: it mobilizes identity, and identity fortifies itself. **So the practical conclusion is the same to the letter:** the success of the atheist conversationalist is not that the believer utters denial before rising—that does not happen. But that he plants an honest question, dismantles a false certainty that faith is "a self-evidence no reasonable person disputes," and keeps a bridge for a coming round. Whoever enters to tear faith out by force leaves having hardened it.

* Second: Atheist, Clarify Your Claim—For the Burdens Are Three, Not One

Before the arguments, specify precisely what you claim—for confusion here is the undoing of many conversationalists on your shore:

The lowest claim: "the evidence for faith does not satisfy me"—the lightest of the claims in burden: it is enough for you to criticize the proofs one by one (and your ammunition is the objections of Chapter 18 in full: who says the universe came to be? and who designed the designer? and the multiverse, and poor design . . .), and it ends you in suspension of judgment, not in denial. **The middle claim:** "it is more probable that there is no God"—and here criticism no longer suffices. You are now required to produce positive clues that favor nonexistence (the strongest of them are coming).

The highest claim: "there is certainly no God"—a total claim about all of existence, whose burden is of the same kind as the burden of religious certainty exactly,

and few of the serious atheist philosophers carry it today. **So choose your seat on the ladder and declare it—** for whoever argues at the lowest and leaps at the close to the highest is exposed by the first alert interlocutor. **Then keep the rule of the two stages from your side:** the easiest of your fields is shaking Stage Two—the details of a particular religion—and the hardest is Stage One. So if you demolish, for your interlocutor, some narratives or rulings and then announce the fall of the Creator, he will block your road with one sentence: "you argued against my religion, not my Lord"—and withdraw safely into deism while you think you have gained.

* Third: Diagnose the Believer You Converse with—For "The Believer" Is Not One Man

And the mirror of the five faces. **The untroubled inheritor.** His faith is the fabric of a home and a community, not a construction of proofs—so refuting the proofs does not touch him, because it never rested on them. His only key is the question of the geography lottery in its gentlest form: "Had you been born in Benares or Salt Lake City, would you not be defending another religion today with the same warmth? So what distinguishes your inheritance from theirs?"—a question that demolishes nothing but awakens the search (and know in advance that our Chapter 5 clarified what this question proves and what it does not: it strips the naive comfort from the inherited belief and does not rule on its truth—so be honest about its limits and you will be respected).

The rational demonstrator. He built his faith on coming-to-be and design—and this is your cleanest field: the critiques of Hume and Kant in full, the question "and why should the universe itself not be the necessary existent?", and the paper on poor design and the futility of the vast, dead cosmic expanses.

The spiritual taster. "I tasted, and so I knew"—do not butt heads with him over his experience, for it is more trustworthy to him than his senses. Open before him the map of the equivalent experiences: the Hindu tasted Krishna, the Christian tasted Christ, and the Sufi tasted annihilation—experiences equal in heat and contradictory in content, so by what scale did you prefer your taste to theirs? (This is the strongest thing in your quiver here—and our Chapter 18 weighed it from both sides.)

The moral utilitarian. He believes because religion "preserves morality and society." So separate for him the usefulness of an idea from its truth (a superstition may be useful, and a calamity may be true), and open the file of Chapter 22: Euthyphro, Buddhism as a venerable moral system with no legislating God, and the witnessed ethics of the irreligious.

The fearful. He is held by the threat and by Pascal's wager—so free the wager for him from within: on which God do you wager among the thousands of deities, some of which threaten the worshipers of others? What wise God would accept the faith of a hedging gambler?—the wager awakens the indifferent (as we said in its mirror) and is not fit as a foundation on which a religion is built.

And in your hand are two golden questions that open with all the faces. The first is the question of "one god further," popularized by the contemporary conversationalists of atheism: "You, my friend, are an atheist about thousands of gods—Zeus, Osiris, Vishnu—and you know exactly why you do not believe in them; I only go one god further than you, and for the same reasons"—a question that forces the believer to examine his reasons for denying the gods of others and see whether they turn back on him (and the answer of our careful thinkers is known: between denying embodied, limited gods inside the universe and denying the transcendent cause of existence lies a difference of kind, not of number—but the question obliges the believer to **say** this answer, not to assume it). The second is the question of falsifiability: **"What is it that, if you saw it, you would say: I was wrong, there is no God?"**—if he answers, he is a seeker who can be conversed with. And if he says "nothing could shake me," he has announced that his conviction is immune to examination. You know from the mirror study that this question will recoil on you in its own form: "And you—what is it that, if you saw it, you would believe?"—**so do not ask it unless your answer to its like is ready.**

* Fourth: Arrange Your Arguments—The Other Shore's Cards in Full

Your positive ammunition—for whoever has gone beyond the lowest claim—is five major cards, each of which we state in its most careful formulation and with the place of its reply in this book.

The card of evil—the weightiest in feeling: the quantity of pointless suffering in the world is a clue to the absence of a merciful governor (in its rigorous evidential form, not the retired logical form—and Chapter 20 is its complete field, with its answers).

The card of divine hiddenness—the most agile philosophically today: a God who wants to be known and loved, able to appear without ambiguity—why does He leave billions of sincere seekers in a perplexity for which they are punished? The existence of "sincere, perplexed unbelief" is itself a clue to absence (we weighed it against the answers of trial and the wisdom of concealment in the conclusion of Chapter 18).

The card of natural sufficiency—the calmest and the most cunning: we do not deny your God. We simply no longer need Him: the universe, life, morality, and religion itself have found their natural explanations, and the surplus hypothesis is shaved by Occam's razor. Graham Oppy, among the most precise of contemporary atheist philosophers and the furthest from rhetoric, raised it to the rank of **"the best argument against God"** in the title of his book: the comparison, for him, is not a claim of conclusive proof but **a weighing of two theories by their theoretical virtues**: naturalism has

fewer commitments and a simpler structure with roughly equal explanatory power.

So it is favored on the scale of economy, as a preponderance, not a certainty (and its reply, for us, is scattered through the book: the natural explanation answers "how" and leaves "why is there anything at all, and why is it intelligible with rational laws?" standing—Chapters 3 and 23).

The card of the equivalence of religions—it demolishes from outside: contradictory claims, equivalent experiences, and a geography lottery that distributes certainty by birth—does this not look more like a human marketplace than a single revelation? (Its scale is scattered through the chapters on resemblance, experience, and bias.) **And the card of the origin of the idea of God**—it explains the phenomenon instead of jousting with it: from Freudian projection to the evolutionary agency detector (Chapter 1 presented it in full—**with the governing rule your card cannot escape: an explanation explains receptivity; it does not settle truth**—and it cuts in your direction as it cut in your opponent's direction when he explained your atheism psychologically). **So this is your kit, complete and honest—and notice what we did:** there is no card with which we did not refer to the field of its weighing. So if you argue from them cut off from their replies, you have done exactly what you fault the preachers for.

* Fifth: Your Fatal Errors—The Mirror of the Seven, and Three of Your Own

You must first avoid the seven we counted on your shore in the previous study (the straw man, the confusion of the two stages, the argument from the conduct of the religious, the self-refuting scientism, Russell's teapot out of place, the self-exemption from the burden, and condescension). **And three more that belong to the situation of conversing with a believer in particular.**

(1) Wounding the sacred instead of criticizing it: mocking your interlocutor's prophet or his book is not an argument but a slap. The slapped do not think. They take revenge; criticize the idea as hard as you like and preserve the symbol's sanctity for its owner, for that is the difference between the philosopher and the provocateur.

(2) The cruelty of timing: the one who buried his mother in the morning—do not lecture him in the evening on the illusion of the hereafter. You are then not the holder of an argument but the holder of an axe over a wound, and you will lose him for a lifetime for the sake of a round.

(3) Demolishing the house without offering an alternative: you are asking your interlocutor to leave a house in which dwell his meaning, his consolation, his community, and the paternity of his loved ones' graves. So if you carry nothing but a pickaxe, do not wonder that he clings to the walls. The great atheists who really made an impact (from Epicurus to Camus) did not offer

demolition. They offered **an alternative dwelling**: tranquility without gods, a meaning that is made, and the dignity of facing things. So if you do not carry the answer to "and what do you give me in place of what you take?" you are not yet ripe for the dialogue (and this question of meaning has its complete field in the chapters on morality and death).

* Sixth: And You, Believer on the Receiving End—The Ethics of Reception

By the one standard, five things for the one to whom this kit comes.

(1) Do not panic—you read in Chapter 2 that the question knocked at the hearts of Ghazali, Job, and Thomas, and that the traditions condemned the obstinate, not the asker. The trembling of your heart at a strong argument is not unbelief but the sign that you are listening honestly.

(2) Ask for the strongest form—if he brings you a straw man, strengthen it for him yourself and then answer it: this astonishes him and honors your religion more than twenty replies to the silly.

(3) Distinguish the two stages from your side—whatever touches a narrative or a ruling has its field in the jurisprudence of your religion and its sciences. Do not make it a battle over the existence of God and so gamble the root in defense of a branch.

(4) Take your time openly—"I will look into it and come back to you" is the answer of the strong, not the

defeat of the weak, and it leaves a truer impression on your interlocutor than a hasty, flimsy answer.

(5) And examine your house from within—for many an atheist argument does not demolish your religion but demolishes **a mistaken image** of it that had clung to you. So make the attack an occasion for purification: how many believers have come out of these dialogues deeper and purer in faith, because their opponent broke for them idols that had been veiling the face of transcendence.

* A Word from the Author: Why Did I Arm My Opponent with My Own Hand?

A dear reader will ask me: you wrote the atheist his kit, and you are a father who hopes for his children's faith—were you not afraid? I answer him with what I believe: I feared the opposite. I feared that my children would meet these arguments for the first time on a platform that presents them victorious with no scale, and suppose that their fathers had hidden them from them out of weakness. **For the hidden argument is a thousand times deadlier than the argument displayed in an honest home beside its reply.** I am true to my charter: I asked the atheist in the previous study to read faith from its deepest people—so I was bound to present to my believing reader the atheism of its deepest people, not its silliest. I did not find my certainty diminished by writing this study by a single letter—I found it increased in one thing only: respect for every honest seeker on both shores, and certainty that a Lord who taught us "Say, 'Produce your evidence'" does not fear for His religion from the display of others' proofs.

* The Unifying Scale of the Two Mirrors—And Their One Open Question

You have now read the principles of dialogue from both shores with one pen and one standard. So take the double conclusion: **the two honorable conversationalists share the same rules**: sowing, not harvest; diagnosis before firing; the strongest forms, not straw men; the consistency of every rule on whoever states it; the sanctity of wound and timing; and a bridge that remains after parting. They differ only in the direction of their hope. **And the question of the two mirrors remains one, addressed to both faces:** each of you entered hoping to persuade—**which of you entered prepared to be persuaded?** That one alone has truly conversed. As for the other—whatever his shore—he has delivered a speech to a mirror. Whoever has read his opponent's kit in full—as you have now done—and was not shaken, has possessed the certainty of one who has seen all the roads. Whoever was shaken has learned exactly where to search—**and both have come out of these two studies the richer, and that is the utmost an honest book can do.**

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the replies to each card in its field: evil in Chapter 20, divine hiddenness and the equivalence of experiences in Chapter 18, natural sufficiency in Chapters 3 and 23, the geography lottery and the Outsider Test in Chapter 5, and the origin of the idea of God and the rule "an explanation does not settle truth" in Chapter 1; the ladder of the three claims in Chapter 2; and Pascal's wager and its critique in Chapter 5.*

* The Gate of Chapter 19: By What Standard Will We Judge? Declaring the Scale Before Entering the Field

A page of pledges before the comparison: its purpose, its scope, its units, and its criteria declared in advance—the single questionnaire by which every religious claim is examined, and the promise not to change the scale along the way

---

Why Declare the Scale Before We Weigh?

In the next chapter you enter the most demanding field in the book: the evidence each religion offers for itself, and the comparison between them. Before you step in, we stop at the threshold to do what most writers on this subject neglect: **to declare, before we judge, by what standard we will judge.** A scale revealed only after the weighing is a suspect scale: its owner can pull it toward whichever side he likes and then say he "found" the result. That is why modern studies of the method of comparison itself insist on this—from Jonathan Z. Smith's warning about the "magic" that lurks in undisciplined comparison, to Oliver Freiberger's codification of its landmarks. The comparer must fix four things **before beginning** and hold to them to the end: the comparison's **purpose** (what does it want to know?), its **scope** (what enters the table and what stays outside?), its **units** (what exactly is being compared with what—texts? doctrines? institutions? experiences?), and its **criteria** (by what questions is each side examined?). Whoever changes one of the four midway has

manufactured his result by hand, however much he may look like a neutral researcher. This page is our declaration of all four.

* First: Purpose, Scope, and Units—Declared

Purpose. Not to tell you which religion is true—that lies beyond what an honest book can do. But to learn this: **how does each religion's claim hold up when it is asked the same questions the others are asked?** The comparison here is a comparison of answers to a single questionnaire, not a contest of speeches. **Scope.** The great living religions that claim a truth about existence and destiny and offer evidence for it (the six families the map laid out, together with irreligion as a rival claim that is asked the same questions wherever they apply). Outside the scope remain the religions that claim no universal truth for everyone (many ethnic and tribal religions), because a questionnaire is of no use for what makes no claim. **Units.** We compare **the normative claim of each religion as its own authoritative scholars state it in its founding texts and accepted commentaries**—not the conduct of its followers, not its image among its opponents, and not its weakest representatives. The unit of comparison is "the claim in its strongest form," on the rule of this whole book.

An example of why the criteria must be declared first. Contemporary Muslim writers have tried applying to the religions the method of **"survey and division"** (*al-sabr wa-l-taqsim*): enumerate everything people on earth believe, then test each to exclude the false and keep the true. The method has Qur'anic roots in the

exhaustive listing of the possibilities of creation: “Were they created without any cause? Or were they their own creators?” (52:35). Its proponents hold that it is the shortest way to the truth, because it puts everyone on trial at once. Its critics object that everything in it hangs on a single question: **by what standard is “the false” excluded?** If the standard is the mapor’s own belief (monotheism as a precondition, for instance), then he has begged the question and surveyed the religions with the standard of one of them. But if the criteria are declared independently before the map, the method becomes legitimate—and that is exactly what this gate does: it declares the standard before anyone begins excluding.

* Second: The Single Questionnaire—Ten Questions Every Claim Is Asked

These ten questions are put to every religion in the next chapter and in every field of the book, **in the same order and with the same rigor**. Each has its place in this book where it is answered:

#	The question	What it measures	Where it is answered in this book
1	**Is its conception of God (or of ultimate reality) coherent in itself?**	The internal consistency of the theology: do the divine attributes contain a contradiction? Does the conception of ultimate reality fit the rest of the creed?	Chapters 9 and 6, and the study on the One and the many (Study 9.1)
2	**What is its claimed source, and how is it established?**	The kind of claim—revelation, disclosure, wisdom—and what is offered as proof of it	Chapters 12 and 13, and Chapter 19
3	**What is the history of its texts: how were they written, collected, and transmitted?**	Sound transmission by the same eight objective criteria (earliest witness; distance in time; number of witnesses; multiplicity of lines;	Chapter 16 and the study on transmission (the table of eight

#	The question	What it measures	Where it is answered in this book
		degree of variation; stability; oral tradition; possibility of reconstruction)—as a condition, not a proof	criteria, Study 16.1)
4	**How strong is the claim of its founder or prophet?**	The founding figure: the claim, its evidence, the reception by contemporaries, and the impact	Chapters 12, 13, and 14
5	**Is there independent corroboration from outside the circle of followers?**	The testimony of opponents and neutral parties, and material remains—not the testimony of believers alone	Chapter 19 (testimony and mass transmission), and the rule of the tinted glass
6	**How does it deal with science and documented history?**	Points of collision and of harmony, and the manner of interpretation where they collide	Chapter 23 and its studies
7	**What is its explanation of evil and suffering?**	The coherence of its theodicy and its internal cost	Chapter 20

#	The question	What it measures	Where it is answered in this book
8	**What is the basis of its morality, and the source of moral obligation?**	The moral structure: the source of obligation, the shared core, and the ritual particulars	Chapter 22 and its studies
9	**What does it say about death and what follows—and on what evidence?**	Its picture of destiny, bound up with justice and meaning, and its evidence for it	Chapter 24
10	**Does it require accepting extraordinary claims without proportionate evidence?**	The rule of proportion: the heavier the claim, the heavier the evidence needed—and how much the reader is asked to grant at the outset	Chapters 14 and 18, and the studies on the principles of dialogue

Two notes on the questionnaire. First, the questions **do not carry equal weight** for every reader. One reader may give priority to the third (transmission) and another to the seventh (evil)—and that is their right, provided they declare their weighting and apply it to everyone. Second, each question is examined from within on **the Seven-Rung Ladder** (Chapter 4). The questionnaire says *what* we ask; the ladder says *how* we examine the answer.

* Third: The Pledge—Not to Change the Scale Along the Way

Here lies the most dangerous fallacy in this whole subject, and the one most hidden from the person committing it: **changing the scale midway.** You demand strict historical documentation of every report from one religion, then accept from another religion a "spiritual experience" as sufficient. You put your opponent's texts through the higher criticism and read your own with submission. You ask others for corroboration from outside their followers and content yourself, for your own people, with the testimony of your own people. You load the rival claim with the full burden of proof and exempt your own because it is "the default." You saw in the chapter on biases that this switching usually works **unconsciously**: the standard looks to its owner like one standard, when in truth it is two scales that trade places depending on which side is being weighed. (Razi's rule about the clear and the ambiguous is the witness to this from within the tradition.) **So here is our pledge for the next chapter—and we ask you to hold us to it:** the same ten questions, with the same rigor, for every claim. What we accept as evidence from one we accept from all, and what we reject from one we reject from all. **And where the nature of the evidence differs between religions** (this one argues from a text, that one from an experience, a third from history), we do not bind a religion to a kind of evidence it does not claim. But we **weigh each kind of evidence by the standard of its kind, for everyone**: experience by the

standard of experience for all; text by the standard of text for all; history by the standard of history for all. Not experience for this one and history for that one.

* Fourth: What This Scale Does Not Measure—Honestly

Three things the questionnaire does not claim. **It does not measure truth directly.** It measures **how well a claim withstands the questions**. A claim may withstand them and still not be true; a claim may stumble on a question and still be true, for a reason the questionnaire did not capture. Its yield is **a balance of probabilities**, not a proof. **It does not measure personal experience**, which may weigh more, for the person who has it, than all ten questions together—and we have given it its due and its limits in its place. **And it does not sit the same in every reader's hand.** The scale is one, and hands differ. Whoever imagines that the questionnaire yields one automatic result for everyone has asked of the scale what no scale can give in the great questions of existence. **It is enough for us that it makes the verdict—if you reach one—the verdict of someone who weighed everyone on a single declared scale, not of someone who chose the result first and then looked for a standard to support it.**

The Seeker's Question at the threshold: If you were asked to write your own criteria—before seeing any evidence—would they be these same ten? Or would you find yourself adjusting them once you knew which religion wins by them?

> ***Cross-references for the gate:*** *the six criteria of comparison (the general ancestor of this questionnaire) in Chapter 6; the Seven-Rung Ladder in Chapter 4; and the rule of the Single Standard and Razi's rule in Chapters 5 and 6.*

A Study Annexed to Chapter 18: The Mystical Experience Across Religions — Is Everyone Describing the Same Mountain?

The one phenomenon that resembles itself in every house; the four features the reports share; the dispute between those who read one experience under many names and those who read many experiences shaped by their names; and how each tradition tests its own mystics

Summary of the study: Sufis, kabbalists, Christian contemplatives, Advaitins, Zen masters, and shamans report an experience with a family likeness: a dissolving of the ordinary self, a sense of contact with something ultimate, and a certainty that outlasts argument. This study sets the reports side by side, distinguishes the four features they share from the doctrines they disagree on, presents the two rival readings of the resemblance—perennialist and constructivist—and shows that every tradition built its own procedure for testing its mystics, which is the book's own rule applied from within.

---

* Opening: The Strongest Case for the Sixth Argument, and Its Hardest Problem

The sixth argument of Chapter 18 rested on religious experience. Its strongest form was not any single believer's testimony but the convergence of testimonies across traditions that never met: that people who had never read one another's books reported, in different

languages and centuries, something that sounds like the same thing. This study takes that convergence as its subject, because it is at once the argument's best evidence and its hardest problem. If the mystics are describing the same mountain from different sides, then the diversity of the religions is a diversity of roads and the summit is one—which is what the pluralist claims. But if each mystic saw what his tradition had taught him to see, then the convergence is in the psychology, not in the object—which is what the critic claims. And the file cannot be settled by picking the answer one prefers.

* First: The Phenomenon in Each House

Sufism. The Sufi describes a passage through stations and states toward *fana*, the extinction of the self's separate awareness in the presence of God, followed—in the sober schools—by *baqa*, a return to the world with the self restored but transformed. The tradition's own vocabulary insists on the two movements: the ecstatic sayings of Hallaj and Bistami are treasured and also disciplined by Junayd's demand that the traveler come back. **Kabbalah.** The Jewish mystic speaks of *devekut*, a cleaving to God in which the boundary of the self thins without, in the classical texts, being erased; the tradition guarded the practice carefully, restricting it by age and learning, because it knew where unguarded ecstasy could lead. **Christian contemplation.** From Dionysius through Eckhart to John of the Cross, the Christian mystic describes a "dark night" in which images and concepts fall away, and a union with God that the apophatic writers refuse to describe in positive terms at all—

knowing, they say, by unknowing. **Advaita Vedanta.** The Hindu non-dualist reports not a union of two but a recognition that there were never two: the deepest self is the Absolute, and liberation is the falling away of the illusion of separateness. **Buddhism.** The Zen practitioner and the Theravada meditator describe a cessation—of grasping, of the sense of a fixed self, and, at the summit, of suffering—and refuse to describe what remains as a "union," because on their account there is nothing to be united with. **Taoism.** The sage speaks of a return to the uncarved block, an effortless alignment with the Way in which striving ceases. **Shamanic traditions.** The shaman describes a journey—out of the body, into another realm, and back with knowledge or healing—in a language of travel rather than of union.

Set these side by side and the reader sees at once both the resemblance and its limit. The resemblance: in every case the ordinary self loosens or dissolves; in every case there is contact with something described as ultimate, real, and more real than the ordinary world; in every case the experience leaves a certainty that argument does not shake. The limit: the Sufi and the Christian describe a union with a personal God whom the Advaitin says was never other than the self, and whom the Buddhist says is not there at all. The mountain, if it is one mountain, is being described by people who disagree about whether it has a summit.

* Second: The Four Shared Features—and the Doctrines That Are Not Shared

William James, surveying the reports, named four marks of the mystical state: it is *ineffable*, resisting description; it is *noetic*, felt as knowledge and not merely feeling; it is *transient*; and it is *passive*, experienced as received rather than produced. Later scholars added the sense of unity, the transcendence of time and space, and the deep positive affect. These features recur in the reports with remarkable constancy across traditions, and they are what makes the comparison possible at all.

But the features are formal, and the doctrines are not. What the Sufi *knows* in the noetic moment is that God is one and near; what the Advaitin knows is that the self is Brahman; what the Buddhist knows is that there is no self to be anything. The form of the experience is shared; its content, as reported, is shaped like the tradition that produced it. And this is the pivot of the whole file.

* Third: Two Readings of the Resemblance

The perennialist reading holds that there is one core experience, prior to language, which each tradition then interprets in its own vocabulary: the Sufi calls it God, the Advaitin calls it Brahman, the Buddhist calls it emptiness, and they are naming the same summit from different sides. Its strongest evidence is the constancy of the formal features and the mutual recognition mystics have often shown one another across traditions. Its strongest advocates, from Aldous Huxley to Walter

Stace, held that the diversity of religions was a diversity of doctrine laid over a unity of experience.

The constructivist reading holds that there is no experience prior to interpretation: the mystic's training, expectation, and vocabulary shape the experience itself and not merely its report, so that the Sufi does not have "the same" experience as the Buddhist and then describe it differently—he has a Sufi experience, because he was made by a Sufi path. Its strongest evidence is that the mystics, when read closely, disagree about what they experienced and not only about what to call it, and that the traditions themselves treat the experiences as different. Its strongest advocates, from Steven Katz onward, argued that the perennialist had abstracted a "core" by ignoring exactly the features that made each experience what it was.

The dispute is not resolved, and the reader should notice why: it is the same dispute as the receptivity rule in Chapter 1, in another dress. The constructivist explains how the experience is shaped; explaining how it is shaped does not settle what, if anything, it discloses. And the perennialist points to a convergence; a convergence in the form of experiences does not settle that they have a single object.

* Fourth: How the Traditions Test Their Own Mystics

Here is the fact most often omitted from popular accounts of mysticism, and it is the fact most relevant to this book: **no major tradition accepted a mystical experience as self-certifying.** Each built a procedure for testing it—which is to say, each applied a scale.

The Sufis tested the state against the law: an ecstasy that led its subject to abandon the obligations of the sharia was, by that fact, judged suspect, and the sober school made return to the world the mark of a true station. The Christian tradition developed the "discernment of spirits," a set of criteria—humility, fruit in conduct, conformity to doctrine, the judgment of a director—by which a claimed vision was accepted or rejected; Teresa of Avila wrote as much about the tests as about the experiences. The Jewish tradition restricted mystical study to the mature and the learned, and treated ecstasy outside the frame of the commandments with deep suspicion. The Buddhist teacher examined the student's realization through questioning and through conduct, and the tradition catalogued the "corruptions of insight"—pleasant states mistaken for awakening. The Hindu guru performed the same office, and the tradition warned that powers acquired on the path were distractions from its goal.

So the traditions themselves answer the question the critic raises. They did not hold that an experience proves its own interpretation; they held that it must be weighed by its fruit, its conformity to a standard outside

itself, and the judgment of those who had gone before. That is the sixth criterion of Chapter 6 applied from within—and it means that the mystic's certainty, which is the strongest thing in the file, was never, in the traditions' own view, sufficient evidence for anyone else.

* The Scale on the Ladder

What the comparison establishes: that the mystical experience is a genuine cross-cultural phenomenon with stable formal features; that its reported content is shaped by the tradition that produced it; that the two readings of this fact are both defensible and both undecided; and that every tradition built its own test, so that no house accepted experience as proof.

What it leaves open is whether the convergence discloses a single reality, a single psychology, or a single structure of the human mind meeting the limit of its concepts. The reader who is a believer may take the convergence as evidence that the roads climb one mountain; the reader who is not may take it as evidence that the human mind, pressed past its ordinary limits, produces a characteristic experience whatever the doctrine—and the evidence presented here does not decide between them. What it does decide is narrower and firmer: that the argument from religious experience is strongest as a cumulative and cross-traditional argument, and weakest whenever any single tradition claims the experience for itself alone.

The Seeker's Question: if a mystic of another religion described to you an experience identical in every formal feature to the one your own tradition treasures,

would you say he had met the same reality under another name, or been shaped by his path into a different experience—and would you give your own tradition's mystics the same answer?

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the sixth argument in Chapter 18 and its limits; the receptivity rule in Chapter 1; the criterion of lived experience in Chapter 6; the neuroscience of religious states in Study 23.8; and the question of one truth under many names in Study 12.1.*

Chapter 19: How Does Each Religion Argue for Itself? (Stage Two Evidence)

The chapter's map: three families of evidence in five studies, on a scale declared at the Gate before the doors were opened

> **Summary of the chapter:** If you are convinced that God exists, the harder question remains: by what evidence does each religion argue that it, and not another, is the truth? After the scale is declared openly at the chapter's gate, six studies examine each religion's strongest case—from inimitability to prophecy to testimony—closing with the largest question of all: which book could truly be the word of God?

* Opening: From "Is There a God?" To "Which Religion Is True?"

In Chapter 18 we finished with **Stage One:** is there evidence for God's existence?—a stage in which all believers stand in one line facing the atheist. Here the line breaks up: the Muslim, the Christian, the Jew, and the Hindu—having agreed that the universe has a Creator or an Absolute—differ over **who spoke in His name, where, and with which book.** This is **Stage Two**, and its question is: how does each religion argue that it is the true religion and no other?

Before you enter, remind yourself of what we pledged to you at **the Gate of the chapter** that preceded: the purpose, scope, units, and ten criteria of the comparison were declared in advance; the

questionnaire is one for every claim. We will not change the scale midway—what documentation is demanded of one book is demanded of its counterpart, and what testimony is accepted from one religion is accepted from another. One limit of scope should be said plainly: the studies that follow concentrate on the traditions that argue from a revealed book and from prophecy, because that is where the three families of evidence are deployed in full. The Dharmic traditions ground their claim differently—in a teaching to be tested by experience, as the Buddha's discourse to the Kalamas (Chapter 13) puts it—and their case is weighed on those terms in the sixth argument of Chapter 18, by the same rule that governs every experiential claim in this book.

* The Evidence the Religions Offer: Three Families

If you gather what every religion says in arguing for itself—from the treatises of the theologians to the pamphlets of the preachers—you find it returns to three families:

1. **The evidence of the text itself:** that the book contains what no human being can produce—in eloquence, or knowledge, or legislation, or numerical structure, or the reporting of the unseen. Its clearest and most rigorously formulated form is **the argument from the inimitability (i'jaz) of the Qur'an**, so we begin with it (Study 19.1 for its rhetorical root, from its founding authorities, and Study 19.2 for the rest of its aspects: the unseen, the legislative, and the numerical), and then we devote an independent study to **"scientific inimitability"** (19.3),

because it is not particular to the Qur'an: the Vedas, the Gospel, and the Torah have supporters who claim the same for them. Here is a decisive test of the single scale.

2. **The evidence of prophecy:** that the later religion was foretold in an earlier book, or that its book reported what happened after it. This evidence is two facing mirrors: the Christian reads the Torah and sees Christ, the Muslim reads the Torah and the Gospel and sees Muhammad, and the Jew reads the same book and sees neither—the genre is one, and the rules by which each camp examines its opponent's claim are the rules by which it should examine its own (Study 19.4).
3. **The social-historical evidence:** the witnesses of the founding event and their martyrdom, the continuous mass transmission (*tawatur*), and what the religion produced on earth in civilization and morality (the fruit). This family is the most misused from both sides, and it has in this book three named rules: "sincerity is not truth," "mass transmission conveys *that*, not *why*," and "the fruit supports; it does not found" (Study 19.5).

How to Read This Chapter

Every study proceeds on the seven-rung ladder: the claim at its strongest from the founding authorities of its own people—not from the summaries of their opponents—then the strongest objections, then the strongest replies, then what is established and what is not, then the Seeker's Question. You will notice that most of

the evidence here is **Islamic in its examples**—not out of bias, but because the Arabic literature on arguing for religion is at its widest and most rigorous in the literature of inimitability, and because readers of Arabic know it well and readers of English seldom see it weighed. Wherever a Christian, Jewish, or Indian counterpart exists, we have set it in its rank on equal terms. **Then notice the most important thing:** that no religion argues from a single piece of evidence, but from a bundle whose parts rest on one another—so the verdict in the end is on the bundle, by the declared scale, not on its weakest link and not on its strongest alone. The five studies close with the map of Stage Two and its ten rules.

Study 19.1: The Linguistic Inimitability of the Qur'an — The Argument and Its Discussion

The founding text; the argument at its strongest from its founding authorities; its kinds and degrees; and the strongest objections and replies

Summary of the study: Islam's strongest case for the truth of its message is neither historical nor philosophical, but literary: that human beings proved unable to match the text itself. What is the origin of the argument from linguistic inimitability as its great scholars established it, and what is the strongest objection raised against it, from within Arabic and from outside it?

---

* First: The Founding Text—A Stated, Graduated Challenge

This argument stands out among all the religions' own evidence by a rare feature: it is not a later inference by loving followers but **a challenge stated in the book itself**, declared in the face of the opponents at the hour of confrontation, and graduated as one widens the door of reply for an opponent: the Qur'an first challenged them to produce **its like** ("let them produce one like it, if what they say is true"), indeed it raised the ceiling to humans and jinn together ("Say, 'Even if all mankind and jinn came together to produce something like this Qur'an, they could not produce anything like it, however much they helped each other'"), then came down to **ten suras**

("produce ten invented suras like it"), then to **a single sura** ("produce a single sura like it—enlist whatever supporters you have other than God"). The shortest suras are three verses—joined to an open future certainty: "If you cannot do this—**and you never will**—" So the structure of the argument—setting aside its assessment—is the structure of a declared, permanently valid test: the door of imitation is open by the text to this day.

* Second: The Argument at Its Strongest—Its Four Pillars

The theologians formulated the argument on four pillars taken together, and in them lies its strength:

1. An explicit challenge, as passed—not the mere admiration of followers.

2. A motive at its height: Quraysh was no lukewarm opponent; it spent in the war against this religion its wealth, its trade, the blood of its chiefs, and the unity of its houses. Imitation would have been the cheapest of all its weapons: a single sura would bring the claim down from its foundation and spare Badr, Uhud, and the Trench.

3. A capacity at its height: those challenged were the nation of eloquence, which made expression its archive, its market, and its pride, which hung its odes on its Ka'ba, and among whom were poets and orators who filled the horizons.

4. A continuing inability: no serious imitation that held its ground has been preserved from the eloquent of the Arabs—by the testimony of the history that

recorded their satire, their abuse, and their poems in the war against the Prophet. Rather the contrary was preserved from them: their turning aside to saying "magic," "poetry," and "fables"—which for the arguers is a declaration of bankruptcy: an opponent does not accuse speech of magic unless matching it has exhausted him. The testimony of taste was preserved from the heart of the enemy camp: such as the testimony of al-Walid ibn al-Mughira, the sage and connoisseur of Quraysh, as the biographies transmit it: "It has a sweetness, and it has a grace . . . it rises above, and nothing rises above it." Al-Jurjani formulated this pillar in *The Healing Epistle* (p. 120) in a formulation without rival—describing Quraysh's turning from imitation to injury: "Rage at what he said reached such a pitch . . . that they abandoned with him their sound judgment and departed from obedience to their excellent minds, until they confronted him with every ugliness . . . and sought them out with every kind of harm." Then he releases his decisive question: "Was it ever heard of anyone possessed of reason and self-command, who was able to silence an opponent who had overreached in his claim with a single word in answer, that he abandoned this for things that draw reproach and with which he is charged with narrowness of resource and inability?"

* Third: In What Does the Inimitability Lie?—The Answer of the Four Founding Authorities

Once the inability is granted, the question of explanation remains: **what is it in this speech that rendered them incapable?** Here we open the most precious thing in the library: the answers of the four great masters of the subject, whose texts are complete in our kit (the treatises of al-Rummani, al-Khattabi, and al-Jurjani in their reference edition, and al-Baqillani's *Inimitability*):

Al-Rummani (d. 386 AH) in *The Subtleties*—in his literal words from its opening (p. 75 of our reference edition): "The aspects of the Qur'an's inimitability appear from seven directions: the abandonment of imitation despite abundant motives and pressing need; the challenge to all; the *sarfa*; eloquence; true reports of future matters; the breaking of the ordinary; and its comparison with every miracle"—gathering in his list the rhetorical and the unseen together. Then he laid the foundation of his doctrine: eloquence is "of three ranks," "and whatever is in the highest rank is inimitable—and that is the eloquence of the Qur'an; and whatever is below that is possible, like the eloquence of the eloquent among people." He detailed its aspects in ten headings (concision, simile, metaphor, harmony, the fitting of the verse-endings, variation, implication . . .), making inimitability a summit on a ladder whose lower rungs the eloquent share—so he gave the argument its "comparative" frame: the inimitable is known by comparison with the highest that human beings have reached.

Al-Khattabi (d. 388 AH) in *The Exposition of the Qur'an's Inimitability*: he enumerated the kinds of speech familiar among the Arabs and ranked them (the eloquent and firm, then the fluent, then the freely permissible), and then showed that the Qur'an lies outside the classification: it gathered from every kind its highest, across its whole extent. He formulated the threefold analysis that became a mainstay: speech stands on three things: **a wording that carries, a meaning that stands by it, and a bond that orders the two**. The Qur'an's inimitability lies in its reaching the utmost in the three together: the most apt words in their most fitting meanings in the most masterly arrangement. He added his penetrating insight that would echo after him: that the Qur'an has—beyond craft—**a sovereignty over hearts** and an awe in souls hardly to be found in anything else, which he made an aspect of its inimitability that few had noticed. And he rejected the *sarfa* decisively.

Al-Baqillani (d. 403 AH) in *The Inimitability of the Qur'an*: he built the argument as a complete theological construction, and the substance of his aspect: that the Qur'an **lies outside the familiar kinds of their speech altogether**—it is not of the kind of poetry with its meters, nor of rhymed prose with its artifice, nor of oratory with its methods—of a wondrous arrangement that belongs to no kind. That **its eloquence is continuously sublime across the variation of its modes**: story, legislation, promise, threat, and argument—whereas the speech of the most eloquent rises in one purpose and falls in another, and varies within a single ode. He did

not stop at the claim. **He applied it as criticism**: he tried the *Mu'allaqa* of Imru' al-Qays—the master of the poets—verse by verse, and an ode of al-Buhturi, exposing the places of unevenness and strain in them, so that the reader might measure the steadiness of the Qur'anic pattern against that human unevenness: the boldest applied critical exercise in the whole heritage of the argument.

And Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani (d. 471 AH)—the summit of the theory: he opens *The Healing Epistle* (p. 117) with the seed of his doctrine in his own words: "Know that for every kind of meaning there is a kind of wording that is more particular to it and more fitting, and a manner of expression that is more proper for conveying it," and that "the way of speech is the way of what admits of degrees." And then in *The Signs of Inimitability* he made his great move of the question: inimitability lies not in rare words nor in the sound of letters—for words are common property among people. But in **arrangement (*nazm*)**: the attachment of words to one another according to the laws of meaning and the observance of "the meanings of grammar" in fronting and deferring, joining and separating, definition and indefinition, and ellipsis—where minds differ in degree, not throats. By this he gave the argument its most precise instrument: inimitability, for him, is tasted by local analysis (why was this fronted? why was that omitted?), not claimed in the aggregate. The theory of *nazm* became the foundation of the whole science of Arabic rhetoric after him: **among the fruits of this argument**

is that it founded a complete science in the service of its examination.

And an internal historical position, recorded for honesty: al-Nazzam the Mu'tazilite (d. about 231 AH) held "**the *sarfa***": that the Arabs were able to imitate, but God turned their resolve away from it—so the inimitability lies in the turning-away, not in the text. (Indeed al-Rummani himself—as you saw in his text—included it among his seven directions, gathering rather than restricting.) The majority of the community rejected it (al-Khattabi, al-Baqillani, and al-Jurjani at the head of those who did: had it been so, the miracle would have been the turning-away and the speech would have remained within their power, and they would have boasted by saying "we were turned away"—and they did not). But recording it is a methodological lesson: even **the mechanism** of the argument was the stage of internal inquiry, and the tradition settled its disagreement by argument, not by preemption.

* Fourth: The Kinds and Their Degrees—A Ladder, Not a Block

The contemporary seeker receives "inimitability" as a single block, when the more accurate description is that it is **a ladder of degrees of differing firmness within the Islamic house itself**: at its firm base **the rhetorical**, which has passed—on it the heritage turns, and the consensus of the art. Then **the legislative** (the coherence and balance of the system of rulings, issuing from an unlettered man in his environment) and **the unseen** (its reporting of a past it had no acquaintance with, and

of a future that happened as it reported—most famously the promise of the victory of the Romans "in a few years' time" after their crushing defeat, and so it was). Then the two recent ones disputed internally: **the scientific**—to which we have devoted its complete study, with its scale, below—**and the numerical**, on which the internal reservation is at its severest (with the cautionary tale established in our sources: Rashad Khalifa and the number 19, beginning as a statistic and ending in the claim of messengership—the lesson of a criterion let loose without a control). **So the reader's rule:** the argument is tried by its firmest degree, not its flimsiest, and for every degree its place in the consensus of its people is to be known.

Fifth: The Strongest Objections—And the Strongest Replies

1. The objection from the criterion. Eloquence is taste, and the more beautiful cannot be weighed on a scale—so how can a conclusive argument be built on "the most eloquent," when the measures of beauty differ? **The reply:** rather, the arts have criteria on which the specialists concur even if they are not numbers—as critics agree on the ranking of poets and musicians with an agreement that is scientifically respectable. The claim here is not "a little more beautiful" but **the severance of a rank**: an exit from the kind of what can be done, testified to by the masters of the art among the enemies before the friends. Moreover, al-Jurjani moved the examination from vague taste to the reasoned

analysis of arrangement—so the door is open for study, not closed by assertion.

2. The objection from position (the weightiest of them). An argument that only a deeply learned master of Arabic can examine directly—so where does the non-Arab stand, indeed the contemporary Arab, between whom and the language of the text lie centuries? A universal argument that only a few can read? **The reply, from several sides:** this is the condition of every specialist argument—the physicist proves and the public trusts the consensus of the masters of the art, and whoever has not examined the equation accepts the mass testimony of those who have. The masters of its craft testified to the text in the age of confrontation (and they were its enemies), and then the masters of the art after them concurred. The arguers add a supporting witness that the non-specialist can grasp: **the effect**—the action of this text in souls and in history (al-Khattabi's sovereignty over hearts)—though this witness is weaker in binding force, because the claim is shared among the books. The critic keeps his word: so most of humanity's share of the argument has become the imitation of specialists—and the believer answers: as their share of most of the certainties of their age, equally.

3. The objection from claims of imitation. Musaylima and others did imitate it! **The assessment by the measure of both camps:** what has been preserved of "Musaylima's Qur'an" (the frog, daughter of two frogs, and its like) is feeble in craft for the arguers, who make it the most eloquent witness to the inability.

Yet the honesty of our method requires its standing caution: the texts of Musaylima were preserved for us by **his opponents** (and the rule of "the glass of the opponents" from the chapter on the history of doubt applies here too), so the critic allows that what was preserved was meant to ridicule. The arguer answers: then where did his community—and the Banu Hanifa survived—preserve a serious imitation to boast of? Continuous absence on both sides is the most eloquent thing. As for the refutation attributed to Ibn al-Muqaffa', it passed in our sorting that the attribution itself is defective and nothing is built on it.

4. The objection from testability. An argument that cannot—in practice—be falsified? For every imitation will be judged a failure by the believers themselves! **The reply:** rather, its form is in the first place the form of an open test ("produce a sura") whose door has never been closed, and the proposed judge is not the believers but **the masters of the art by its criteria**—as they are made judges in every literary comparison. Across history challengers have come forward and the art itself has judged them. The critic replies: and the masters of the Arabic art are mostly believers, so the circle stands. The arguer answers: then let an atheist of eloquence produce it and let them both refer it to judges blind to its source . . . and so the debate advances round by round, **and its correct place for both camps is one:** the field of applied linguistic examination, not aggregate crossfire.

The Study's Conclusion: The Unifying Rule — "The Miracle Is of the Kind in Which the People Excelled"

We close with an observation that the Muslim scholars themselves caught long ago, and which serves as a key to the whole subject of "the religions' own evidence": that the sign of every prophet came **of the kind in which his nation excelled**—Moses in the age of Pharaoh's magicians came with what swallowed their magic. Jesus in the age of flourishing medicine came with the healing of the blind and the leper and the raising of the dead. Muhammad in the nation of eloquence came with inimitable eloquence—they said: so that the proof might be established against the people of every art by their own art, for the people best acquainted with the inimitability of a thing are the masters of its craft. This same observation teaches the seeker how to read the map of the whole chapter: **every tradition presents its evidence in the currency of its own market**—eloquence here, fulfilled prophecies there, a witnessed resurrection for a third, and the survival of a people through its ordeals for a fourth. The rules by which we examined this argument (the challenge, the motive, the capacity, the continuity of the result, the glass of the opponents, testability, and the single standard for all) are your kit before all the other currencies. As for the weight of this argument on your own scale—whether it is conclusive, as millions have found it across the centuries, or in need of the mediation of a specialty that weakens its binding force for those outside it, or

between the two. That is your verdict, for which the final part was written to qualify you.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the concept of the miracle and the challenge in Chapter 14; the study on scientific inimitability, with its degree and its scale, below in this chapter; and the foretellings in their study.*

Study 19.2: The Remaining Aspects of Inimitability — The Unseen, the Legislative, and the Numerical

Completing the map of the five aspects: each aspect with its claim, its strongest objections, and its replies—and its degree of firmness in the internal consensus

Summary of the study: Linguistic inimitability is not the only face of the argument its defenders press. Three further faces—foreknowledge of the unseen, precision of legislation, and numerical structure—are set out here in their strongest form and against their critics' strongest objections, weighed on the same ladder, and kept carefully apart from one another rather than defended as a single block.

* Preface: Completing the Map

In the first study (19.1) we presented the root of the argument (the rhetorical—also called the linguistic, since it turns on the eloquence of arrangement, not the rarity of words), and we devoted to the scientific its own study with its scale. There remain of the five current aspects three with which we complete the map here: **the reporting of the unseen, the legislative, and the numerical**—keeping to the two rules we established: that the aspects are **a ladder of degrees** of differing firmness in the internal consensus itself, and that the argument is tried by its firmest degree, while every degree is known by its standing.

* First: The Inimitability of the Unseen—"These Accounts Are Part of What Was Beyond Your Knowledge"

The claim is threefold, as its people arrange it:

The unseen of the past. The stories of the nations and the prophets in their details, issuing from an unlettered man—"You never recited any Scripture before We revealed this one to you; you never wrote one down with your hand." The text itself names this category: "These accounts are part of what was beyond your knowledge [Muhammad]. We revealed them to you. Neither you nor your people knew them before now." **The strongest objection:** that the material of the stories was in circulation in the environment—the merchants of Quraysh traversed Syria and Yemen, monks lived along the roads, and the Jews of Yathrib had their reports—indeed the first opponents of the call argued from this very thing ("ancient fables, which he has had written down"), and the later polemic put the story of the meeting with the monk Bahira to its own use (for Muslims it is the meeting of a passing boy whom a monk who discerned prophethood in him blessed—and for the counter-polemic an alleged source of instruction: **the one story is the weapon of both camps**, and our usual lesson: refer it to its context in its sources).

The strongest reply: that the Qur'an itself faced the accusation and refuted it with a structural argument: had it been copying from the People of the Book, it would have matched their narratives—whereas in fact it **differs from them and corrects them methodically**

at their joints: it exonerates the prophets of what the people's texts attributed to them (no drunkenness of Noah, no episode of Lot's daughters, no calf of Aaron on their telling), and it rebuilds the stories on a different, monotheistic, purpose-driven axis—and what copyist copies and then corrects his source and challenges it? Then the arguers add the witness of uniqueness: details absent from what circulated that the Qur'an brought (such as the naming of "Haman" at Pharaoh's court, and the preservation of Pharaoh's body "as a sign to all posterity"). The critics give their answers to every witness, and the debate advances item by item in its specialized literature.

The unseen of the present. The exposure of the secrets of the hypocrites and what they plotted, so that the Sura of Repentance was called "the Exposer"—and its significance, for the arguers, lies in **its risk**: for one who fabricates does not gamble on an immediate refutation possible every day.

And the unseen of the future—the pillar of this aspect. Timed reports that happened as they reported, at their head the witness that gathers all the conditions of a strict test: "The Byzantines have been defeated in a nearby land. They will reverse their defeat with a victory in a few years' time"—revealed when the Romans lay crushed before Persia so completely that observers thought their state finished. The prophecy fixed **the event** (the victory of the Romans) **and the time ceiling** (a few years: three to nine) **publicly**, so that Abu Bakr wagered on it with the polytheists of Mecca in a famous

wager—and then it happened within its term. This—in the language of the philosophy of science we taught in the study on scientific inimitability—is **an advance, timed, falsifiable prediction issued before the event, not a reading after it**: the highest grade of this genre. With it stand other witnesses (the promise of entering the Sacred Mosque in safety, and it came to pass; the threat against Abu Lahab of dying in unbelief—a prophecy he could have refuted with a single word of feigned belief, and he did not for a whole decade; and the prophecy of the Qur'an's own preservation, "We Ourself will guard it," as an **open, continuing** prophecy tested every century—whose assessment we refer to the file on transmission in Chapter 16). **And the strongest objections to the whole aspect:** that some of its witnesses are generalities fulfillable in several ways.

That the later history was written by believers (the glass of the narrators, this time, not of the opponents). The question of the two facing readings, "were defeated / defeated." **The reply:** that the witness of the Romans in particular is surrounded by its controls (its revelation before the event is mass-transmitted in the sources, the Companion's witnessed wager is a social fact not to be invented, and the other reading is anomalous, not read by the majority). The final scale, as is our custom, belongs to the reader after reviewing the file from both ends. **And the degree of this aspect on the ladder:** among the firmest after the rhetorical—on condition that the witness be disciplined by the criteria of advance prediction that are now in our reader's kit.

* Second: Legislative Inimitability—A System from an Unlettered Man in a Tribal Environment

The claim at its strongest. It lies not in a single ruling but in **the system**: that an unlettered man in a tribal environment with no state and no codified law brought forth in a quarter century a legislative system complete in its chapters—creed, worship, family, property, penalties, war and peace, and international dealings—balanced among its poles with a balance that defeats committees of experts: between the individual and the community, spirit and matter, stability (definitive rulings firmly fixed) and flexibility (spaces of interpretation and universal purposes: the preservation of religion, life, reason, progeny, and property), capable of growth until a civilization of law was built upon it that governed different nations for centuries and produced among the most venerable traditions of jurisprudence in history. So whence all this, for one not taught from above? **The strongest objections are three:** that the system is the child of its environment and its inheritances—the customs of the Arabs, the laws of the neighbors, and the laws of the People of the Book—a development, not a creation (the most famous academic form of this objection is **the claim of borrowing from Roman law**, and the mainstay of the reply to it is complete in our kit: the book of Sufi Abu Talib—himself a professor of Roman law—detailing the structural differences between the two systems; and the whole file is presented under the rule "resemblance does not prove borrowing," applied

uniformly to claims of borrowing among all the religions); second, that the gradual codification over a quarter century, with its occasions and its causes, is closer to the craft of a legislator who learns than to a ready-made revelation. Believers turn this into a stated virtue: the wisdom of piecemeal revelation and gradualness, "to strengthen your heart [Prophet]" and to lift hardship.

Third—the sharpest today—the objection of **contemporary moral assessment** to particular rulings (on slavery, women, penalties, and the non-Muslim)—an enormous subject whose correct place we have settled: it is not tried in passing lines but in its own chapters (morality, Chapter 19; accepting the other, Chapter 26, where we presented the model of *dhimma* with its double assessment; and the methodology of trying ancient texts by modern standards in Chapter 6). It is enough here to fix the rule of both camps: the believer argues by the criterion of **relative precedence in context** (what did the legislation give, measured against the reality of its age and its neighbors: the woman's ownership and inheritance in an environment of female infanticide, the narrowing of the sources of slavery and the opening of the channels of emancipation . . .), and the critic argues by the criterion of **the absolute goal** (why did the final text not settle what later centuries settled?)—and each knows the other's answer, and deciding between them is among your own deepest decisions. **The degree of the aspect:** its firmness among its people is high, and its binding force for others is suspended on the settlement of that battle of criteria—in

this respect it is closer to "the argument from fruit," which is coming, than to mathematical proof.

(Among this aspect's adopted equipment now are two models for presenting the system from within: al-Qaradawi's The Lawful and the Prohibited in Islam*—the best-known contemporary codification of its governing rules: the default in things is permissibility; prohibition is God's right alone; to forbid the lawful is the twin of permitting the forbidden; what leads to the forbidden is forbidden; and necessities are measured by their extent—and its root in the heritage, the Book of the Lawful and the Prohibited in Ghazali's* Revival*, with its four ranks of scrupulousness; so whoever wants to see "the system" whose inimitability is claimed as a living system with its rules, not a list of rulings, these are its door.)*

∗ Third: Numerical Inimitability—The Flimsiest of the Degrees, by Internal Admission

The claim and its attraction. That the Qur'an contains intended numerical balances that testify to an all-encompassing source: the word "this world" and its derivatives as many times as "the hereafter" (115 each); "the angels" as many as "the devils"; "the month" 12 times and "the day," in the singular, 365. Symmetries in the openings of the suras and the counts of letters—and its attraction lies in its "objective, mathematical" appearance, which promises an argument the computer can check.

And the examination—whose internal map we documented from a peer-reviewed study in our kit. The Muslim scholars themselves fall into **three groups** on it: strong deniers, those who suspend judgment, and supporters with conditions—so it is no consensus to be attributed to Islam. **And the strongest objections are methodologically fatal,** and the Muslim deniers say them before the opponents: **the flexibility of the rules of counting** (when is the singular counted, and when the plural, the derivative, and the pronoun?—the rule changes from one count to another according to what produces the scale, and in scientific method this is self-invalidation). **Selectivity** (the agreeing balances are announced and the thousands of pairs that did not balance are silenced—and if all the possible pairs in a text the size of the Qur'an were counted, the laws of probability would require the appearance of astonishing coincidences by chance, as they produce them in any large book).

The problem of the textual basis (on which orthography, verse count, and reading is the statistic built? and the difference of verse counting among the schools is known). **And then the cautionary tale established in our sources:** Rashad Khalifa and "the miracle of 19"—it began as a celebrated count, and when the number failed in two places he proposed deleting two verses from the codex to make it come out, and it ended in the claim of messengership. So his path became the lesson of the subject: **a criterion without a control ends with its holders making the number the judge of the text instead of the text the judge of**

the number. And our book's position is the position of the careful thinkers among the people of the argument themselves: this is the flimsiest of the degrees. Nothing is built on it, and the mother argument is not tried by it—and whoever meets our seeker with tables of balances now faces his sieve: ask about the rule of counting fixed in advance, about the record of what did not balance, and about the textual basis—before you are dazzled.

* Conclusion: The Five Aspects on One Scale

The map is complete, so let us draw it as an explicit ladder as the careful tradition itself draws it: at the summit **the rhetorical**—the consensus of the art and the axis of the heritage, on which alone the claim rests for the founding authorities. Next **the unseen**, with its witnesses disciplined by the criteria of advance prediction. Then **the legislative**, whose binding force is suspended on the battle of moral criteria. Then **the scientific**, disputed internally, with its detailed scale in its study; and at the bottom **the numerical**, by the admission of the internal groups. The two closing rules are the seeker's kit before every discourse of "inimitability" he meets: **the first**, that the argument is tried by its firmest degree—so whoever rejects the whole claim by refuting a numerical table has tried the rope by its flimsiest strand. **And the second**—its mirror—that the claim is not championed by its flimsiest degree—so whoever builds his certainty on the scale of "the day, 365" has built on sand, and the careful thinkers among the people of the argument themselves are the first to say so.

Between the two stands the scale where this book has always placed it: **in your own hand, now that all the strands and their degrees lie complete before you.**

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *Study 19.1 (the rhetorical, from its founding authorities) and the study on the scientific above; the file on claims of borrowing (Sufi Abu Talib) in this chapter's sources; and the assessment of the rulings of dhimma and double standards in Chapters 26 and 6.*

Study 19.3: "Scientific Inimitability" And Allusions That Preceded Science— Across All the Sacred Books

Between correspondence, anticipation, and reading-in: how do we examine claims about science in sacred texts?

Summary of the study: Do scriptures contain scientific hints that anticipated discovery by centuries? The claim is not Islam's alone, as is often assumed—the Torah, the Gospels, and the Vedas all have their own defenders making the same case. Here all of them are placed on one scale, and the claim is tested by its own stated conditions.

* Opening: The Most Appetizing Evidence for the Child of the Scientific Age

Among all the Stage Two evidence, no argument addresses the person of this age in the language of his age as this one does: **that an ancient text alluded to truths science uncovered only centuries later**—so whence did its author get them, unless his source was the Knower of the unseen? The argument is simple in structure and modern in attraction: it summons the prestige of science—the most trusted authority of the age—as a witness for revelation, and promises the seeker an "objective" proof examined under the microscope, not by taste. This is why it has become, in the last century, among the most popular doors of preaching—**and not in Islam alone, as we will see, but in all the great religions with the same structure**—a

methodological discovery that will overturn the way we examine the whole subject.

Before entering, a clarification of place: we treated "scientific inimitability" in the chapter on science and religion (Chapter 23) as a phenomenon in **the relationship of contemporary Muslims to science**. We treat it here from its other angle: as **evidence** offered in the court of Stage Two. So the two studies complement each other and do not repeat.

* The Written Book of God and the Book of Nature—Clarifying the Comparison Before the Examination

Believers—in the three faiths, and among the sages of India and China in another way—have an ancient metaphor that governs this whole subject: God has two books, **a written one**, which is revelation, and **a visible one**, which is the cosmos with its planets, stars, and seas, and the bodies of its creatures. The verses in the scripture are signs, and the signs on the horizons and in the self are signs. Because the source, for the believer, is one, the two books do not contradict each other; **but their two readings often contradict each other**—and there lies the whole comparison.

	The Written Book of God (the text)	The Book of Nature (the cosmos)
Its language	Words in a human tongue, with multiple meanings, context, and metaphor	Phenomena observed and measured; its language is mathematics and experiment
Who reads it	The commentator—and commentators differ	The scientist—and scientists differ, then agree by experiment
Its purpose for its people	Guidance: what do I do, and to whom do I turn?	Description: how does this work?
What it says about the other	It refers to the cosmos as a witness: "look"	It says nothing about the text; silence is its station
Its possible error	Not in the text—for the believer—but in its understanding	Not in the cosmos but in our theories about it, which change
When contradiction appears	Either the interpretation of the understanding, or waiting for science, or an admission of ignorance	The final verdict belongs to repeated observation, not to the text

On this table "scientific inimitability" is weighed in all its fields: when the text says that the heaven was built with hands and "We are making it ever wider," that between the two seas is a barrier, that the embryo is a

drop, then a clinging thing, then a lump, that bees have houses and paths, that the mountains are pegs, and that the earth is diminished from its edges—the seeker faces three readings, not two: **(1) Agreement:** the text is true of the cosmos in the language of its time, and this is a condition of revelation, not its miracle, for every truthful book agrees with reality. **(2) Inimitability:** the text mentioned what no human being of its time knew, in a detail the known meaning cannot bear—a heavy claim requiring proof of two things together: that the scientific meaning is the first meaning of the text, not a meaning extracted after the discovery, and that no one knew it. **(3) Projection:** that the text is read after the discovery, its words loaded with what they did not carry for its people for thirteen centuries, and then the discovery is returned to the text as evidence. This is not a reading of the written by the visible but a writing of the visible onto the written.

And the rule the reader takes from this comparison: the Book of Nature is a silent witness that testifies for no one unless a reader speaks in its name. So always ask: **who is reading, in what meaning did he read, and was this meaning readable before the microscope?** If it was: the two books have met. If it was not: the interpretation and the laboratory have met—which is a good thing, but it is not what the claim claims. Everything that follows in this study is a detailing of this rule, on one standard for the Qur'an, the Torah, the Gospel, and the Vedas.

* First: The Claim in Its Islamic House—The Root of the Argument and Its Expansions

This argument must first be set in its correct place in the Islamic edifice. Neglecting this placement is the root of half the confusion in the subject: Islam's central argument for the prophethood of Muhammad, for its scholars across history, is **rhetorical inimitability**: the challenge to the nation of eloquence to produce the like of the Qur'an, and its continuing inability despite the strongest motives (the challenge being stated and graduated in the Qur'an itself), on which the heritage turns from al-Khattabi and al-Baqillani to al-Jurjani. **And the claim has an explicit root in the heritage that must be given its due:** Ghazali in *The Jewels of the Qur'an* affirms that "the Qur'an is the encompassing ocean, and from it branch the knowledge of the first and the last," and counts medicine and astronomy among what the Qur'an alluded to in their principles (*The Jewels of the Qur'an*, vol. 1, p. 22). And al-Suyuti expanded the position after him—while al-Shatibi took toward this expansion a position of rigorous opposition (the Qur'an addressed an unlettered nation in the familiar usage of its tongue).

So the question is a venerable internal battle among leading scholars before it is a matter of modern institutions. As for "scientific inimitability" as a movement and a detailed commentary, it is a modern expansion that grew at the opening of the twentieth century (from the commentary of Tantawi Jawhari to the contemporary institutions of inimitability and their leading figures, such as Zaghloul El-Naggar—with

the hinge that carried the genre around the world lying in between: a French surgeon's book, Maurice Bucaille's *The Bible, the Qur'an and Science* (1976), which subjected the two scriptures to one and the same test of modern knowledge and reported—by its author's own verdict—no contradiction on the Qur'an's side and several on the Bible's; the genre's most translated text, and the reason its critics—Muslim intellectuals among them, such as Ziauddin Sardar—named the whole tendency "Bucailleism": a scripture made hostage to a science that keeps changing) on the thesis that the Qur'an contains cosmic allusions that preceded science—among its most widely circulated witnesses: the stages of the embryo (a drop, then a clinging thing, then a lump "formed and unformed," then the clothing of bones with flesh). The beginning of creation ("Are the disbelievers not aware that the heavens and the earth used to be joined together and that We ripped them apart"); the building of the heaven, "We built the heavens with Our power and made them vast"—whose Arabic participle (*la-musi'un*, "surely expanding/making vast") the claim reads as the expansion of the universe, while the Oxford translation renders it simply "made them vast"; the mountains as "pegs" (the roots of mountains); the mingling of the two seas with a barrier between them; the darknesses of the deep sea, one above another; the forelock "lying, sinful" (the functions of the frontal lobe). The sending down of iron ("We also sent iron")—the cosmic origin of iron being from the stars.

The card of the embryo file (the most famous of the subject's witnesses—as its proponents present it, from this book's sources): a sequence of six Qur'anic stages which the arguers match to the stations of

embryology: "a **mingled** drop" (the zygote from two mingled fluids). Then "**a clinging thing**" (arguing from the triad of its linguistic meaning: what clings and adheres—the stage of implantation in the womb—clotted blood, and the shape of a leech). Then "**a lump**, formed and unformed" (a morsel like the mark of chewing—the somites—some of which form into organs and some do not). Then the creation of "**bones**" and their clothing "**with flesh**" (the precedence of the first signs of the cartilaginous skeleton over the clothing of muscles); then "**another creation**." The site of its battle—Galen and the knowledge of the age—is in the third rule of examination below, with the literature of both sides.

And what honesty requires before any external criticism: that this expansion is disputed within the Islamic house itself, in a documented dispute—the scholars of the law themselves fall into three groups (as we documented in this chapter's sources): supporters who ground it with conditions; those who suspend judgment. **And opponents among the leading masters of exegesis and rhetoric** who regard the Qur'an as a book of guidance, not an encyclopedia of physics, and warn against tying the fixed text to changing theories and against stretching meaning—a position with its explicit root in the heritage: al-Shatibi (eighth century AH) censured whoever loads onto the Qur'an the sciences of nature and geometry that the Arabs it addressed did not know. More severe than that: the cautionary tale told in the sister subject ("numerical inimitability") about Rashad Khalifa and the number 19—it began as a count, was counted an inimitability, and

ended with its author claiming messengership and denying the Sunna—an internal lesson in the escape of a criterion when the control is absent. **So the seeker learns here his first rule:** Islam is not saddled with everything said in the name of inimitability, and its original argument (the rhetorical) is not tried by the weakest extensions of the enthusiasts.

* Second: The Greater Discovery—The Same Claim Among Most of the Nations

Here is the surprise of the subject, unknown to most of those who dispute it: **this genre of argument is not peculiarly Islamic. It is a worldwide industry present in every great tradition, with the same structure and the same enthusiasm.**

The parallel Christian literature ("science in the Bible") gathers its witnesses: Job "hangs the earth upon nothing" (Job 26:7—the earth suspended in space!). Isaiah, "he who sits above the circle of the earth" (Isaiah 40:22—its sphericity, though the Hebrew *chug*, "circle," the enthusiasts translate as "sphere"); Ecclesiastes describes the circuit of the winds and the rivers (the water cycle!); Job's "springs of the sea" (Job 38:16—the hydrothermal vents of the deep!). Leviticus, with its rules of quarantine and circumcision on the eighth day (the peak of the clotting factors!)—an enormous literature with its institutions, its books, and its websites, an exact replica of its Islamic counterpart in method and tone.

And the Hindu nationalist movement ("Vedic science") boasts of greater than this: a commentary attributed to the Vedic commentator Sayana (fourteenth century CE) is read today—by the supporters of this reading—as having calculated **the speed of light** with striking accuracy. The passages on the *vimanas* (the flying chariots of the gods) are read as ancient aviation. The Vaisheshika sage Kanada anticipated "the atom" (*anu*). The vast Hindu cosmic time-cycles are matched to the ages of modern astronomy—so that these readings have become part of an official nationalist discourse at times. **And contemporary Buddhism** presents itself as "the most scientific of religions": the countless universes of its texts are read as the multiplicity of galaxies, its analysis of the mind is certified by neuroscience, and quantum indeterminacy is read into its emptiness and its dependent origination. Indeed, the structure has its complete **secular** counterpart: the readers of Nostradamus extract from his obscure quatrains every great event—**after it occurs.**

And the significance of this spread is a double-edged sword that must be handed to the reader with both its edges: the critic says: a method that establishes the Vedas, the Gospel, the Qur'an, and Nostradamus all equally is not enough to establish any of them—it is an elastic machine that produces "inimitability" from any obscure, revered text, and the fault is in the machine, not in the texts. The careful believer turns it around: rather, this requires **individual examination,** not wholesale rejection—for the claims are not equal: some rest on the stretching of a translation, and

some may withstand the criteria. The verdict of collective collapse before examination is as much a begging of the question as the verdict of collective establishment. **And both agree—and this is the gain—that the single criterion must be applied to everyone's texts equally:** whoever accepts "he who sits above the circle of the earth" as a criterion must accept its counterparts, and whoever rejects "the Vedic speed of light" as stretching must examine his own witnesses with the same rigor—it is the rule of "the equality of weapons" on which we built the study on foretellings, and its third mirror is completed here.

* Third: The Supporting Reading at Its Strongest

We do the claim justice, so we present the strongest of what its careful supporters say (not its popular discourse):

1. **The argument from accumulation.** A single witness may be dismissed by interpretation, but the combination of dozens of allusions consistent with science in a single text—with not one **explicit** scientific error, by their criterion—exceeds the calculation of chance. The heavenly text is not required to lay down the sciences; it suffices that it not collide with them and that it hint above the knowledge of its age.
2. **The argument from cognitive context.** Some witnesses are hard to refer to the knowledge of the seventh century: the detailing of the embryo's stages in their sequence, the layered darknesses of the depths known only to the diver of the modern age, and the precision of

"the forelock"—whence, for an unlettered man in a desert environment?

3. **And the sober school's discipline of itself.** The major founders laid down declared conditions: the text is interpreted only by a scientific truth **established beyond doubt**, not a fluctuating theory. The word is not loaded beyond its linguistic capacity. The verse is not claimed to be "a text" on the question but an allusion the word can bear—so their own careful scholars disown the excesses of the popular satellite discourse.

* Fourth: The Critical Reading at Its Strongest—The Six Rules of Examination

The strongest thing the critics have is not mockery but **a method of examination** in six rules, which we present because—whatever their outcome—they are tools the seeker needs whatever his decision:

1. The test of advance prediction (retroactive reading). The distinguishing mark of real knowledge is that it is extracted **before** the discovery, not after it. It is observed that every "scientific inimitability"—in most religions—was announced **after** science had uncovered the truth, and the text was then read in its light. And in the literature we reviewed there appear no clear and agreed examples of a new scientific truth being derived from the text before its experimental discovery. So the text—says the critic—is a mirror reflecting what its reader brings to it, and real evidence would have required the reverse.

2. The test of selectivity. The discourse counts the agreements and interprets away what appears to disagree—whereas sound method weighs both accounts together: the same texts contain what the people of the centuries interpreted contrary to today's science for long ages (the arrangement of the seven layered heavens as the ancients understood it; the sun's running "to its resting place," interpreted for an age on geocentrism; and the Bible's firmament, the pillars of the earth, and its dome). So if these may be interpreted today, the critic asks: why argue from the apparent sense of what agrees and interpret away the apparent sense of what disagrees? **One standard, or no standard.**

3. The test of the age's knowledge. Some of the major witnesses had a presence in the sciences of the ancients: the stages of the embryo in Galen and Hippocrates (four successive stages) were known and translated—and this is **the most famous engagement of the subject**: the critic details the correspondences, and the defenders reply with fine differences in which they see the Qur'an correcting Galen rather than following him (such as the formation of bones before the clothing of flesh, contrary to him). The decision on this is a matter of anatomy and language together, and we refer the inquirer to the specialized literature of both sides. It is enough here to teach the rule: **the text's precedence is not established until it is established that the information was not within the reach of its age. And a case study from our sources teaches the rule in practice—the channels of the claim's transmission:** a short student paper in Islamic studies (of a type

produced by the thousands every year) presents "the inimitability of the creation of man," copying verbatim from a booklet by a mass preacher (Naik), and affirms that "non-Muslim scholars used to hold the Greek view that the embryo is formed from menstrual blood"—**thereby testifying, without intending to, that the theory of the age was known and current**, which is exactly what the critic builds his objection on. It then closes by saying that the Qur'an "alone spoke" of the stages before the instruments, and misnumbers two of the verses it cites. The intention is not to fault a student, but to diagnose **a chain**: a mass booklet → a student paper → a digital post—the claim passes through three layers without a single examination touching it in any of them, and it reaches the seeker at the last of its links while he takes it for rigorous science. **So the reader's rule:** ask of every "inimitability" that reaches you: **from which layer did it come to me**—from a specialized study that examines the knowledge of the age, or from the layer of transmission that shares a single enthusiasm and a single reference?

4. The test of the change of science (the trap of the gaps reversed). Whoever ties the sanctity of his text to today's theory has entangled it in its refutation tomorrow. It has happened: "scientific" commentaries of a past generation were built on sciences their people have abandoned, and they became an argument against their authors. This is why the condition of "the truth established beyond doubt" among the careful supporters themselves is an implicit acknowledgment of the

soundness of this test—and a rare meeting of the two opponents on a rule.

5. The test of wording and translation. Many witnesses rest on charging a word beyond its capacity or on a directed translation: the Hebrew "circle of the earth" becomes "sphere". "*Dahaha*" ("He spread it out") is read as "He made it like an egg" by a late, disputed etymological interpretation. "Joined together / ripped apart" is matched to the Big Bang although the earliest commentaries took it in other senses (the closing of heaven and earth and then their separation by rain and vegetation). So the rule: **the word is examined by the familiar usage of the text's language and the earliest commentaries of its people, not by the dictionary of the twenty-first century.**

6. The test of generalization (the equality of weapons). We founded it above—the examiner asks the holder of every claim: do you accept this method of yours if it is applied to your opponent's text? If he says no, he has testified against his method.

* Fifth: The Middle Position—"The Book Teaches You How to Go to Heaven, Not How the Heavens Go"

Between categorical argument and categorical rejection, careful thinkers among the people of the religions themselves have settled on a third position, summed up by the famous saying that Galileo loved and attributed to a cardinal of his age: the Bible teaches us **how to go to heaven**, not **how the heavens go.** The function of revelation. For these—is guidance and meaning, not the

laying down of physics. Its cosmic discourse is a discourse of directing attention and of worship in a language every age understands ("Do they not see how camels were created?" is a call to reflection, not a lesson in anatomy). Its not colliding explicitly with science is a sign of soundness that suffices—without any need to conscript it into the race of discoveries. This position has its great supporters in all the houses: from al-Shatibi to the contemporary opponents of "inimitability" in Islam, to a broad current in Christian and Jewish theology that reads the texts of creation theologically, not cosmologically. **The merit of this position, for its holders:** it shields the text from the guillotine of all six tests—since it removes it from their field altogether. **And its declared price:** it gives up the argument—so "the precedence of science" is no longer an argument for its religion against others. Between the gain and the price every tradition strikes its balance—and this balancing is itself among the subtlest things the seeker observes in the contemporary discourses of the religions.

* The Study's Conclusion: The Seeker's Scale—And Open Questions

The reader leaves this study with a kit of five test questions to put to **any** claim of "scientific inimitability" from **any** book presented to him: was the information extracted from the text before science discovered it, or after? Does the word bear the meaning in the language of its age and the earliest commentaries of its people, without stretching? Was the information really beyond the reach of the age's knowledge? Is the same criterion

applied to what appears to disagree in the same text? Does the holder of the claim accept his method applied to the books of others?—what passes the five questions deserves serious examination, and what fails at the first fails at all that follow.

The two open questions remain, with both their faces. **The first:** this worldwide race among the religions for the testimony of science—is it an implicit admission that science has become the supreme judge even among its opponents (so that it testifies for secularism where it meant to refute it, as the critic says)? Or is it the legitimate use of the tongue of every age in its call (for the theologians argued by the logic of the Greeks when logic was the sovereign of the age, as the believer says)? **And the second is subtler:** if the seeker, in all detachment, found in some text a single allusion that withstood his five tests completely—how many such allusions would he need before judging it probable that behind the text lies a knowledge above human beings? No ready-made scale answers this. It belongs to the kind of responsible personal judgment that the final part trains you in—and it is enough for this study to have handed you the sieve. What settles in it is between you and your examination.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *scientific inimitability as a phenomenon in the relationship of science and religion (the Arab case) in the body of Chapter 23; the trap of the gaps and methodological naturalism in its studies; and the original argument from rhetorical inimitability, with its pillars and objections, in Study 19.1.*

Study 19.4: The Argument from Prophecies and Foretellings— The Two Facing Mirrors

Christians argue from the prophecies of the Torah for Christ, and Muslims argue from the two books for Muhammad—the genre is one, the rules of examination are one, and the circle turns

> **Summary of the study:** The Christian reads the Torah and sees the Messiah foretold; the Muslim reads it and sees Muhammad; the Jew reads it and sees neither. Two facing mirrors held up to a single argument, presented here by the same rules each side demands of the other.

---

* Preface: The Most Beautiful Circular Structure in the Whole Subject

This argument—arguing from an earlier text for the truth of a later one—is among the most venerable of the Stage Two arguments, and it contains a circular structure for which we know no parallel in any other subject: **Judaism** holds the original: its texts promise an awaited Messiah with certain descriptions. **Christianity** built its central claim on those prophecies having been fulfilled in Jesus. The first people of the text (the Jews) answered it with their objections; **and Islam** built its supporting witness on the two books together having foretold Muhammad. The people of the two texts (the Jews and the Christians) answered it **with nearly the same objections the Christians had been receiving from the Jews.**

So every community in this circle is a claimant on one face and an objector on the other, and the weapon it brandishes against those after it is the one brandished against it by those before it—which is why this study is the most fertile school in the whole book for the rule of **the single standard**: what you accepted as method for your claim binds you in the claim of others.

* The First Mirror: The Christian Argument from Prophecy—"So That What Was Spoken Through the Prophet Might Be Fulfilled"

The claim at its strongest. The Christian arguers count dozens of Hebrew prophecies which they see converging on Jesus beyond all probability: his birth in **Bethlehem** (Micah 5), of **a virgin** (Isaiah 7:14), his entry into Jerusalem on a colt (Zechariah 9), his being sold for thirty pieces of silver (Zechariah 11), and the most moving and famous, **the Suffering Servant** of Isaiah 53: "wounded for our transgressions . . . like a lamb that is led to the slaughter" (Isaiah 53:5, 7). So that the chapter is called among them "the fifth Gospel"; and Psalm 22 with its cry and its details ("they pierced my hands and my feet . . . they divide my clothing"—22:16, 18, KJV). The unifying argument: **the argument from probabilistic accumulation**—one prophecy may be a coincidence; dozens of intersecting prophecies in one person cannot be.

And the strongest objections—from the people of the text first. The Jewish tradition—the owner of the language and the context—replied with strict method: that most of the witnesses are **torn from their context**: Isaiah 7 is an address to a contemporary king (Ahaz) about a child who is a sign in his own crisis, and its Hebrew word "***almah***" (עלמה) means the young woman, not specifically the virgin (for the virgin there is its own word, "*betulah*"). "The virgin" came from the Greek Septuagint translation, so the doctrine—says the objector—was built on a translation. That **the Suffering Servant**, in the larger context of Isaiah, is named repeatedly: "you are my servant, **Israel**"—so he is the suffering community in exile, not a coming individual. That the reading "they **pierced** my hands" in the Psalm rests on a literal textual dispute (כארי, "like a lion," in the Masoretic text, against "*karu* / they pierced" in other readings)—a single letter on which the witness turns! Then the greatest, structural objection: **the stated conditions of the Messiah were not fulfilled**—no ingathering of exiles, no building of the Temple, no world peace where "they shall beat their swords into plowshares." The Christians answered with the doctrine of **the Second Coming**: he will complete them on his return. And the objectors called it the postponement of the test to what cannot be tested. **And the methodological lesson** before leaving the mirror: note the tools of objection—context, the original language, the disputed text, and unfulfilled conditions—**and keep them. For you will now see them working in the other direction.**

* The Second Mirror: The Islamic Argument from Foretellings—"Whom They Find Described in the Torah That Is with Them, and in the Gospel"

The founding text is explicitly Qur'anic: "who follow the Messenger—the unlettered prophet they find described in the Torah that is with them, and in the Gospel" and "bringing good news of a messenger to follow me whose name will be Ahmad." So the claim is a doctrinal principle, not the inference of latecomers, and its most refined contemporary scholarly formulation is complete in our kit (Amiri's book); among its pillars:

1. The fiery law from Paran—Deuteronomy 33 and Habakkuk 3. The text of Moses' testament shortly before his death: "The LORD came from **Sinai**, and dawned from **Seir** upon us; he shone forth from Mount **Paran** . . . with flaming fire at his right hand" (Deuteronomy 33:2)—three manifestations of revelation in three places, which the Muslim arguer reads as the map of the three messages: the Sinai of Moses, then Seir (Edom / Palestine) of Jesus, **then Paran—which for the arguers is the wilderness of Ishmael, where he dwelt by the text of Genesis (21:21)—Muhammad**. Amiri strengthens the reading with the argument from **rhetorical gradation**: a coming, then a dawning, **then a shining forth**—the greatest for the last. **And the documentary jewel:** that the linking of Paran to the son of Ishmael is **a documented internal Jewish reading**—Rashi himself (the most famous of their commentators, d. 1105 CE) wrote on the verse, literally: "He went there and offered to **the children of Ishmael** that they accept the Torah, and they did not consent" (שהלך שם ופתח לבני

ישמעאל שיקבלוה ולא רצו), and he repeated it on Habakkuk 3:3: "When You came to give the Torah You went to Esau **and Ishmael** and they did not accept it." So the identification of the Ishmaelites with Paran is no Islamic invention. **And the control of honesty we have kept to:** the function of the passage in Rashi is **the opposite**: he adduces it to establish the merit of Israel, which accepted what others refused, not as a foretelling of a prophet.

So the passage and its function for its author are presented together, and the Muslim arguer keeps his word: it is enough for us that it grants the geography and the lineage. As for the interpretation of "the offer and the refusal," it is answered, for him, by the argument from gradation (is what was refused described by the greatest words of manifestation?). **And the reply of the Christian and Jewish objectors:** Paran in the geography of the Torah is the wilderness of northern Sinai, not the Hijaz (in it the Children of Israel wandered), and the whole text is a poetic recollection of the single Sinai manifestation under the names of neighboring mountains, in the manner of Hebrew parallelism. The question returns to a dispute of geography and poetics, in which each side has its literature.

2. "A prophet like you from among their own people"—Deuteronomy 18:18. "I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their own people; I will put my words in the mouth of the prophet" (Deuteronomy 18:18)—the Muslim arguer argues from two qualifiers: "**like you**." And which prophet resembled Moses in the great measures (a new law, a nation built,

a migration, a struggle, rule, marriage, and offspring) as Muhammad did? Deuteronomy itself even closes: "Never since has there arisen a prophet in Israel like Moses" (34:10)—so the likeness is from outside Israel; and **"from among their own people"** (literally, "from among their brothers")—and the brothers of the Children of Israel are their cousins: the children of Ishmael. **And the counter-answers:** the Jews: "their brothers" in the usage of Deuteronomy means the Children of Israel to one another (as in the verses on the king and the Hebrew slave), and the one promised is the line of the prophets, or Joshua. The Christians: rather, it is Jesus—and Peter himself argued from it in the Book of Acts! **So look at the circular structure itself:** the one text is contested by the three communities, and each qualifies "the likeness" by what serves its candidate—and the seeker's lesson: **whoever owns the criterion of "the likeness" owns the result,** so true examination begins by clarifying the criterion before applying it.

3. The Paraclete—John 14–16. Christ's promise to his disciples: "And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another **Advocate** (*parakletos*), to be with you . . . he will not speak on his own, **but will speak whatever he hears,** and he will declare to you the things that are to come. **He will glorify me"** (John 14:16; 16:13–14)—which the Muslim arguer reads as the descriptions of a human prophet and seal (for the descriptions are those of a speaker conveying from another—and exactly so in the Qur'an: "He does not speak from his own desire"), and supports it by noting that its reading as a prophet is **ancient**: early groups counted as heretical

understood it as a promised one to come, so much so that **Mani claimed it for himself** in the third century—so the prophetic reading is no Islamic novelty. **And the normative Christian answer** from the context of John itself: the text names him "**the Spirit of truth**, whom **the world cannot see** . . . he will be **in you**," and promises him to the disciples present themselves—the descriptions of an indwelling spirit, not of a man born centuries later. **And it turns Mani's entry through the door into a weapon**: a door through which Mani entered—whom Muslims and Christians alike call false—is a door fit for identifying no one. The arguer answers the descriptions of the spirit by the claim that the Greek transmission altered a lost Aramaic original—so the battle moves to the file of text and transmission (the field of Chapter 16). **As for the witness of "*Machmadim*"** (Song of Songs 5:16: "he is **altogether desirable**"—מחמדים), we record it honestly at its grade: some arguers favor it for its sound, and the critics reject it. **And the careful Muslim scholars themselves reserve judgment on it**—on the ground that the word is an intensive plural of the adjective "desired / beloved" in a love poem of explicit context, not a proper name—a living example of the rule "the claim is not championed by its flimsiest witnesses."

* The Five Rules of Examination—Uniting the Two Mirrors

We now extract the seeker's kit, having seen the rules work in both directions:

1. Prophecy or description?—Is the text a report of something to come at all, or a description of the present of its own time (Ahaz, the exile, the love poem) later turned into a prophecy?

2. Identification from the text, or upon it?—The examining prophecy identifies by what distinguishes (a time, a place, a name, or a sign that fits no one but the one claimed). The wider the description ("a prophet like Moses," "another Advocate"), the wider it stretches to everyone's candidates—and whoever owns the criterion owns the result.

3. The original language is the judge, not the translation—*almah* / *betulah*, כארי, *machmadim*, Paran: half the battles of the subject are battles of lexicon, and they are decided only by the original and the dictionaries of its people.

4. The position of the people of the text and the context of their commentators counts—with its function—Rashi's passage is a jewel on condition that it be presented with its function for him. Every community's arguing against the people of a text from an understanding they reject requires showing why the people of the tongue got their own tongue wrong (and the arguer has his answer: the partisanship of position may veil the people of the text—an answer that recoils on him equally).

5. The single standard on the whole circle—the golden conclusion: every objection the Christian directs at the Muhammadan foretellings (context, language, identification) is exactly what he receives from the Jews about his prophecies. Every answer he gives there is available to his opponent here—**so let every arguer put his method on the table first, and then accept its verdict on everyone.**

The Closing Scale

Two explicit scales face each other in this subject: **the measure of accumulation** for every arguer (one witness may be dismissed; ten converging cannot be—the rope of clues once more), **and the measure of the elastic machine** for the critic (a method that produced Christ from the Torah for the refusing Jews, Muhammad from the two books for their refusing people, and Mani from the Paraclete—a machine that produces for every claimant his claim). The decision between them is made not wholesale but **witness by witness on the five rules**—and the files of the major witnesses (Paran, the prophet like Moses, the Paraclete, Isaiah 53, and *almah*) are open in the specialized literature of the three parties, whose titles we have placed in the kit. **And one cautionary file before the close, because the popular literature will put it in your hands: the "Gospel of Barnabas."** An Italian-language text with no ancient manuscript trail and no citation by any ancient author, surfacing in Europe centuries after the events, dense with anachronisms. Yet waved in some polemics, since its Arabic translation in 1908, as "the true Gospel" because it names Muhammad explicitly. Apply to it the very tests this book applies to everything—who wrote it, when, in what language, and how did it arrive?—and it fails them all at once. Which is why the careful researchers of the Islamic side themselves set it aside. The lesson is the single standard cutting both ways: **a witness you would not accept against yourself, you may not call to testify for yourself**—whoever waves it

purchases a moment's applause at the price of the standard by which he criticizes everyone else.

As for you, you have come out of the study with something more valuable than a ready verdict: **you have seen the circle turn its full circuit, and in your hand now are the keys to examining it wherever it stops.**

The Seeker's Question: Which prophecy would you accept in another's book by the same criteria by which you accept a prophecy in your own—and if you cannot find one, which of the two criteria is the one you are hiding from yourself?

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the impossibility or occurrence of alteration of the texts and their originals (the arena of the "lost original" answers) in Chapter 16; the rule of the glass of the opponents in Chapter 17; and the study "What Have the Religions Said About One Another?" for the structure of later and earlier.*

Study 19.5: The Arguments from Testimony, Mass Transmission, and Fruit — The Social-Historical Trio

The last of the pillars of Stage Two: the witnesses of the founding event, the continuous mass transmission, and what the religion produced on earth—at their strongest and with their critiques, and then the conclusion of the completed chapter and its final map

> **Summary of the study:** Three arguments shared by believers of every religion: witnesses to the founding event, the transmission of the report generation after generation, and the fruit the religion has borne in its followers' lives. What is this triad actually worth, and where is it abused more than any other argument in the book?

---

* Preface: From the Evidence of the Text to the Evidence of People and History

The preceding studies of the chapter presented the evidence of **the text** (inimitability in its aspects, and foretellings in their two mirrors). This study closes with the evidence of **people and history**—the trio that most religions share in similar forms: **testimony** (that the founding event was witnessed by eyewitnesses who gave their lives for it), **mass transmission** (that the transmission ran through multitudes whose collusion custom rules out), **and fruit** (that the tree is known by its fruit—so look at what this religion did on earth). The feature of the trio that we offer as a key: it is **the least**

binding of the arguments in the councils of inquiry, and the widest in its sway over the hearts of the masses. For most believers across history believed not by a proof from design or a comparison of manuscripts, but by trust in witnesses, transmission, and fruits they saw—so it must be examined with the seriousness of the weight it carries.

* First: The Argument from Testimony—"Who Dies for a Lie He Knows to Be a Lie?"

The Christian form—and its people have polished this argument more than any. The whole Christian claim rests on a single event (the resurrection), and its first evidence is its witnesses: Paul's very early text (1 Corinthians 15—whose creedal formula the critics themselves date to a few years after the event): "he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve. Then he appeared to more than five hundred brothers and sisters at one time, **most of whom are still alive**" (15:5–6)—that is: ask them. Then clues in which the defenders take pride: that the first witnesses in the Gospels are **women** (and their testimony was of little weight in the courts of the age—so who invents a story that begins with witnesses who do not count? This is the critical "criterion of embarrassment" itself). That the witnesses turned from the flight of the night of the arrest to public proclamation under the lash until most of the apostles were killed; and that two obstinate opponents (Paul the persecutor and James the unbelieving brother) turned into witnesses unto blood. So the argument is framed: people may die for **an error they take for truth**—but

these were self-professed eyewitnesses: if the story was invented, they were its inventors.

So who dies for a lie he himself knows to be a lie? (And beside the argument from the witnesses stands the file's most famous popular weapon, C. S. Lewis's "trilemma": a man who claimed what the Gospels report Jesus claiming is either lying, or mad, or Lord—the one door Lewis declared closed is "a merely great moral teacher." Its critics answer with a fourth L, *Legend*: the argument stands only as high as the reports of the claims themselves, which returns its whole weight to the transmission file of Chapter 16. The Muslim reader adds a fifth door that Lewis's map did not show: a truthful prophet whose community exalted him after him—which is precisely the Qur'an's own reading. The trilemma is a real fork only after its premise is purchased—and each camp purchases a different premise. The same fork is deployed in reverse by contemporary Islamic apologetics for Muhammad—liar, deluded, or truthful—and it invites the same fourth door from its own critics.)

And the Islamic form: the testimony of the first generation to the states of revelation (they see it descend on the Prophet and he pours with sweat on a winter day; they hear the ready answer to the absent question), and before that the testimony of a lifetime: forty years among them as "the truthful, the trustworthy." So that Heraclius said it in his famous exchange with Abu Sufyan (then an enemy): he would not abandon lying to people and then lie about God. And the steadfastness of the first tortured (Bilal and

the family of Yasir) in a religion that then promised neither spoils nor rank.

And the critique at its strongest: (1) Martyrdom proves sincerity, not truth. For the followers of every creed have died for their creeds: Manichaeans under everyone's swords, martyrs of schools that declare one another unbelievers, and modern groups that went to their deaths in certainty—death is a currency paid by true certainty and by mistaken certainty alike. (2) And the critic undoes the condition of "the eyewitness": between the event and the writing of the Gospels lie decades, the lists were transmitted by later believers (the glass of the narrators), the psychology of testimony documents how the memory of yearning groups is formed, and visions true to their subjects are a third door between lying and sensory witnessing—Paul himself describes his experience as "a vision." (3) And the conversion of opponents occurs in every mission (we made it, in the chapter on preaching, "a witness to the strength of an experience," not a verdict on the truth of its content). **And the careful reply:** the serious scholars grant that the martyrdom of **later followers** goes no further than sincerity—and confine the argument to **the first layer, which claimed to have witnessed**: the division "sincere but mistaken" does not apply to these except on the assumption of repeated collective hallucination (and among five hundred at once?). The critic answers by taking the list apart critically . . . and so the real dispute narrows to a precise historical question:
is a layer of eyewitnesses established who died for what they witnessed?—a question of documents that takes us back to Chapter 16, not a question of rhetoric.

* Second: The Argument from Mass Transmission—Its Most Mature Theorizing Islamic, Its Most Famous Formulation Jewish

The Islamic theorizing. The Muslim legal theorists polished this argument to a degree no other tradition reached, with clarified conditions: a report transmitted by **a multitude whose collusion in a lie custom rules out**, **from sense perception**, not inference, **in every layer** of transmission without interruption. And when it is complete it yields necessary knowledge that needs no inquiry: like your knowledge of the existence of countries you have not seen. Its applications for them: the Qur'an (by the double mass transmission we detailed). The practical pillars of the religion (the form of the prayer is mass-transmitted in practice, generation after generation—a mass transmission by deed, not by report alone!); and the existence of the Prophet and the major events of his life.

And the most famous Jewish formulation—the Kuzari argument. Judah Halevi (twelfth century CE) formulated it in his dialogue: the revelation at Sinai was not to an individual in a cave but **to a whole nation in collective witnessing**. A story of this kind cannot be **planted** later in a nation's memory: what impostor says to a people, "all your ancestors saw and heard, and you have handed it down father to son"—when they have never heard of it? Acceptance would be impossible. So the mass transmission of the founding event—for them—is a fingerprint of authenticity that cannot be forged.

And the critique at its strongest: (1) Mass transmission conveys "that," not "why". This is the undoing of arguing from it doctrinally unless it is disciplined: it is mass-transmitted that Muhammad existed, recited this Qur'an, and issued its challenge (a sensory fact)—whereas **its being a revelation from God** is not something the senses convey at all but an interpretation of the fact, and the interpretation is not mass-transmitted. Only its material is. Likewise what is mass-transmitted in every nation is **the belief** of its ancestors, not **the truth** of the belief—which is why the "mass transmissions" of the religions do not really collide: each conveys the facts of its people truthfully, and the dispute is in the interpretations. (2) And the Kuzari argument of "the impossibility of planting" is refuted by the witness of mass myths of origin that really did arise and take root in nations (and scholars document the emergence of "ancient" collective memories within a few centuries). Its supporters reply with the difference between **the gradual, hazy emergence** of a myth with no point of declaration open to refusal, and **a sudden claim upon a present generation** able to refute it—and examining the difference rages in its literature. **And the rule the seeker takes from the whole argument:** sound mass transmission is **the firmest ground of history for facts, and the most neutral in interpretations.** So accept by it the facts of every nation (by it we presented in this book what historical evidence establishes of the existence of the prophets and the major events in every nation), and move the dispute over interpretation to its fields.

* Third: The Argument from Fruit—"You Will Know Them by Their Fruits"

The argument at its strongest. The rule is Gospel in its wording ("You will know them by their fruits. Are grapes gathered from thorns?"—Matthew 7:16) and universal in its use: every tradition reaches into its basket of fruits. **The Muslim arguer** points to the phenomenon that perplexed the historians of civilizations: an unlettered nation on the margin of the world turning within a single century into a world civilization in science, law, and building—a speed, breadth, and continuity that asks: does a lie do this? **And Begović raises the argument from quantitative boasting to a proof from structure** (as we clarified in our extraction of it): the argument is not the number of scholars but **the engineering of the system**: a religion that preserves the two poles that tore others apart—the spirit of the individual and the order of the community, the prayer and the marketplace, asceticism and building (a *zakat*—the obligatory alms—that joins the justice of organization with the warmth of charity; an ablution that unites the purity of body and of spirit). A structure that knows the twofold human being with this knowledge testifies—for him—to a source that made it. **The Christian arguer** presents his basket: the revolution of institutional mercy (hospitals and shelters as an early Christian innovation), the universities, the leadership of modern abolition by believers acting in good conscience, and the turning of the values of weakness (forgiveness, service of the lowest) into the virtues of a civilization.

The Buddhist's fruit is an extended inner peace and civilizations of compassion that arose without courts of creed. **And the Jew's** fruit is the miracle of survival: a small people whose identity has crossed four thousand years of ordeals intact—does an illusion live that long?

And the critique at its strongest—here on its home ground:

(1) Every basket has its bitter bottom: beside every glory in every religion's record stand black pages (wars of creed, courts, enslavement, persecution of the dissenter—we documented everyone's share in the study on accepting the other). So by which of the two fruits do we judge the tree? And who authorized the arguer to select the peaks and charge the depths to "poor application"?

(2) And the problem of causal isolation is fatal: history runs no controlled experiments—so is the civilization of Islam the fruit of revelation or the fruit of the unification of markets and the translation of Greece and Persia? Is the rise of Europe the fruit of Christianity or the fruit of liberation from its dominion (both European camps argue from the same history!)? Attributing the fruit to the chosen root is **an interpretive decision**, not an observation.

(3) And "moderation" and "balance" are subjective descriptions that every tradition claims for itself with its own matrix (Begović has his table, and others have tables that make their tradition the middle).

(4) And the deepest: the fruit—even if granted—testifies **to usefulness, not to truth**: a placebo may really help—and the question stands: useful because true,

or “true” for them because useful? **And the careful reply:** the people of the argument try the tree by its stated purposes, its general direction, and its peaks, not by the deviations of its people (as medicine is not tried by the errors of physicians). The proof from structure partly answers the isolation objection (the structure is set down in the books **before** the historical fruit—so it is no retrospective claiming of a shared glory). **And their careful scholars concede the fourth limit explicitly**: which is why the careful thinkers—from Ghazali to the contemporaries—never made the fruit a mainstay, but **a supporting witness** that prepares the heart and tips the scale where the scales are even—and that is its just rank on our ladder.

The Conclusion of Chapter 19 — Now Complete: The Final Map and Its Rules

With this study the chapter "How Does Each Religion Argue for Itself?" is complete in all its pillars, so we draw its closing map as a single ladder: at the summit **the evidence of the text itself** (inimitability in its aspects—the firmest being the rhetorical, by the consensus of its people—and the prophecies and foretellings, on condition that they pass their sieves); next **the evidence of the founding event** (testimony with its precise condition: a layer of eyewitnesses, not followers; and mass transmission with its golden rule: it conveys "that," not "why"). At the supporting base **the fruit** (it prepares and tips the scale; it does not found). **And the chapter's unifying rules**—your final kit before any evidence from any faith—are ten: try every claim by its own evidence. The single standard for all. The argument is tried by its firmest degree and not championed by its flimsiest. Advance prediction is the decider of every "precedence"; the word by the familiar usage of its language and the earliest commentaries of its people. The glass of the narrators is as the glass of the opponents. Sound transmission is a condition, not a proof. Sincerity is not truth. Facts are mass-transmitted and interpretations are not; and usefulness is not truth.

Then the two closing metaphors that sum up the two philosophies of dealing with all the evidence: the arguers say: our evidence is **a rope of braided clues**—a single strand may be debated, but the combination of inimitability, prophecy, testimony, mass

transmission, and fruit, converging, has the force of the whole and not of the units. The critics say: rather, composite evidence is **a chain whose strength is the strength of its weakest link**—and adding probabilities together does not beget certainty. Adjudicating between the two metaphors themselves is a serious logical inquiry (when do clues converge and when do they form a chain?) that we promised you in the seeker's tools (Chapter 4). **And as for weighing the rope or examining the links in a particular religion, that is your own work, for which this chapter has qualified you, and no book does it in your stead.**

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the witnesses of the states of revelation and the conversion of opponents in Chapters 11 and 12; the layer of witnesses and its documents in Chapter 16; and the Kuzari argument and its critique among the literature of Chapter 15.*

Study 19.6: Which Book Could Truly Be the Word of God?

The three scriptures before ten questions on a single standard: what each book claims about itself, how it arrived, and by what it argues—and the Seeker's Question that turns the whole question around

Summary of the study: Grandeur, antiquity, and a multitude of followers are not, on their own, enough to prove a book divine—a billion readers can simply be a billion heirs of geography. Ten questions, declared in advance, are applied by one standard to the Torah, the New Testament, and the Qur'an together, arriving at a rule that brings down half the triumphant claims made in every camp.

If God has communicated with humanity, then among the most important questions a sincere seeker can ask is not merely, "Which religion is true?" but something even more fundamental:

Which book, if any, can reasonably claim to preserve a revelation from God?

Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all connect themselves to divine revelation. The Torah, the Bible, and the Qur'an have shaped civilizations and influenced billions of lives. Yet reverence, popularity, and antiquity alone cannot establish that a book is divine. Age is not authorship; devotion is not evidence; and a billion readers can be a billion heirs of geography.

A fair investigation should therefore avoid beginning with the conclusion. We should not assume that the Qur'an is true because Muslims believe it is true, that the Bible is true because Christians accept it, or that the Torah is true because it stands at the foundation of Judaism. Each of those assumptions merely restates the accident of where the assumer was born—and the believer who leans on it has no answer to the neighbor leaning on the same crutch in the opposite direction.

Instead, we can place the major scriptural claims before the same set of questions—declared in advance, applied without favor, and answerable, at least in part, by believer and skeptic alike. Whoever announces the verdict before the criteria has told you about himself, not about the books.

The Ten Questions

1. What does the book claim about itself? The first question is surprisingly important. Does the text present itself as the direct speech of God? Does it contain revelation alongside history, biography, poetry, letters, or human reflection? Does the religious tradition distinguish between the words of God and the words of inspired human authors? Before asking whether a claim is true, we must first determine precisely what the claim is.

2. Who wrote it? Do we know who produced the text? Was its author a prophet, an eyewitness, a disciple, a later historian, or an unknown writer? Is the traditional attribution supported by historical evidence? Were different portions written by different people and

at different periods? Anonymous or disputed authorship does not automatically make a text false, but it becomes highly relevant when a book is presented as a reliable vehicle of divine revelation.

3. When was it written? How much time passed between the events being described and the earliest known composition of the text? A document written during the lifetime of witnesses occupies a different historical position from one written generations or centuries later. The greater the gap, the more carefully we should investigate how the information was transmitted.

4. In what language was it first delivered? Can we still read the revelation in the language in which it was originally proclaimed? Or does our knowledge of it depend primarily on translations, later manuscripts, or reconstructed forms of the text? Translation is unavoidable in the spread of any religion, but a translation is an interpretation as well as a transmission. Therefore, access to the original language matters.

5. How was the text preserved? This is among the most important tests. What are the earliest surviving manuscripts? How close are they to the period in which the text originated? How consistent are the manuscripts with one another? Were there additions, omissions, alternative readings, editorial changes, or competing textual traditions? The existence of textual variants does not by itself disprove divine origin; ancient documents naturally develop manuscript differences. The important question is their nature, extent, and significance.

6. How was the canon established? Who decided which writings belonged to scripture? Was there agreement from the beginning, or did communities debate certain books? Were some writings accepted in one religious community but rejected in another? A seeker should therefore distinguish between two questions: **Was a text revealed?** and **How did later communities determine which texts were authoritative?** The two are routinely collapsed, and they must not be: the authority of the *canon* is itself a claim requiring evidence, over and above the claims of the texts it contains.

7. Is the message internally coherent? If a book comes from an all-knowing God, we would reasonably expect its central message to possess a deep degree of coherence. What does it teach about God? What does it say about humanity, morality, sin, justice, mercy, death, and the purpose of existence? Is the portrait consistent from the book's first page to its last? Apparent contradictions should be examined carefully rather than exaggerated or dismissed: some may disappear when language, context, genre, and historical setting are understood; others may raise genuine questions. The standard should be the same for every scripture.

8. What is its concept of God? Perhaps no question is more important. Does the scripture describe God consistently as the eternal, independent Creator? Is God one? Does God resemble creation? Can God become human? Can God suffer or die? Does God require intermediaries? How does the book reconcile divine justice with divine mercy? A claimed revelation should offer a concept of God worthy of the ultimate source of

existence and internally consistent with the attributes it assigns to Him.

9. Does it provide evidence for its divine origin? A book should not be accepted as revelation merely because it declares itself to be revelation. What reasons does it give us to believe its claim? Does it appeal to prophecy, historical events, miracles, its language, its message, fulfilled predictions, the character of its messenger, or some other form of evidence? More importantly, can these claims be investigated independently? Extraordinary claims require serious evidence.

10. Has its message remained accessible? If God intended a revelation to guide humanity beyond one generation, we may reasonably ask whether its essential message remained identifiable and accessible. Can a person today determine with reasonable confidence what the original revelation taught? Or must the seeker choose among substantially different reconstructed versions, theological traditions, or later interpretations before even discovering what the original message was? This is not simply a question of manuscript preservation. It is also a question of preservation of meaning.

The Three Books Before the Questions

What follows compresses, without verdicts, what the chapters behind you lay out in full—each case at its strongest, each objection at its strongest. Question 1 must lead, because **the three scriptures do not claim to be the same kind of thing:** the Qur'an claims verbatim divine speech—the wording itself, with the messenger as transmitter and not author. The Torah, in the tradition's own account, carries layers—direct divine speech, Mosaic narration, and closing verses whose writer the Talmudic sages themselves debated (who wrote of Moses' death?—Bava Batra 15a). The Gospels claim not dictation but testimony—four accounts *about* the Word, who in Christian theology is a person, not a book. To fault the Gospels for not being what the Qur'an claims to be is to miss their own claim. To credit them with what they never claimed is equally careless. The single standard does not mean the single test; it means the same *fairness* of testing.

The Torah. Its strongest card is not a manuscript but a scene: revelation claimed before an entire people at Sinai—the Kuzari argument, that a national memory of public revelation cannot be planted later, for the planted generation would ask its parents why they had never heard of it. Its transmission since the Masoretes is a marvel of scribal discipline, letter-counted and unmatched in its era. **And the strongest objections:** the Qumran scrolls, the Septuagint, and the Samaritan Torah reveal a textual plurality *before* the Masoretic standard that the later discipline cannot retroactively

erase. The documentary analysis of sources finds seams where tradition reads one hand. The gap between the events narrated and the earliest surviving witnesses is counted in many centuries. The tradition has answers—oral transmission, the resilience of national memory—and the debate between them is genuinely open, not settled by either side's applause.

The New Testament. Its strongest card is earliness of testimony: the resurrection creed embedded in First Corinthians 15 is dated by friend and foe within a few years of the event itself—Lüdemann, the atheist New Testament scholar, places its elements within the first two to three years—an eyeblink by ancient standards. Behind it stand more manuscripts, earlier and more abundant, than any other ancient text can show, with the vast majority of their variants trivial. **And the strongest objections:** abundance of copies measures popularity of copying, not truth of content; the testimony comes entirely from inside the circle of believers; the four accounts show development among themselves; the named authorships are traditional, not signed. The earliest complete manuscripts still postdate the events by generations during which the text demonstrably moved—which is why the tradition's own scholars, not only its critics, built the science of textual criticism. Here too the strongest replies exist—the criterion of embarrassment, the witnesses' unprofitable deaths—and here too the case is a weighing, not a proof.

The Qur'an. Its strongest card is the transmission apparatus itself: a single text carried by two mutually reinforcing mechanisms—hearts and lines, mass

memorization alongside writing—standardized within a generation under documented discipline, with early manuscripts agreeing with the text recited today (the Birmingham folios, radiocarbon-dated to 568–645 CE with 95 percent confidence; the Sanaa palimpsest's upper text), and no competing recension surviving anywhere. Joined to a standing public challenge, issued to the masters of the language with maximal motive to answer it, that the tradition records as unmet. **And the strongest objections:** the multiplicity of the qira'at is urged as plurality under another name. The Sanaa palimpsest's lower layer shows a companion-era text that differs. The Uthmanic standardization achieved unity partly by destroying alternatives—unity by bonfire, says the critic. The inimitability argument is judged in a court of taste whose judges must know Arabic; and the revisionist school contests the traditional account's dating wholesale. The replies are on record—the qira'at as chained modes of recitation rather than recensions, the lower layer as remaining within known readings, the challenge as collective failure under maximal motive. The striking fact, conceded by most non-believing specialists of transmission, is that in the specific matter of *arrival*, this apparatus gathers properties that gather for no other ancient text. But—

The Sentence Every Honest Comparison Must Contain

—soundness of transmission is a condition of truth, not evidence of it. A perfectly preserved text may be a perfectly preserved human text. Answering question 5 brilliantly earns a candidate its seat in the examination hall; it does not hand it the verdict. This single sentence, held firmly, collapses half the triumphant pamphlets of every camp: the Muslim pamphlet that leaps from preservation to divinity, the Christian pamphlet that leaps from manuscript abundance to resurrection, the Jewish pamphlet that leaps from national memory to Sinai. Equally the skeptical pamphlet that leaps from any textual variant anywhere to "therefore all of it is legend."

What is established is real and differentiated: the question of arrival has answers, and they are not the same for all three books. The internal-marks arguments are serious enough to have occupied first-rank minds for a millennium. And no candidate's case survives being carried at its flimsiest. **What is not established**—by preservation, earliness, inimitability, or fruit *alone*—is that any text is God's speech in the way a proof compels a fair mind starting outside all three circles. Each argument at its strongest is a strand. **The great convictions are braided from strands, not from a single strand.** And the braiding runs through the prior question standing at this study's door: whether there is a God whose word a book could be. A seeker who

reverses that order will find every text's evidence weightless—and will have measured the scales, not the books.

* Applying the Same Standard

These questions should now be applied without favoritism to the Torah, the writings that constitute the Christian Bible, and the Qur'an.

The purpose should not be to prove a predetermined conclusion.

If the evidence favors the Bible, the sincere seeker should be willing to follow it.

If it favors the Qur'an, the same intellectual honesty should apply.

And if the evidence proves insufficient for either claim, that possibility must also be faced.

This is what makes the investigation meaningful.

Faith reached through examination is different from faith inherited without examination.

The central question is therefore not:

"Which book was I taught to believe?"

It is:

"If God truly spoke to humanity—where is His message most reliably preserved, and best evidenced?"

That question deserves to be asked without fear, answered without prejudice, and followed wherever the evidence leads.

The books are open. The questions are declared. No study can walk the last mile for the traveler.

Cross-references for the study: the texts' own claims and their layers: Part V and Chapter 15; the mechanisms of arrival, the variants, and the laboratory comparison: Chapter 16 and Study 16.1; the Kuzari argument and the arguments from testimony and mass transmission: Study 19.5; rhetorical and scientific inimitability and the foretellings: Studies 19.1–19.4; the concept of God across the religions: Chapter 9 and Part VIII. The Rule of the Braided Rope: Chapter 18; the geography lottery: Chapter 5.

Part VIII: The Great Questions

The arenas of existential engagement

An Introductory Study to Chapter 20: Fate and Predestination Across Religions and Civilizations — Who Writes Destiny, and Where Does Human Freedom Stand?

The question that precedes the problem of evil: is what happens decreed in advance? And who decreed it—a God, a blind law, or no one? And if it is decreed, why am I held to account?—The tour through the nations' answers, then the table, then the five patterns, then the internal debate in every house, then modern science re-posing the question in its own dress—and the scale on the ladder

* Opening: Two Questions in One Word

When people say "fate" they confuse two questions: **(1) Is destiny written in advance?—**a question about **the structure of the universe**: is it governed by a prior order (divine or natural), or open?

(2) Is the human being free in what he does, and held to account for it?—a question about **the position of the human being** within that order. The nations we will tour answered the first in divergent ways (a fate above the gods, or in the hand of one God, or a self-operating law, or nothing), and then every house divided **from within** on the second,

a mong compulsion, freedom, and reconciliation—until the disagreement within each religion became sharper than the disagreement among the religions. This study is a necessary preface to the chapter on the problem of evil: whoever does not know how each tradition distributes responsibility between heaven and the human being will not understand how it answers suffering.

* First: The Tour—Who Writes Destiny Among the Nations?

Mesopotamia—fate written on a tablet. The oldest documented conception: "**the Tablet of Destinies**," held by the chief of the gods, and whoever seized it ruled the world (the bird Zu steals it; Marduk gains it after killing Tiamat), and the *me* (the cosmic ordinances) that assign everything its place. So fate here is **a property transferred among the gods**, and the human being seeks knowledge of it by divination and escapes it by rite. **Egypt.** Shai, the god of fate, accompanies every newborn, but Maat—order and justice—stands above all, and the human being is judged on the standard for his deeds. So the Egyptian is fated and responsible at once, with no reconciling philosophy. **Greece—fate above the gods.** The most consequential thing in the tour: the **Moirai** (the three sisters: Clotho spins, Lachesis measures, Atropos cuts) are **stronger than Zeus himself**, who weeps for his son Sarpedon and cannot avert his fate. The tragedy of Oedipus is the cry of the whole civilization: everything he did to escape his prophecy dropped him into it. Then the philosophers parted: **the Stoics** made fate (*heimarmene*) an

inescapable cosmic reason, and human freedom lay in **one's inner attitude**, not in the course of events ("the dog tied to the cart: it walks willingly or is dragged"). **The Epicureans** introduced into the atoms a random "swerve" to rescue freedom from determinism—the oldest physical attempt to found choice. **The Norse.** The three **Norns** weave the destinies of humans and gods, and Ragnarök—the end of the gods—**is inevitable, known to Odin and not to be averted**. And the hero's virtue is to go to his known fate with courage: a heroic fatalism. **Iran.** The debate grew so fierce that it split the religion: original Zoroastrianism is **the clearest of the religions of freedom**—the human being chooses between truth and the lie in a responsible choice that is the essence of the religion. Against it rose "**Zurvanism**," which made Zurvan (infinite Time) father of light and darkness alike and placed destinies in the hand of Time: **a fatalism inside the religion of freedom** (and some scholars trace to Zurvanism an influence on medieval fatalism—with caution). **India.** Two terms pull at all the epics: "**daiva**" (the decreed) and "**purushakara**" (human effort)—and the Mahabharata discusses them openly and usually sides with effort. As for "**karma**," it turns the question over: no external decreer, but **you are the maker of your fate by your past deeds**.

So your present is decreed by your past, and your future is free by your present: an automatic reconciliation without a God. From India also came **one of the strictest doctrines of determinism in history**: the Ajivikas (Makkhali Gosala, a contemporary of the Buddha),

holding "*niyati*"—absolute necessity: every being passes through its cycles as a ball of thread is thrown and unwinds to its end, and no effort advances or delays—**which the Buddha counted the most dangerous of doctrines**, because it kills the road. **Buddhism.** Karma without fatalism: present deeds make the future, so freedom lies in intention (*cetana*). **China.** "**Ming**" (fate / mandate) in Confucius: "Life and death are governed by fate, wealth and honor are determined by Heaven." But the duty is to do what must be done whether it bears fruit or not (the ethics of pure duty). **Mozi** devoted a chapter titled "**Against Fate**," holding that fatalism ruins nations because it kills effort; and Taoism counsels flowing with the current, not resisting it—three positions in one house.

The Abrahamic house—fate in the hand of the one God, and the dispute over the human being's space. Here the pagan conception is turned upside down: **there is no fate above God. Fate is His act**—so the whole question becomes: how do His all-encompassing knowledge and absolute power coexist with human responsibility? **Judaism.** Josephus tells that the three sects differed on exactly this: the Sadducees for complete freedom, the Essenes for complete fate, **and the Pharisees** for the combination. Rabbinic Judaism inherited the Pharisees' position in the most famous reconciling formula in history: "**Everything is foreseen, yet freedom of choice is granted**" (Akiva), and "**Everything is in the hands of Heaven except the fear of Heaven**" (the Talmud): circumstances are decreed and the moral stance is free.

Christianity. It inherited the debate and doubled it with the doctrine of grace: Augustine against Pelagius (can a human being choose the good by his own powers, or by grace alone?—and Augustine won conciliarly). Then **Calvin** with "double predestination" (God chose before creation who is saved and who perishes—and faith is the sign of election, not its cause), **the Arminians** against him, holding that grace is offered to all and acceptance is free. **Catholicism** took a middle path (Molinism: God knows what every human being would choose in every circumstance). **And Orthodoxy** with "synergy" (grace and will work together). **Islam.** Belief in predestination, "its good and its evil," is a sixth pillar, and the theologians detailed it into **four ranks** (prior knowledge, writing on the Tablet, will, and creation)—and then in the first century erupted the fiercest internal debate: **the Qadariyya** (Ma'bad al-Juhani and Ghaylan al-Dimashqi: the human being creates his own act—to exonerate God of evil) against **the Jabriyya** (Jahm ibn Safwan: the human being is like a feather in the wind).

Then **the Mu'tazila** inherited the Qadariyya's position in the name of "justice" (no one is punished for what he did not do by his own choice). **The Ash'aris** invented **"*kasb*,"** acquisition (God creates the act and the servant acquires it—a formula its opponents counted a riddle: "subtler than al-Ash'ari's *kasb*"). **The Maturidis** gave the particular will a clearer role. **The Imamis** formulated the middle way in their motto: **"neither compulsion nor delegation, but a matter between two matters."** Ibn Taymiyya tried to gather the parties: God

is the creator of everything, and the human being is a real agent by a will God created in him. **And the most useful things in the Islamic heritage for the seeker are three practical controls:** that **arguing from fate to excuse disobedience is condemned** (fate is invoked for misfortunes, not for faults—and the hadith of "Adam and Moses disputing" is read by the careful scholars as concerning misfortune, not sin). That **fate does not cancel the taking of means** ("we flee from God's decree to God's decree"—Umar during the plague; and "tie it, and trust in God").

That **contentment with the decree after its occurrence is not passivity before it**. By these three the modern reformers (Abduh and Iqbal) answered the charge of "fatalism" that Orientalism pinned on Muslim civilization as a cause of its decline: they said that popular fatalism is a deviation from the religion, not its fruit. As for **the most widely circulated popular formula** in the contemporary Arab world, it is what spread from Sheikh al-Sha'rawi in his televised lessons: the human being is **free in the station of choice and driven in the station of necessity**—he can extend his hand or withdraw it, and he cannot command his heart to beat, and he is held to account only where he has power—a practical, not a theological, formula, of the kind of "practical reconciliation" on which you will see the nations meet, and it has become, through its mass broadcast, the most firmly fixed conception of fate in the minds of the Arab public, more than all the formulations of the theologians.

* Second: The Table—By One Standard

Tradition	Who decides destiny?	The space of human freedom	The formula of reconciliation	The observed behavioral effect
Mesopotamia	The assembly of the gods (the Tablet of Destinies)	Narrow; escape sought through rite and divination	—	Widespread divination; existential anxiety
Greece	The Moirai, above the gods	In the attitude, not in the course (Stoicism) / the swerve of the atom (Epicurus)	Philosophical	Tragedy; Stoic tranquility
The Norse	The Norns; an inevitable end	Courage before the inevitable	—	Heroic fatalism
Zoroastrianism	No fate: a choice between truth and the lie	The widest in the ancient world	—	Individual responsibility (and Zurvanism as a fatalist relapse)

Tradition	Who decides destiny?	The space of human freedom	The formula of reconciliation	The observed behavioral effect
India (Vedanta)	Karma (your past deed)	A decreed present and a free future	Automatic, without a God	Acceptance of caste / striving for liberation
The Ajivikas	Niyati—absolute necessity	Zero	—	Abandonment of striving (condemned by the Buddha)
Buddhism	Karma by intention	In intention	Automatic	The eightfold path
China	Ming / Heaven (Confucius)—no fate (Mozi)	Duty whatever the outcome	Ethical	Diligence in work with acceptance of the outcome
Judaism	God	"Freedom is granted"	"Everything is in the hands of Heaven except	Responsibility and commitment to the law

Tradition	Who decides destiny?	The space of human freedom	The formula of reconciliation	The observed behavioral effect
			the fear of Heaven"	
Christianity	God (grace)	Disputed: Augustine / Calvin ↔ Pelagius / the Arminians	Molinism; synergy	The "work ethic" among the Calvinists (Weber)
Islam	God (knowledge, writing, will, creation)	Disputed: Jabriyya ↔ Qadariyya / Mu'tazila; kasb; a matter between two matters	Four ranks + the controls on means	Trust in God versus passivity—the debate of the Renaissance

* Third: The Five Cross-Cutting Patterns

(1) The great Abrahamic reversal. In the paganisms fate is **above** the gods (the Moirai, the Norns, the stolen Tablet of Destinies). In the Abrahamic religions fate is **the act** of God, not His master. So the problem of evil moved from "a blind fate that wrongs everyone" to "a wise God: why does He permit?"—and this shift is what grew the whole of theodicy.

(2) Karma without a decreer. The Indian house alone solved the equation by deleting the decreer and keeping the decree—an automatic justice that explains inequality and preserves freedom—at the price of the question of the beginning (which we weighed in Appendix F).

(3) Every house grew its own determinism and its own freedom together. Zurvanism in Zoroastrianism, the Ajivikas in India, Essenes and Sadducees in Judaism, Augustine and Pelagius, Jahm and Ma'bad. The battle is **internal** in every religion, which forbids reducing any religion to "the fatalist" or "the free."

(4) Reconciliation is practical before it is theoretical. The most mature formulas do not solve the metaphysical riddle but distribute life: "circumstances are decreed and the stance is free" (Akiva), "the duty is yours and the outcome is Heaven's" (Confucius), "contentment after occurrence and striving before it" (Islam), "the inner attitude is free" (Stoicism)—four nations on almost one formula.

(5) The civilizational effect is contested. Weber claimed that Calvin's double predestination produced the capitalist "work ethic" (anxiety over election drives diligence), and Orientalists claimed that the Muslims' fate produced passivity and decline. The two claims **contradict each other in logic**: the same fate is credited with diligence here and laziness there, which shows that the effect comes from **the social form** of the doctrine, not from the doctrine itself.

* Fourth: Modern Science Re-Poses the Question in Its Own Dress

Nor did the irreligious escape the question by escaping God. They received it through the door of physics: "Laplace's demon" (1814): a mind that knows the position and velocity of every atom knows the whole past and future—**a mechanical determinism** stricter than Jahm's. Then quantum mechanics shook it without founding freedom (for randomness is not choice—Epicurus's own problem, two thousand years later). Then neuroscience came with Libet's experiments (1983: the brain "decides" a fraction of a second before the agent's awareness), igniting the debate over "the illusion of free will." The philosophers divided as the theologians had divided: **determinists** (no freedom), **libertarians** (freedom is real and physics is incomplete), and **compatibilists** (freedom is to do what you want even if your wanting is caused—which is very nearly **Ash'ari *kasb* in modern language**). So the question that the modernists supposed a dead theology is among the hottest questions of contemporary philosophy of mind, and all the religions are partners in it with their tools.

The Scale on the Ladder — And the Study's Question

The claim (the comprehensive Abrahamic claim): "God knows everything and decrees it, and the human being is responsible." **The strongest case:** denying prior knowledge undoes divinity, and denying responsibility undoes law and conscience together—so the combination is necessary. **The strongest objection:** the combination is a riddle without solution: if the act is known and decreed in advance, its choice is meaningless. And if it is chosen, its decreeing is meaningless—and the formulas of reconciliation (*kasb*, the matter between two matters, synergy, Molinism) name the problem without solving it. **The strongest reply:** prior knowledge discloses. It does not compel (my knowledge that you will choose such-and-such does not force you), and the decree includes the decreeing of the choice itself. As for the "riddle," it belongs to the riddles of all freedom—and the determinist atheist is in the same predicament without a God. **What is established:** that the question crosses religions, philosophies, and sciences; that every great tradition split on it from within; and that the practical formulas of reconciliation nearly coincide among the nations. **What is not established:** a theoretical solution that binds everyone—religious or philosophical—nor that fate necessarily produces passivity or diligence.

And the Seeker's Question: if the Stoic, the Jew, the Muslim, and the Confucian have met on "do your duty and leave the outcome" by roads that do not meet in theory—**might the wisdom of fate lie in the way it is lived rather than in the way it is explained?**. This answer leads directly into the chapter on evil: for whoever accepts that wisdom is lived before it is explained will read suffering with an eye unlike that of one who demands the explanation first.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the problem of evil (the body of Chapter 20) and theodicy; karma and the question of the beginning in Chapter 24 and Appendix F; and Zurvanism and dualism in Chapter 9 and the study on the One and the many.*

Chapter 20: The Problem of Evil

The heaviest objection in the history of faith: its three forms, the nations' answers house by house, the great philosophical answers, the critique of "God is love, absolutely," the analogy of the actor and the covenant, and a sample of the popular question—and the scale on the ladder

> **Summary of the chapter:** Why do many people lose their faith at a dying child's bedside, not on hearing a philosophical argument? The heaviest objection in the history of belief is presented in its three forms, with each tradition's own answers, the great philosophical responses, and a candid critique of the idea that "God is love, without qualification."

---

* Opening: The Door Through Which Most of Those Who Left Have Gone

It was not the argument from coming-to-be, nor Darwin, that demolished the faith of most of those who lost it. But the bed of a dying child, a mass grave, and a single question: **if God is able and knowing and merciful, then why?** The introductory study on fate preceded you to this door, and you saw how monotheism turned the problem upside down: in the paganisms a blind fate above the gods wrongs everyone without wisdom, so there is no problem but the problem of luck. **And in the Abrahamic religions evil is a riddle that the one wise God carries on His shoulder alone**—this is the

price of monotheism we promised to visit. We proceed on the book's method: we clarify the forms, present the nations' answers as their people make them, and weigh without judging.

* First: The Three Forms—For Whoever Does Not Distinguish Them Argues About Three Questions Thinking Them One

(1) The logical form. That the existence of evil **contradicts** the existence of an all-powerful, all-good God—in an explicit logical contradiction (Epicurus formulated it long ago: either He cannot, or He does not wish). This is **the form that most atheist philosophers themselves today acknowledge has fallen**, after Plantinga's reply: the mere possibility of a sufficient reason for permitting evil (such as freedom) is enough to dissolve the contradiction.

(2) The evidential (probabilistic) form. No contradiction, but **the quantity** of evil and its kind—the suffering that appears to have no purpose (a fawn burning in a forest no one sees; a child dying of cancer)—**makes it more probable** that there is no governor with the claimed attributes. This is the living, heavy form (Rowe, and Draper).

(3) The existential form. Not an argument but a cry: "why me?"—the form of Job and of the bereaved mother—and it is answered not by philosophy but by presence, and we warned in the study on dialogue that the wounded are not besieged with proofs.

And confusing the three is the root of half the debate: the believer answers the existential with a proof and is cruel. The atheist argues from the logical, which has fallen. And the evidential alone is the field of examination.

***Second: The Nations' Answers—House by House**

Judaism—the sacred cry and God's silence. The Book of Job is the deepest thing written on the subject because it **refuses the ready answers**: Job's friends who said "you were afflicted because you sinned" are condemned by God at the end, and Job, who cried out, is vindicated. And then he is answered not with an answer but with a presence: "Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth?" (Job 38:4)—so the book says that wisdom is wider than reason, not that evil is justice. Then came the Holocaust and gave birth to a Jewish theology of protest against God from within faith (Fackenheim and Wiesel: "to protest, not to deny"), and some gave up omnipotence (Kushner, *When Bad Things Happen to Good People*: God shares our suffering and does not prevent it).

Christianity—the Fall and the redemption. Evil entered the world through the Adamic Fall, and humanity inherited its condition (original sin—Augustine; R. C. Sproul of the Reformed school laid it out in this book's sources: creation in God's image, then total corruption), **and the greatest answer is not a theory but an event: God Himself entered suffering on the cross.**

So the God is not far from the wounds but wounded. This is the strongest thing in the Christian house

emotionally and the weakest, for its opponents, logically (why should the Creator need to suffer to forgive?). It has two philosophical counterparts: **the Irenaean theodicy** (second century CE, revived by Hick): the world is "a vale of soul-making"—not created perfect, but so that the human being might become perfect in it through suffering. The theodicy of **freedom** (Augustine, then Plantinga): no moral good without choice, and no real choice without the possibility of evil. **Islam—trial without inheritance, and the hidden wisdom.** The Qur'an parts from the Christian house on two points and shares two with it: **no inherited sin** ("No burdened soul will bear the burden of another"—and Adam repented and was forgiven; al-Shinti in our sources gathered the texts of the two Testaments that deny inheritance, in his polemical genre, so the file of the Fall is complete with both its mirrors), **and God does not suffer**—He tests. It shares **freedom** (the human being is charged and chooses) **and trial**, which is the whole of this world ("to test you [people] and reveal which of you does best")—so evil is an examination, not a punishment and not futility. Suffering is expiation and the raising of rank. **And the wisdom may be hidden** (the story of Khidr: the breaching of the boat and the killing of the boy are an apparent evil with a hidden wisdom—and the same story says that Moses—the prophet—could not bear what he had not been given knowledge of: so the text acknowledges that the answer is sometimes beyond one's capacity). The hereafter is the scale that makes the reckoning deferred, not absent ("He is not to be questioned about what He does"

guards the limits of the question; it does not forbid the question).

India—no problem at all: karma. The only house that **solved the problem by deleting its premises**: no one suffers except by the desert of a prior deed—in this life or the one before.

So no injustice, no futility, and no God to be questioned; **and its price**, which you saw in Appendix F: whence the first ignorance that began the cycle? And why is a child punished for what he does not remember? And how is a justice without memory justice? **And Buddhism** solved it from the other end: suffering is a datum (the first noble truth), not a riddle to be justified, and there is no God to blame, and the only question is: how do we get out of it. **And dualism** (Zoroastrian, Gnostic, and Manichaean) solved the problem with two gods: evil comes from an independent principle of evil—the cleanest of the solutions logically and the costliest theologically (a God who does not own the whole universe—and we weighed it in the study on the One and the many: an objection to the wisdom of the One, not a proof of the existence of the many).

* Third: The Great Philosophical Answers—And the Strongest Against Them

(1) Freedom. Moral evil is the price of real choice—**and the strongest objection:** what of natural evil (earthquakes, children's cancer, and predation for millions of years before the human being)? **And the strongest reply:** fixed, predictable laws are a condition of freedom itself (no choice in a world whose laws

change to prevent every harm), and natural pain is a vital alarm.

(2) Soul-making (Irenaeus / Hick). The virtues (courage, mercy, patience) do not arise in a paradise—**and the objection:** do these virtues need the ovens of Auschwitz? And what of the suffering that crushes and does not educate? **And the reply:** the limits of our grasp of what educates and when.

(3) The hidden wisdom ("skeptical theism" in the philosophy of religion). Our inability to see a purpose for some evil does not mean there is no purpose—we are like a child who screams at an injection from a merciful physician. **And the strongest objection in the whole subject:** if every evil is capable of a hidden purpose, then the claim has become unexaminable. And if God leaves suffering for purposes we do not know, why do we prevent it? **And the reply:** our moral duty is independent of God's wisdom, and the absence of empirical examination does not invalidate an answer in a question beyond the empirical to begin with.

(4) The hereafter as the scale. Every suffering is compensated, and every injustice requited—and by it the objection turns into a proof, as you saw in "the argument from the thirst for justice" (Chapter 24): evil without a hereafter is absolute futility. **And the objection:** compensation does not justify the infliction (whoever beats a child and then gives him candy has not become just). **And the reply:** not compensation alone but a meaning disclosed—and here the debate stops at the limits of the unseen.

* Fourth: The Critique of "God Is Love, Absolutely"—And the Analogy of the Actor and the Covenant

Mustafa Mahmoud—in his journey from doubt—paused over a common saying thrown out as if it were a solution: "God is love". And he criticized it in a critique that deserves presentation as **a religious conception, not a shared premise**: that reducing God to love produces the problem instead of solving it. For true love entails discipline (the loving father treats his son with what hurts him), and justice entails that the wrongdoer and the wronged not be equal. Hence punishment—indeed Hell, for him—is **the requirement of justice** for whoever escaped every earthly reckoning (like the tyrant who died in his bed), so God is justice, wisdom, majesty, and mercy together, and whoever takes one attribute has made a god who does not explain the world. **And the counter-objection is present and must be present:** proportion—how does a finite sin deserve an infinite punishment?—an ancient objection that believers have answered in many ways (the eternity of the intention, not the act; that eternity is a consequence, not a measured punishment; and the position of a group of Muslim and Christian scholars on the passing away of Hell, or universal salvation)—and the door is open within the houses.

Then Mustafa Mahmoud answers the deeper question—"why was I created without being asked? and why does He hold me to account for a role I did not choose?"—**with the analogy of the actor and the covenant**: an actor who lost the memory of his contract with the director stood on the stage protesting the role

"imposed" on him—he who had signed it with his own hand. So the human being—in this conception—had a covenant taken from him by his Lord before birth ("Am I not your Lord?" they replied, "Yes, we bear witness") and was then made to forget it so that the test might be a test. It is an eloquent answer **presented as a religious conception built on the doctrine of the covenant,** not as a proof binding on whoever does not accept the covenant: the critic asks: what justice is there in a contract that one of its parties does not remember? The believer answers: that is the condition of the test, not a flaw in it. You will see in the table that every answer in this chapter carries a pair like this: a strength within its system and a gap for whoever stands outside it.

* Fifth: A Sample of the Popular Question—"Why Did He Create Us Knowing Our Fate?"

So that the chapter does not remain in philosophy alone, we present the form of the question as it is actually asked in the popular literature of fatwas: "If God knows I will enter Hell, why did He create me?." Its circulating answer: that knowledge does not compel (His knowledge of what you will choose does not force you to it—as a teacher knows which of his students will fail, and his knowledge does not fail them). That creation is for the test, not for the result. And that whoever enters Hell enters it by his deed, not by God's knowledge. **And the analysis of the form is more useful than its answer:** it gathers in one sentence two questions that the study on fate separated (prior knowledge ≠ compulsion) and a third (eternal punishment). So the popular

question is often three questions pressed together, and its popular answer answers one of them and thinks it has answered all. And the seeker's skill—from Chapter 4—is to take the bundle apart before accepting the answer or rejecting it. **And the titles of Mustafa Mahmoud's own chapters** ("Why did God create evil?", "If God decreed my deeds, why does He hold me to account?") are a clue that these forms are the ones that usually reach people—not the forms of Rowe and Draper.

* Sixth: The Two Neighboring Doors—Poor Design and Divine Hiddenness

The problem has two twins in evidence. **The objection from poor design** (Chapter 18): if the universe is designed, why the eye with its blind spot, the appendix, and dead planets by the trillion?—it is the problem of evil in the language of engineering, and its answer is the same: the limits of our knowledge of purpose, and our standards of perfection are not the Creator's standard. **And the objection from divine hiddenness** (the conclusion of Chapter 18): why does a God who wants to be known not appear?—it is the problem of evil in the form of **the evil of absence**: is leaving the sincere in perplexity not a suffering? Its answer is the answer of trial: an overwhelming appearance cancels choice. **And the three chapters (18, 20, 24) are one house with several doors:** the evidence asks "does He exist?", evil asks "how can He exist while this happens?", and the hereafter answers "because the reckoning is not yet closed"—and whoever reads one door without its two siblings comes out with half the answer.

The Scale on the Ladder — And the Chapter's Question

The claim (the evidential—the strongest form of the objection): "The quantity of futile suffering makes it more probable that there is no merciful, powerful governor." **The strongest case:** the enormous natural evil before the human being and after him, with no apparent purpose. **The strongest objection:** the limits of our grasp of purposes, freedom, soul-making, and the hereafter—together a braided rope, not a strand. **The strongest reply:** if every evil admits of a hidden explanation, the religious claim cannot be examined, and mercy is emptied of its meaning.

What is established: that the logical form is abandoned by most philosophers. That the evidential is alive and heavy and no answer removes its weight; that every religious house paid a price—inheritance here, hidden wisdom there, a first ignorance in India, and a deficient god in dualism. That the emotional answer (a God who suffers / a God who tests and compensates / no God to blame) has a deeper effect on people than the logical answer.

What is not established: that evil invalidates God; nor that the answers remove the question. **And the truth that closes the chapter with its double scale:** evil is a double-edged argument in history—it grew atheism in those who found no answer, **and it grew the deepest faith in those who faced it:** Job believed after the cry, not before it. Dostoevsky wrote the strongest argument against God in history (Ivan Karamazov: "I most

respectfully return Him the ticket") and then wrote the deepest answer to it in the same book through the life of Father Zosima, not through his argument. The survivors of the camps divided: some lost faith, and some found nothing else.

And the Seeker's Question—which this chapter hands to the chapter on Satan and then to the chapter on death: **if evil itself has led people in both directions. Then it is not evil that decides, but what you bring to it: do you bring to it the question "why?" and await an answer, or the question "what now?" and await yourself?**—both questions are legitimate, and the difference between them is the difference between a philosophy of pain and a life with it.

> ***Cross-references for the chapter:*** *fate and the formulas of reconciliation in the introductory study (immediately preceding); poor design and divine hiddenness in Chapter 18 and its conclusion; and the One and the many, and dualism, in the study of Chapter 9.*

Chapter 21: Satan and the Powers of Evil — The Dark Mirror

Its concept across religions and civilizations: its meanings, its origin, and the lines of its development (an expanded study attached to Chapter 10)

Summary of the chapter: Every great religion has a cosmic adversary—but he is not the same figure everywhere. A dark mirror traces how each tradition pictured its eternal enemy: from a functionary in the heavenly court among the earliest Jews, to a fully cosmic enemy in Christianity, to an Iblis bound by the constraints of strict monotheism in Islam.

---

* Opening: Every Heaven Has Its Shadow

In the previous chapter we traced how human beings conceived the highest light; this chapter turns the mirror around: how did they conceive the darkness?

Seldom does a civilization draw its God without drawing—in the margin or in confrontation—another face: a serpent stalking the sun, a fallen angel, a spirit that snatches infants, or a whisper in the breast. It is as if human beings could not bear to leave the question "whence does harm come to me?" without a face and an address, just as they could not bear to leave the question "whence did I come?" without an answer.

But beware the first trap: the word "Satan"—like the word "God" in the previous chapter—translates

conceptions so radically different that some of them are almost the opposite of others. The Satan of Job is an official at God's court. The Ahriman of the Persians is an independent counter-creator. The Mara of Buddhism is your own desire embodied. And the African Eshu is a cunning messenger wronged by the translators. So let us begin with the keys before the tour.

* The Six Keys for Analyzing Any Conception of a Power of Evil

1. A person, a principle, or chaos?—A conscious enemy with a will and a plan (Iblis), or an impersonal cosmic principle (darkness, ignorance, bad karma), or mere chaos and disorder without intent (Tiamat, Apophis)?

2. Independent of God, or created by Him?—The most consequential of the keys: an eternal power rivaling God (dualism), or a rebellious creature inside God's kingdom who moves only by His permission (monotheism)? On this question all the theologies are ranked.

3. God's enemy, or His employee?—An adversary who wars against heaven, or an instrument in its hand: a tester, a public prosecutor, an executioner of justice?

4. External, or internal?—A being who whispers from outside you, or a tendency within you: a soul that commands to evil, an ignorance, a psychological shadow?

5. What is its fate?—Inevitably defeated in the epic of the end, or repelled forever without resolution (managed, never uprooted), or without a fate because it is not "anyone" at all?

6. What is its weapon against the human being?— Bodily harm (illness, death, abduction), or moral seduction (whispering and adornment), or cognitive veiling (illusion and heedlessness)?

You will notice in the tour that the civilizations distribute themselves across these keys in a way that almost draws the map of their souls.

---

* The First Movement: The Grand Tour— What Did They Mean by the Powers of Evil?

1. the First Religions: Evil Distributed, Without a Center

In the oldest layers—as among the indigenous peoples of Africa, Siberia, Australia, and the Americas—you find no single great "Satan". You find **a forest of small spiritual dangers**: harmful spirits inhabiting places, angry dead improperly buried, an envious eye, and magic sent by a spiteful neighbor. Evil here is **an event with a near agent**, uncovered by divination and repelled by rite and amulet—not a cosmic principle to be fought.

In this layer appears a unique figure that will accompany us: **the trickster**—the Raven among the peoples of the North, Coyote among the nations of the plains, and Anansi the spider in West Africa: a cunning, mischievous being who steals and deceives and breaks the rules . . . and then from his mischief comes fire for human beings, or the sun for the sky. **Good and evil in one skin**—as if these peoples refused to split existence in two, and kept the ambiguity at the heart of the sacred

itself. Keep this in mind; the decisive split is coming from Iran.

2. Mesopotamia: The Demons of Disease . . . and Evil Driving out Evil

In Sumer and Babylon the night is crowded: **Lamashtu**, daughter of Anu, with the head of a lioness, steals in upon pregnant women and snatches infants—the embodiment of the child mortality that reaped the houses of the ancients. The *udug* spirits and "the Seven Evil Ones" bring fever and headache. *Lilitu*, the wind-demoness (whom the Jewish tradition would later inherit as Lilith). And the defense? Not repentance nor virtue but **talisman, incantation, and guardian statue**—and among the strangest things, the Babylonian would hang on a pregnant woman's chest the image of **Pazuzu**, the very king of the wind-demons, hideous and winged—because Lamashtu fears him: **evil is hired to drive out evil.** So the whole Mesopotamian scene says: the powers of harm are part of the administration of the cosmos, not a revolt against it—even the mother-chaos **Tiamat**, whom Marduk split and from whose corpse he built heaven and earth, is not a moral "she-devil" but the primal disorder on whose subjugation order was founded. And which must be subjugated again symbolically every year at the New Year festival.

3. Egypt: Apophis—The Evil That Does Not Die but Is Repelled Every Night

The purest embodiment of evil in Egypt is not a god but **the antithesis of existence**: the enormous serpent **Apophis (Apep)**, the being of chaos who lurks beneath the horizon to swallow the boat of the sun on its nightly journey. Every night the battle is fought, and every dawn is a victory—**a temporary one.** For Apophis is never finally killed. He is cut up and burned in rites and curses, and then he returns tomorrow. Here is a complete philosophy: **evil is not an enemy defeated once, but the constant pressure of nothingness on the wall of existence, and order (Maat) is daily maintenance, not final victory**—which is why rites, kingship, and morality were all a cosmic "maintenance service."

Beside him stands the more complex case: **Seth**—the killer of Osiris and usurper of the throne, god of storm, desert, and disturbance . . . **who nonetheless stands at the prow of Ra's boat, spearing Apophis every night!** The necessary villain; the rough force that order needs against what is worse than it. Then see what history did with him: when foreign invaders occupied Egypt (the Hyksos and others after them) and adopted Seth, **the Egyptians gradually demonized him** until in the late periods he became the cursed god of the enemies, his statues smashed. Record this lesson, for it will recur: **demonization follows politics—your enemy's god is a standing candidate for the post of your devil.**

* 4. Iran: The Birth of the Complete Satan—The Great Turning

All that preceded was dangers, chaos, and ambiguity. In Iran occurred the decisive split in the history of the

idea: Zoroaster came and divided existence by a strict moral division: facing the wise, good Ahura Mazda stands **Angra Mainyu** ("the Evil Spirit," later Ahriman). For the first time we see the complete bundle that would define "Satan" ever after: **a conscious cosmic will, evil in essence** (not blind chaos). **A counter-creator** (meeting every good creation with corruption: Ahura Mazda created life, and he created death; health, and he created disease; light, and he created darkness—even the harmful insects and the bitter winter are his work); **the commander of an army** of *daevas*. **A party to a cosmic war** in which the human being is a soldier by his thought, word, and deed. **And inevitably defeated** in the final renovation, when the molten metal floods and the earth is purified.

Here the model was completed—at a heavy theological price we discussed in the chapter on God: the purity of God was bought by splitting divinity in two. The later Persians (the Zurvanites) even tried to repair the unity by making eternal Time, "Zurvan," the father of both twins—and thereby restated the dilemma instead of solving it: whence did evil come to one of the twins?

And a linguistic observation that sums up a history: the word that means "the gods" in India (*deva*) is the very name of "the demons" in Iran, and vice versa (the Indian *asura*, condemned, ↔ the Iranian *ahura*, sacred). Two nations of one origin split, **and the gods of each side became the demons of the other**—the oldest witness engraved in language itself to the law of mutual demonization.

* 5. India and Buddhism: Satan Dissolves into the Interior

In India you will not find "Iblis." The *asuras* fight the *devas* in the myths, but it is a struggle of races and powers, not a camp of pure evil—indeed among the *asuras* are worshipers and ascetics, and among the *devas* the arrogant. The greatest "villains" of the epics are more complex than demonization: **Ravana**, the abductor of Sita in the Ramayana, is a great scholar and worshiper of tremendous austerity, corrupted by power and lust—evil here is **the deviation of greatness**, not the essence of darkness. Time itself declines (we are in the "Kali Yuga," the fourth age of darkness), so corruption is a cosmic phase, not a person's plot.

So where is real evil for India? **Within**: *avidya*—ignorance of the reality of the self—is the root of the fetters, and karma is a law that returns your deed to you without a mediating devil or an external judge.

Buddhism took this direction to its limit in the figure of **Mara**—the "devil" of the Buddha, who tried to turn him from enlightenment on the night of the tree: he sent his armies and their arrows became flowers. He sent his daughters (desire, discontent, and lust) and not a hair moved on the one seated. And who is Mara? The tradition itself answers with astonishing transparency: he is the embodiment of **desire, death, and illusion**—that is, the powers of your own self. That is why Mara is fought not with a sword or an incantation but **with attention**: whenever the tempter drew near, the Buddha would say calmly, "I see you, Mara"—and he would

withdraw. Perhaps the deepest line in the whole file: **evil that is seen and named is exposed and powerless; all its power lies in disguise.**

* 6. China and Japan: Evil as Disorder and Impurity, Not a Cosmic Enemy

Chinese civilization—reserved about personification, as we saw in the chapter on God—produced no cosmic Satan: evils come from the *gui* (the hungry, neglected spirits of the dead—human beings' failure in their duty to the ancestors makes their own tormentors!), from the imbalance of yin and yang, from deviation from the Tao, and from a ruler's loss of "the Mandate of Heaven." Even **Yanluo, the king of hell**, is no rebel against Heaven but **a judicial official in a cosmic bureaucracy** who runs the courts of the dead with ledgers and registers—the Chinese hell is a government department, not the kingdom of an enemy.

Shinto Japan sees evil as **impurity (*kegare*), not sin**: a pollution that clings to a person from death, blood, and harm, and is washed away by rite and water (*harai*). The spirits of harm (the *oni*, and the *magatsuhi* spirits) are expelled and appeased. The most famous "troublemaker" of heaven, Susanoo—the stormy brother of the sun goddess who wrecked her fields so that she fled to the cave and the world went dark—

was punished and exiled . . . and then became on earth the slayer of the dragon and a hero: once more, ambiguity instead of splitting, and purification instead of cosmic war.

* 7. Judaism: From Court Official to Enemy—A Story of Development Within a Single Text

Here is the subtlest of the chapter's files, and the most astonishing to the modern reader, because the development takes place before your eyes between the covers of one book:

In the oldest layers, **"the satan"** (in Hebrew: the adversary, the opponent) is **a function, not a proper name**: in the Book of Job "the satan" enters **with the sons of God** at the heavenly court, argues with God about Job's sincerity, and God permits him to test him within drawn limits—he is more like a public prosecutor or a testing officer in God's kingdom, **not God's enemy.** The serpent of the garden of Eden in the Book of Genesis itself is called in the text neither Satan nor a fallen angel—only "more crafty than any other wild animal". The link between it and Satan is an interpretation centuries later.

Then came **the Babylonian exile and Persian rule**—two centuries under the sky of Zoroastrian dualism—and after them the tone changes: the figure of the adversary swells in the literature between the Testaments: the First Book of Enoch tells of the fall of the angels, "the Watchers," who lusted after the daughters of men and taught them magic and weapons. The Qumran scrolls divide humanity into two armies: the sons of light led by God and the sons of darkness led by **Belial**—a duality almost Persian in accent. A broad segment of scholars favors the influence of Iranian contact in this swelling (and the traditionalists refer the

development to the gradualness of revelation and its disclosure)—and you are used, from our book, to the presentation of both readings.

The third surprise: later rabbinic Judaism—which became the Judaism of history—**went back and shrank Satan**: it brought forward in his place *"yetzer hara"* (the evil inclination), the inner instinct that is fought with the Torah, so that its sages even said that without that very inclination no man would build a house or marry—the raw energy to be tamed, not the enemy to be fought. So Judaism tried all three positions: the official, then the enemy, then the inner inclination.

* 8. Christianity: Satan at the Height of His Glory . . . Literary Glory Too

Christianity inherited the swollen Satan of the intertestamental period and raised him to the summit: **the Devil / Satan** in the New Testament is a central, present figure: he tempts Christ in the wilderness with three temptations (and offers him the kingdoms of the earth, which are his to offer!). He is called "the ruler of this world" and "the god of this age"; he enters the heart of Judas. In the Revelation of John he fights the last war of the dragon and ends in the lake of fire. Satan came to have **a role at the heart of the doctrine itself**: the cross—in major theological interpretations—is a battle of redemption by which the Devil's authority over the fallen race was broken. His complete biography was then assembled by later theological composition: the lament for "Helel son of the dawn," fallen from heaven (Isaiah 14—whose original context is the king of

Babylon), and the lament for the cherub expelled from Eden (Ezekiel 28—whose context is the king of Tyre) were read as the biography of Lucifer: the most beautiful of the angels, whom pride brought down before the creation of Adam. And so the story known to the whole West was completed . . . **and half its details come from interpretation and accretion, not from the explicit text**—another lesson in the layers of texts.

Then the Middle Ages wrote their dark chapter: Satan swelled in the popular imagination until he stood behind every calamity, and the jurisprudence of his pursuit flourished. Hence the witch trials and their tragedies, whose price tens of thousands of lives paid (most of them women): **when Satan swells in minds, innocent human beings pay the bill**—a rule we will need in the conclusion. On the other side, literature made its most dangerous transformations: Milton in *Paradise Lost* gave Lucifer a captivating eloquence and pride ("Better to reign in Hell, than serve in Heaven") that so enchanted the Romantics after him that they read him as the hero of noble rebellion—**Satan enters the age of attraction**. Dostoevsky turned it into biting irony: the devil of Ivan Karamazov is no mighty angel but a shabbily dressed, philosophizing parasite—evil is banal and trivial, not majestic.

* 9. Islam: Iblis the Owned—Monotheism Disciplines Satan

The Qur'an came with a strict disciplining of this whole inheritance on the rule of monotheism: **Iblis** is not a fallen angel but **one of the jinn** ("He was one of the jinn

and he disobeyed his Lord's command"), created from fire, who refused to prostrate to Adam **out of pride and a corrupt analogy** ("I am better than him: You created me from fire and him from clay"). So the first sin in existence was **pride and essentialist racism**, not lust. Then the most striking things in the Qur'anic construction are three touches:

The first: the enemy under license. Iblis himself asks for respite ("Give me respite until the Day people are raised from the dead") and God grants it, and he announces his project ("I will lie in wait for them all on Your straight path"). So the whole battle runs **inside God's kingdom, by His permission and His wisdom**, not a war of two rivals: the furthest antithesis of Persian dualism.

The second: his only weapon is whispering. He has no power of coercion whatever, and the decisive text is on his own tongue on the Day of Judgment: "I had no power over you except to call you, and you responded to my call; **so do not blame me; blame yourselves**"—the most eloquent disavowal in the history of religious literature, returning responsibility wholly to the human being: Satan is a preacher of evil, not a coercer.

Among the most mature dissections of this whispering in the heritage is what Ibn al-Qayyim did in *Relief for the Distressed from the Snares of Satan*—whose very title is its method: Satan, for him, is the owner of "snares" tailored to the gaps of hearts: he enters upon the worshiper through the door of excess and severity as he enters upon the heedless through the door of lust, and he

lures by excess whomever he failed to lure by neglect. So whispering is an individually measured craft, not a single call. In *The Benefits* he detailed the ladder of the rise of sin in the soul with a precision that recalls the Buddhist watching of thoughts that has passed before you: **a passing thought**, if not repelled, becomes **an idea**. An idea becomes **a desire**. A desire becomes **a resolve**; a resolve becomes **an act**. An act repeats until it becomes **a habit** hard to leave—so he referred the whole battle to its first door: repelling the passing thought at the hour it knocks, before it owns the house—which is the very shared counsel you will meet in the chapter's conclusion.

The third: the world of the jinn is not a camp of evil—for among them are righteous believers ("Some of us are righteous and others less so"), and evil is a choice, not a species. Islam adds the inner front openly: "the soul that commands to evil" is the partner of the whisperer—so it joined the outside and the inside together.

(And on the astonishing margin: some Sufis—al-Hallaj and then Ahmad al-Ghazali—strayed into a shocking reading of Iblis: a monotheist lover who refused to prostrate to any but his beloved, and so burned by the decree of fate! A reading most the community rejected categorically, which we mention as a witness that even the darkest figure has attracted attempts at "reinterpretation"—the human mind never stops turning its symbols over.)

* 10. Africa and the Americas: When Translation Made Devils

The two sections that remained incomplete in our first draft—and in them lie the chapter's two most valuable lessons:

Africa. The indigenous African religions—in their immense variety—know no cosmic Satan. Evil comes from **magic** (the most dangerous social accusation on the continent, with its victims to this day), from harmful spirits, and from **the disorder of relationships**: with neglected ancestors, and with wronged neighbors. So evil is a tear in the fabric of the community, diagnosed by the diviner and mended by rite and reconciliation. Then the conceptual crime occurred: when the missionaries translated the Bible into the languages of the continent, they needed a word for "Satan," so they seized ambiguous local figures—the most famous being **Eshu / Elegba** among the Yoruba: **the messenger** of the *orisha*, cunning, the guardian of crossroads, the lord of chance and probability, the sacred trickster who tests and teaches. In the translated Gospels he became "Satan," and the descendants of his worshipers inherited the name of their god as an insult.

Translation makes devils: whoever has no devil in his system had one made for him out of his dearest symbols—the chapter's gravest example of the demonization of the other.

The Americas. Among the nations of the North the **trickster** (Coyote and Raven) stands at the front with

his familiar ambiguity, and with him an evil of a deep psychological type: **the Wendigo**—the spirit of hunger in the long winter forests, a giant of ice whose heart is snow, **who grows hungrier and larger the more he eats**: the embodiment of cannibalism in famines, which in the modern reading became the symbol of **the greed that is never satisfied**—evil as a bottomless appetite. In Aztec Mexico stands **Tezcatlipoca**, "the Smoking Mirror"—god of night, fate, and magic, the adversary of Quetzalcoatl and his overthrower—but he is not "Satan". He is the pole of mystery and power in a cosmic duality, worshiped and feared together. Then the Spanish conquerors came and read all the continent's gods as devils, and demolished the temples on that interpretation—the colonial chapter of the law of demonization.

* 11. Modernity: Satan Takes off His Horns and Puts on Our Masks

And what did the modern age do with the figure? Three movements:

It secularized him as a symbol: Faust and Mephistopheles (the devil as a sardonic intellectual buying souls with knowledge and youth), the Lucifer of the Romantics as the hero of rebellion, and even declared contemporary "Satanism" (LaVey and his like), which is in truth **a theatrical atheism** that raises the symbol as a provocation, not the worship of a person one believes in.

It internalized him as science: psychology returned Satan to the interior that India had spoken of long ago—**"the shadow"** in Jung: everything we hate in

ourselves, which we repress and then **project onto others**. Hannah Arendt came from the Eichmann trial with the heaviest phrase of the century: **"the banality of evil"**—the most atrocious crimes were committed not by a horned monster but by an ordinary, obedient official who did not think. Modern evil is bureaucratic and gray, with no brimstone and no smell.

And it re-employed him politically: the discourse of "the Great Satan," "the axis of evil," and "the agents of Iblis" in the literature of every camp—political demonization is the age's best-selling commodity, working at full capacity in a time that claims to have outgrown myth.

---

* The Second Movement: How Did the Concept Arise? —Four Tributaries

1. The embodiment of dangers. Disease, darkness, the predator, and the death of infants—pains with no visible agent. And the mind that you learned in the chapter on *fitra* is a hyperactive "detector of agents" cannot bear a harm without an intender—so it lodged faces in the darkness. Lamashtu is child mortality, and the Wendigo is the winter famine: **the first map of demons is the map of their makers' fears.**

2. The demonization of the other. The gods of enemies are the greatest factory of devils—*deva* / *asura* between Iran and India, the Seth of the Hyksos, the Baal of the Canaanites who became "Beelzebub" (lord of the flies), the prince of demons in the New Testament, the translated Eshu, and the demolished gods of the Aztecs.

Seldom was a devil born who had not been the god of a defeated or rival people.

3. The theological solution to the problem of evil. The higher God rose in purity and power, the sharper the need for an "accused" to carry the file of evils on His behalf—so Satan is **a theological function**: a lightning rod protecting the throne of divine justice from the questions of pain. That is why—notice—Satan was completed only in the purest monotheisms, and was almost absent where the gods themselves were ambiguous and carried their evil in their own hands. (And the coming chapter on the problem of evil will tell you that this rod postpones the question and does not solve it: who created Satan and permitted him?)

4. Psychological projection. Jung's shadow—what we cannot admit in ourselves we cast outside ourselves as a person we fight; and groups do what individuals do. This tributary explains **the heat** of the relationship with Satan: in him we are hunting ourselves.

As in the chapter on God: every tributary has its pocket of the map, and the two final readings are deferred to the conclusion.

* The Third Movement: The Great Lines of Development

The first line—from distributed chaos to the centralized enemy. Scattered spirits of harm (Mesopotamia) → great poles of ambiguity (Seth, the trickster) → the cosmic evil will (Ahriman) → the rebellious angel / jinni inside God's kingdom (Iblis). Notice the law that governs the line: **the centralization of evil is the**

shadow of the centralization of God—the more light was unified in a single person, the more darkness condensed in a single adversary. So the complete Satan is the child of monotheism, not of paganism, since the paganisms distributed evil among their own gods and had no need of him.

The second line—from natural harm to moral seduction. The demons of the first layers sicken, kill, and abduct; the demons after the Axial Age whisper, seduce, and mislead—the theater of battle moved from the body to the heart when the center of religion itself moved from power to morality (the line we tracked in the chapter on God—the shadow follows its owner).

The third line—the rise and fall of his authority. A court official (Job) → a cosmic enemy at the height of his sway (medieval Christianity: behind every calamity and every witch-burning) → a rationalist shrinking (rabbinic Judaism in antiquity, and the Enlightenment in modernity: Satan is a superstition) → **a return in masks**: as a literary symbol, a psychological shadow, and political demonization. The figure is driven out of the door and returns through the window.

The fourth line—the dance of outside and inside. The path of the religious West: an external enemy to be fought. The road of the East: an inner ignorance and desire to be enlightened ("I see you, Mara"); the road of Islam: the combination (a whisperer outside + a soul that commands to evil). Then psychological modernity came and voted for the East: the last Satan lives inside us. Every position has its price: the purely external tempts one to acquit oneself and demonize human

beings, and the purely internal may rob evil of its cosmic seriousness—and perhaps the most mature formulas are those that held both ends.

The fifth line—the one datum and the two readings. The development of the image of Satan across history is a fact neither camp disputes—so what does it mean?

The critic's reading: the biography of Satan is the exposure of his manufacture—he was born of our fears, we named him with the names of our enemies, we employed him as an advocate for the justice of a God bewildered before pain, we swelled him and burned the innocent with him, and then psychology exposed him as our shadow: **the history of Satan is the most reliable record of what human beings hate, fear, and repress.**

And the believer's reading: rather, behind the rubble lies a spiritual reality of which revelation informed us and which the nations groped after with their deficient vessels—as they groped after God Himself; the universality of the sense of a power hostile to the good is a clue for it, not against it (is this not the very logic of *fitra* that passed before you?). Human exaggerations and distortions—from the witch-burnings to the demonization of opponents—are deviations from the origin against which the sound text itself testifies: the Satan of the Qur'an has no power but to call, and your human opponents are not he.

Conclusion: The Shared Counsel

Perhaps the most valuable thing the seeker takes away is that the two readings—for all their theoretical incompatibility—meet in a single practical counsel, framed by the two sides of the twentieth century from their two trenches:

The believers said in warning—in a phrase that spread until it became a proverb—: the greatest trick of the Devil is to persuade you that he does not exist. Solzhenitsyn—emerging from the hell of the camps—said his immortal words: the line dividing good and evil does not run between states, or classes, or parties—but **through the heart of every human being.**

So whether or not darkness has a personal prince, human experience has nearly agreed—from "I see you, Mara" to "do not blame me; blame yourselves" to "the banality of evil"—on the two truths that are worth the price of this long tour:

that evil is real and serious and not to be taken lightly. And that its first field is your own heart—**and that its most dangerous moment of all is the moment you see it dwelling in another's face alone.**

Through this very gate—the gate of the seriousness of evil—we enter the next chapter into the heaviest of the questions of existence for faith: if God is good and able . . . why all this suffering?

Study 21.1: The Iblis of the Qur'an— Does He Have a Presence in Other Religions and Civilizations?

A supplementary study to the chapter on Satan: tracing the name, the story, and the elements

Summary of the study: Is the devil you know a purely Islamic figure, or an echo of something older and wider? This study traces the Qur'an's Iblis specifically, then asks: where are his counterparts, and where does he differ from them, across the religions and civilizations that knew a comparable cosmic adversary?

---

* Clarifying the Question First

When we ask "does Iblis appear among others?" we are really asking four distinct questions, each with a different answer:

1. **The name:** does the word "Iblis" itself have an existence or an origin outside Arabic?
2. **The story:** his specific Qur'anic story—the command to prostrate to Adam, the refusal, the argument from fire and clay, the expulsion, and the request for respite—does it have counterparts or ancestors among the nations?
3. **The function:** the role he plays (the whispering, respited enemy of the human being)—which we answered in the previous chapter with its full tour, and here we will confine ourselves to reference and summary.

4. **The figure after the Qur'an:** what did the cultures do with Iblis after the Qur'an presented him?

Let us walk through them one by one.

---

* First: The Name—"Iblis" Between Two Etymologies

On the origin of the name there are two positions that run through the books of language and the studies to this day:

The traditional Arabic position: Iblis is from *ablasa*, meaning he despaired and his argument was cut off. So he is "the one made to despair" (*mublas*) of God's mercy. This is the position of most of the ancient philologists, supported by the fact that the Qur'an itself uses the root: "they are plunged into despair," "the guilty will despair."

And the prevailing position in modern studies: that the name is Arabized from the Greek **"diabolos"**—meaning the slanderer, the accuser, whoever hurls the charge—through the intermediaries of Aramaic / Syriac, which was the language of the Christians of the East just before Islam, with the dropping of the first syllable (dia-bolos → bolos / blis → Iblis). The strong witness for this position is that "diabolos" itself was no neutral Greek word but **the official translation** chosen by the translators of the Torah into Greek (the Septuagint, third century BCE) for the Hebrew word **"satan"**—and from it came all the derivatives of the West (Devil, Diable, Diavolo, Teufel).

If this etymology is sound, then before us lies an astonishing chain of linguistic transmission that sums up the whole previous chapter in a single word: **Hebrew *satan* → Greek *diabolos* → Syriac → Arabic *Iblis***—the name itself traveled across the nations as the idea traveled. (As for "*shaytan*," it comes from a shared Semitic root older than all of this—*sh-t-n / s-t-n*, in the sense of distance or enmity—known to Arabic and Hebrew alike, and used in pre-Islamic poetry before Islam.) And for many careful scholars there is no practical conflict between the two paths: the origin may be Arabized, and then the Arabs sensed in it their own root *ablasa*, so that word and meaning fused in a beautiful fusion—one who despairs, whose name is despair.

* Second: The Story—The Ancestors and Counterparts of the Prostration Scene

Here is the center of the question and its most precious answer. The specific Qur'anic story of Iblis—a highest assembly commanded to prostrate to Adam, one who refuses in pride, arguing from the nobility of his origin, and is expelled and threatens the human being—**has a documented presence in Jewish-Christian literature earlier than the Qur'an**, most famously in two texts:

The first text: *The Life of Adam and Eve*—an apocryphal book (that is, outside the canonical books), probably Jewish in origin with Christian recensions, whose Greek and Latin versions date to between the first and fourth centuries CE. In it Satan tells Adam the reason for his enmity: when you were created in the image of God,

Michael came with the angels and said: prostrate to the image of God. Michael prostrated and called me, and I said: **Why should I prostrate to him? I was created before him, and he is beneath me in rank—rather it is he who ought to prostrate to me.** And when I refused, and my angels refused with me, God grew angry and expelled us from our glory to the earth. So on your account we were deprived, and that is why I schemed against your wife until you were driven out as I was driven out.

The second text: The Cave of Treasures—a Syriac Christian work (traditionally attributed to Ephrem, though it is later than him; usually dated to about the sixth century CE, and its homeland is the very milieu of the Christians of the East bordering the cradle of Islam). In it the scene is clearer and closer: when Adam was created and the angels prostrated to him, Satanael (the chief of one of the orders) refused and said, in substance: **It is he who ought to prostrate to me. I am fire and spirit—shall I prostrate to dust kneaded from clay?.** So the chieftainship was stripped from him and he and his host were expelled, and from that day he set his enmity against Adam and his offspring.

So here—before the Qur'an—the three great elements are gathered: **the command to prostrate to Adam, the refusal out of pride, and the argument from the superiority of substance (fire over clay).** How do we read this convergence? On our book's method, with both readings, and honestly:

The reading of academic criticism: the Qur'an addressed an environment in which these stories were widespread and current (among the Jews of the Peninsula and the Christians of Syria, al-Hira, and Najran), and it contains what reflects that shared narrative inheritance—as it contains the Companions of the Cave and Dhu l-Qarnayn, known to the environment. In their view the Qur'an refined the story and unified its threads.

And Islam's reading of itself: the Qur'an never claims to bring stories that were never heard. It declares its function as "confirming the Scriptures that came before it, and with final authority over them." So the story, for it, is **a single real event** that the first revelation reported and the nations passed on in vessels into which entered the sound and the distorted, and then the Qur'an came and separated its sound part from its intrusions. Indeed, Muslims see the precise Qur'anic corrections as a witness to this: the earlier texts made the refuser **an angel**—and so opened upon their theology the dilemma of the disobedience of infallible angels—and the Qur'an settled it at a stroke: "He was **one of the jinn** and he disobeyed his Lord's command." The earlier texts made the prostration "to the image of God" in Adam—with all the difficulty of anthropomorphism that carries—and the Qur'an made it a prostration of greeting and honor by God's command, not worship.

It is not the task of this study to adjudicate between the two readings—that is entrusted to your scale, armed with the chapters on evidence and texts. But it is its task that you know that the textual datum itself (the

existence of the story's ancestors) is disputed by neither camp, and that its significance is the battle: **human intertextuality, or revelation's confirmation of a single ancient report?**—which is precisely the structure of all the battles of this book.

* Third: The Elements of Iblis Scattered Through the Heritage of the Nations

If we take the figure of Iblis apart into his elements, we find for almost every element a kinship in some nation—and we find the complete combination to be Qur'anic in its formulation:

The Qur'anic element	The nearest counterparts and ancestors
The one fallen from the highest assembly through pride	The Christian Lucifer (assembled from Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28, as we detailed), and the fallen ones of the Book of Enoch
The respited enemy working by God's permission	The satan of Job (who tests under license), and the angel "Mastema" in the apocryphal Book of Jubilees—who **asks God** to keep a band of spirits under his command so as to test human beings by them, and is granted it! (the nearest precedent for the scene of "give me respite")
The whisperer who has no power but to call	"*Yetzer hara*" (the evil inclination) among the rabbis, and the Buddhist Mara, who withdraws when exposed

The Qur'anic element	The nearest counterparts and ancestors
The one who argues from the nobility of his element (fire over clay)	Satanael in *The Cave of Treasures* ("I am fire and spirit")—and before them the root of the idea in every racism of beings
The one joined to the serpent and the first seduction	The later Jewish tradition made **Samael** (the chief of the accusing angels) the rider of the serpent in Eden—while the serpent in the text of Genesis itself remained a serpent with no Satan
The head of a host of devils and a tribe	Belial and his hosts at Qumran, and Ahriman and his *daevas*
The one who disavows his followers on the Day of Judgment	This element—the speech of Iblis at the Gathering: "so do not blame me; blame yourselves"—**is almost purely Qur'anic**; we know no complete counterpart to it before

So the precise answer to the chapter's question: **yes and no together**—the elements of Iblis are scattered through the heritage of the region and the world, and his composite figure as the Qur'an drew it (a jinni, not an angel; a former worshiper brought down by pride; a licensed enemy of limited weapon; an orator of disavowal on the Day of Reckoning; inside a monotheism that grants him not an atom of sovereignty) is a unique formulation found in its completeness in no one before it.

* Fourth: And What Did the Cultures Do with Iblis After the Qur'an?

The figure did not stop at the borders of the scripture; he went out into the cultures and lived new lives—some among the strangest chapters of the book:

1. The Iblis of the Sufis—the great ordeal. You met in the chapter on Satan the ecstatic stray of al-Hallaj, which reached its height in Attar's *The Conference of the Birds* and in Ahmad al-Ghazali: Iblis as **a monotheist lover** who refused to prostrate to any but his beloved and accepted the curse as the price of monotheism—a "chivalry" in divine love! A shocking reading that most the community rejected categorically (and many counted it among the lapses of mystical taste), but it testifies to the power of the figure's presence: Iblis became the material of the deepest questions of will, fate, and love in Persian and Arabic literature.

2. Tawus Malak of the Yazidis—the bloodiest file in the subject. Among the Yazidis (the ancient Kurdish religion blended with Islamic-Sufi and Iranian tributaries), at the head of the seven angels stands **"Tawus Malak"**—the Peacock Angel. In some of their accounts he was tested by the prostration to Adam and refused **out of monotheism and obedience to God's first command that none be prostrated to but Him,** so he passed the test and became the chief of the angels and God's steward over the world. When their Muslim neighbors heard the story of "the one who refused to prostrate," they matched it to their Iblis,

and the Yazidis were branded for centuries as "devil-worshipers"—they who themselves forbid even the word "Satan" and reject the accusation altogether. They paid the price of this matching in dozens of campaigns of slaughter across the centuries, down to ISIS's extermination of them at Sinjar before our eyes. Our book finds no graver example of its repeated lesson: **demonization kills**—one story read in two neighboring houses in two readings, so that the hero of one became the devil of the other, and the differences of interpretation were paid in blood.

3. Iblis in modern Islamic literature. Muhammad Iqbal conversed with him in his philosophical poetry (the dialogue of Gabriel and Iblis: Iblis boasting that it was he who set the human story in motion and filled existence with movement by his test!), and al-Aqqad, Tawfiq al-Hakim, and the writers of Arabic employed him as a symbol of the questions of freedom, compulsion, and rebellion. So the Arab Iblis joined his cousins (Faust and Milton's) in the club of literary devils.

4. The opposite current within Islam itself. Some contemporary rationalist commentators (such as Muhammad Abduh in certain of his readings) reduced the personification of Satan in favor of reading him as powers of evil and the whispering of the self. So the same debate we saw in every tradition repeated itself within Islam: outside, or inside?

Summary

- **The name:** on the more probable view, a link in a linguistic chain crossing the nations (*satan* → *diabolos* → *Iblis*), which fused in Arabic with the root of despair in an eloquent fusion.
- **The story:** the scene of the prostration and the refusal has documented ancestors before the Qur'an in the Jewish-Christian apocrypha (*The Life of Adam and Eve*, *The Cave of Treasures*)—the datum is agreed, and its significance is divided between the reading of intertextuality and the reading of confirmation, as in all our battles.
- **The function:** it has counterparts in most civilizations (our previous chapter with its tour)—and the nearest relatives: the satan of Job and the Mastema of Jubilees (the license), Lucifer (the fall through pride), and Mara (the exposed, powerless whispering).
- **The Qur'anic uniqueness:** his being a jinni and not an angel (by which the dilemma of the angels' infallibility was dissolved), his direct dialogue with God, the confinement of his weapon to calling with no sovereignty, and his speech of disavowal on the Day of Resurrection—a combination found complete in no one else.
- **And after the Qur'an:** Iblis lived new lives—a lover among the ecstatic Sufis, an innocent wronged by a name among the Yazidis (at the gravest blood price in the whole subject), and a philosophical symbol among Iqbal and the writers.

So if anyone asks you from now on, "Is Iblis particular to the Qur'an, or found among the nations?" say—in a figurative tongue—: his narrative body is from the clay of a shared inheritance divided among the nations of the Book and the region, and his disciplined theological spirit—a runaway servant in the kingdom of the One, neither rival nor coercer—is the particular breath of Qur'anic monotheism. As for how you explain the meeting of the clay and the breath—a human convergence, or the confirmation of revelation—that is the great question of the book, which accompanies you into the chapters on evidence.

> ***Its place:*** *a supplementary study attached to Chapter 21.*

Chapter 22: Does Morality Need God?

Clarifying the confused question; the shared sense; the Euthyphro dilemma with its answers; the three roads to founding obligation; the two empirical witnesses—and the study on the ethics of the texts, with its two mirrors

Summary of the chapter: Does morality need God to be binding, or are reason and shared human sense enough? The question usually confuses two different things: where morality came from, and what makes it obligatory. This chapter separates them, faces the Euthyphro dilemma that has troubled philosophers since Plato, sets out the three roads by which obligation has been grounded, and consults two empirical witnesses—the conduct of believers and of unbelievers—before turning to the ethics of the road.

* Opening: The Most Famous Sentence in the Subject—And the Most Famous Confusion

"If God does not exist, everything is permitted"—the sentence attributed to Dostoevsky's heroes has become the banner of a whole camp. Facing it in the field is the other camp's cry: "Here are atheists filling the earth with honesty and kindness without a book, and here are religious people stealing and killing with their books—so what need is there of heaven?" The whole chapter hinges on a single clarification that untangles the knot from its start: **the question "does morality need**

God?" is three distinct questions that both camps confuse.

The question of knowledge. Does the human being need a revelation **to know** that honesty is good and treachery is ugly? The answer on which reasonable people of all faiths nearly agree: **no**—the knowledge of the principles of morality is implanted and shared (we will present its evidence shortly); indeed most religious traditions themselves affirm this (the Qur'an addresses people with "the right" and "the wrong" as things already known to be right and wrong before the address!). **And the question of conduct.** Are religious people **more committed** in practice to morality than others?—This is a complex empirical, statistical question whose witness we will present fairly, and it is not the crux of the philosophy. **And the question of foundation**—which alone is the chapter's real battle: when I say "injustice is ugly"—is this **an objective, binding judgment** standing in the structure of existence, binding on every reasonable person even if the whole world disagreed with it? Or **a useful human preference** (evolutionary, contractual, or of taste) that has no authority over the dissenter but force and upbringing? And if it is the first—what in existence carries this obligation? Here the road divides, and here alone does "the need for God" enter the place of serious dispute—so whoever argues with you in the subject, bind him first to specify which of the three questions he is discussing.

* First: The Shared Datum—The Implanted Moral Sense

Before the theories, the facts: in most of the civilizations history has known there is a moral core repeated with a regularity that astonishes the scholar—the prohibition of treachery to a covenant, the condemnation of lying and false witness, the ugliness of killing the innocent, the right of parents, the protection of the weak, and the formulas of the golden rule ("treat people as you would like to be treated") echoing in nearly the same letters from Confucius to Hillel to the Prophetic hadith ("None of you truly believes until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself"). So that comparative scholars have gathered this cross-cutting core into tables that nearly coincide. The religions themselves have tried to codify this core as a shared document: the **"Declaration Toward a Global Ethic"** (the Parliament of the World's Religions, Chicago, 1993), drafted by the Catholic theologian Hans Küng and signed by the representatives of dozens of traditions—on the golden rule and four commitments (nonviolence and respect for life; solidarity and economic justice; truthfulness and tolerance; and equality between the sexes). Its supporters see it as a practical proof of the shared core, while its critics—from inside the religions—hold that it reduces every religion to a shared moral denominator that neglects what distinguishes it, and from outside them, that it proves that morality stands without any particular religion: so the one document is a witness for both readings. Modern experimental psychology added

its witness: infants before speech prefer, in experiments, the "characters" who help over those who hinder, and children distinguish early between the rules of a game that can be changed and the rules against harm that "do not become right even if the teacher permits"—so the sense of moral discrimination precedes instruction. The Qur'an named this datum in its own way: "by the soul and how He formed it and inspired it [to know] its own rebellion and piety!". Western theology called it "the natural law" written on hearts. Kant called it "the moral law within me," which he paired with his wonder at the starry heavens above him.

And the decisive methodological lesson: this shared datum **does not settle the dispute but opens it**—for it is the thing whose interpretation the two camps contest: the believer reads it as the fingerprint of the Creator ("the natural disposition God instilled in mankind") and as one of the arguments for existence (the "moral argument" passed in Chapter 18). The evolutionist reads it as the inheritance of a social selection: ancestors who cooperated survived, so we inherited the intuition of cooperation as we inherited the fear of snakes—a useful instinct, not a written revelation. The datum is one, and the two readings are opposite—as with all the great data of this book.

The Golden Rule in Ten Traditions—One Table, and a Caution

The most striking single item in the shared datum deserves to be seen side by side. In the wording below each maxim is given in a plain paraphrase, not a quotation, so that the reader compares the idea and not the translator:

Tradition	The maxim, paraphrased	Where
Judaism	Love your fellow as yourself; and Hillel's summary: what is hateful to you, do not do to another	Leviticus 19:18; Talmud, Shabbat 31a
Christianity	Do to others whatever you would want them to do to you	Matthew 7:12; Luke 6:31
Islam	None of you truly believes until he wants for his brother what he wants for himself	hadith in Bukhari and Muslim
Hinduism	Do not do to another what you would find painful if done to you	Mahabharata, Anushasana Parva
Buddhism	Since I fear pain and cherish life, so do all beings—do not strike or kill	Dhammapada, chapter 10

Tradition	The maxim, paraphrased	Where
Jainism	Treat all creatures as you would wish to be treated	Sutrakritanga
Confucianism	What you do not wish for yourself, do not impose on others	Analects 15:24
Taoism	Regard your neighbor's gain as your own, and his loss as your own	Treatise on Response and Retribution
Zoroastrianism	Whatever is disagreeable to you, do not do to others	Shayast-na-Shayast
Sikhism	See no enemy and no stranger; all are companions	Guru Granth Sahib

The caution that keeps the table honest. Three differences run beneath the resemblance. First, some formulas are *negative* (do not do what you would hate) and some *positive* (do what you would want); the second demands more, and the traditions themselves have argued over whether the two are equivalent. Second, the word rendered "neighbor," "brother," or "other" has not always meant everyone: in several texts its first reference was the fellow member of the community, and the widening of its circle to all human beings is part of each tradition's later history. Third, the rule is shared but its *grounding* is not: one house roots it in the image

of God in every person, another in the unity of the self behind all selves, another in the fear of pain common to all sentient beings, another in the order of Heaven—so the convergence is real at the level of the maxim and disputed at the level of its reason. That is why this table belongs to the "shared datum" and not to the proof: it establishes that the moral sense is common; it does not, by itself, settle what makes it binding. ### Second: The Euthyphro Dilemma—The Oldest Trap in the Subject, and Its Answers

Before presenting the roads, we must pass the trap that Plato set twenty-four centuries ago and that is still set every day: Socrates asked Euthyphro: **do the gods love an act because it is good, or is it good because the gods love it?**—Two horns, both painful for whoever founds morality on the divine will: if you say "He commands it because it is good," you have admitted a goodness before the command and independent of it. So morality does not need the command. And if you say "it is good because He commanded it," you have made morality sheer arbitrariness: had He commanded treachery, treachery would have become a virtue—which collides with the sense we have just admitted.

And the answer on which the careful thinkers of the three traditions settled (Thomas Aquinas for Christianity, most the Muslim theologians in their formulations, and contemporary philosophers of religion) is **to break the dichotomy with a third horn**: the good is neither before God nor subject to the arbitrariness of His will. Rather, **the good is God's own nature**: God does not "choose" honesty from a list from which He

could have chosen its opposite, nor does He submit to a standard above Him—His commands are the expression of an essence that is goodness, justice, and mercy itself, so the standard is neither above Him nor below Him but **is He Himself**. And thereby obligation remains founded on an Absolute that is not arbitrary. The other side answers: is this not moving the question one step (and what makes His nature "the good")?—and the debate advances in its literature.

And a treasure unknown to many Arab disputants: that this very dilemma was discussed **inside Islamic theology** in one of the deepest discussions ever written on it, under the heading **"moral goodness and badness: rational, or scriptural?":** the Mu'tazila said (and with them the Maturidis, with qualifications): the goodness of honesty and the badness of injustice **are intrinsic and grasped by reason** before the arrival of revealed law. The law discloses and confirms. It does not create (they even inferred from this that one whom the call did not reach is held to account for the universals of reason). The Ash'aris said: there is no judge before revealed law—the good is what the Lawgiver made good, in preservation of absolute transcendence and will (while granting that reason grasps what is suitable, short of otherworldly obligation). And between them lie qualifications and middle positions that filled the long treatises. **So let the seeker know:** the Euthyphro question is no external weapon against religion—it is a workshop in which the people of religion themselves labored for centuries, more finely than most of those who brandish it today know.

* Third: The Three Roads to Founding Obligation

The first road: founding on God—at its strongest

The essence of the road: objective, binding morality needs **an absolute legislator above human beings and a judge whom no one escapes**—for without them "values" remain the opinions of an animal species about itself. Its central argument in its contemporary formulation: if objective moral duties exist (and its holders cite a widely shared intuition: that torturing a child for amusement is **ugly in itself**, not merely "not useful")—what structure of existence carries them? Atoms issue no commands; evolution explains why we **feel** obligated, not why we **really are** obligated (for it fitted us for useful illusions, as its own proponents say elsewhere). Society has the power to punish but not to **bind a conscience** (or else the reformers who broke from the consensus of their societies—the liberators of slaves against the laws of their age—would be rebels, not heroes!). So absolute obligation—in this argument—stands only with an Absolute.

And the most refined formulation of this road in our sources is Begović's in *Islam Between East and West*—whose merit is that it argues with the tools of European philosophy, not with texts: morality, for him, is **a phenomenon that cannot be derived from nature** at all: nature knows the stronger and the fitter, and does not know "duty." Attempts to derive morality from utility end by abolishing it (for self-sacrifice—the summit of morality in the intuition of all humanity: the

martyr, the mother, the rescuer of the drowning—is **a pure loss on every utilitarian calculation**, and yet the whole human race honors it with an honor that no utility explains). So the pure moral act is "the proof of another world": duty, sacrifice, and remorse have no meaning unless the human being is **free** (and strict materialism denies freedom) **and responsible before one who knows the hidden hearts** (and nature does not know) **and immortal, so that justice has an appointment** (and the grave, for materialism, is the end of the reckoning). So freedom, immortality, and God are for him not doctrines added to morality but **the logical conditions of its possibility**, and whoever denies them and then behaves morally is living on credit drawn from a bank whose existence he denies.

The second road: founding without a God—at its strongest, too

Nor is the opposite camp as poor as the preachers picture it; it has four great edifices. **Contractualism** (from Hobbes to Rawls): morality is the rules that reasonable people who want to live together agree to. Its latest form is the Rawlsian "veil of ignorance": the just rules are what you would have agreed to had you not known which position you would occupy in society—an elegant founding of justice from pure reason. **Utilitarianism** (Bentham and Mill): the good is what maximizes the happiness of the greatest number—an explicitly secular calculating criterion that really did change the legislation of the world.

Kantian deontology: reason legislates its own universal law for itself ("act so that the maxim of your action could become a universal law" and "treat humanity always as an end, never merely as a means")—an obligation from the core of rationality without an external reference (though Kant himself—and the paradox is majestic—went back and made God and immortality "postulates" required by practical reason so that the union of virtue and happiness might hold!). **And contemporary naturalistic humanism**: our values are the fruit of the flourishing and suffering of conscious beings—and the suffering of the conscious is a sufficient criterion, objective enough for practical purposes.

And the strongest thing directed at this whole road is one old, ever-renewed question—Hume's second guillotine: it is not valid to infer "ought" from "is." For all four edifices begin from facts (we want to live, we hate pain, reason generalizes) and leap to obligation. And the leap is the thing to be proved: **why does a contract I never signed bind me** if I can cheat safely? And why does the happiness of "the greatest number" bind one who is not among them? And who holds to account the one who broke Kant's law and profited?—Its holders answer that "reasonable practical" obligation suffices human beings and there is no need for a phantom Absolute, and that demanding of morality a cosmic guarantor is a religious begging of the question against the very meaning of morality . . . and the first road replies: rather, calling reasonable preference "obligation" is a linguistic begging of the question against the reader. And so rages the noblest of the debates of philosophy, and we have set before you the summits of both arguments.

* The third road: the face of the other—Levinas, and obligation before theorizing

Between the two camps the Jewish-French philosopher Emmanuel Levinas—a survivor of an age that saw the collapse of morality founded on the great systems—cut a third way that reverses the whole order: morality begins not from a principle to be founded (divine or rational) but from **an encounter**: when **the face of the other** looks at me—naked, fragile, woundable—it **commands me before every theory**: "You shall not kill me"—a call that precedes my freedom and my choice. My responsibility for him is not a contract I signed but a condition I found myself in ("responsible for the other before being responsible for myself"). So obligation, for him, is **a primary given**, like perception, not the result of a proof. All theorizations come after it, explaining it or betraying it (and in Levinas's depths there is a theological dimension: in the face of the other lies "the trace" of the Infinite—so his road is not purely secular so much as a religiosity without prior proof). The attraction of this road is that it matches lived experience (we do not infer the ugliness of the cry of one in distress—we are struck by it as a command). Its declared weakness is that it is an eloquent description of the phenomenon more than a foundation that settles why the hardened egoist is bound by what he does not feel.

* Fourth: The Two Empirical Witnesses—Buddhism, and History

The first witness: Buddhism—a lofty morality without a divine legislator. The secularists brandish it: here is a moral system among the loftiest humanity has known (five precepts, compassion for every living thing, and strict self-discipline) with no commanding God at all—so the claim of necessary connection has fallen! **And the examination is more precise than the cheer:** yes, Buddhism refutes the claim that morality stands only by a personal divine command. But it is **no witness whatever for a naturalistic morality**: behind its precepts lies a thick metaphysics called **karma**—a cosmic law of requital that no act or intention escapes, pursuing the agent across lives: "a judge without a face" that occupies in the Buddhist structure the place of the Judge in the Abrahamic religions (in encompassing, requital, and deferred justice). So the correct witness to be drawn: binding morality has stood historically without **a personal God**, and has not stood in a single great tradition without **a system of requital that transcends visible nature**—a middle result by which both extremes lose together.

The second witness: actual conduct across history. Here we do justice without evasion: history and statistics testify to **a wide disconnection between theoretical foundation and behavioral output**: believers in the Judge have filled the earth with injustice, and atheists of conscience have lived and died as saints without a heaven; societies of little religiosity top the

indices of public honesty, and others of intense religiosity top the opposite. The intertwined factors (law, development, culture) forbid crude inference from either side. **And the witness's fruit for the chapter:** that the question of foundation (philosophical) and the question of output (educational-social) are truly independent—a person may possess the best foundation and not comply, and one who possesses no foundation may comply (living—in Begović's language—on the inherited credit). Which is why arguing from the morality of atheists for morality's independence of God is like arguing from the health of someone ignorant of medicine for health's independence of causes. **And arguing from the depravity of the religious for the falsity of the foundation is exactly the same**—and the decider is what we clarified at the chapter's start: distinguish your three questions.

* Fifth: The Study on the Ethics of the Texts—The Two Mirrors

The hottest field of the subject today is not abstraction but the texts: the critic opens the sacred books to texts of wars and extermination (the commands of the ban against the Canaanites in the Old Testament are the file's most famous), of slavery, penalties, and unequal rulings, and launches Dawkins's double argument: these are texts whose morality today's conscience cannot accept. **And worse:** you yourselves do not accept them all. You select and interpret—so your selection shows that your moral standard is **from outside the**

books, not from them, and the claim that they are the source of morality has fallen.

And the answer at its strongest—whose mainstay is complete in our sources (Copan for the Old Testament, and its established Islamic counterparts)—comes in layers.

The layer of civilizational context: ancient legislation is read in the horizon of its age, not ours—so the biblical laws of slavery and war, measured against their Mesopotamian surroundings, are **a restriction and an elevation**, not a founding (which is exactly what our chapter established on the *dhimma* system and the two standards).

The layer of the genre of discourse: the language of "total extermination" in the texts of ancient wars—Copan documents—is **a stereotyped rhetorical formula** across all the war literature of the East (the inscriptions of Israel's neighbors say it of their enemies, and then the enemies appear alive in the next line!), so they are not statistical reports. The texts of the Book itself show the survival of the "exterminated" peoples—so what is meant is the language of military decisiveness, not a literal program of extermination.

The layer of gradualness and purpose: legislation leads a caravan from where it stands toward a higher destination—and the destination is read in the purposes of the texts and their peaks (the verses of emancipation and beneficence, and "no Arab has superiority over a non-Arab"), not at the point of departure.

The layer of distinguishing description from prescription: much of what is brandished is stories the Book narrates as fact and does not endorse as law (the atrocities of the Book of Judges are a lesson, not a model).

Then the recoiling reply that turns Dawkins's argument itself around: you say that we select by a standard outside the texts—then whence came this standard to which you too appeal, and by which you try the books and history? If you say "evolution and preference," we are back at the question of obligation whose helplessness you have seen. And if you say "an absolute human sense that rises above texts and ages," **you have testified to the implanted objective moral law—which is the first of the arguments of the first road!** So the argument from selection is a sword that cuts toward its bearer too. **And there remains, after all the layers, what our honesty requires:** files whose remaining weight, after every interpretation, fair-minded people of the religions themselves acknowledge, and in which the answer is entrusted to hidden wisdom or to revisions of reading. The decider for us is the two facing criteria you know (relative precedence in context / the absolute goal), and the choice between them is among your deepest decisions.

The Chapter's Conclusion: The Elevator Question — And Provisions for the Road

We test the whole map with a single bare question—call it the elevator question: **you found a fat wallet in an elevator with no camera and no witness, and its owner will never know—why do you return it?** The first road answered: because an eye that does not sleep sees you, and because honesty is an attribute of the One who created you in His image or formed you upon His disposition. Obligation here is fully equipped: a knower, an absolute standard, and an appointment of reckoning. The second answered: because you made with society a contract whose breach loses for everyone, because the benefit of public trust is greater, and because the law of reason does not exempt you. The critic whispers: and all of them fall silent if you were guaranteed never to be known and did not care about being "reasonable." The third answered: because the face of its owner—though absent—is present in the wallet, commanding you. Then look at the final nicety: most people—from all the camps—**actually return it,** before completing any proof: is that because the religious foundation works in them even if they deny it (Begović's drawn credit)? Or because the social instinct is deeper than all theology (the evolutionist's answer)? Or because the command preceded the proof (Levinas)?—The chapter's question stands here open, as the book's honesty requires.

And the road's last word: whatever you choose in foundation, the people of the three roads meet—and thank God for the meeting—at the core of the virtues

with which we opened: honesty, fidelity, mercy, justice, and beneficence. So let your theoretical perplexity be what it may—**your conduct cannot afford the luxury of waiting**: live the agreed core while you search (it is the eighth counsel in your practical program in the appendix to the conclusion), for the best of seekers is the one whose perplexity does not delay his kindness. Perhaps in the living of virtue itself there is a light on its source that the debates cannot reach.

> ***Cross-references for the chapter:*** *the moral argument among the arguments for existence in Chapter 18; the problem of evil (the facing side of the subject) in Chapter 20; and the assessment of the rulings of dhimma and the two standards in Chapters 6 and 26.*

Study 22.1: The Lawful and the Forbidden Across the Religions — A Map of the Great Prohibitions and Their Systems

Most of the nations—if not all—have forbidden: so what did the nations forbid, who holds the power of prohibition among them, and why is the forbidden forbidden? The field tour, then the four deep structures, then the golden observation that divides the map—and the scale

> **Summary of the study:** What one religion forbids outright, another permits without a second thought. A comprehensive map of prohibitions—from food to marriage to ritual—across the major religions, along with each religion's own internal system for classifying the permitted and the forbidden, rather than a scattered list of bans.

---

* Opening: The Phenomenon from Which Almost No Society Departs

The previous chapter examined the theoretical question of morality: does it need God? This study brings the question down from the sky of theory to the ground of tables, bodies, and markets: before the human being philosophized about the basis of obligation, he was—in most of the societies history has known, if not all—

living inside a network of prohibitions: food not to be eaten, days not to be worked on, words not to be spoken, and bodies and acts surrounded by fences. Hardly a nation exists without a "forbidden"—among the phenomena nearest to universality in anthropology—and

the nations differ only in **what** they forbade, **who** among them holds the authority to forbid, and **why** the forbidden is forbidden. These are the study's three questions, and with them we make the tour.

* First: Clarifying the Concepts—For the Systems Are Not Copies of One Mold

The first thing that spoils comparison in this subject is the assumption that every nation has "a lawful and a forbidden" with the same structure, and only the lists differ. In reality **the structures themselves differ**:

The Islamic system is not a binary at all but **a five-rung ladder**: obligatory, recommended, permissible, disliked, and forbidden. The space of the permissible in it is the widest default (its founding rule, as its contemporary jurists codified it: **the default in things is permissibility**, and prohibition is an exception requiring a text)—indeed above this ladder stands another, venerable in the heritage: **the ranks of scrupulousness** that Ghazali detailed in his *Revival*: between the clearly lawful and the clearly forbidden lie the degrees of the pious who leave what is harmless for fear of what is harmful—so the system is a spectrum, not an on-and-off switch. **The Jewish system** turns on a double binary: **kosher / treif** in foods (the fit and prepared / the torn and defective), and **pure / impure** (*tahor* / *tamei*) in rites and bodies. Behind them the apparatus of the 613 commandments with its divisions (positive and negative; rulings of intelligible reason, "*mishpatim*," and others purely devotional, "*chukim*," which are not explained—like the red heifer that baffled its own rabbis).

Christianity—here the first reversal of the map—**dismantled nearly the whole inherited ritual system**, as you will see. **The Indian house** runs the subject by the concept of **ritual purity and pollution**, graded with the social ladder (the food of the Brahmin and its restrictions are not those of others), and by the scale of **karma**: the prohibited brings its consequence by a cosmic mechanism, not by a judge's decision. **Jainism** built the strictest of all systems on a single principle (*ahimsa*) pushed to its limit. **Confucian China** is almost empty of "theological prohibition" altogether: its scale is **propriety and harmony** (*li*), not revealed prohibition—so food is medicine and the scale of yin and yang more than religion. **And the nations of the Pacific** gave the world's lexicon its very unifying word: **taboo**—the prohibited because it is charged with a power (*mana*) whose contact is dangerous—so the forbidden here is not "filthy" but **dangerous from the excess of its charge**: a third logic, neither command nor karma. So keep the tally: **four great logics of prohibition**: a stated divine command; a self-operating cosmic consequence; propriety and order; and a dangerous power to be isolated—and you will see the nations blending them in various measures.

* Second: The Field Tour—What Did the Nations Forbid?

The field of food—the widest of the doors and the most revealing. In Judaism stands the most precise dietary system in the history of religions: of land animals only the **ruminant with a cloven hoof**, both together, is permitted (the camel ruminates but is not cloven-hoofed, and the pig is cloven-hoofed but does not ruminate—so both are *treif*); of water creatures only **those with fin and scale**; with a ritual slaughter (*shechita*) and the draining of blood. Above that the strict separation of **meat and milk** (from "you shall not boil a kid in its mother's milk"), so that vessels and kitchens were separated. In Islam a briefer list in one comprehensive text: **carrion, blood, the flesh of swine, and what has been consecrated to other than God**—with ritual slaughter and the invocation of the Name, and the permission of the food of the People of the Book by text (a unique legislative bridge among the faiths). **Then the Christian reversal**—among the greatest events in the history of food prohibitions: Jesus himself is reported to have stated the revolutionary principle: **"it is not what goes into the mouth that defiles a person, but it is what comes out of the mouth"** (Matthew 15:11). Peter saw the vision of the sheet filled with every kind of creature and was told "What God has made clean, you must not call profane" (Acts 10:15). **The Council of Jerusalem** (about 49 CE)—the first of the Church's councils—settled that the Gentiles who entered were not to be

burdened with the yoke of the ritual law beyond a few commandments.

So purity moved from the kitchen to the heart, and the road opened to the religion's universality (you saw in the chapter on preaching how this decision was the hinge of all Christian history). In the Indian house, the exact reverse of the course: **the cow** is a sacred, bountiful mother not to be touched. So the prohibition of its flesh is not "impurity" but **the sanctity of holiness** (a precious distinction: a thing is forbidden for its lowliness and forbidden for its holiness—two ends of one ladder), and vegetarianism is the station of the upper castes and the model of piety. Jainism went to the limit: a strict vegetarianism that avoids even **roots and tubers** (uprooting them kills the plant and harms the minute living things of the soil), and its devout filter their water and avoid eating at night for fear of swallowing an insect. Buddhism made a subtle distinction: what is forbidden is **killing**, not meat—so meat was permitted to monks when the animal was not killed for them specifically (with its conditions), while the Chinese Mahayana branch grew stricter and turned vegetarian. The same item ("eating meat") you find an obligation here, a scruple there, and permissible elsewhere, according to the position of the founding principle.

The field of intoxicants—and the most eloquent paradox of the whole subject. Wine itself—the same drink—is **categorically forbidden** in Islam ("an abomination of Satan's doing") and among the Sikhs and in Buddhist schools (the fifth of the lay precepts: to abstain from intoxicants because they corrupt

mindfulness), **and ritually sacred** in Judaism (the *kiddush* cup opens the holiness of the Sabbath) and in Christianity (the wine of the Lord's Supper—and for Catholics it is, after consecration, **the blood of Christ** itself). So the one substance is an abomination in one house and an offering in its neighbor. There is no example in the whole map clearer than this that **the forbidden is made not by the substance but by the system.**

The field of the body. The nations nearly agree on forbidding **adultery** and fencing sex within an institution (among the firmest items of the shared core you met in the body of the chapter). And then they part widely on what lies beyond it: polygamy restricted here and forbidden there; **sacred celibacy** as the summit of perfection in Christian monasticism and Hindu *sannyasa*, against "**no monasticism**" and the sanctification of marriage as a sunna in Islam and Judaism (so perfection itself is contested in direction). **Circumcision** as the sign of the Abrahamic covenant (a founding obligation in Judaism, a sunna / natural practice in Islam) with no place among the other families.

The field of money. The three Abrahamic religions forbade **usury** by text (the Torah forbade it toward "the brother" and permitted it toward the stranger—and this difference opened the door to a whole European economic history). Then Christian history saw the longest retreat from a textual prohibition (from the condemnations of the councils to the banks of our age). While the prohibition remained alive and productive in Islam until it generated a contemporary alternative financial industry—so this field is the greatest laboratory

of "the forbidden under the pressure of reality." With it, **gambling**, forbidden absolutely in Islam and restricted morally among others.

The field of time and place. The most famous temporal prohibition in history is the Jewish **Sabbath**: a day on which categories of work are forbidden (the tradition detailed them in thirty-nine headings) until the Sabbath itself became—in the words of their rabbis—"a sanctuary in time". Islam has its **sacred months** and the *ihram* of the pilgrimage with its prohibitions. The Hindus have their fasting days and a moon to be observed. All the nations have **forbidden places** entered only in purity and on condition: from the Holy of Holies, which none but the high priest entered, one day a year, to the two Sanctuaries and the boundaries of *ihram*, to the mountains set apart among the nations of the spirits.

The field of violence. The prohibition of **killing a person** is a shared universal. The divergence lies in the exceptions and their limits: Jainism and the Gandhian currents extend *ahimsa* to include every living thing with no exception for war, while the Abrahamic religions forbid killing and codify exceptions (retaliation, and war under conditions)—and we detailed the covenants of war and its ethics in their places.

Third: The Deep Structures—Who Holds the Power to Forbid? and Why Is the Forbidden Forbidden?

The question of authority first. In Islam a decisive rule codified by its jurists: **permitting and forbidding are the right of God alone**. So whoever forbids what is

lawful has claimed the rank of legislation (and the Qur'an calls the forbidding of good things without authority **a fabrication**), and the jurist's function is to disclose the ruling, not to create it. In Catholic Christianity the authority to **bind and loose** is given to the Church by the founding text ("whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven")—so the institution is a delegated partner in drawing the limits, and on this structural difference the battles of the Reformation were fought. In rabbinic Judaism the apparatus is run by the councils of law and the generations of rulings (*halakha*) upon the text. In the karmic houses there is no "forbidder" at all in the personal sense—the law works as gravity works. In taboo it is **the power** itself that forbids, and whoever holds it (the chief and the priest). So whenever from now on you meet an argument about "clerics permitting and forbidding," your first questions are: **in which system are we? and is prohibition in it a delegated creation, or a disclosure bound by a text?**

Then the question of purpose—and why is the forbidden forbidden?

Four great answers share the map.

(1) Pure devotion: an obedience that tests submission, whose wisdom is hidden—what the jurists of the Jews called "*chukim*," and what Muslim legal theorists affirm in the devotional rulings: to comply with what one cannot grasp the reason for is—in their words—the truest servanthood.

(2) Intelligible benefit: this is the broad Islamic line of "the purposes" (the preservation of religion, life, reason, progeny, and property) and the line of explanation

that contemporaries laid out: God forbade nothing but for its foulness and its harm, and He forbade nothing without giving something better in its place.

(3) Symbolism and classification: here stands the most famous thesis of anthropological scholarship (Mary Douglas in *Purity and Danger*): the ritually forbidden is **the breaker of classification**—the creature that does not fit the categories of creation as the Book of Genesis drew them: the creatures of the water "swim with fin and scale," and whatever departed from the model (like shellfish) was anomalous and so prohibited. The pig is cloven-hoofed without rumination—**a hybrid of two categories**. So impurity, in this reading, is "matter out of place," and the forbidden is the guardian of the symbolic order of the cosmos (a brilliant thesis presented as an explanatory reading, on which the people of the texts have their reservations).

(4) The fence of identity: prohibitions are the walls of the community—nothing preserved the Judaism of the diaspora for two thousand years as its kitchen and its Sabbath did: daily boundaries that prevent dissolution and declare belonging three times a day; the Sikh's five articles of dress and the communal fast of Ramadan are witnesses of the subject. **And the living systems blend all four**—only the measures vary.

* Fourth: The Golden Observation—Where Do the Nations Agree and Where Do They Part?

Now lift your head from the fields and look at the map all at once: you will find a regularity worth carrying with you wherever laws are compared: **the nations' divergence in ritual prohibitions (food, purity, time, and rite) is many times greater than their divergence in moral prohibitions** (murder, adultery, theft, lying, and disrespect to parents). So the moral layer is almost **the shared core** that the body of the chapter examined with its two readings (an innate disposition or a first law, for believers; the necessities of society and the selection of cooperation, for the critics), and the ritual layer is **the particular fingerprint of each house**—in which its identity and history show (and perhaps its environment, by the testimony of the materialist explanations, and its own wisdom, by the testimony of its people). This observation is a double-edged methodological sword by the one standard: whoever mocks others' ritual prohibitions ("they forbid that?!") while holding their counterpart has testified against himself. Whoever would invalidate the religions by the contradiction of their ritual lists has mistaken the layer—for the religions themselves do not claim that their particular rites are human universals. They contest claims of source, and that is the field of Part VII, not of the kitchen.

The Scale — And the Study's Open Question

You leave the tour with a fivefold kit: **the structures of the systems** (binaries, five-rung ladders, and spectra of scrupulousness); **the four logics of prohibition** (command, karma, propriety, and taboo). **The map of the authority to forbid** (disclosure by text / delegated creation / self-operating law). **The four answers about purpose** (devotion, benefit, symbol, and identity); **and the golden observation** (the ritual divides, the moral unites). With these you can read any argument in the subject as an analyst, not a brawler. **And the study's question remains, which we leave with you:** you have stood before the one thing—wine, for example—an abomination forbidden in one house and a sacred offering in its neighbor, and before the one flesh as the obligation of a feast here and a crime of killing there: **how do you read this sharp contrast?** Do you read it as a chaos of human legislations that invalidates all the claims of heaven? Or as a diversity of laws from one Legislator who tested every nation with what suited it ("We have assigned a law and a path to each of you"—the Qur'an's declared reading of the very multiplicity of laws)? Or as the fingerprints of environments and histories, each of which shaped its own sacred and its own forbidden?—The map in your hands is one, and the three readings contest it. **And deciding which is the more probable is not settled at the tables, but where we have always left it: in evidence.**

Cross-references for the study: *the shared moral core and the question of the basis of obligation in the body of Chapter 22; the Euthyphro dilemma (is a thing forbidden because it is ugly, or ugly because it is forbidden?—the question of "chukim / mishpatim" in a Greek tongue) in the same body; and the Council of Jerusalem and its hinge in Chapters 8 and 11.*

Study 22.2: A Comprehensive System of Life, or a Path of the Spirit? — A Map of "Legislative Comprehensiveness" Across the Religions

Islam is "religion and world": creed, law, economy, society, and politics—is this the condition of all the religions, or are most of them spiritual and devotional? The tour along four axes, then the surprises that break the binary, then the reversed question: is comprehensiveness a perfection or a burden?—And the scale

Summary of the study: Does religion mean to govern your whole life—economics, politics, even what you eat—or is it content with your soul alone? A structural divide that splits religions in two, and on which turns each religion's relationship to the state and the law, and the limits of what it asks of its followers.

---

* Opening: A Question the Muslim Often Asks—And It Deserves a Map, Not a Speech

The Muslim knows his religion as a system that encompasses the whole of life: creed and worship. A family law (marriage, divorce, and inheritance with its shares detailed in the text itself). An economic order (a *zakat* of fixed measures, the prohibition of usury, and a jurisprudence of contracts and partnerships); a judiciary and penalties; rulings of war, peace, and relations among nations. The etiquette of eating, dressing, sleeping, and entering the privy. So that its famous description holds:

"religion and world." Then he turns to his neighbors and asks—a legitimate question, raised in every gathering of comparison—: **are all the religions like this, or are most of them "spiritual," managing the heart and leaving the market, the court, and the state?** He is usually answered with a speech from one of two directions: "our religion alone is comprehensive and the others are rituals," or "all religions are the same." Both wrong the map. So let us draw it by the book's method: **declared axes of measurement, then an honest tour, then an open scale.**

* First: The Four Axes of Measurement—So That We Do Not Compare Fog with Fog

We measure the "comprehensiveness" of each tradition by four specific questions: **(1)** does it have a civil **law of transactions** (sales, contracts, inheritance, personal status) binding religiously? **(2)** does it have **a theory of rule and politics** (who rules? by what right? and what are his limits?) stated or grounded? **(3)** does it have a structural **economic direction** (property, sacred taxes, financial prohibitions)? **(4)** and what is **the source of all this**: a founding text, an accumulated jurisprudence, or a custom that became sacred?—With these questions we make the tour.

* Second: The Tour—And What It Reveals About the Limits of the Common Binary

Judaism—the nearest counterpart, indeed the oldest.

The first surprise of the tour for whoever supposed comprehensiveness a uniquely Islamic feature: Judaism

is **a religion of law par excellence**—the 613 commandments cover the judiciary, testimony, penalties, sales, usury (forbidden toward "the brother"), pledges, the wages of laborers, and agriculture itself (the sabbatical year for the land, and the jubilee of the fiftieth year with the restoration of property and the freeing of slaves—among the largest cyclical economic legislations in any ancient text), personal status in its details, and war and its rulings. The *halakha* (its accumulated jurisprudence in the Mishnah, the Talmud, and the responsa) is a complete structural counterpart of Islamic jurisprudence, in schools, principles, and branches. **But history imposed on it the opposite experiment:** the nation of the law lost the state for two thousand years, and so became a law without a sword—the jurisprudence of a community managing the family, the kitchen, and the internal court under the sovereignty of others (their famous medieval rule, "the law of the kingdom is law," regulates this duality)—until the modern age reopened the question of the state with the founding of Israel, and the tension that fills its politics to this day exploded: a state largely secular in its law, for a people of a comprehensive law. **So textual comprehensiveness is one thing, possession of the state another, and combining them is the hard equation.**

Christianity—the founding reversal. Here is the opposite pole by the founding text itself: "**My kingdom is not from this world**," and "**Give to the emperor the things that are the emperor's, and to God the things that are God's**"—so the founding texts came down with no civil law and no theory of the state. The Council of

Jerusalem loosed the inherited ritual law, as you saw. The legislative inheritance remained as ethics and spirit: "the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life." **Then came history's opposite surprise:** the religion "apolitical" by text became the largest political actor in the history of the West: a canon law complete in its chapters regulated marriage, inheritance, and oaths for centuries. A papacy crowned emperors and deposed them. Byzantine theocracies and Calvin's Geneva were run by the Book. The conciliar prohibition of usury governed the European economy for an age—so Christianity is **spiritual in text, political in history**: it built its system by institutional jurisprudence, not by the founding text. **And the fruit of this structural difference is far-reaching:** when modernity came, it found in "the things that are the emperor's" an internal text founding the separation of state and church. So Western secularism is the child of a Christian structural possibility as much as it is a revolt against it—whereas the Muslim finds the separation colliding with the textual structure of his religion itself, and here lies the root of the difference in the battles over "religion and state" between the two civilizations to this day (we touched on it in the chapter on the age of acceleration).

Hinduism—the third surprise: a dharma that encompasses state and market. Whoever supposed the Indian house a pure "spirituality" has not read the shelf of the **Dharma-shastra**: the system of "Manu" and its sisters are complete laws of society—castes and their duties, stages of life (*ashramas*) each with its rulings, marriage, inheritance, judiciary, and penalties. Indeed

the civilization devoted to politics and economics its own explicit science: the **Arthashastra** (Kautilya, about the centuries before the common era)—a constitution of kingship, state administration, taxation, espionage, and war, among the shrewdest ever written in its field in antiquity. So Hinduism is **truly comprehensive**—but in a different pattern: its comprehensiveness is **customary, caste-based, and accumulated** (*smriti*: of the sages' composition, below *shruti* in sanctity), not a central revealed legislation in a single book—and the difference lies in **the source of obligation**, not in the extent of coverage.

Buddhism—the house nearest to "the road of the spirit" . . . with a qualification. Here the description "spirituality" is truest: no civil law at the founding, no theory of rule. The only detailed legislation is one: the **Vinaya**—the precise constitution of the monks (with hundreds of rules)—while the laity have five moral precepts and general guidance. **And the historical qualification is obligatory:** wherever Buddhism ruled, it became political: Ashoka made "the dharma" the policy of an empire in his inscriptions. The kingdoms of South Asia legislated in its name. In Tibet the matter reached a complete theocracy in which the supreme monk headed the state itself—so even the most ascetic of paths grew states when it came to rule.

Confucian China—the equation turned upside down. The most curious cell of the map: a system that is **entirely an order of state, society, and moral economy**—the rule of the virtuous, filial piety as the foundation of politics, and state examinations on its texts for

two thousand years—**with almost no theology, no revelation, and no hereafter**: "comprehensiveness without a heaven"—its very existence undoes the connection the asker supposes necessary between "comprehensiveness" and "revelation": a complete system of life can exist without a claim of revelation, as a claim of revelation can exist without a system of life.

Sikhism—the conscious synthesis. The clearest middle case: the doctrine of "**miri-piri**"—the two swords, the temporal and the spiritual together in the belt of the sixth Guru—an explicit declaration that the religion carries the world and the religion. Its fruit is the *Khalsa*, an organized community of political-military character and comprehensive identity (the five articles of dress and the *langar*)—without a detailed juristic apparatus of the size of the *halakha* and *fiqh*.

And the nations of sacred custom—the deepest undoing of the question itself. In the ethnic-animist religions the binary collapses from its foundation: the sacred custom **is** the law of marriage, land, hunting, war, and inheritance—not because the religion "encompassed" the world, but because **the separation between the two boxes never occurred to anyone**: the boxes "religious / worldly" are themselves a late manufacture (Western in origin to a large extent, as the students of the concept establish). Most human beings across history lived before their invention.

* Third: The Map Extracted—And the Two Rules

So the honest answer to the opening's question: **no, the religions are not one kind. Nor two naive kinds.** The map is a spectrum on two axes: the axis of **extent of coverage** (from the monastic Vinaya to the comprehensive *halakha* and *fiqh*) and the axis of **source of obligation** (a central revealed text / an accumulated institutional jurisprudence / a sacred custom / the wisdom of a state without a heaven). Islam and Judaism head the cell of "a comprehensive legislation attributed to a central revelation with a venerable juristic apparatus"—while they part in the experience of the state (Islam arose as a state from Medina, and Judaism lived its law without a state for an age). Christianity, spiritual in founding, built its comprehensiveness by institution and then carried in its text the seed of undoing it. India is comprehensive by sacred custom. China is comprehensive without revelation. Buddhism is a path of the spirit that grew states. And the nations of custom never knew the question. **And two rules govern the whole map.** The first: **every religion that ruled expanded, and every religion that was ruled contracted**—history presses everyone toward the extent of their sovereignty: see contemporary Islamic minority jurisprudence reproducing the Jewish experience of "the law of the community," and see Buddhism crowned in Tibet. The second: **comprehensiveness is a descriptive datum, and its assessment is a standing battle**—and that is our last section.

* Fourth: The Reversed Question—Is It a Perfection or a Burden? (Here the Assessors Part)

Once the map is settled, the verdict comes—**and here exactly the question turns into a polemic running in opposite directions, so we have done justice to both faces.** The Muslim reads comprehensiveness as **perfection, mercy, and inimitability**: a religion that leaves its servant perplexed in no transaction, inheritance, or ruling, and a balanced system that an unlettered man and his environment could not have produced (the claim of "legislative inimitability" we weighed in its study). Cites as its fruit a civilization of law that governed nations. **And the opponents read the same card reversed:** the Christian theologian reads the "spirituality" of his religion as **liberation, not deficiency**: God freed religion from the yoke of the letter so that it might possess the heart ("the letter kills"), and left law to the management of renewing reason. So freezing the details of the market and the penalty in an eternal text is, for him, the deficiency. The modernist critic reads comprehensiveness as **a burden and a danger**: an encompassing legislation means—in his reading—a religious authority pursuing details, and rulings born for one century imposed on the centuries. He explains Islam's comprehensiveness **historically, not theologically**: the child of its birth as a state in Medina (for the Prophet was ruler, judge, and commander—so the state legislated of necessity), as Christianity's "spirituality" was born of its birth as a ruled minority for three centuries.

And the Muslim's reply is ready: simultaneity is not an explanation that invalidates the source (the receptivity rule). Rather, the believer reads the birth of the state itself as part of the perfection of the divine plan: the final religion was sent down in a cradle that displays its system complete and applied. **And the outcome for the seeker:** notice that the two camps agree on **the map** and part in **the ladder of values** by which it is judged: is fixity a virtue or a fetter? is comprehensive guidance mercy or guardianship?—this is a comparison of highest criteria that the map itself does not settle, and its field is the chapters on the scale (24) and on evidence. **So beware of being sold a begging of the question about the criterion in the wrapping of a description.**

The Scale — And the Study's Open Question

Your kit from the tour: **the four axes of measurement** (coverage, rule, economy, and source of obligation); **the breaking of the binary** by five surprises (the Jewish *halakha*, Christianity's political history, India's Arthashastra, China's comprehensiveness without a heaven, and Buddhism's states). **The two rules of historical pressure** (who ruled expanded, who was ruled contracted) **and the separation of description from assessment**. The study's question remains with you from both its faces: **if true revelation has come down—which of the two images better befits it: to hand you the complete map of life so that you are never perplexed, or to hand you the compass and the heart and entrust your reason with the road?**— Both answers have been formulated as rigorous theology by their people, and each counts its own image the perfection. **And you now know at least that this is the real question beneath the two slogans of "comprehensiveness" and "spirituality"—and that is half the answer.**

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the landscape of prohibitions and their systems in the study immediately preceding; the claim of the system and its scale in the study on legislative inimitability (Chapter 19); and the Council of Jerusalem and "the things that are the emperor's" in Chapters 8 and 11.*

Study 22.3: Religion and Power — A Map of the Relationship Between the Religions and Rule Across History to the Present

The question "does religion contain a theory of rule?" came before—this is the question "how did religion actually live with rule?": the nine institutional models, then the tour of the great houses from their founding to our present, then the six rules extracted—and the seeker's scale in the most inflamed of files

> **Summary of the study:** Religion has served power, restrained it, and at times become power itself. Three distinct relationships that history has tried out between religious institutions and rule, with examples from every civilization, and the effect of each model on individual liberty—and on religion itself—down to the present day.

---

* Opening: Two Questions, Not One

The study on comprehensiveness (immediately preceding) closed with the map of what the religions **say** about the state in their texts and structures. This study opens the second file, which the first cannot replace: what did the religions and the states **do** to each other across four thousand years? The text is one thing and history another—"My kingdom is not from this world" is a Christian text, and the courts of the Inquisition are Christian history. "There is no compulsion in religion" is an Islamic text, and the civil strife of the sword over the caliphate is Islamic history. Whoever reads one without the

other comes out with half the map thinking it the whole. **And our declared method is here at its most insistent:** this is the file of the book most open to polemical exploitation from every side ("religion is the root of despotism" / "secularism is the root of atheism" / "our religion alone is innocent" . . .). So we present the map by its patterns, name the witnesses of each pattern from **all** the faiths without favor, and defer the verdicts to their scales.

* First: The Nine Institutional Models—The Tools of Analysis Before the Tour

The relationship of religion to rule is not a binary of "religious state / secular state" but **a spectrum of nine major models** among which the nations move:

(1) Direct theocracy. The clergy rule themselves in the name of God—rarer historically than is supposed: the priesthood of Amun when it swallowed Upper Egypt; the Papal State in central Italy for a thousand years; Calvin's Geneva; the Tibet of the Dalai Lama. Its most complete contemporary model, **the Guardianship of the Jurist** in Iran (1979–): a modern Shia innovation that handed the jurist the headship of the state itself.

(2) Sacred kingship. The ruler is a god, or the son of a god, or his shadow—the most widespread of the ancient models: Pharaoh the living god; the emperor of Japan, descendant of the sun goddess (until he formally renounced his divinity in 1946 by decision of the occupation!); the Chinese "Son of Heaven" by its mandate—

with the ingenious Confucian restriction: the mandate is conditional on justice, and its lapse legitimates revolt (among the oldest codified theories of "the right of revolution"); the European "divine right of kings." The sultanic titles of "the shadow of God."

(3) Caesaropapism. The state stands above the religious institution and runs it as an arm—Byzantium is its mother model, inherited by tsarist Russia (the Holy Synod as a government department) and the Church of England, whose supreme head is the monarch himself, from Henry VIII to this day.

(4) Two parallel, contending powers. An independent throne and an independent altar pulling at each other—medieval Europe is its epic model (the struggle of popes and emperors: the scene of **Canossa, 1077**—the emperor Henry IV standing in the snow for three days begging the pope's forgiveness—is the icon of the altar's summit; then the scale turned until popes were imprisoned). **And it has a structural Islamic counterpart that few notice**: the independence of the institution of the scholars from the sultan: the schools of law arose **outside the court** and sometimes against it (Abu Hanifa died in the caliph's prison for refusing the judgeship, Malik was flogged, and Ibn Hanbal stood firm in the inquisition before three caliphs—so his steadfastness became the founding of the independence of "the people of knowledge" as a conscience parallel to power, not its employee), and juristic legitimacy remained a soft power to be courted, not owned.

(5) An official state religion with managed plurality. The state has an authorized religion and the dissenters a codified, lower status—the community of Islam and the People of the Protection; the Ottoman "*millet*" system. The Catholic / Protestant states of Europe after the Peace of Augsburg (1555) codified its explicit rule: **"the religion of the prince is the religion of the realm"**—so Europe was distributed as a map of creeds according to its thrones.

(6) Friendly separation (liberal secularism). A neutral state that neither adopts a religion nor opposes it, with religion free in society—its founding model is the American First Amendment and "the wall of separation"—with its famous paradox: the most venerable of the separating states is among the most religious in popular life and in the presence of religion in its politics.

(7) Strict secularism (laïcité). The state excludes religion from the public sphere—France (1905), Kemalist Turkey, and revolutionary Mexico—a secularism of combative temper, born of battles with a church / institution that had been ruling.

(8) The atheist state. The state adopts atheism as an official creed and suppresses religion—the Soviet Union and its system; Albania, which declared itself the first "atheist state" (1967) and then **banned religion constitutionally** (1976)—the first in history. North Korea—and you saw in the study on accepting the other that it inflicted on the religious the most violent quantitative persecution in history.

(9) The ruled / persecuted religion. The facing side of all the above: a religion living as a minority

under another's sovereignty—the situation of Christianity in its first three centuries, of Judaism for two thousand years, of the Baha'i faith in its cradle, and of the Uyghurs today—the model that **shaped the theology of its people** as much as power shaped the theology of the rulers, as you will see.

* Second: The Tour—Every House from Its Founding to Its Present

Judaism—from the kingdom of the prophets to a state without consensus. It began as a restrained sacred kingship (Saul, then David), but its founding uniqueness is that prophecy arose within it as **a power above power**: Nathan rebukes David to his face, Elijah confronts Ahab, and Jeremiah is imprisoned and does not fall silent. So in this house was born one of the oldest documented traditions of "speaking truth to the sultan." Then it lost the state (70 CE) and lived the unique experiment: **two thousand years of religion without politics**—a complete law managed as a community under the rule "the law of the kingdom is law," until Zionism overturned the table: a movement **secular in most of its founders** (Herzl and Ben-Gurion) established a state for a people of law. So Israel inherited the structural tension that splits its politics to this hour: from the Haredim, some of whom rejected the state altogether (no kingdom may rise before the Messiah), to the religious Zionism that sanctified it, and the battles over "who is a Jew," conscription, and the Sabbath are open in its courts and streets.

Christianity—the most violently changeable course on the whole map. Three centuries **a persecuted minority** with no power at all—in which the theology of "the things that are the emperor's" and of peaceable obedience took shape. Then **the Constantinian reversal** (312 CE–): from the religion of the persecuted to the religion of the empire within two generations—among the greatest shifts of position in the history of religions—and with it began at once what attends power: the state's use of the creed and the church's use of the state, and the persecution of pagans and heretics by law. Then the two courses parted: **the Byzantine East** in caesaropapism (the emperor convenes the councils and deposes the patriarchs), and **the West**—after the fall of Rome—inherited the vacuum of power, so the papacy rose as a temporal force and entered a thousand years of the debate of the two swords (Canossa its summit), theorized in advance by Augustine with his two cities (the City of God and the earthly city, distinct and intertwined until the Hour). Then **the Reformation**: it broke the unity of the altar, so the churches were distributed among the thrones ("the religion of the prince"), and it ignited a century of **wars of religion** (France; the Thirty Years' War, which destroyed—by historians' estimates—between a fifth and a third of the population of the German lands)—until the Peace of **Westphalia** (1648) founded the logic of the sovereign state above the logic of the confession, then the Enlightenment, then the modern separation in its two forms (the friendly American and the strict

French—you learned in the study on comprehensiveness its internal textual root).

And its present today is a complete spectrum: a Vatican as a symbolic state, Scandinavian official churches in societies among the world's least religious, an American evangelicalism as a huge electoral actor, and a Russian Orthodoxy returned as an arm of state identity after seventy years of suppression—the whole map in one house.

Islam—the founding uniqueness and its transformations. Religion and state were born twins in Medina—the Prophet a prophet, ruler, judge, and commander—a structural uniqueness among the great founders (Jesus did not rule, the Buddha withdrew, and Moses is the nearest in resemblance) that ordered everything after it. Then the Rightly Guided Caliphate as an ideal model in memory (consultation, allegiance, and justice) and short in time, and then the matter turned—by the testimony of the Sunni heritage itself and its texts: "then there will be a biting kingship"—into hereditary monarchies asking religion for legitimacy. **And here occurred the most important development, which the hasty miss:** an early practical separation between **the sultan** and **the sharia**: the state for the princes, and jurisprudence grew independently among scholars outside the court (and the inquisition of Ibn Hanbal is the symbol of that independence), so Muslims lived for centuries under a composite equation: a ruler who prevailed by force and was obeyed to avert strife, and a law administered by a judiciary and jurists who possessed legitimacy but not the sword—codified by al-

Mawardi and his peers (*The Ordinances of Government*) as the codification of the possible reality, not the desired ideal.

Then the Ottomans institutionalized the relationship (the Shaykh al-Islam as a state office—approaching the Byzantine model), until the earthquake of **1924**: the abolition of the caliphate. For the first time since Medina, Muslims were without any unifying political umbrella, even a nominal one, and from that vacuum was born the question of the century that still burns: what is the form of Islamic rule in the age of the nation-state? **And its present is a complete spectrum too:** monarchies drawing religious legitimacy (Saudi Arabia, and Morocco with its "Commandership of the Faithful"); a juristic theocracy (Iran); strict secularisms (Kemalist Turkey and then its revisions). Movements of "political Islam" in their range from the parliamentary to the armed—with their founding concept of ***"hakimiyya"*** (sovereignty): that legislation belongs to God alone, so no rule that does not establish His law has legitimacy. Mawdudi formulated it in India and then Sayyid Qutb crystallized it in *In the Shade of the Qur'an* and *Milestones* (most of which was written in prison) in the duality of "Islam and *jahiliyya*" (the pre-Islamic "age of ignorance," turned into a name for any un-Islamic order). **And it was opposed from inside the Islamic house itself** by scholars and thinkers who saw in it a confusion between God's legislative sovereignty (agreed) and the stripping of legitimacy from human rule and the excommunication of societies (sharply disputed).

So the concept itself is an internal Islamic battle before it is a battle with modernity—and neutral states with civil constitutions and religious peoples—and the internal debate among these models is among the community's largest contemporary debates. **And at the heart of this debate is the question of "Islam and democracy,"** on which its people split three ways: **a rejection** that sees democracy as making legislation the people's rather than God's (from the school of *hakimiyya* onward). **An acceptance** that sees it as a modern mechanism for ancient Islamic values—consultation, allegiance, the rotation of power, and the accountability of the ruler—with the condition of the reference frame (al-Qaradawi, Ghannouchi, and their like).

And a constitutional reconciliation that establishes a procedural democracy within a sharia or civil framework (the experiences of Indonesia, Malaysia, Tunisia, and Turkey, in their variety). It is matched in the West by a parallel debate: the thesis of "structural incompatibility" (Huntington and his predecessors) against those who see the obstacle as political, not religious (Esposito and others)—and the empirical evidence is contested.

And for comparison, a dated precedent to be read: the Catholic Church itself explicitly condemned modern liberalism and democracy (the *Syllabus of Errors*, 1864) and then accepted them a century later (Vatican II) without changing its creed. The question, for whoever cites this precedent, is a question of **position and time**, not of texts alone.

Hinduism—an ancient functional separation and a modern nationalism. The caste system itself arranged the relationship in a unique way: **the Brahmin sanctifies and legitimates, and the Kshatriya rules and fights**. So kingship is worldly, surrounded by the duty of protecting the dharma rather than a priestly practice (and the Arthashastra you met theorizes for this realist king without scruple). This arrangement lived through kingdoms, then the centuries of Islamic rule, then the British Raj, until independence set the house before two roads embodied by two men: **Gandhi**—religion in politics as spirit and ethics (nonviolence and truthfulness), not a sectarian state—and **Savarkar**, father of "**Hindutva**": Hinduism as the national identity of nation and state. Nehru's secular constitution won in text . . . and Hindutva rose in reality until it ruled (the Bharatiya Janata Party)—so India today is the largest living laboratory for the question "a secular state for a religious nation, or a state of religious identity?"

Buddhism—from patron of the sangha to the monks of nationalism. Ashoka founded the golden model: the king as patron of the community (the sangha), protector of the dharma and its propagator—a reciprocal relationship (the king protects and feeds, and the sangha legitimates and educates) which the Buddhist kingdoms of Asia followed, reaching in Tibet complete fusion (the supreme monk as king). **And the surprise of the age breaks the stereotype:** the rise of **Buddhist nationalism** armed with identity: the monks of Sri Lanka as a hard actor in its civil conflict, and

monastic movements in Myanmar at the heart of the incitement against the Rohingya. So the most famous religion of "nonviolence" produced, when it became the identity of a majority that felt besieged, what all besieged identities produce—the harshest witness to the rule of Chapter 26: **power and position before creed.**

China and Japan—the state that manages heaven. Confucianism lived for two thousand years as **the civil religion of the state,** with its examinations and the rites of the Temple of Heaven performed by the emperor himself (the nation's supreme priest). Then Mao fought it savagely . . . only for it to return today as an instrument of the same state (Confucius Institutes as a soft arm, and the official discourse invoking "harmony"). So China is the model of the state that **uses religion and is not religious.** Japan made Shinto **a national state religion** until 1945, so that its dismantling and the emperor's renunciation of divinity were a condition of the post-defeat settlement—the clearest case in history of a religion detached from the state by decision.

* Third: The Six Rules Extracted—The Seeker's Kit from the Whole Tour

(1) Position makes political theology more than the text does. Every religion changed the jurisprudence of its power when its position changed—the Christianity of the minority is not the Christianity of Constantine, the jurisprudence of empowerment is not the jurisprudence of minorities, and the Buddhism of asceticism is not the Buddhism of the anxious majority. So read any

"religious theory of rule" and ask first: **from what position was it written?**

(2) Legitimacy is history's most expensive commodity. States have asked nothing of religion as they have asked legitimacy—it is cheaper than armies and more durable. So much so that the atheist states themselves, when they confiscated religion, **imitated it**: the infallibility of the leader, his embalmed body, his sacred texts, and the rites of loyalty—a civil religion without a heaven, and an inverse witness that the office of "the sacred" in politics does not stay vacant.

(3) And religion holds a counter-sword over power. The party that grants legitimacy can withdraw it—from the rebuking prophets of Israel, to the pope of Canossa, to the jurists of the inquisition, to the authorities of Najaf and the monks of the color revolutions—religion has remained across history the most durable of the institutions of opposition, because it alone possesses a source of legitimacy the state does not monopolize.

(4) Complete fusion usually corrupts both parties. Where the state swallowed religion, it became a ministry that lost its dignity with the state's loss of its own (the empty official churches of Europe are witness). And where religion swallowed the state, it carried the errors of politics on the shoulder of the creed (the internal literature of post-revolutionary Iran itself testifies to the tension)—which is why the experience of the centuries in several houses inclined toward formulas of cooperative distinction, neither fusion nor rupture.

(5) The secularisms themselves are religions of position. The friendly one was born where the churches multiplied and needed a neutral referee (America), and the strict one was born where a single institution had been ruling and needed an adversary to exclude it (France and Turkey). So even "neutrality" is the child of its local history and cannot be imported as a mold.

(6) And our age is not the end of the secular story. The twentieth century wagered on the decline of political religion, and the last decades brought its opposite worldwide—the return of religion as a rising political actor on every continent (its students called it "the revenge of God" and "the return of the sacred") from Washington to Delhi to Ankara to Tel Aviv to Yangon. So the file some suppose an archive is among the hottest files of your own future.

The Scale — And What This Whole File Does Not Prove

The closing rule that guards you against the widest fallacies of this subject: **the history of religion with power does not settle the truth of religion**—the conduct of states and institutions is no argument for revelation or against it (we established this as a general rule: bad stewards do not disprove the king, and good ones do not prove him). Rather, the file gives you two lesser benefits: **it breaks the absolute claims** from every side ("our religion never knew political priesthood" / "religion is the root of despotism" / "secularism is always the guarantee of freedom"—all of which fell to witnesses you have seen), **and it hands you the questions of examination** whenever any formula of the relationship is offered to you today: which of the nine models is it? from what position was its jurisprudence written? who in it holds the granting of legitimacy and its withdrawal? and what are the institutional restraints on whoever rules in the name of the sacred—or in the name of excluding it? **And the study's open question remains—and history has testified to both answers together:** did power corrupt religion when it embraced it (so that the best of its centuries were the days of its distance from it), or did religion refine power when it restrained it (for nothing restrained the tyranny of kings across the ages like their fear of a God above them and a reckoner before them)?—**Both scenes are preserved in the archive with witnesses that cannot be denied, and your reading of which is**

the rule and which the exception will say as much about you as about history.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the structure of "legislative comprehensiveness" and the textual theories of rule in the study immediately preceding; the rule "power before creed" and the three tests of freedom in the study on accepting the other (Chapter 26); and fundamentalisms as a modern phenomenon and the return of religion in the chapter on the age of acceleration.*

Study 22.4: The Religions and Wars — How They Influenced and Were Influenced, Whether the Sword Spread Religion, and How Religions Recede

The Islamic conquests, the Crusades, the Mongol and Tatar invasions, the European wars of religion, and the wars of the East—the tour through the major cases, then their table by one standard, then the six rules extracted, then the map of recession in its five patterns—and the seeker's scale in the file most tempting to exploit

> **Summary of the study:** Did the great religions really spread by the sword, or is that a myth far simpler than reality? A candid examination of religion's relationship to war across history, with neither blanket acquittal nor blanket condemnation, but case by case, on documented historical evidence.

---

* Opening: Two Questions That Must Be Separated

"Religion and war" is a file on which debate flares from both sides: "the religions are the cause of wars," say their opponents. "Our religion spread by kindness and theirs by the sword," say the people of every religion. We untangle the question first:

(1) How did wars influence the religions?—Did they spread them? And what effect did they leave on their structure, their jurisprudence, and their sects?

(2) How did the religions influence wars?—Did they ignite them, restrain them, or were they used for them? Then a third question comes last: **how do religions recede?**—By the sword, or by other means? Our rule from Chapter 11 is with us: **the constant distinction between the spread of the state and the spread of the religion**—the sword opens land in years, and religion opens hearts in centuries.

* First: The Major Cases—The Tour

The Islamic conquests (632–750 CE)—the fastest conquest and the slowest conversion. In a single century the sovereignty of the Muslims was spread from Andalusia to Sind. But the quantitative studies of conversion (the most famous being Richard Bulliet's curve, built on the dates of families' embrace of Islam in the biographical dictionaries) establish that **Islamization lagged behind the conquest by centuries**: neither Egypt nor Syria nor Iran became majority Muslim until three or four centuries after the conquest—along a gradual S-shaped curve resembling the spread of every social phenomenon—not by a leap following the battle. The reason is structural: **the contract of protection (*dhimma*)** made the continuation of the People of the Book in their religion, under the poll tax, a codified option (some governors even discouraged conversion out of concern for the tax revenue), so the machine was neither a machine of organized coercion as it is pictured nor a machine of proselytizing as some might wish. But a machine of **sovereignty that opens the door and leaves it**, through which people entered slowly with

composite motives (of faith, society, taxation, and marriage). **And the two decisive witnesses:** India, which the Muslims ruled for eight centuries and which remained Hindu in its majority, and Indonesia, which no army conquered and which became the largest Muslim nation. So the sword spread the state, the state prepared the climate, and the religion spread by its slow instruments.

The Crusades (1096–1291 CE)—the war that did not spread its religion and changed everything. They were summoned in the name of the cross to recover Jerusalem. They established Latin principalities for two centuries and then ended with no missionary effect worth mentioning in the East—indeed **they harmed the Christians of the East themselves** (the sack of Constantinople in 1204 by the Latin Crusaders is the deepest wound in the history of the Christian schism, and it deepened the separation of East from West more than any battle with the Muslims did), and they ended in the Islamic East an atmosphere of tolerance toward the local Christians, who became objects of suspicion. **Their real effect was in Europe:** they unified the Latin West around the papacy. They produced the orders of monk-knights (the Templars and the Hospitallers)—the explicit union of monasticism and the sword. They made the concept of "indulgence by fighting". They transferred to Europe the sciences, goods, and tastes of the East. They accelerated the Spanish Reconquista, which ended with the fall of Granada (1492) **and then with the expulsion of Muslims and Jews and their forced conversion, and the expulsion**

of the Moriscos (1609)—here the sword really did spread religion, but by eliminating the dissenter, not by persuading him: the exception that confirms the rule. **And in the north** the "Northern Crusades" (twelfth–fourteenth centuries) spread Christianity in the Baltic by the sword and settlement—the clearest case in Christian history of Christianization by conquest—as the Spanish conquest spread it in the Americas by the marriage of sword and mission.

The Mongol and Tatar invasions (1206–1400 CE)—the sword that embraced the religion of its victims. Among the largest invasions in history, it was **without a religion to spread**: Genghis and the Yasa tolerated all religions (exempting the clergy from taxes, and holding debates among the religions at the khans' court). Then Hulagu burned Baghdad (1258), ended the Abbasid caliphate, and killed hundreds of thousands—so that it seemed to the Muslims that Islam was ending. **Then came the strangest reversal in the history of religion and war**: within two generations the Mongols embraced the religion of those they had invaded: the Golden Horde converted to Islam (Berke Khan), then the Ilkhans of Persia (Ghazan, 1295), then the Chagatais. Their multitudes converted; in China the Yuan khans embraced Tibetan Buddhism; and in Iran the conqueror turned into a protector of Islamic civilization after having destroyed it. This was no coercion—the sword was in their hands—but **the attraction of the higher civilization**: a rule Ibn Khaldun observed in "the vanquished is enamored of imitating the victor," and then history turned it around: **the victor by the**

sword is vanquished by civilization. Then came Timur (the Tatars), a Muslim invading Muslims and building pyramids of skulls in Damascus (1401). So religion was neither the motive of the war nor its restraint. The Mongols had two far-reaching religious fruits: **the transfer of Islam's center** from the Arabs to the Turks, Persians, and India (for the Mongols and the Timurids are the ancestors of the Indian Mughals), **and the spread of Islam across the steppe** into the depths of Central Asia and Russia at the hands of the converted invaders.

The European wars of religion (1524–1648 CE)—the war that begot its opposite. From the Peasants' War to the Thirty Years' War, Europe fought in the name of creed for a century and a quarter (we weighed its losses in the study on power). No side spread its religion into the other's camp. The sectarian map came out after 1648 nearly as it went in ("the religion of the prince is the religion of the realm" fixed the status quo). **And its greatest fruit was the exact opposite:** exhaustion from religious war grew Westphalia, then tolerance, then secularism. **So religious war weakened political religion in Europe more than all of atheism did.** It has an older counterpart: the Jewish wars against Rome (66–135 CE) destroyed the Temple and the state and gave birth to spiritual **rabbinic Judaism**—the militarily defeated became a religion without a sword for two thousand years.

The Far East and India. Ashoka after the massacre of Kalinga (~260 BCE)—the war that made the greatest propagator of Buddhism, by remorse and not by

victory. Buddhism in Japan produced **the warrior monks** (*sohei*), who fought for centuries until Nobunaga exterminated them, and in Theravada today an armed nationalism (you saw it in the study on power). **Sikhism** was born as a spiritual path with Nanak and then became the armed *Khalsa* after the Mughals executed its Gurus—**the war of the other made the militarization of the religion. And Hinduism** did not usually spread by war (it is not a missionary religion), but it absorbed its invaders and grew its modern nationalism out of its struggle with Islam and the Raj.

* Second: The Table—By One Standard

The war	The attacker's religion	Did it spread the religion?	The reverse or unintended effect
The Islamic conquests	Islam	Spread the state at once; the religion slowly across centuries (the *dhimma*)	India remained Hindu; Indonesia became Muslim without conquest
The Crusades	Latin Christianity	No—in the East	The wound of the Christian schism (1204); the hardening of both sides; the transfer of

The war	The attacker's religion	Did it spread the religion?	The reverse or unintended effect
			sciences to Europe
The Spanish Reconquista and after	Catholicism	Yes—by eliminating the dissenter (forced conversion and expulsion, 1609)	Economic and human hemorrhage; the Inquisition
The Northern Crusades	Christianity	Yes—by sword and settlement in the Baltic	The last European paganism (Lithuania until 1387)
The Mongol invasion	No religion (the Yasa)	No—rather **the invaders embraced the religion of the invaded**	The transfer of Islam's center; its spread across the steppe
Timur's campaigns	A Muslim against Muslims	—	Devastated cities and new kingdoms
The European wars of religion	Catholics / Protestants	No—the map was fixed	Westphalia, then secularism

The war	The attacker's religion	Did it spread the religion?	The reverse or unintended effect
The Jewish-Roman wars	Judaism	Defeated	The birth of rabbinic Judaism without a sword
Kalinga (Ashoka)	—	Buddhism spread by the victor's remorse	The patron king as a model
The Spanish conquest of the Americas	Catholicism	Yes—by sword, mission, and epidemic	Demographic collapse; syncretic religiosity

* Third: The Six Rules—What the Cases Reveal Together

(1) The sword spreads the state, not the religion—except when it eliminates. Where the dissenter remained alive, he remained in his religion for generations (Egypt, Syria, and India). And where religion really was spread by the sword (Andalusia after 1492, the Baltic, the Americas), it was by eliminating the other, expelling him, or annihilating him demographically, not by persuading him—the sword does not bring religion into a heart; it removes the heart from the land.

(2) The victor by the sword is vanquished by civilization. The Mongols converted to Islam and to Buddhism. The Germanic peoples converted to Christianity

when they demolished Rome. And the Turks converted to Islam when they conquered Islam—the rule holds almost uniformly when the invaded are higher in civilization.

(3) War militarizes the religion it fights. The Crusades made the hardened jurisprudence of defensive jihad as they made the orders of knights. The Mughals' persecution of the Sikhs made the *Khalsa*. And Rome made rabbinic Judaism by the reverse (disarmament)—so the threatened religion either arms itself or spiritualizes.

(4) Religious war begets its opposite. Europe came out of its wars secular, and the East came out of the Crusades more religious—the direction depends on who won and who was exhausted.

(5) Most wars attributed to religion are wars of power that put on religion. The Mongols had no religion. Timur was a Muslim slaughtering Muslims. The Thirty Years' War ended with Catholic France allied with the Protestants against Catholic Austria; and the Crusaders sacked Christian Constantinople. The modern statistics of the encyclopedias of wars attribute to religion as a principal cause a limited proportion of history's wars (cited with their contested figures on close examination)—but religion was **the most efficient of legitimacies** for mobilization, so it was used where it was not the cause. **(6) And religion restrained war as much as it ignited it.** The Islamic jurisprudence of jihad set conditions (no killing of women, children, or monks; no burning of trees) a thousand years before

Geneva. "Just war" in Augustine and Aquinas is a set of conditions for legitimacy and means; the medieval "Truce of God" of the Church forbade fighting on particular days. The *ahimsa* of India forbade it altogether—so the religions that ignited wars are the ones that tried to refine them, and history preserves both faces.

* Fourth: How Do Religions Recede?—The Five Patterns

And if the sword spreads religion only by elimination, does it end religion? The tour reveals five patterns of recession. **(1) Annihilation by sword and decree.** Manichaeism was exterminated from Roman North Africa to China at the hands of all its opponents (Romans, Muslims, and Chinese). Catharism was annihilated by an internal crusade (1209–1229). The paganism of Europe ended by the decrees of Theodosius and then the swords of Charlemagne. The Islam of Andalusia by expulsion—**this pattern requires the monopoly of power and the will to annihilate together,** and it is relatively rare.

(2) The slow demographic hemorrhage. The Christianity of the East was not annihilated by any sword. It dwindled over centuries by gradual conversion (the poll tax, mixed marriage that attaches the children to the Muslim father, and the incentives of advancement) until it became minorities—the widest of the patterns of recession and the most hidden.

(3) Absorption. Buddhism vanished from its Indian cradle (thirteenth century) by three things together: the loss of royal patronage, the destruction of its great

monasteries by invasion (Nalanda), **and Hinduism's absorption of it** until the Buddha became an incarnation of Vishnu—so the mother house swallowed it instead of killing it.

(4) The loss of the incubator. Zoroastrianism receded when it lost the Sasanian state and became the religion of a migrating minority (the Parsis). And the religions of Mesopotamia and Egypt died with the death of their states and their languages before Christianity came.

(5) Modernization and enticement. The recession of religiosity in modern Europe was made by no sword and no decree (except in the Soviet experiment) but by prosperity, education, mobility, and alternatives—the only pattern that **cannot be resisted by resistance**, because it does not attack but entices. **And the conclusion that intersects with the first rule:** closed religions (with no mission and no political incubator) recede by the sword and the hemorrhage, and open missionary religions recede by enticement and absorption—and seldom does the sword kill a living religion as long as its people have a land to migrate to.

The Scale on the Ladder — And the Study's Question

The claim (common from both sides): "The sword spread the religions" / "Our religion did not spread by the sword." **The strongest case** for the first: Andalusia, the Baltic, and the Americas; and for the second: Bulliet's curve, Indonesia, and India. **The strongest objection** to both: the cases diverge so widely that generalization is forbidden, and the state that the sword conquered prepared the climate in which the religion slowly spread—so the sword is an indirect partner even when it does not coerce. **The strongest reply:** that the distinction between direct spread (rare: by elimination) and indirect spread (common: by sovereignty) is what settles the debate instead of the two slogans. **What is established:** that the sword spreads sovereignty. That religious conversion is a slow phenomenon of composite motives even under sovereignty. That invaders often embraced the religion of the invaded; and that religious war militarizes the religion fought and exhausts the religion fighting. **What is not established:** that a single great religion spread by the sword alone, nor that a religion spread without any state to protect it at all (except in a few cases).

And the Seeker's Question—a rule from his kit returning here with its heaviest load: **if every religion's history with the sword is the history of its followers and its states—by what right is the religion itself judged by it, for or against?**. Whoever answers this

question with one scale for all the religions has closed the widest of the doors of fallacy in this book.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the distinction between the spread of the state and the spread of the religion, and the contract of protection, in Chapter 11; the models of religion and power, the wars of religion, and Westphalia in the study on power; and persecution by the numbers and the rule "power before creed" in the study on accepting the other.*

A Study Annexed to Chapter 22: Women in the Scriptures, the Laws, and History — The File That Tests the Single Scale Most Severely

What the founding texts say at their strongest and at their hardest; how the layer of interpretation has read them; where history parted from the text in both directions; and the four positions of the modern contest inside every house

Summary of the study: No question is put to the religions more often today than the question of women, and none is more often answered by comparing one tradition's ideal with another's worst practice. This study applies the three layers of Chapter 15 to every house alike—founding text, authoritative interpretation, and lived history—then maps the four positions of the modern contest, which recur in every tradition, before asking what a fair comparison can and cannot settle.

---

* Opening: Why This File, and Why Here

A reader who has come this far will already have noticed a silence. The book has weighed the religions on their conception of God, their texts, their transmission, their evidence, and their ethics—and has said little about half of the human beings who hold them. The silence was not an oversight of ordering; it was the difficulty of the file. On no other question is the comparison so easily corrupted: the believer compares the loftiest

verse of his own tradition with the ugliest practice of his neighbor's, and the critic compares the harshest ruling of the tradition he rejects with the most enlightened law of the society he lives in. And on no other question does the distance between text, interpretation, and history run so wide—in every house without exception.

So the study proceeds by the rules already in the reader's hands.

Rule one: the three layers of Chapter 15—what the founding text says, what the authoritative interpretation made of it, and what the community actually did—are distinguished throughout, and never confused.

Rule two: every tradition is presented at its strongest and at its hardest, in the same paragraph, because a presentation that gives one house only its ideals and another only its abuses has already decided the comparison before making it.

Rule three: the modern contest is mapped, not adjudicated. This is a chapter on ethics, and the book's charter forbids it a verdict.

* First: The Founding Texts—At Their Strongest and at Their Hardest

Judaism. At its strongest, the Hebrew Bible opens with a creation of male and female together in the image of God, gives the matriarchs and the prophetesses—Sarah, Rebecca, Miriam, Deborah, Huldah—decisive roles, and closes Proverbs with a portrait of a woman of valor who buys fields and runs a household economy. At its hardest, the same text assigns the daughter a smaller inheritance, makes a wife's vow subject to her husband's

annulment, and frames the laws of purity around her body. The rabbinic layer both narrowed and widened this: it exempted women from time-bound commandments (a ruling that later served to exclude them from public ritual), while also building, through the *ketubah*, one of antiquity's strongest instruments of a wife's financial protection, and ruling that a man may not divorce his wife without her consent.

Christianity. At its strongest, the Gospels show women as the first witnesses of the resurrection—in a legal culture that discounted their testimony—and Paul's letter to the Galatians declares that in Christ there is neither male nor female. At its hardest, other Pauline and Pastoral texts instruct wives to submit and women to keep silence in the assembly, and the doctrinal tradition drew from them a settled ordering of the sexes. The interpretive layer split along a line that has not closed: churches that read the harder passages as binding order, and churches that read them as addressed to a first-century situation—so that the same canon today grounds both the exclusion of women from ordination and their admission to it.

Islam. At its strongest, the Qur'an addresses believing men and believing women in explicitly parallel formulas, gives the woman an inheritance she did not have in the Arabia it entered, makes her dowry her own property, and preserves the record of women who argued with the Prophet and were answered by revelation. At its hardest, the same text assigns a daughter half a son's share, makes the testimony of two women equal to one man's in certain financial contracts, and contains

the verse of Nisa' 34 on the husband's authority and the disputed word that some read as "strike" and others as "separate from." The jurisprudential layer built on both: it secured the wife's independent property (which European law did not grant until the nineteenth century) while also constructing, through the doctrines of guardianship and obedience, a hierarchy that the modern contest inside Islam turns upon. Nor is that layer one thing: the four schools differ over the age and consent of marriage, the conditions of divorce, and the woman's right to stipulate terms in her contract. The Islamic case is usually presented in a settled shape, from scholarly treatises down to student papers: a *before-and-after* frame (the burial of infant daughters and the inheritance of widows as property in the Arabia before Islam, against the rights the revelation established), an enumeration of rights *by role*—as daughter, sister, wife, and mother—with the Prophet's own conduct toward his wives (his consultation of Umm Salama at Hudaybiyya, his tenderness, his forbearance) as the founding model, and an explanation of the husband's authority by his obligations of maintenance and defense. That shape is the argument at its strongest, and it should be read as such. Its critics answer on two points: that the before-and-after frame compares Islam's text with Arabia's practice, which is the very comparison this book forbids in every other file; and that grounding the husband's authority in his functions leaves the ruling exposed when the functions change—which is exactly where the reform debate inside Islam now stands.

Hinduism. At its strongest, the tradition holds the divine feminine—Devi, Lakshmi, Saraswati, Durga—at the very center of worship, and the Vedic age names women among the composers of hymns. At its hardest, the *Laws of Manu* subordinate the woman to father, husband, and son in turn, and the later history of *sati* and of the treatment of widows became the most cited case in the colonial literature. The interpretive layer is as plural as the tradition: reformers from Ram Mohan Roy onward argued from the older texts against the later practices, and the argument was won, in law, from inside the tradition.

Buddhism. At its strongest, the Buddha admitted women to the monastic order and declared their capacity for awakening equal—an event without precedent in its world. At its hardest, the texts record his reluctance, the "eight heavy rules" that subordinate the senior nun to the junior monk, and later commentaries that doubted a woman could attain Buddhahood in a female body. The interpretive layer today contains the movement to restore full ordination for women where it lapsed, and the resistance to it, both arguing from the same Vinaya.

Sikhism. At its strongest, the founding Guru rejected the seclusion of women, the disparagement of menstruation, and *sati* in explicit hymns, and asked why one should call inferior the one who gives birth to kings. At its hardest, the tradition's own historians note that practice in the Punjab did not always follow the text—a gap the community's reformers have repeatedly measured.

The Confucian tradition. At its strongest, it made the mother the first teacher and the household the first school of virtue. At its hardest, the doctrine of the "three obediences" fixed the woman's subordination across her whole life, and foot-binding, though no Confucian text commands it, flourished for a millennium under its social order. The modern reformers of Confucianism have argued that the hierarchy was a historical accretion on an ethic of reciprocity; their critics reply that the hierarchy is in the classics themselves.

* Second: The Layer of Interpretation—Where Every House Divides

Set the founding texts side by side and one pattern appears at once: **no tradition speaks with one voice on this file, because no tradition's interpretive layer does.** In every house there are texts that lift the woman and texts that subordinate her, and in every house the interpreters have chosen which to make the rule and which to make the exception. This is not a defect peculiar to religion; it is what a layered text does in a changing society. But it has a consequence for comparison: the question "what does Islam (or Christianity, or Hinduism) say about women?" has no single answer, and any comparison that supplies one has quietly chosen a school and called it the religion.

Three moves recur in the interpretive layer of every tradition. The first is *contextualization*: a hard text is read as addressed to its own time, so that its principle survives and its form does not. The second is *hierarchy of texts*: a general principle (the equal image of God; the

parallel address of believers; the equal capacity for awakening) is made to govern the particular rulings, rather than the reverse. The third is *the appeal to the founding moment*: the reformer argues that the founder's own practice was more generous than what his followers built, and asks the tradition to return to it. There is also a fourth thing, which is not a move but a genre: the *enumeration of rights*, in which a tradition's defenders list what its texts granted women—property, inheritance, consent, maintenance, education—as proof of its honor for them. Every house produces this literature, and it is useful for what it documents; its limit is that a list of grants does not engage the hardest texts, and an enumeration is not a comparison until the same list is drawn up for the other houses by the same rule. Each of these moves has its traditionalist rejoinder, and the reader will recognize them from every other file in this book: that contextualization has no stopping point, that the particular rulings *are* the principle applied, and that the founding moment is known only through the same tradition being criticized.

* Third: History Against Text—In Both Directions

The layer of lived history parted from the text in two directions, and honesty requires naming both. In one direction, communities fell below their own texts: a tradition whose scripture secured the woman's property saw that property routinely absorbed by male relatives; a tradition whose founder admitted women to the order let that order lapse for centuries; a tradition whose

gospels made women the first witnesses barred them from the witness stand for most of its history. In the other direction, communities rose above their own texts: laws of inheritance were circumvented by gifts and endowments to daughters; women became scholars, jurists, and transmitters of hadith in numbers the legal theory did not anticipate; abbesses governed monasteries and, in some centuries, territories; and the Sikh, Hindu, and Buddhist reform movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were led, in part, by women whom the classical texts had not imagined leading anything.

The methodological lesson is the one the whole book has taught: **history is evidence about a community, not a proof about a text**—and it cuts in both directions. The critic who cites a society's cruelty as proof of its scripture's cruelty must accept that its generosity proves its scripture's generosity; the believer who claims the second must accept the first.

* Fourth: The Modern Contest—Four Positions in Every House

Whatever the tradition, the contemporary debate distributes itself into four positions, and knowing them prevents the commonest confusion—the confusion of the position with the religion.

(1) The traditionalist, who holds that the classical interpretive layer is binding, that the ordering of the sexes it describes is divine or natural, and that the modern critique is a foreign standard imposed on a

complete system. His strongest argument is that a text read against its own tradition can be made to say anything.

(2) The reformer from within, who accepts the founding text as authoritative and argues that the classical layer misread it—by neglecting the general principle, by absorbing the customs of its age, or by forgetting the founder's own practice. His strongest argument is that the classical interpreters were themselves men of their time, and said so.

(3) The critic from outside, who holds that the founding texts themselves are the product of patriarchal societies, that reform from within is a rescue operation for texts that do not deserve it, and that the only honest course is to judge the texts by a standard independent of them. His strongest argument is that the reformer's readings appeared only after the modern standard existed.

(4) The rereader, who holds that the texts contain resources the whole tradition has not yet used—that feminist theologies, in every house, are recovering voices the interpretive layer suppressed. Her strongest argument is the documentary one: the women scholars, mystics, and jurists whom the tradition's own archive preserves and its histories omitted.

The book does not choose among these. It notes only that the four positions exist, in nearly identical form, in Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism—so that the person who claims the debate is peculiar to one religion has not looked at the others.

The Scale on the Ladder — What the Comparison Can and Cannot Settle

The comparison can settle a great deal that is usually left vague. It can establish what each founding text actually contains, at its strongest and its hardest, in the same paragraph. It can show that the interpretive layer is plural in every house and that the modern positions recur across them. It can expose the two commonest frauds: the comparison of one tradition's text with another's history, and the comparison of one tradition's best school with another's worst. And it can measure the distance between text and practice in each community—which is a measurable thing, and different from one community to another and one century to another.

What the comparison cannot settle is the question the reader most wants settled: which tradition is *right* about women. That question turns on a prior one—by what standard?—and the standard is exactly what the four positions dispute. A person who has decided that the standard is the equality of contemporary law will find every founding text wanting, and will rank them by their distance from it; a person who has decided that the standard is the founding text will judge contemporary law by the text, and rank societies by their fidelity. The book's single scale does not resolve this, because the single scale is a standard for weighing evidence, and this is a dispute about the standard for weighing value. What the scale does require is that whichever standard the reader chooses, he apply it to every house alike—

including the house he was born in, and the society he lives in.

The Seeker's Question: take the hardest text on women in the tradition you were raised in, and the hardest in the tradition you find most foreign. Have you read the interpretive layer of both with the same charity? And when you compared them, did you compare text with text—or your text with their history?

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the three layers of a text in Chapter 15; the reach of religious law in Study 22.2; the position of the interpreter in Study 22.3; freedom of belief and the dignity of the dissenter in Chapter 26; and the question of the standard itself in Chapter 6.*

* Chapter 23: Science and Religion—Adversaries or Neighbors?

Summary of the chapter: The longest and most heavily documented chapter in the book takes up the defining quarrel of the modern age: from the limits of the laboratory itself, through physics, astronomy, cosmic and human origins, Darwin and the flood, to the neuroscience of belief—ending with the philosophy that knocked on this door centuries before science did. Adversaries, or neighbors who have misheard each other? The files are left to answer.

Two Stories That Get Told

In people's minds today there are two opposing stories about science and religion, and each story has its enthusiastic narrators.

The first story says: science and religion are adversaries in an eternal war. Whenever science advances a step, religion retreats a step. Faith is nothing but gaps in knowledge that progress fills one after another. And the matter will end with the victory of the laboratory over the temple.

The second story says: there is no quarrel at all. All of science testifies for faith, every new discovery is a sign, and there is no established theory that religion had not alluded to before.

This chapter claims that both stories betray the truth, and that the actual relationship between science and religion—as those who have studied their history and

philosophy know it—is more complex than war and harder than an embrace.

The Question "How" And the Question "Why"

Let us begin with the distinction on which many on both sides agree.

Empirical science is an ingenious instrument for answering the question "how": how the planets revolve, how the cell divides, how living diversity arose, how memory works. Its instruments are observation, measurement, and repeatable experiment, and its domain is everything that falls under these instruments.

As for the great questions of "why"—why is there a universe at all? why are its laws as they are? does existence have a purpose? does life have a meaning?—these are not of the kind that goes under a microscope or is repeated in a laboratory.

Hence a group of thinkers said: the two domains are separate and collide only when one oversteps its bounds—when the man of religion speaks of the details of astronomy from his texts, or the man of the laboratory speaks of meaning and purpose from his test tubes.

But fairness requires saying that this elegant separation does not satisfy everyone: the atheist objects that the religions have not historically kept to it but have made claims about the natural world itself. The believer objects that his religion is not "values and meanings" only but factual claims as well: that the universe has a Creator, that revelation happened, that the miracle occurred. So the borders between the two kingdoms are

contested, and that is exactly what keeps the question alive.

Four Models, Not One

Scholars of the philosophy of science and religion—the most famous classification being Ian Barbour's—have proposed that the possible relationship between the two is not one but four:

Conflict. The model of the hardliners on both sides together: the religious literalist who tries science by the apparent sense of the texts, and the scientistic materialist who sees science as the sole source of all possible knowledge—and both see the arena as a battle of exclusion.

Independence. Each has its kingdom, its questions, and its instruments, as passed in the distinction of "how" and "why."

Dialogue. The two domains are independent, but on their borders lie shared questions that deserve a meeting: why is the universe mathematically intelligible at all? what is the origin of consciousness? whence nature's amenability to law?

Integration. The attempt to build a single vision that orders science and faith together, as scientist-theologians and philosophers from various traditions have done.

The seeker's knowledge of this map frees them from the first deception: the deception that they have only two choices, either science or religion.

The Root in the Heritage: The Question Eight Centuries Before Barbour— Three Islamic Positions

Nor is the map of models a modern invention; the Islamic heritage fought the battle of "reason and transmission" as deeply as any civilization ever fought it, and three positions crystallized in it that correspond to Barbour's models as if they were their ancestors.

(1) The universal rule (the theologians—al-Razi): if the apparent sense of the text contradicts rational demonstration, **reason is given precedence and the text is interpreted**—because reason is the root of establishing transmission, so if we invalidated reason in favor of transmission we would invalidate the thing by which transmission was established; a method corresponding to "integration by interpretation."

(2) The Decisive Treatise (Ibn Rushd): "truth does not contradict truth but accords with it and testifies to it." So if demonstration leads to what contradicts the apparent sense of the law, the apparent sense must be interpreted according to the rules of the Arabic tongue, **for the people of demonstration alone**, not for the public; the nearest of the ancestors to Galileo's "two books" and to the model of disciplined dialogue.

(3) The Averting of Contradiction (Ibn Taymiyya)—in ten volumes replying to the universal rule from forty-four angles: that contradiction between **explicit reason** and **sound transmission** does not occur at all.

If a contradiction appears, one of the two parties is defective—a transmission that is not sound, or a reason that is not explicit (a doubt, not a demonstration). That the question is not "reason or transmission" but **the certain or the probable, from whichever source it comes**: the certain is given precedence over the probable whatever its source, and the claim that "reason is the root of transmission" confuses the reason that taught us the truthfulness of the Messenger with probable rational opinions that are meant to be given precedence over a certain text. His supporters hold that he solved the question at its root by denying contradiction rather than managing it, and his opponents hold that he reproduced the rule in another form (for who judges that this is "explicit" and that a "doubt," if not reason?). **And the lesson for the seeker**—whatever their house: that the great religious nations did not discover the question of "religion and science" in the nineteenth century. They managed it for centuries with their own tools, and today's three positions (interpretation upon contradiction / disciplined independence / denial of contradiction at the root) have names and authors in the heritage. So let no one sell them one formula of these as "the" single Islamic position.

Study 23.1: "Science Does Not Find God in the Laboratory"— The Limits of the Empirical Method

> **Summary of the study:** Why can no laboratory prove or disprove God's existence? Not because science is incapable, but because the question itself lies outside what the experimental method was built to answer. This study draws that boundary carefully before the whole chapter wades into its details.

Many battles in this subject dissolve with a single philosophical distinction that the disputants do not know: the difference between **methodological naturalism** and **philosophical naturalism**.

Empirical science—by the agreement of its philosophers—works by an operating rule called methodological naturalism: it admits into its explanations only natural causes that can be measured and tested. If you ask the laboratory about the cause of rain, it answers you with condensation, not with angels—**not because it has proved the nonexistence of the unseen, but because its instruments do not reach it at all**, as a metal detector does not "see" wood: its inability to detect it is no evidence of its nonexistence. Philosophical naturalism is another, larger claim: that nature is **all** there is, and there is nothing beyond it—and this is not a laboratory result but a metaphysical position its holder takes before the laboratory and from outside it.

And the fruit of the distinction for the seeker is double, on both sides together: when they are told "science has not found God, therefore there is no God," let them know that its speaker has leapt from the methodological to the philosophical in an illegitimate leap. For science has not "found" the nonexistence of God either, nor does it find, by the nature of its instruments, the value of justice, the beauty of a melody, or the meaning of life. And what lies outside the range of the instrument the instrument testifies neither for nor against. And when they are told, on the other side, "we have found the trace of God in this phenomenon that science cannot explain," let them remember the trap of the gaps we warned of: present inability may be temporary ignorance, not a door to the unseen. **So the legitimate place for the discussion**—as we saw in the arenas of engagement—is not inside the results of science but at its borders: in the questions at which science itself stops because of its method (why the laws? why is the universe mathematically intelligible? what is the source of existence itself?)—and there the believer and the atheist converse **as two equal philosophers**, not as a scientist against an ignoramus.

With this distinction the reader understands a phenomenon that would otherwise have puzzled them: how do the believer and the atheist share the one laboratory and the one research paper without disagreement, and then part as heaven parts from earth in interpreting its meaning? The answer: because they agree on **the methodological** and part on **the philosophical**—and the science in their hands belongs to both of them equally.

* History Without Myths

In this subject stories are told that have become founding myths of the two opposing stories, and honesty requires clarifying the most famous of them.

Galileo. The common story reduces it to "a scientist against a church." The historical event is more complex: a dispute in which were intertwined scientific evidence that was not complete at the time, personalities and politics and the sensitivities of an entire age, and clergy who were among Galileo's supporters and others among his opponents. Injustice occurred, yes, and the real lesson is not "religion is the enemy of science" but: when any institution—religious or not—becomes a power that tries ideas by force, everyone pays the price.

And the facing side, told less than it deserves: that many of the founders of modern science were believers who saw their research as a worship that tracks "the traces of God's workmanship". That Islamic civilization supplied empirical science with an enormous provision for long centuries; that the author of the "Big Bang" theory itself—Georges Lemaître—was a Catholic priest; and that an Austrian monk, Mendel, laid the foundation of genetics. So whoever wants to make history a pure war between temple and laboratory will have to hide half the characters.

And on the other side too: it is not right to deny that religious texts and interpretations have really been used across history to resist scientific ideas that later proved sound, and that the price of that was sometimes heavy. So history is a witness for both sides and against them.

* The Real Places of Engagement

Away from the myths, where do science and faith engage in an engagement that really concerns the seeker? In four major arenas:

The origin of the universe. Modern cosmology has established that the observable universe has a history extending about 13.8 billion years from an initial state of extreme density and heat. Here the two interpretations part, not the two sciences: the believer reads the beginning and the fine-tuning of the constants of nature as witnesses of purpose and creation, and cites the perplexity of great non-religious scientists before numbers that appear "carefully tuned." The atheist answers: the observed beginning is not necessarily an absolute beginning, fine-tuning has competing explanations (a multiverse, or a deeper physical necessity not yet discovered), and it is not right to fill a gap of ignorance with a god. The believer replies: rather, the inference here is from science, not from its gaps . . . And so it becomes clear that the battle is not between science and religion, but between two philosophical interpretations of one science that both sides accept.

Evolution. The most firmly established unifying theory in modern biology, and around it the most famous misunderstanding in our whole subject. The common image—"believers against evolution and atheists for it"—is inaccurate: the reality is that the positions of believers themselves are a broad spectrum—from those who reject the theory wholesale, to those who accept it as the manner of creation that God carried out ("guided

evolution," or the evolutionary faith held by many believing scientists of various faiths), to those who suspend judgment on the details. The strategic error this book warns against from both directions: tying the whole question of God's existence to the fate of a scientific theory. Whoever hung his faith on the fall of evolution has wagered on a battle not on his own ground, and whoever made evolution an argument for atheism has confused the "how" and the "why" with which we began: describing the mechanism by which species arose does not by itself answer the question of the source of existence, of the laws, and of the first life.

Miracle and the laws of nature. The objector says: science was founded on the regularity of laws, and a miracle is their breach, so to accept it is to demolish the scientific mentality. The believer answers: a law is a description of a running custom, not a constraint on the One who runs it. Whoever believes in a creator of the laws finds nothing in reason to forbid His disposing of them, and whoever denies Him has begged the question before the inquiry. The dispute here—once again—is philosophical, before the laboratory: is nature all there is?

Consciousness. How does an awareness that perceives itself emerge from matter? A question the philosophers call "the hard problem," which materialists see as gradually solvable by neuroscience, and others—among them non-religious thinkers—see as a gap in the materialist conception itself. It is among the most fertile arenas of dialogue today.

* "Half of Science Is Unseen"—An Argument and a Reply

In this context there arises an argument that Mustafa Mahmoud framed brilliantly in his journey: whoever refuses to believe in anything but the sensible must reject half of science. For gravity is not seen but known by its effects—and Newton himself admitted ignorance of its essence—the electron no one has seen, and waves fill the room without any sense falling on them. So science itself believes in an unseen on the strength of its effects; why is this path forbidden to the believer alone?

The other side's answer is known and deserves presentation at its strength: the unseen things of science are bound to effects that can be measured, predicted, and falsified—we calculate the electron's path before observing its trace, and the calculation comes true—whereas the religious unseen offers no laboratory predictions of this kind, so the analogy is drawn with a difference.

Then the believer returns and says: rather, the thing to be proved is that every existent must be of the kind that is measured in a laboratory—and this is a begging of the question, not a demonstration . . .

And so the reader sees that the dialogue is serious on both sides, and that to belittle either of them is to be ignorant of it.

* Beware the Excised Quotation: A Case Study

In the books of this subject—from both sides—there is a phenomenon against which the seeker must arm themselves: the use of the sayings of great scientists torn from their context and from the positions of their authors.

Take a real example from the sources of this very book: much believing literature quotes phrases of the astronomer Robert Jastrow about the discomfort of the scientific mind at the idea of "a universe with a beginning," phrases of Fred Hoyle about a physics that looks as if "a superintellect" had tampered with its numbers, and phrases of Paul Davies about "an overwhelming impression of design"—all of them real sayings their authors said. But complete honesty requires mentioning with them that Jastrow lived as an agnostic, that Hoyle remained the holder of idiosyncratic explanations far from traditional religion, and that Davies does not adopt a personal, intervening God. On the other side, atheist literature tears out phrases of believers or musters "the consensus of scientists" on philosophical questions that are not within the competence of scientific consensus at all.

The rule the seeker takes away: a scientist's testimony is taken within the limits of what he said and of his specialty, with his position complete—indeed the agnostic's saying "the phenomenon is perplexing" is stronger by the measure of fairness than deluding you that he was a believer. Whomever you find quoting

without this honesty—from any camp—make that a reason for further verification of his manner of citation.

* A Special Arab Case: "Scientific Inimitability"

In the Arabic sources there is a widespread phenomenon that deserves a frank pause: interpreting Qur'anic verses by modern scientific discoveries and counting that as evidence of inimitability.

What the reader must know is that this subject is **a matter of disagreement within the Islamic house itself** before it is a polemic with the outside: among Muslim scholars are those who expanded it and made it the argument of the age, and among them are leading authorities in Qur'anic studies who reserved judgment on it severely for sound methodological reasons: that scientific theories change, so tying the definitive text to them endangers it. That twisting the meanings of words to chase every discovery is strained. That much of what circulates in this market—especially on websites and satellite channels—is stories and statistics that have not withstood scrutiny. Its younger sibling, "numerical inimitability," has a sharper debate, in which researchers divided into strong deniers, those suspending judgment, and supporters with conditions, and in its history is a famous cautionary tale of a researcher who began by counting numbers and ended by claiming messengership.

So let the seeker keep here to the method they have learned: distinguish the root of the argument from inimitability on which the heritage turns (the rhetorical, which comes in the chapter on the religions' evidence)

from the disputed modern expansions, and examine every example by specific criteria: does the original text indicate the claimed meaning before the discovery, or was it loaded onto it afterward? Is the story told documented? Is the scientific indication definitive, or a theory open to revision?

So What Do the Scientists Themselves Say?

A last question that occurs to every seeker: the people of the laboratory themselves—where have they ended up?

The honest answer: at all the positions—and the documented figures here are a whole school in reading statistics fairly, so let us look at them together.

In 1914 the American psychologist James Leuba surveyed the scientists of his country and found about forty percent of them believing in a personal God, and he predicted that the proportion would collapse with the spread of education. More than eighty years later (1996) the historian Edward Larson repeated the map by Leuba's own method and found the proportion about thirty-nine percent—that is, almost unchanged, belying the prophecy of collapse. So the believer says: here is the steadiness of faith in the heart of the people of the laboratory for a whole century.

But the map reverses among the highest elite: among the members of the American National Academy of Sciences, Larson and Witham (1998) found that only about seven percent believe in a personal God, and a later study of the fellows of the British Royal Society showed a similar predominant rejection. So the atheist says: the

higher you climb the pyramid of science, the less the faith.

Then the lens widens beyond the Anglo-Saxon world, and the map changes again: the international studies of Elaine Ecklund and her team—among the widest surveys of the world's scientists—concluded that most scientists worldwide see no conflict between science and religion, that the myth of war between them is to a large extent "a Western manufacture," and that in major countries the majority among scientists themselves are religious. At the level of peoples generally, Ronald Inglehart recorded a decline of religiosity in forty-three of the forty-nine countries he studied between 2007 and 2019—while other surveys show the resilience and renewal of religiosity across wide regions of the world.

So which of the figures "is the truth"? All of them—each within the limits of its question, its sample, and its time. This is the lesson: a single excised statistic serves any orator, and the complete picture serves only the fair-minded researcher. The complete picture says: the proportions of irreligion among scientists are higher than among the general public, and highest in the Western academic elites, with religious believers remaining at the summit of every specialty from particle physics to the genome project, and an enormous variation among the countries of the world.

And what does the seeker gain from this? Two lessons, opposite in appearance and complementary in truth:

That scientific genius does not settle this question automatically—or else the geniuses would agree.

That no one is entitled to say to them "science imposes atheism on you" or "science imposes faith on you". For if science imposed either, its people would not be divided as they are.

The Chapter's Summary

Science is the greatest of humanity's instruments for understanding "how" this world works, and it has accomplished in a few centuries what resembles a cognitive miracle, and whoever has fought it or belittled it—in the name of any creed—has lost.

But this book's question—is there a God behind the world?—stands at the borders of its empirical method. Not because the question is "unscientific" in the belittling sense, but because it is deeper than the instruments of measurement: it is a question about the interpretation of the whole of existence within which science operates.

That is why we have seen in every arena of this chapter the same pattern recur: one science that both sides accept, and two philosophical interpretations that contest it.

So do not accept it from anyone who says to you "choose between science and faith"—for this is a choice that the scientific method itself does not impose.

Carry with you from this chapter its compass: wherever you find the two sides agreeing on the scientific datum and disagreeing on its reading, know that you have left the laboratory and entered a wider court—the

court whose instruments of judgment we laid down in Part II of this book (the seeker's tools).

The Seeker's Question: When you hear "science has proved" in a matter of the unseen—from either side—can you separate, within the same sentence, what the instrument measured from what its reader said?

Study 23.2: Physics and Religion— The Science That Stands at the Edge of Metaphysics

Why Physics in Particular?

> **Summary of the study:** It is the physicists—not the botanists or the geologists—who write books with theological titles, for and against. The reason is structural: the questions of their science end, by their very nature, at the edge where metaphysics begins. Five stops along that shared edge, from the origin of the universe to its final fate.

Of all the sciences, physics has been—and remains—the most fertile arena for the dialogue of science and religion and their engagement. This is no accident: physics is the science that studies **origins and universals**—matter, energy, time, space, and the laws that hold for everything—so its questions end by their nature at the edge where the questions of metaphysics begin: where did everything come from? why are things ordered? does time have a beginning? That is why you find the great physicists—not the botanists and geologists, say—writing the books with theological-sounding titles, in affirmation and in denial. We detailed in the chapter on evidence (18) the two greatest physical fruits of this dialogue—the argument from the universe's beginning and the argument from fine-tuning, with their objections and replies—so we do not repeat them here. In this study we cross what lies beyond them: five stations that belong to physics alone.

* The First Station: Why Is the Universe Written in Mathematics at All?

Before any particular physical result, there is a puzzle in **the possibility of physics itself**: why does the universe respond to equations? Mathematical scribbles that human beings set down on paper—some of them invented for their own sake centuries ago with no applied purpose—predict the behavior of galaxies and particles with an astonishing precision reaching dozens of decimal places. This so perplexed the Nobel laureate physicist Eugene Wigner that he wrote his celebrated essay on "The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics in the Natural Sciences" (1960), describing the matter as a wonderful gift we neither understand nor deserve. Before him Galileo held that the book of nature "is written in the language of mathematics."

Here the two interpretations part, in the way we have observed: **the believer's reading:** the universe is mathematically intelligible because it issued from a rational mind—a written order points to a writer, and nature's amenability to law is itself the trace of legislation (many of the founders of modern science—Kepler, Newton, and their like—made this their explicit belief: they read "the thoughts of God" in the equations). **And the other side's reading,** from several angles: that mathematics is a human craft tailored gradually to the measure of nature, so it is no wonder that it fits it (as no one wonders at the fit of a glove to the hand it was sewn for). That our minds are the product of an evolution in this universe, so it is natural that their instruments

should fit its structure. That physics succeeds where it succeeds and we see only its successes (where are the equations for the phenomena that have resisted?). The first side replies: tailoring to measure does not explain the prediction, by mathematics invented in sheer play (like the non-Euclidean geometries), of a physics discovered centuries later . . . The debate stands, and it is among the finest debates of "dialogue" in Barbour's models—no conflict in it and no victor, but a borderline question at which both parties stand amazed for two different reasons.

* The Second Station: The Laws Themselves—Descriptions or Commands? And Do They Need a Legislator?

In recent decades a saying of great physicists has become famous: that the laws dispense with a creator—its most widely circulated form being what Stephen Hawking (with Mlodinow) wrote in *The Grand Design*: as long as there is a law like gravity, the universe can create itself from nothing, spontaneously, so there is no need for a god to light the fuse. This claim—whatever the eminence of its author in physics—moved the discussion from physics to its philosophy, and there it received criticism from philosophers of science believing **and unbelieving** together, the upshot being three questions. First: a physical law is **a description** of the regularity of the behavior of existing things, so how can it be an agent that brings into existence? (Gravity describes how masses attract each other; it does not "make" masses out of nothing—just as the laws of

arithmetic describe your money and deposit not a coin in your account.) Second: if the "nothing" from which the universe creates itself is charged with the law of gravity and quantum fields, it is not nothing. The question has recoiled a step: whence the law and the field? (This is the very criticism directed at Lawrence Krauss's book *A Universe from Nothing*—directed at it also by atheist philosophers who saw in the title a fallacy of naming: the physicists' "nothing" is a physical vacuum governed by laws, not the sheer nothing the philosophers ask about.) And the third and deepest: what is the standing of the laws in the first place? Are they entities with a subsistence that govern matter (then where do they "dwell," and what is the source of their authority?), or merely our summaries of regularities we observe (then why the regularity itself?)—an open philosophical question whose answer, the specialists admit, physics presupposes and does not possess. **And the lesson for our seeker is double:** do not accept "the laws dispense with a creator" as a physical result—it is a philosophical leap over questions not yet answered. Do not accept, on the other side, the turning of the obscurity of the laws' standing into a ready-made argument—that is of the kind of the gaps we warned of. The correct place of the question: the argument from regularity within the arguments from design in Chapter 18, on its scale there.

* The Third Station: Quantum Physics—The Science Most Exploited by Both Sides

Quantum mechanics is perhaps the scientific theory most misused in the history of religious debate—from both directions, and our duty is to warn the seeker against both exploitations together:

The "spiritual" exploitation. Marketing the quantum as scientific proof of the spirit, or of the effect of consciousness on reality, or that "everything is connected to everything"—a thriving market (the critics called it "quantum mysticism") that leaps from the fact that observation in quantum experiments is associated with the collapse of the wave function to "consciousness creates reality," while the interpretation of quantum measurement is a matter of dispute among dozens of physical schools, most of which give consciousness no special role. So whoever sells you "quantum physics proves the creed"—any creed—hold on to your money.

And the opposite exploitation. Arguing from quantum indeterminacy to demolish the principle of causality on which the arguments for existence stand ("events without a cause, so no need for a first cause")—we presented this objection and its reply in its place in the argument from coming-to-be (Chapter 18), and we add here its physical refinement: quantum indeterminacy—on its most probable readings—means that **the timing and outcome** of the individual event are not determined in advance within an existing system governed by strict probabilistic laws. So it is "statistical causality" inside an existing structure, not the emergence of

existence from sheer nothing—and the difference between the two is the whole question.

And the quantum keeps a legitimate fruit in our subject: it shattered the naive confidence that common sense is the measure of the possible and the impossible in existence. Whoever lived through the twentieth century seeing the particle pass through both slits at once and entanglement bind what is far apart can no longer say "this is impossible because it is strange." Both sides have used it: the believer to say "so do not find the unseen strange," and the atheist to say "so do not assume your intuitions of the universe—among them the intuition that everything has a purposeful agent." And both are legitimate uses . . . and equally destructive of the opponent's weapon.

* The Fourth Station: Time—Where Augustine Met Relativity

Among the most delightful and astonishing meetings in this subject: when the theologian Augustine (fifth century CE) was asked the mocking question "what was God doing before He created the world?" he gave his famous answer that transcends the mockery: there is no "before" at all. For time itself is created, and the world was created **with** time, not **in** time. Then Einstein's relativity came fifteen centuries later and established that time is not an absolute container but a dimension woven into spacetime, bound to matter and motion. Modern cosmology came speaking of the origin of spacetime itself with the universe, until the question "what was before the beginning?" became for many physicists a

malformed question like "what is north of the North Pole?" So the intuition of ancient theology met the architecture of modern physics in a meeting that believers recall with pride. **And yet we discipline the significance with our scale:** this meeting testifies that the proposition "creation with time" is not an ancient absurdity but a coherent conception that has returned to respectability. But it does not "prove" theology by physics. For the atheist accepts the origin of spacetime and stops there without a creator, and the disagreement remains in the interpretation, as always. (The detail of what follows from the beginning of time is in the argument from coming-to-be, Chapter 18.)

*The Fifth Station: The Fate of the Universe—Physics Poses the Question of Meaning

Physics has a word at the end, not at the beginning alone: the most probable of its scenarios for the distant fate of the universe is "heat death"—an expansion that never reverses, stars going out one after another, entropy reaching its limit, and then cold and darkness and stillness without end. This physical prophecy threw a heavy stone into philosophy: what meaning has the whole human project if the fate of the entire stage is darkness? Bertrand Russell framed it in a famous, somber formulation (that the soul's habitation must from now on be built on the firm foundation of unyielding despair at the fate of the universe), and the theoretical physicist Steven Weinberg wrote his widely quoted line to the effect that the more the universe seems comprehensible, the more it also seems pointless. And then

followed it (and this is what is forgotten of his words) with the remark that the effort to understand it is itself among the things that lift our lives above farce. Believers used it as a witness from great opponents that materialism leads to nihilism and that the thirst for an abiding meaning is not quenched by physics. Existentialists and the irreligious used it as a witness for the opposite: that meaning is our own making in the face of the silence, truer and braver than a promised meaning. **And this is no physical dispute**—for the equations are the same for both camps—but it is exactly the gateway of "the great questions" to which we devoted Part VIII, and the chapter "Death and What Follows" is its appointment.

* The Study's Conclusion: The Physicists Themselves—and the Misuse of Their Testimony

We close by fortifying the reader against the weapon of quotations—and it has a whole literary genre worth knowing by name: "books of scientists' testimonies," whose most famous Arabic classics in translation are *God Reveals Himself in the Age of Science* (the testimonies of forty American scientists) and Morrison's *Science Calls for Faith*—books of the 1950s that had an enormous preaching effect in the Arabic library for a whole generation, and are today the historical specimen of the genre: truthful in their testimonies for their time, dated in some of their scientific examples, and methodologically standing on what this paragraph shows. For the market of debate is full of the names of physicists brought forward as witnesses: Newton,

Kepler, and Maxwell were deeply believing (true—and they were from ages in which faith was the framework of nearly everyone, so the significance of the number is disciplined by its context). Planck and Heisenberg are quoted in words exalting religion (and they have their contexts and their own conception of religion). Einstein is the most wronged of them by both sides: believers cite his words about "the cosmic religious feeling" and "the rejection of chance," and atheists cite others. The man declared his position repeatedly: he believed in what he called "Spinoza's God," manifest in the harmony of existence, **and did not** believe in a personal God who cares and judges—so he is closer to an admiring pantheism than to either camp of the debate, and conscripting him for either is an amputation of his doctrine. The rule the seeker takes away is the chapter's mother rule: **the positions of the great are a phenomenon to be understood, not an argument by which to settle**. For the one physics produced the theistic Newton, Weinberg abstaining from meaning, Hawking dispensing with the hypothesis, and Polkinghorne, who left the chair of mathematical physics to become a priest—and had the equations imposed a creed, their authors would not have divided as they have. Physics brings everyone to the same edge; what lies beyond the edge is a leap of interpretation that each makes by his own lamp.

Cross-references for the study: *the argument from the universe's beginning and entropy, and the argument from fine-tuning with its pillars and objections (the multiverse, observational selection), in Chapter 18; methodological and philosophical naturalism in Study 23.1 above; and miracle and the laws of nature in the body of this chapter.*

Study 23.3: Astronomy and Religion—The Sky at Which Everything Began

Opening: Why Was the Sky Religion's First Theater?

Summary of the study: From the loss of earth's centrality to the possibility of other life in the cosmos, the sky humanity first gazed at has become a renewed arena of dialogue between astronomy and religion. This study dismantles the popular myth of conflict, and shows what remains genuinely open.

No science's story has been intertwined with the story of religion as astronomy's has—and this is no wonder: the sky was the first human being's temple before it was his observatory. In it the ancient saw the greatest thing an eye falls upon: a daytime fire that gives life, nighttime lamps that guide the traveler, and an unfailing regularity that governs his seasons, his sowing, and his tides—so he lifted his face to it as a worshiper before he lifted it as a student. We laid out in the map of objects of worship (Chapter 1) how the sun was worshiped almost everywhere—Ra, Shamash, Surya, Amaterasu. With it the moon and the planets: Ishtar is Venus, Nergal is Mars, Nabu is Mercury, and the days of our week to this day carry, in many languages, the names of the divine bodies. The first great buildings were raised as observatories and temples at once: the ziggurats of Mesopotamia as stairways to the gods of the sky, the pyramids of the Maya aligned to the timings of the sun, and Stonehenge aligned to its solstice. So astronomy and religion

were born twins in one cradle, and this historical fact alone suffices to bring down the myth of "eternal war" between them.

* First: Astronomy in the Service of Religion—The Worship That Built the Observatories

Among the most curious paradoxes of this subject is that religion was, across history, among the greatest **funders** and directors of astronomy, because its rites hang upon the sky directly. Judaism and Christianity needed the calculation of the feasts (and the fixing of Easter remains an astronomical-ecclesiastical question that dragged along the reform of the calendar itself: the Gregorian calendar by which the world dates today was issued by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582 to fix the date of Easter). Islam tied its daily and annual worship to the sky with a binding that made astronomy practically a collective obligation: the times of the five prayers by the motion of the sun, the *qibla* a problem of spherical trigonometry on the surface of the earth, and the month of fasting and the pilgrimage by the sighting of the crescents. So there arose in Islamic civilization a complete science called "the science of timekeeping," with its officials in the great mosques. The observatories flourished from Baghdad to Maragha to Samarkand. The *zijes* (tables of astronomical calculations) were compiled. The influence went so far that **many of the names of the stars in the language of world astronomy to this day are Arabic**: Aldebaran, Fomalhaut, Algol, Altair, Canopus (Suhayl), and Rigel—linguistic witnesses hung in the sky to an age in which the muezzin and the

astronomer worked in the same building. The same story holds in India (an astronomy serving the Vedic rite) and among the Maya (precise calendars for ritual cycles). So whoever wants a fair history says: as religion sometimes engaged with astronomy, it was for long centuries its incubator and the cause of its precision.

* Second: Astronomy and Astrology—The Forgotten Engagement

Centuries before Galileo, religion fought another "astronomical" battle that is told less than it deserves—but in the opposite direction from the common image: its battle with **astrology**, the claim of reading human destinies in the positions of the planets. Astronomy and astrology were born joined in Babylon and remained a single craft for centuries, and their separation was a gradual achievement in which—side by side with the philosophers and astronomers—**the scholars of religion** took part: the Islamic tradition explicitly forbade the claim of knowing the unseen by the stars (the jurists distinguished between praiseworthy astronomical calculation and blameworthy astrological judgment, and theologians and jurists waged organized campaigns against the latter), and Christian theology attacked it from Augustine downward because it threatened free will and divine providence together—all this in ages when the courts of kings (Muslim and Christian alike) seated astrologers in the places of honor. So here is a case in which religion and modern science stand **in one trench** against a common adversary that is still alive and well in the horoscopes of the newspapers and the

apps of phones—and we detailed astrology and its sisters within the chapter on the intermediate unseen (Chapter 10).

* Third: Geocentrism—The Actual History Behind the Common Image of Conflict

Then came the battle that became the symbol of the whole subject: the earth's passage from the center of the universe to a wandering planet. We clarified the story of Galileo in the body of this chapter, and we add here two corrections absent from the common account:

The first. The common account says: "geocentrism made man feel himself the master of the universe, and then Copernicus came and humiliated him"—whereas the historical reality is more precise and more curious: in the Aristotelian-medieval cosmology that theology adopted, the center of the universe was not **the noblest** of positions but **the lowest**: the place of density, corruption, and change to which heavy things settle (Dante's Hell is at the heart of the earth—the bottom of the center—and the heavens grow nobler the higher they rise), so some of Copernicus's contemporaries saw in lifting the earth into the sky a promotion, not a humiliation. So the widespread psychological tale ("the cosmic wound to dignity") is an elegant later formulation more than a description of what the people felt—and its methodological lesson: beware history redesigned to serve a moral.

And the second. The heroes of the story themselves spoil its warlike narrative: Copernicus was a churchman (an administrative canon of the cathedral) and

dedicated his book to the pope. Kepler—the discoverer of the laws of the orbits—was a devoted theologian who saw in the geometry of the heavens a "praise." The story ended in complete reconciliation until the acceptance of heliocentrism became the consensus of believers themselves without remainder. **And this ending itself is the chapter's great lesson:** wherever observation settled a question of "how," believers ended—though some were late—by rereading the apparent sense of the texts in accordance with it (as the texts on "the fixity of the earth" were reread in most traditions), so religion remained and the battle of position departed. The intelligent seeker asks here his legitimate question: may not what resembles it among today's battles be measured by it?—which is exactly what we treated in the section on evolution in the body of this chapter.

* Fourth: The Shock of Vastness—Does the Size of the Universe Dwarf the Human Being?

Then the telescope opened the door that has not yet closed: the vastness of the universe. From Ptolemy's bounded sky to a galaxy of hundreds of billions of suns, to **billions of galaxies,** to an earth that appeared from the edge of the solar system—in the image Carl Sagan made famous—"a pale blue dot" swimming in a beam of light. On this vastness a widespread emotional atheist argument was built: is it conceivable that this whole tremendous ocean should be the stage for the story of a creature on a speck of its dust? The sizes mock the claim of providence.

And the believers' answer comes in layers.

The first: that their texts preceded in making the human being small before creation, not large: "the creation of the heavens and earth is greater by far than the creation of mankind," in the text of the Qur'an. The psalmist lifts his eyes to his sky and cries: "what are human beings that you are mindful of them?" (Psalm 8:4)—so awe before vastness is a venerable religious experience, not a telescopic discovery, and vastness in the logic of faith is a magnification of the Creator, not a belittling of the intended creature.

The second is logical: size is not the measure of worth—the sleeping child is more precious than a mountain that outweighs him billions of times over, and his brain is the most complex structure we know in the whole observed universe. So to infer smallness of standing from smallness of space is the fallacy of confusing rank with area.

And the third turns the argument around: this very vastness—by the calculation of fine-tuning—is **a condition** of our existence: a universe younger and smaller would not have had stars that cooked the elements of which our bodies are made. So we do not swim in a surplus void but in the minimum required for our manufacture (in the language of physics itself). The other side returns: rather, observational selection explains that without purpose . . . and the question returns—as always in this whole subject—to two interpretations above one observation, its detail in Chapter 18.

* Fifth: Are We Alone?—The Question of Life Beyond Earth

The last of astronomy's doors open onto religion is a question not yet settled by observation: life—and mind—beyond the earth. Its probable answer, in both its faces, has become an arena of advance inference:

If other intelligent life were found: enthusiasts assert that it would demolish the "human-centered" religions. Calm examination shows that the shock is distributed less evenly than is supposed: the Islamic traditions appear more spacious in accommodation (the Qur'an describes God as "Lord of the Worlds," and mentions "the living creatures He has scattered throughout them"—through the heavens and the earth—so that ancient commentators spoke of creatures in the heavens without embarrassment, and the angels and the jinn are in any case non-human rational beings at the core of the creed); Christian theology faces a more particular question because its doctrine centers on an incarnation and a redemption that took place on this earth (does the redemption of the earth include other worlds? or does every world have its own dispensation?)—a discussion theologians have pursued seriously for centuries, and some have flexible answers. While Judaism, Hinduism, and Buddhism are the least embarrassed of the traditions (indeed the worlds of Buddhism and Hinduism are already inhabited by countless beings). **And if it were established after long search that we are alone.** The silence of the universe so far despite its vastness is the famous "Fermi paradox": where is

everybody?—believers would use it as a witness of election and providence (a rare earth, deliberately prepared), and the other side would answer with observational selection once again. So consider: **the two contradictory possibilities are already conscripted by both camps**—and this is a methodological warning sign that the reader of the chapter on biases knows: a hypothesis that wins for you under all the possible outcomes is not being tested by them.

The Study's Conclusion: The Shared Awe — and What It Proves and Does Not Prove

The astronauts tell of a documented psychological effect that its students called "the overview effect": that seeing the earth suspended whole in the blackness produces in the viewer an awe and a reversal of perspective that changes some of them for the rest of their lives—some of them returned deeper in faith, some returned more humane without religion, and all of them returned taken hold of. This is the summary of astronomy with religion in a single image: **the sky astonishes everyone, and dictates to no one the interpretation of his astonishment.** The psalmist saw in it the glory of God, and Sagan—contemplating the pale dot—saw in it a call to humility and mercy without a god. The observation between them is one and does not tilt. (And the devotional use of looking is still alive in the literature of counsels to this day—among it the counsel of the author of these lines to his children: "Read a page of medicine or astronomy, so that you may sense the greatness of His power"—this is a looking that seeks reverence, for one who already believes, and it is other than the looking that seeks proof, for one who does not yet believe: and distinguishing the two is among the gains of this chapter.) At the telescope everyone's agreement begins, and at it—as at every station of this chapter—the parting of interpretation ends: and there, not in the lens, is the place of your decision.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the map of the worship of the heavenly bodies in Chapter 1; astrology within the intermediate unseen in Chapter 10; and the story of Galileo and believers' positions on evolution in the body of this chapter.*

Study 23.4: The Origin of the Universe in the Great Religions— The Creation Stories Before the Big Bang

The grand tour of the traditions' cosmologies in their texts, what the Big Bang actually says and does not say, and the comparison table—and the rules for measuring "agreement" that guard against the double trap

> **Summary of the study:** Every great civilization told its own story of how everything began. How do these stories hold up against what science says today about the Big Bang? A comparative table weighs each creation story by one standard: where its structure aligns with the scientific picture, and where it departs from it.

---

* Opening: The Oldest of Questions—And a Distinction That Disciplines the Whole Study

"Where did everything come from?"—perhaps the oldest question a human mind ever uttered, and no religious tradition exists whose answer to it is not at the core of its identity. Before the tour we clarify a distinction that disciplines the subject: **cosmogony** (the story of the universe's origin as a tradition tells it: who acted? how? and why?) is other than **scientific cosmology** (the description of the evolution of the observed universe by equation and observation: what happened, and when?)—the first answers about the agent and the meaning, the second about the mechanism and the

history. The question of "agreement" between them is legitimate but beset by the double trap we warned of in the study on scientific inimitability: stretching the texts to match the latest theories, or trying them by a literalism they never claimed—and we will walk between the two traps by rules we declare at the close.

* First: The Grand Tour—Every Tradition in Its Own Text

Mesopotamia—creation as combat. In the Babylonian *Enuma Elish* existence begins as primal mingled waters (Apsu the fresh and Tiamat the salt) that give birth to the gods. Then the war of the divine generations breaks out, and Marduk kills the sea-mother Tiamat **and splits her corpse in two: from one half a sky and from the other an earth,** and creates human beings from the blood of a slain god to toil on the gods' behalf. So creation here is **an order wrested from chaos by combat,** and the universe is the body of a defeated goddess—this "combat cosmogony" is a widespread pattern (repeated in the myths of Canaan, Greece, and others).

Egypt—creation as emergence . . . and by the word. From the primeval ocean of chaos, "Nun," the first mound rises, and upon it Atum brings himself into being by himself and then issues the gods and the world. **And the most precious thing in the Egyptian file** is the theology of Memphis: the god Ptah creates things **by his heart and his tongue—he conceives them and utters them and they are:** among the oldest documented formulations of the idea of "creation by the

word," centuries before the Torah—the critics read it as a literary precedent of a great idea, and some believers read it as the trace of an ancient revelation or a *fitra* finding its way—and you know the measure of both readings.

Hebrew Genesis—creation as word and as the stripping of myth. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"—one God who creates **by command** ("Let there be light; and there was light") in six days and then rests on the seventh, from an initial state "formless and void" (*tohu va-bohu*) with His spirit hovering over the face of the waters. **And its revolutionary value appears in comparison, not in isolation:** where Babylon makes the sun and moon gods, Genesis names them—with an almost mocking dismissal—"the two great lights": **created lamps hung up for timekeeping**. Where the Babylonian human is created a toiling slave, Adam is created "in the image of God," an honored steward. And there is no war and no goddess's corpse—only a calm, sovereign word. So the chapter is—in the language of scholars of religion—**a manifesto stripping divinity from nature** more than a report of physics. **As for the test of agreement, with the honesty of both faces:** its large structure (an absolute beginning, light first, and an ordered gradation rising to the human being) is where believers find echoes of the Big Bang and its spirit. The details of its literal order collide explicitly with the sequence of science (plants on the third day before the sun of the fourth; an earth before stars)—which is why the house of interpretation divided long ago, before Darwin and Lemaître: the

literalism of the six days (on which the young-earth calculations of the fundamentalists rest) against venerable symbolic and framework readings (Augustine himself—a thousand years before modern science—saw the days as a didactic structure, not a timing, and the modern "framework" reading sees the six days as a thematic organization: realms, then their inhabitants)—so the fate of agreement here hangs on the interpretation chosen, an authentic internal disagreement, not a modern patch.

The Qur'an—the joining and the splitting, and days without a timetable. The Qur'an presents creation in summary, distributed: the heavens and the earth "**used to be joined together and We ripped them apart**". The sky was built "**and We are making it ever wider**". The command came to the sky "**while it was smoke.**" The creation was "**in six Days**"—and the day in its own usage stretches ("a Day with your Lord is like a thousand years"; "on a Day whose length is fifty thousand years"), so the commentators understood them as stages, not solar days (there being no sun before its creation in the first place). "We made every living thing from water." **And two structural features distinguish its file.** The first is an explicit correction of the doctrine of rest: "We created the heavens, the earth, and everything between, in six Days **without tiring**"—a direct denial of the seventh day's weariness, on the method of "a copyist does not correct his source" that you know. The second is **the intended summary**: no detailed timetable and no daily ordering of realms—and this summary is a double-edged sword, honestly: it is what

gave the text a wider space of agreement with the changing of the sciences (it did not hang its fate on the order of plant and sun), and it is the thing that makes the critic say: a summary text that agrees with everything is tested by nothing. We handed you the full scale of this debate in the study on inimitability (the two witnesses of the joining/splitting and the smoke being among the pillars of its examined examples there, by its rules).

Hinduism—the most plural of the files . . . and the boldest in doubt. Not one story but stories: the golden cosmic egg (Hiranyagarbha) floats on the waters and splits into sky and earth. The cosmic man Purusha is sacrificed and his limbs become the world and the castes. Brahma creates and then **the universes revolve in an eternal cycle**: a day of Brahma (a *kalpa*) equals 4.32 billion earthly years, in which the worlds are created and then dissolve in his night, and so on without an absolute beginning—figures of astronomical breadth in which enthusiasts take pride for their nearness to the ages of modern astronomy (a day of Brahma approaches the age of the earth!), and the standard answers with what you know: the nearness of a selected number does not make a method. **And the jewel of the Indian file, without rival,** is the Hymn of Creation (the Nasadiya Sukta) in the Rig Veda—among the oldest great religious texts that close the story of creation **with declared doubt**: "There was neither existence nor nonexistence then . . . Who really knows? Who can say whence this creation came? The gods themselves came after it!—Perhaps the one who surveys it in the highest

heaven knows . . . **or perhaps he too does not know!**"—a rare epistemic humility at the heart of a sacred book, celebrated by scientists and skeptics together, and read by the Hindu as a witness of depth, not of weakness.

Buddhism—the refusal of the question itself. The Buddha was asked about the eternity of the world and placed the question among "the questions he does not answer," and struck his immortal parable: the man struck by a poisoned arrow does not delay its removal until he learns the tribe of the archer. So the cosmic question is a luxury that distracts from the urgent cure (release from suffering). The Buddhist universe is without a declared beginning: countless worlds arise and dissolve in vast cycles driven by **karma, not a creator**. Its contemporary advocates invest this ("a religion without a creator who needs proving") as a supposed agreement with the temper of science, and the scale answers: the absence of a claim is no evidence, just as its presence is no charge.

China—spontaneous emergence. "The way begets one; one begets two; two begets three; three begets the myriad creatures"—a calm emergence from an impersonal principle with no creating will and no combat; beside it the popular myth of Pangu (the giant splits the egg of chaos, lifts the sky, and then his body becomes the world—an echo of Purusha). **And Zoroastrianism:** a creation in two stages (spiritual, *menog*, then material embodiment, *getig*) within a bounded time established as the arena of the cosmic battle—the first to give cosmic history **an arc and a goal. And the religions of the**

peoples: the earth-diver (an animal dives into the primal waters and rises with a handful of mud that becomes the earth—from Siberia to the Americas!), and the Australian Dreaming in which the features of the world are "dreamed"—witnesses to the universality of the question and the diversity of the imagination.

* Second: And the Big Bang Itself—What It Actually Says, and What It Does Not

Before the comparison table we do justice to its second party: the Big Bang model says that the observed universe **is expanding from an initial state of extreme heat and density about 13.8 billion years ago,** on firm evidence (the expansion, the background radiation, and the ratios of the elements). **And it does not say** that it was "an explosion in space" (rather the expansion of space itself), **it does not say** what was "before" that state, nor whether there is a "before" at all, **and it does not utter** the words "creation from nothing" in the philosophical sense—those are its borders, at which its equations break down, and from them set out the speculations (eternal inflation, cyclic universes, quantum birth) whose market we presented in Chapter 18. **And the subject's golden story, which sums up its whole literature:** the father of the model himself was a Catholic priest—Georges Lemaître. And when Pope Pius XII celebrated the theory as a scientific witness to "Let there be light," it was **Lemaître himself** who worked to restrain this celebration: the model, for him, is physics that stops at its borders, and mixing it with theology harms both—a priest protecting physics from religious conscription: the noblest lesson in the subject, from inside both houses at once.

* Third: The Great Comparison Table

Tradition	The structure of cosmic time	The mechanism of origin	From prior matter?	The nearest places of claimed "agreement"	The most prominent places of friction
Mesopotamia / Greece	Mythic linear	The combat of gods and the division of a corpse	Yes (primal waters)	—	A purely mythic structure
Egypt	Linear + Nilotic cycles	Self-emergence; and creation by the word (Memphis)	Yes (Nun)	The precedence of "the word"	The plurality of gods
Genesis	**Linear par excellence**	Creation by divine command	An interpretive dispute (*tohu va-bohu*)	An absolute beginning; "light" first; gradation	The literal order of the days (plants before sun); the age of the universe

Tradition	The structure of cosmic time	The mechanism of origin	From prior matter?	The nearest places of claimed "agreement"	The most prominent places of friction
					among the literalists
The Qur'an	Linear (creation, then resurrection)	Divine command ("Be") without combat or weariness	"Joined," then split; and "smoke"	The splitting, the widening, the smoke, and the water (by the scale of the study on inimitability)	Few details in structure—its strength and its critic's argument together
Hinduism	**Cyclical, endless**	Emergence / sacrifice / the egg—and Brahma's breathing	Yes (waters / chaos)	Cyclicity resembles the speculative cyclic models; the breadth of the numbers	No absolute beginning (contrary to the standard model); and narrative plurality

Tradition	The structure of cosmic time	The mechanism of origin	From prior matter?	The nearest places of claimed "agreement"	The most prominent places of friction
Buddhism	Cyclical without beginning	Karma without a creator	Worlds beget worlds	"No creator needed" fits the temper of naturalism	It refuses the question science answers
China (Taoism)	Cyclical / emergent	Spontaneous birth from the Tao	From chaos	Spontaneity and regularity	No agent and no sharp beginning
Zoroastrianism	**Linear with a goal**	A double creation (spiritual, then material)	Disputed	The arc of cosmic history	The duality of the two principles

* Fourth: The Analysis—The Three Structures, and the Rules for Measuring "Agreement"

The table rises to a structural summary: the cosmogonies of humankind—for all their scattering—run in **three major structures: linear with a beginning** (the Abrahamic religions and Zoroastrianism): their general structure is the nearest in form to the structure of standard cosmology (a universe with a history, an initial state, and a directed evolution)—which is why the Big Bang at its arrival was a heavy guest in a scientific milieu **comfortable with eternity** and a welcome guest in the Abrahamic houses (so much so that great physicists resisted it at first for its "theological" flavor, and one of its opponents coined the name "Big Bang" in mockery, and it stuck!); **cyclical without an absolute beginning** (India and China): contrary to the standard model, and resembling—in structure, not in detail—the **speculative** cyclic and oscillating models that no observation has favored; **and non-questioning** (Buddhism), which takes itself out of the contest. **Then the four rules of measurement that guard the seeker:**

(1) agreement is measured at the level of **structure** first (a beginning? a direction? an order?)—that is the legitimate comparison—whereas matching details is the death of everyone: no ancient text whose literal details are read as a physical timetable escapes shattering;

(2) within every house is **a spectrum of interpretations** (literal / symbolic / framework), and the fate of

"agreement" hangs on which is chosen. So no religion is to be assigned the position of one of its currents alone;

(3) remember always the lesson of Lemaître: conscript physics for no creed and make it no creed's enemy. For the scientific model is changeable by nature, and whoever marries his text to a theory is widowed by its death (the double trap);

(4) and the question of "the agent and the meaning"—which all the cosmogonies answer and on which cosmology does not utter a letter—remains after every comparison where it was: in evidence (the argument from coming-to-be and fine-tuning in Chapter 18), not in the tables of agreement.

Conclusion: What Remains After the Tour?

There remains a scene worth contemplating in itself: one species on one planet told of the birth of the universe as many tales as it had civilizations—a goddess's corpse here, a calm word there, a golden egg, a god's breathing, a dream that is dreamed, and a bold doubt that confesses "perhaps he too does not know." And then it came with its equations and read the universe a biography of 13.8 billion years beginning from a point of heat beyond which it does not know. The monotheist believer reads the scene thus: the tales scattered, and those among them were right that resembled the one truth (a beginning, a word, an order)—and true revelation is what agreed with what became settled. The critic reads it: rather, the tales are mirrors of their environments (the rivers of Babylon in its primal waters, the Nile of Egypt in its mound), and the "agreements" are

but a later selection from a wide rubble some of which inevitably hits the mark. And the Hindu reads it with the smile of his ancient hymn. You—now possessing the map, the table, and the rules—know that the decision is not here: cosmology tells "how it went" in a tongue that grows more precise every decade, and your greater question—"and who is behind the going, and what is its meaning?"—awaits you where we left it: in evidence, and on your own scale.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the argument from coming-to-be and the Big Bang with its philosophical limits in Chapter 18; the standard of "scientific allusions" and the rules for examining them (the joining and the smoke as examined examples) in the study on scientific inimitability in Chapter 19; and the meeting of Augustine and relativity in the study on physics.*

Study 23.5: The Origin of the Human Being Across Religions and Cultures — Adam and Eve, the Single Origin, and the Question of Evolution

Three questions that debate confuses: how did the human being begin? are human beings from one father? and was the human being created in his present form?—The tour through the nations' accounts, then the cross-cutting patterns, then what the science of humankind says, then the religions' positions on evolution, then the scale on the ladder

Summary of the study: Did we come from a single handful of clay, or a lineage that evolved over millions of years? Three intertwined questions about human origins—how it began, whether from a single ancestor, and whether the body has always looked as it does now—are separated here, because conflating them is what most corrupts the debate.

* Opening: Three Questions, Not One

Seldom is "the question of Adam" raised except as a mixture of three questions whose answers and evidence differ completely:

(1) How did the human being begin?—the question of the founding accounts: from clay? from a god's blood? from a grain of maize?

(2) Are all human beings from one origin—a first father and mother?—a question of lineage and unity, with a theological face and a genetic face.

(3) Was the human being created in his present form all at once, or did he come to it through a long transformation?—the question of evolution that inflames our age. You will see that a religion may answer the first with a rich myth and be silent on the second, that science says of the second and third what it does not say of the first, and that most of the battles of "religion and evolution" broke out because the disputants answered one question while thinking they were answering another. So let us take the bundle apart.

* First: The Tour—How Did the Nations Tell the Beginning of the Human Being?

The Abrahamic house—the clay, the breath, and the first couple. The Book of Genesis tells the story in **two adjacent accounts** that scholars read as two layers: in the first (chapter 1) the human being—male and female together—is created "in the image of God" on the sixth day as the crown of creation. In the second (chapters 2–3) Adam is formed from the dust of the ground and the breath of life is breathed into him, Eve is built from his rib, the two are placed in the garden, they eat from the tree, and they are expelled. **Then the Abrahamic house parted in reading the Fall, a parting you saw in the chapters on evil and Satan:** Judaism knows no inherited "original sin" (but two inclinations in the human being, to good and to evil, and the choice between them). Western Christianity—since Augustine's

reading of Romans 5—made the Fall a cosmic event from which humanity inherited guilt and death, hence its need for a Redeemer (and Eastern Christianity is lighter on inheritance). The Qur'an tells of Adam from dust, clay, and sounding clay, into whom the spirit is breathed, who is taught all the names, to whom the angels prostrate, who is placed in the garden and slips. **And then repents and is forgiven, with no inheritance of guilt**: "no soul will bear another's burden". Eve in the Qur'an is "his wife" with no mention of the rib (the rib is in the hadith, not the Qur'an, and the commentators differed over taking it literally or figuratively). Humanity is addressed as "children of Adam," and the origin is mentioned as "from a single soul." In the three Abrahamic religions there is an explicit single origin—which is what will concern us in the second question.

Mesopotamia—from clay and a god's blood, to serve. In *Atrahasis* and the *Enuma Elish* a god is slaughtered (Kingu, in one of them) and his blood mixed with clay to make human beings **as slaves bearing the toil of labor on the gods' behalf**—the conception that Genesis deliberately answers with "in the image of God," as you saw in the study on the origin of the universe. And Enkidu in Gilgamesh is pinched from clay.

And Egypt: Khnum the potter-god shapes human beings on his wheel, or they come forth from the tears of Ra—the clay is present, and the purpose almost absent.

And Greece: Prometheus fashions human beings from clay, and Pandora, **the first woman**, is made as a punishment and opens the jar, releasing the evils—a

striking parallel to Eve in linking the first female to the entry of evil (and scholars of religion read it as a shared patriarchal pattern, not a borrowing). Hesiod tells of **the five ages of humankind**, from the golden to the silver to the bronze . . . a descent, not an ascent; and after the flood Deucalion and Pyrrha create human beings from stones.

India—the cosmic man and the divided origin. The hymn of "Purusha" in the Rig Veda tells of the first giant human who was sacrificed, and from whose limbs came the four castes and the universe—so the human being here is the material of the world, not its product. "Manu," the first human and survivor of the flood (the Sanskrit word for human, *manushya*, means "child of Manu"—a counterpart of "children of Adam"). **And the most precise of its texts in our subject** is in the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad: the first Self was alone, was afraid, and took no pleasure, **so it divided into male and female** as a grain splits—and from them came human beings (an explicit parallel to "from a single soul"). But the Indian framework is **cyclical**: no absolute beginning, but cycles (*kalpas*) in which creation is repeated—so the question of "the single origin" lacks in it the Abrahamic sharpness. **And Buddhism**—as is its habit—fell silent on the origin ("the poisoned arrows": the Buddha does not occupy himself with what does not help toward release), but the *Aggañña Sutta* tells a satirical account of the origins of the castes: luminous, weightless beings without dense bodies **tasted the sweet crust of the earth, craved it, and grew dense and heavy**, losing their light—a "fall" by craving with no god and no disobedience: the most curious of the story's parallels.

China—the yellow clay, and no commanding heaven. The goddess Nüwa made human beings from yellow clay with her hands, and when she tired she flicked the clay with a rope, so that the flicked ones became the commoners and the hand-made the nobles—a myth of origin **and a myth of classes** together. Pangu, from whose body the world was formed (the counterpart of Purusha). Confucianism possesses no central myth of origin at all—for it the question is moral, not cosmic.

Zoroastrian Iran—the first human and the couple from a plant. Gayomart, the first human, is killed by evil, and from his seed grows **the rhubarb plant,** which separates into two halves: Mashya and Mashyana—the first couple—**who lie** (attributing creation to Ahriman), and so evil begins in human beings: a fall by lying, and a single origin.

The nations of custom—a thousand beginnings. In Africa (the Yoruba: Obatala shapes human beings from clay—and drunkenness spoils some of them, so the disabled are born; the Zulu: the human being comes out of a reed). In the Americas the most magnificent is the Mayan **Popol Vuh**: the gods try to create human beings from clay (it dissolves), then from wood (soulless and ungrateful, so they are drowned), then **from maize dough,** and it succeeds—the human being from his sacred food, after failed attempts (a rare pattern: a creator who experiments and errs). The Norse: Ask and Embla from two tree trunks the gods found on the shore; and the Aboriginal peoples: the ancestors of "the Dreaming" shape human beings and the land together.

And in most ethnic religions there is no "one father" of humanity—each tribe has its own ancestor and its own descent (from a rope, a tree, or a cave), and strangers are sometimes outside the definition of "people" altogether.

*Second: The Patterns Across Civilizations—What Is Shared and What Diverges?

Lift your head from the details and you find five patterns.

(1) Clay as material. In most of the great accounts (Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, China, Africa, and the Abrahamic religions) the human being is from clay / dust—the critic reads it as the obvious image among nations that made everything from clay, and the believer reads it as the trace of a single report or a shared wisdom (and our rule: resemblance does not prove borrowing).

(2) The first couple. In most of them a first couple, and the female **from** the male or **with** him (Eve from the rib; the divided Self; Mashya and Mashyana from one plant)—with the wide ethnic exception.

(3) Descent from a higher state. Nearly universal and astonishing: a lost garden, or a golden age, or luminous beings that grew heavy, or a light that vanished with a lie. So humanity in the memory of the nations is **descending from a summit,** not ascending from a depth (the exact reverse of the evolutionary picture—and we will return to it).

(4) The single origin. Explicit in the Abrahamic religions (Adam), Zoroastrianism (Gayomart), and India (Manu / the divided Self); absent in the cyclical and tribal traditions.

(5) Purpose. The service of the gods (Mesopotamia) / stewardship and honor (Genesis and the Qur'an) / no declared purpose (Egypt and Greece) / the bearing of gratitude (the Maya).

*Third: What Does the Science of Humankind Say?—Precisely, to Guard Against the Fallacies of Both Sides

The picture on which modern scholarship agrees—by data, not by philosophies: that *Homo sapiens* is **a species that appeared in Africa** about three hundred thousand years ago, after a long series of hominins (Australopithecus—"Lucy," about 3.2 million years ago—then the successive species of *Homo*). That it went out of Africa and populated the continents (the prevailing "Out of Africa" theory). That on its way it interbred with close species (Neanderthals and Denisovans—whose traces are in our genome today). **And here are two points on which the public errs from both sides. The first:** "Mitochondrial Eve" and "Y-chromosomal Adam"—the most recent common ancestor on the mothers' side and the most recent common ancestor on the fathers' side of everyone living today—**were not a single couple**, nor were they alone. They lived in populations of thousands of individuals and may not even have been contemporaries. So using them as evidence for a literal "Adam and Eve" is a common fallacy in

preaching literature. **And the reverse use**—that science "has proved there is no single origin"—is a fallacy too: science establishes **the unity of the species and its single African origin** as firmly as any biological fact is established (a victory for the single origin in the specific sense over all the racist "polygenist" tendencies that circulated in the nineteenth century), and at the same time denies—according to the observed genetic diversity—that the species descended from **a single couple** (the lowest estimates of the "bottleneck" are a few thousand individuals, not two). **The second:** that science says **how** the body changed across time, and has no power to say anything about **why** it exists, nor about the soul, the spirit, and honor—that lies outside its apparatus by definition (as we established in the study on the laboratory).

* Fourth: The Religions' Positions on Evolution—The Map of Currents Within Every House

(1) Literal rejection. Its holders hold that the texts establish a direct creation of Adam in his form, and that evolution—of the human being especially—contradicts the text and the honor together. This is the position of evangelical "creationism" (and its "young earth" branches deny even the age of the earth), of a majority of Orthodox Jews, **and of a broad current among contemporary Muslim scholars,** some of whom accept the evolution of other living things and exempt the human being by the text of his creation from dust and the angels' prostration to him.

(2) Guided evolution (creation through evolution). Its holders hold that evolution is the Creator's mechanism, not His substitute, and that the texts establish the agent and the purpose, not the biological details. This is the official Catholic position since the encyclical of Pius XII (1950), which permitted inquiry into the evolution of the human body **on condition that the soul is created directly**, and was affirmed by later popes (John Paul II: "more than a hypothesis"), and the position of most of the mainline churches and of Reform and Conservative Judaism.

(3) And in the Islamic house an internal spectrum of which many are unaware: among the early thinkers were those who arranged "the ladder of beings" in gradation from mineral to plant to animal to human (the Brethren of Purity, Miskawayh, and Ibn Khaldun in his *Muqaddima*)—**a ladder of ranks, not a transformation of species, so it is not right to make it a "precedent" of Darwin as some enthusiasts do.** Among the moderns are those who opened the door of interpretation cautiously (hints in Muhammad Abduh, and Iqbal in *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, and an expansion in Tantawi Jawhari), and contemporaries who propose that Adam **was chosen from a prior species**, inspired and honored ("then He chose him"). **And this view is a sharply contested minority,** whose opponents hold that it collides with the apparent sense of the texts on Adam's creation without parents.

(4) The Indian and Buddhist houses: no structural collision—the cyclical framework and the conception of changing forms (karma already transfers the soul among species) made evolution less of a shock there than in the Abrahamic religions, though literalist Hindu schools rejected it in favor of the antiquity of the human being through the cycles.

(5) The Far East: wide acceptance with no theological battle.

And the thread that gathers the interpreters in the three Abrahamic houses: that they—even when they accept the evolution of the body—keep one red line: **the soul / the spirit / the image of God is a direct creation,** not derived from clay or from ancestors, for it is the seat of honor and of "the best of forms." Here science stands silent, because it possesses no instrument to measure it.

* Fifth: The Scale on the Ladder—Question by Question

The first question (how did the human being begin?). The accounts answer about the **meaning** of the beginning, not its mechanism. Believers read them as truth, symbolically or literally according to their schools, and the critic reads them as myths of origin that explain classes, evil, and purpose. The firmest cross-cutting pattern in them is **descent from a summit,** which makes the confrontation with the ascending evolutionary picture a confrontation of **two directions** before it is a confrontation of details: did we descend or

ascend?—and each of the two answers carries a complete philosophy of the human being.

The second question (the single origin). What is established: the unity of the species and its single African origin—which believers in the single origin accept as their witness to "you are all from Adam" in the unifying sense, and which science accepts at the level of the species. **And what is not established,** indeed is denied by the present genetic datum: **the literal single couple**. So the literal believer may say that science measures what remains of the diversity, not what was (a reply in circulation), and the interpreter may read Adam as the head of the species or its chosen father—and the disagreement within the houses of faith is sharper than between them and science.

The third question (in his present form?). What is established: that the human body carries the traces of a long history (fossils, shared genes, and vestigial organs) that the specialists do not dispute. **And what is not established,** and science is unable to establish: that this history is **without a purposer,** or that the soul is the fruit of the clay. So believers stand between literal rejection and guided evolution, and the irreligious stand at "the clay alone"—and each reads the same fossils with his own eye. **And the study's open question—left with you:** if the clay of which all the accounts speak took—in the scientific reading—millions of years to stand on two feet and ask about its origin: **does that diminish the meaning of "the breath," or increase it?—**This is where the literalist, the interpreter, and the

denier part, and the science of humankind does not settle it and cannot.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the stories of cosmic creation and the standard of agreement in the study on the origin of the universe (immediately preceding); Darwin, the argument from design, and cumulative selection in Chapter 18; and the Fall and original sin with their two mirrors in Chapter 20.*

Study 23.6: Darwin and the Religions — How the Theory Changed People's Thinking, How the Clergy Confronted It, Who Accepted It and Who Refuted It, and the Strongest That Stands for It and Against It

The three layers that debate confuses, then the shock of 1859 and its effect on thought, then the history of reception in the religious houses (and in the Islamic world in particular), then the table of the six positions with their leading figures, then the seven strongest arguments for it and the seven strongest objections against it with their replies—and the scale on the ladder

> **Summary of the study:** Darwin's theory turned the way humanity thought about itself upside down. How did each religion confront it, and which of its own scholars accepted it and which fought it? Seven major scientific objections to the theory are presented here in their strongest form, with the Darwinists' strongest replies to each, one by one.

---

* Opening: Three Layers, Not One Theory

Before you ask "does the theory collide with religion?" distinguish three layers that the disputants from both shores confuse: **(1) the fact of evolution** (that living species have changed across time and descended from common ancestors)—a historical question tried by fossils and genes; **(2) its mechanism** (natural selection acting on random hereditary variation, with what

science later added)—a scientific question tried by experiment and observation. **(3) Philosophical naturalism** (that the whole process is **without a purposer**, and the human being a blind accident)—a philosophical question on which the laboratory holds no verdict. Darwin himself in *On the Origin of Species* (1859) did not say the third. He closed his book with mention of "a Creator" who breathed life "into a few forms or into one"—and then inclined personally over the years to agnosticism. **And most of what you will read in this subject, of hostility or of surrender, mistakes the layer**: it rejects the fact out of fear of the philosophy, or imposes the philosophy in the name of the fact.

* First: The Shock—How Did Darwin Change People's Thinking?

On the Origin of Species was not the first book on evolution (Lamarck before it, and Darwin's grandfather Erasmus), but it was the first to offer a convincing **mechanism** and a mountain of evidence—and after it five things changed in general thought.

(1) The centrality of the human being: after Copernicus removed the earth from the center of the universe, Darwin removed the human being from the center of life—a cousin of the ape, not a master created separately (and Freud counted himself the third wound).

(2) Deep time: millions of years instead of Genesis's thousands—prepared by the geologists (Lyell).

(3) The death of the argument from the watch: Paley's proof, which had been the pillar of English natural theology, found its rival explanation, so the debate moved from "who designed the eye?" to "who wrote the laws of selection?"—that is, from biology to physics and cosmology (as you saw in Chapter 18).

(4) Textual literalism: the literal reading of Genesis was embarrassed, and the door of interpretation opened wide in houses that had not needed it.

(5) And the most dangerous in its social effect: "Social Darwinism"—the transfer of "survival of the fittest" from biology to society, nations, and races: the justification of colonialism, savage capitalism, and "the improvement of the stock" (eugenics), which democratic states legislated before the Nazis. **And none of this follows from Darwin's science** (description does not yield prescription, and the naturalistic fallacy is well known), but it followed from people's understanding of it, and it was the strongest thing the clergy used in criticizing the theory morally: "look what it has grown."

* Second: How the Clergy Confronted It—The History of Reception House by House

Christianity—from Oxford to Dover. The iconic beginning is the Oxford debate (1860): Bishop Wilberforce asks Huxley mockingly whether it is on his grandfather's or his grandmother's side that he descends from an ape, and Huxley answers that he would rather have an ape for a grandfather than a man who uses his gifts to mock science—(memory has magnified the scene, and the contemporary documents are calmer

than it). Then the roads parted: **Catholicism** was silent for a long time, then opened the door with the encyclical *Humani Generis* (1950), and then John Paul II declared (1996) that evolution is "more than a hypothesis"—with its red line: the direct creation of the soul. **Protestantism** split: acceptance among many theologians (even the conservative Warfield—one of the fathers of "verbal inerrancy"—accepted evolution as a mechanism in God's hand!), and a rejection that became the pillar of American "fundamentalism": the **Scopes** trial (1925—"the monkey trial" in Tennessee: a teacher tried for teaching evolution), then "scientific creationism" (1961 onward: a literal flood and a young earth in scientific language), then "**intelligent design**" (the 1990s: irreducible complexity with no mention of God), until a federal court (Dover, 2005) ruled that it is religion, not science. **And the creative acceptance:** the Jesuit current of Teilhard de Chardin made evolution itself an ascent toward "the Omega Point," Christ. **Judaism:** Reform and Conservative accepted, and Orthodoxy divided (and in Modern Orthodoxy there are readings of the days of Genesis as ages). **India:** Vivekananda folded evolution into Vedanta (the evolution of the body and the involution of the spirit—"what evolves was involved"), so the Indian house found no great shock in it. **And Buddhism:** the Dalai Lama establishes that if science proves what contradicts the texts, the texts are reread—and the acceptance of evolution is wide.

The Islamic world—the chapter that most disputants do not know. The theory reached the Arabs early, and through the door of philosophy: **Jamal al-Din al-**

Afghani wrote *The Refutation of the Materialists* (1881), attacking the materialists. Evolution as their weapon—with a superficial reading of the theory. **And the surprise** is in Sheikh **Husayn al-Jisr** of Tripoli in *The Hamidian Epistle* (1888): an imam who establishes that **if evolution were proved scientifically it would not collide with the Qur'an**, because the texts admit a gradual creation with God as its agent. So interpretation preceded collision; **Isma'il Mazhar** translated *On the Origin of Species* (1918) and defended it, **Shibli Shumayyil** adopted it materialistically, and **Muhammad Abduh** hinted cautiously. **Iqbal** brought it into *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, citing Rumi and the ladder of beings. Then the wave turned in the mid-twentieth century with the modern fundamentalisms: **Mawdudi and Qutb** made it a face of modern *jahiliyya*, and the reading of rejection prevailed in religious education—until the largest event in the subject came: **Harun Yahya** (Adnan Oktar, Turkey) and *The Atlas of Creation* (2006–), sent free in thousands of copies to the schools and universities of Europe, **borrowing** the arguments of American creationism verbatim and addressing a worldwide Muslim public (its grave scientific errors have been taken apart—such as the maps of fly-fishing lures presented as fossilized insects). The preachers of the platforms followed him (Naik). And Turkey removed evolution from its secondary curricula (2017). **And the outcome:** the Muslim public—according to surveys—is among the religious publics furthest, in the contemporary debate, from accepting evolution (according to cross-national surveys whose results vary

greatly from one country to another—from wide acceptance in parts of Central Asia to wide rejection in parts of the Arab world—and which are subject to the audit protocol), with a scholarly minority and contemporary thinkers reopening the door of al-Jisr and Iqbal.

* Third: The Table of the Six Positions—Who Accepted and Who Refuted

The position	Its content	Leading figures and witnesses
1. Creationism (young earth)	Rejection of evolution and of the age of the earth together; a literal Genesis and a global flood	American scientific creationism (Morris); Harun Yahya (accepts the age of the earth and rejects evolution—between 1 and 2)
2. Creationism (old earth)	Acceptance of the age of the universe and the earth, and rejection of the transformation of species; the major kinds created directly	A broad current in contemporary Islamic education; many evangelicals
3. Intelligent design	Evolution partly accepted, but some structures (the flagellum, the cell)	Behe, Dembski (the Discovery Institute); the Dover court, 2005

The position	Its content	Leading figures and witnesses
	need a direct designer	
4. Guided evolution	Evolution is a fact with an ordinary mechanism, but God guides it and creates the soul directly	Contemporary Catholic positions accepting evolution with faith in divine creation (and the official documents leave the detail of the mechanism to science and reserve the creation of the soul); al-Jisr (probably); contemporary Muslim interpreters (Adam by election)
5. Full theistic evolution	God acts through the laws, not by intervention; evolution is continuous creation	Warfield, the Teilhard current, Francis Collins (director of the Genome Project), Vivekananda in his own form
6. Naturalism	Evolution without a purposer or a goal; the human being an accident	Huxley, Dawkins, Dennett—and most biologists of the age on the mechanism (not necessarily on the philosophy)

And notice the real dividing line: not between "religion" and "science" but between **positions 1–3** (which contest **the fact or the mechanism** scientifically) **and positions 4–6** (which accept the fact and contest **the philosophy**). Most of the battles of the pulpits are fought in the first zone, while all the serious philosophical debate lies in the second.

* Fourth: The Seven Strongest Arguments Offered for the Theory

(1) The fossil record and its order. The fossils are arranged in the strata in one order that no site contradicts: no rabbits in the Cambrian, no humans with the dinosaurs. With the "transitional links" the theory predicted and then found: **Tiktaalik** (2004: a fish with a wrist—between fishes and amphibians, found in the stratum and the place the researchers predicted), *Archaeopteryx* (a feathered dinosaur), and the series of whales from land mammals (*Pakicetus*, then *Ambulocetus* . . .).

(2) Comparative anatomy and vestigial organs: the pelvic bones in whales, the human tailbone, and the covered eye of the mole.

(3) Embryology: the pharyngeal arches in mammalian embryos.

(4) Biogeography: the distribution of species follows the history of the continents, not the suitability of the environment (Australia's marsupials, the finches of the Galápagos).

(5) Genes—the strongest of the modern evidence: the tree of life extracted from DNA matches the tree of fossils that is independent of it. **The shared disabled pseudogenes** (the vitamin C gene disabled in humans and the great apes by the same break), **the endogenous retroviruses** buried in the same positions in our genome and the chimpanzee's, **and the fusion of human chromosome 2** (we have 23 pairs and the great apes 24—and our second chromosome carries the trace of the fusion of two, with two centromeres and internal telomeres).

(6) Observed evolution: bacterial resistance to antibiotics, Lenski's long-term experiment (since 1988: more than 70,000 generations of bacteria, and the appearance of a new capacity to metabolize citrate), and the documented formation of new species.

(7) Predictive power: the theory predicts what is discovered (Tiktaalik, the pseudogenes)—and that is the first criterion of science.

* Fifth: The Seven Strongest Objections Offered Against It—And Their Replies

(1) The Cambrian explosion: the "sudden" appearance of most animal phyla about 540 million years ago—and the Darwinians reply: the "suddenness" is tens of millions of years, the soft-bodied Ediacaran fossils preceded it, and it is explained by the oxygenation of the oceans and the appearance of hard parts capable of fossilizing.

(2) Irreducible complexity (Behe: the bacterial flagellum)—and the reply: its parts performed other functions (the type III secretion system) before they came together—functional "co-option."

(3) Impossible probabilities (a single protein by chance is remoter than the heart of the universe). The reply: the calculation assumes assembly all at once, and cumulative selection overturns the calculation (as you saw in Chapter 18).

(4) The origin of life: whence the first cell?—**and this is really the strongest of the objections, and the honest reply:** the theory does not claim to explain the origin of life at all (that is another science—"abiogenesis"—still open without a complete theory): so the objection is sound and the address is wrong.

(5) The missing links—and the reply: fossilization is rare, every transitional fossil found opens "two gaps" on either side of it, and the evidence has accumulated beyond any comparison with Darwin's day.

(6) The second law of thermodynamics (evolution contradicts the increase of disorder)—and the reply, by the consensus of physicists: the law concerns isolated systems, and the earth receives the sun's energy. This objection has been abandoned even by the leading creationists.

(7) Consciousness, morality, and reason: how does a blind selection produce a mind that grasps truth and a conscience that binds?—This is a **philosophical** objection that concerns not the first and second layers but the third, and it is alive in the philosophy of mind even

among the irreligious (Nagel in *Mind and Cosmos*—"the materialist neo-Darwinian conception of nature is almost certainly false"—and he is an atheist!). Its field is the chapters on morality and the brain, not this study.

The Scale on the Ladder — And the Study's Question

The claim: "Species evolved from common ancestors by natural selection." **The strongest case:** the matching of the two independent trees of fossils and genes, and the fulfilled predictions. **The strongest objection:** the origin of life and of consciousness (both outside the claim), and the Cambrian explosion and irreducible complexity (both inside it). **The strongest reply:** the first two objections strike the third layer, not the first, and the last two have explanations accepted by the specialists, though debate remains in the details. **What is established: the fact of evolution** by a broad scientific consensus (accepted by major religious institutions, among them the Catholic Church in its contemporary documents), **and the mechanism** in its foundation, with modern additions (neutral genetic drift, evolutionary developmental biology, "evo-devo," and horizontal gene transfer) that refine Darwin and do not refute him. **What is not established—and science cannot establish:** that the process is without a purposer. Nor that soul and mind are the fruit of clay alone; nor the origin of life itself. **And the Seeker's Question:** Sheikh al-Jisr said a century and a quarter ago: if evolution is proved, there is no harm to religion in it—so why, after a century, has it become **the symbol of the battle** for most of the people of his religion, when its evidence has become a thousand times stronger? **Is it science that changed, or the position of religion toward modernity?**—And the answer to this question says more

about “religion in the age of acceleration” than it says about fossils.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the argument from design, cumulative selection, and irreducible complexity in Chapter 18; the map of the religions’ positions on the creation of Adam in the study on the origin of the human being (preceding); and the god of the gaps in Chapter 3.*

Study 23.7: The Flood Across Religions and Civilizations — The Story of Noah: Does Everyone Know It, and What Does Their Knowing It Mean?

The most widely spread tale in the memory of the nations—and the deepest test of the method of comparison: the tour through its accounts, then the table of its shared elements, then the telling absences, then the file of Gilgamesh and Genesis, then what the Qur'an adds, then the four explanations, then the geology—and the scale on the ladder

Summary of the study: In December 1872, a man stood before a learned society reading a clay tablet that told of a flood centuries older than Noah's. What does it mean that flood stories resemble one another across civilizations that never saw each other? Three possible readings, and a rule that settles how such resemblances should be read in general.

---

* Opening: Two Questions in One

The seeker asks: **do all the nations know the story of the Flood?**—And the honest answer begins by correcting the question: **most of them, not all**. For the collectors of folklore from Frazer (in *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*) to Dundes (in *The Flood Myth*) have counted **hundreds** of flood accounts on every continent—until the tale became the most widely shared of the tales in humanity's heritage—but they counted with them

telling absences among great nations, at which we will pause because they teach more than presence does. **Then comes the deeper question:** if most of the nations know it—what does this knowledge mean? The memory of one event? A tale that traveled? Repeated local experiences?—Here the readings divide, and here is the place of the scale.

* First: The Tour—The Flood in the Accounts of the Nations

Mesopotamia—the oldest account of all. Here is the cradle of the tale, in dated texts: **Ziusudra** in the Sumerian story (a tablet of about 1600 BCE, and the tradition older). **Atrahasis** in Akkadian (~1700 BCE): the gods grow weary of the **noise** of the multiplying human beings and decide to annihilate them, so Enki betrays the secret to Atrahasis and orders him to build a ship. **And Utnapishtim** in the eleventh tablet of the Epic of Gilgamesh (the Nineveh recension of the seventh century BCE, the origins far older): the warning through the reed wall, the cubic ship, the carrying of "the seed of every living thing," seven days of storm, the grounding on Mount Nimush, the sending of a dove, then a swallow, then a raven, and the offering around which the hungry gods gather "like flies"—then the immortality of the survivor. **The Abrahamic house:** Genesis (6–9) makes the cause **the corruption of the earth and its violence**, not noise; the agent one God, not a quarreling assembly; the survivor Noah, righteous in his generation. It closes with an offering and **a covenant** whose sign is the rainbow (and scholars read in it two merged

accounts: seven pairs of the clean animals in one and two of each in the other, and forty days in one and a hundred and fifty in the other). **And the Qur'an** mentions Noah in about thirty suras and devotes a sura to his name, presenting what the other accounts do not—and we will set it apart. **India:** Manu saves a small fish that grows until it warns him of the flood, and he ties his ship to its horn (the *Shatapatha Brahmana*, then the *Matsya Purana*, where the fish is an incarnation of Vishnu)—and he becomes the father of humankind after it. **Greece:** Zeus drowns the corrupt Bronze Age, Deucalion and Pyrrha survive in a chest, and they recreate human beings by throwing stones behind their backs. **The Norse:** the blood of the slain giant Ymir drowns the giants except Bergelmir and his wife in a chest. **The Americas:** among the Aztecs Nata and Nena survive in a tree trunk. In the *Popol Vuh* the gods drown the wooden people, the failed generation. Among the peoples of the Andes "*unu pachacuti*"—the water turns the world over. Among hundreds of the peoples of North America the flood carries local features (the raven and the beaver bring mud from the bottom to make a new earth: "the earth-diver"—the most famous pattern there). **And Australia:** accounts of a sea flood among the coastal peoples, which scholars link to a memory of the rise of the sea after the ice age (told from about 10,000 years ago—a matter under research). **And sub-Saharan Africa:** the continent poorest in accounts, some of them suspected of later Christian or Islamic influence.

* Second: The Telling Absences—The Nations That Do Not Know a Punishing Flood

Here is the most precious thing in the tour for the seeker.

(1) Egypt: no myth of a destructive flood—and the reason leaps to the eye: the flooding of the Nile is for the Egyptian an annual **blessing**, not a curse (the nearest thing they have: "The Destruction of Mankind," where Hathor is sent to annihilate the rebels and is tricked by reddened beer she takes for blood—a catastrophe without water).

(2) China: it has a great flood—but **with no punishment in it and no single survivor**: it is a natural catastrophe **that the human being conquers by engineering**: Yu the Great digs the channels for thirteen years without entering his house. So the hero is an engineer, not a survivor, and the story is the founding of a state, not the renewal of humanity (and Nüwa mends the pierced sky).

(3) Japan, Confucianism, and Buddhism: no founding religious flood.

(4) Zoroastrianism: its first catastrophe is **a deadly winter**, not water: Yima builds the "*Vara*" (a fortified enclosure) in which he preserves the seeds of the good among living things—the structure is the structure of the flood (a warning, a refuge, and the seeds of every living thing) and the material is snow, not water. **And the conclusion that presses itself:** the punishing flood with the single survivor is **the tale of the civilizations of the unpredictable rivers** (the destructive Tigris

and Euphrates, not the regular Nile) and of those who received it from them—and where the water was merciful or conquered, the tale was absent or changed. This is an observation used by the supporters of the local explanation, and answered by the supporters of the single memory with the reply that a memory may be forgotten or cast in the language of each environment—and both readings are before you.

* Third: The Table of the Shared Elements—By One Standard

The element	Gilgamesh (Utnapishtim)	Genesis (Noah)	The Qur'an (Noah)	India (Manu)	Greece (Deucalion)
The cause of the flood	The noise of human beings and their disturbing of the gods	The corruption of the earth and its fullness of wrong	The denial of Noah's people and their wrongdoing after a long call	The close of a cosmic cycle (no explicit punishment)	The corruption of the Bronze Age
The agent	A divided assembly of gods (Enlil decides, Enki betrays the secret)	The one God	The one God	The cosmic water / Vishnu	Zeus
The warning	A whisper through the reed wall	A direct command	Revelation and a declared message	The fish's warning	Prometheus's warning to his son

The element	Gilgamesh (Utnapishtim)	Genesis (Noah)	The Qur'an (Noah)	India (Manu)	Greece (Deucalion)
The survivor	A king, his household, and craftsmen	Noah and his family (eight)	Noah and those who believed with him—"only a few believed with him"	Manu alone (with the fish)	A couple
The vessel	A cubic ship of seven decks	An ark of stated dimensions	An ark built "under Our watchful eye and according to Our revelation"	A ship towed by the fish	A chest
The animals	"The seed of every living thing"	Of every kind, in pairs	"Of every kind, one pair"	The seeds (in some accounts)	—
The duration	Seven days of storm	40 days / 150 days	Unspecified	—	Nine days

The element	Gilgamesh (Utnapishtim)	Genesis (Noah)	The Qur'an (Noah)	India (Manu)	Greece (Deucalion)
The grounding	Mount Nimush	The mountains of Ararat	Al-Judi	A mountain peak in the north	Parnassus
The birds	A dove, then a swallow, then a raven	A raven, then a dove twice	—	—	—
The close	An offering around which the gods gather; the survivor's immortality	An offering, a covenant, and a rainbow	The rescue of the messenger and the destruction of the deniers; the drowning of Noah's son	The renewal of humanity from Manu	Human beings from stones

And the reading of the table: the columns of Mesopotamia and Genesis **match structurally** in the ship, the animals, the birds, the mountain, and the offering, with a match counted among the firmest in comparative literature. They part **theologically** completely (a turbulent assembly drowning human beings for their noise → a just God drowning them for their corruption and making a covenant with them); the Qur'an's column parts from both in its focus: **no birds, no dimensions, and no duration**—all its weight is on **the call, the denial, the messenger, and the fate**; and the columns of India and Greece share the skeleton and part in every detail.

* Fourth: The File of Gilgamesh and Genesis—The Most Famous Comparison in the History of Textual Criticism

In December 1872 George Smith—who had begun his life as an engraver frequenting the British Museum—stood before the Society of Biblical Archaeology reading the translation of the eleventh tablet he had just deciphered: a flood, a ship, birds, and a mountain. The news shook Victorian Europe: **the Bible's tale in an older pagan text.** From that day the reading divided.

The first—prevailing among most scholars of the ancient East—that Genesis uses **the shared Mesopotamian material** and reformulates it theologically (removing the plurality and the turbulence, and introducing justice and the covenant)—the Torah's writer in the Babylonian exile (sixth century BCE) knowing these stories well.

The second—among the conservatives and the believers in historicity—that the match is a witness to **a single event** preserved by the nations in various accounts, the Mesopotamian being a distorted version and the biblical (or Qur'anic) the true one.

And the third—a combining one: material shared in origin that the traditions parted in shaping. **And this book's rule is present: resemblance proves borrowing neither way, nor denies it**—it proves a connection, and determining its direction needs independent evidence (history, provenance, and the direction of transmission), not mere priority.

* Fifth: What the Qur'an Adds—And Where Its People Differ

The Qur'an parts from the two preceding accounts in four things.

(1) The long call: Noah is a caller "a thousand years, less fifty," arguing with his people by night and by day, in secret and openly—so the flood is **the close of a call**, not a god's mood nor mere punishment.

(2) Noah's son: he refuses to board and says "I will seek refuge on a mountain to save me," and drowns—and the dialogue between the father and the son, and then between Noah and his Lord ("my son was one of my family"—"he was not one of your family. What he did was not right"),

has no counterpart we know of in the other accounts, and its theological meaning is sharp: salvation is by faith, not by lineage.

(3) Noah's wife is among the destroyed.

(4) Al-Judi as the mountain of grounding, not Ararat (traditionally located in southern Turkey today—and Ararat is the name of a region in the Torah before it became the name of a particular mountain). **And as for the disagreement of its people:** most the commentators hold that the flood **covered the whole earth**. And contemporary commentators (among them some of the reformist current) held that it was **regional**: it drowned the land of the people called, because "We sent Noah to **his people**" and because the Qur'an's rule is that every nation is destroyed by itself. The first group reply with the apparent sense of the verses ("do not leave any of the disbelievers on earth")—and the file is open within the Islamic house, which matters to the seeker when he reads the geology.

* Sixth: The Four Explanations—And the Geology

How is the breadth of the tale's spread to be read?

(1) The memory of a single event: the traditional Abrahamic explanation—a real flood preserved by humanity in accounts that were distorted among some nations—its holders arguing from the structural match among nations with no connection.

(2) Diffusion from a center: Mesopotamia as the source, and the tale traveled by trade, conquest, and writing—prevailing among scholars **for the cluster of the Near East and Greece**, and weaker in explaining the flood of the Andes and Australia.

(3) Independent local events: every river or coastal civilization knew a catastrophic flood and told it as a myth—supported by the fact that the details are local (the raven, the beaver, the fish, the maize) and that the nations safe from flooding did not tell it.

(4) The major geological hypotheses: the end of the ice age (a rise of the sea of about 120 meters between 20,000 and 6,000 years ago, drowning inhabited coasts—which some link to the accounts of Australia and the coasts), and the **Black Sea** hypothesis (Ryan and Pitman, 1997: the rush of Mediterranean waters through the Bosphorus around 5600 BCE, drowning inhabited shores—**a matter of intense scientific dispute** in its scale and speed). **As for geology's position on "the global flood" in its literal sense** (the covering of all the mountains in human times): the consensus of earth science is its **non-occurrence**—no single global sedimentary layer, no interruption in the ice-core, tree-ring, and archaeological records of the continuous civilizations (Egypt and China were not interrupted), and Woolley's excavations at Ur (1929), announced as "the flood layer," turned out to be a local flood that does not extend to the neighboring cities. This is the datum that pushed the interpreters toward the regional reading, and the literalists answered that the flood is a miracle not subject to sediments.

The Scale on the Ladder — And the Study's Question

The claim: "The Flood is a historical event that all the nations know." **The strongest case:** the very wide spread and the structural match among distant nations. **The strongest objection:** the telling absences (Egypt, China, Japan), the locality of the details, and the absence of a geological trace of a global flood. **The strongest reply:** diffusion explains the near cluster, not the distant continents. Memory is cast in the language of each environment. And the regional reading takes the text out of collision with geology. **What is established:** that the tale of the flood is **the most widely spread of humanity's tales and the oldest in documentation**. That most of the nations—not all—know some flood. That the literal global flood is without a geological witness. And that catastrophic regional floods are a recurring fact. **What is not established:** that all the accounts are the memory of one event. Nor that they are all transmitted from one center. Nor that behind them lies a particular event that can be named. **And the Seeker's Question:** when you find the one tale among the Babylonian, the Greek, the Indian, and the Aztec. Miss it among the Egyptian and the Chinese—**which tells you more: its presence among those who knew an angry river, or its absence among those who knew a merciful one?**—The answer to this question is what decides which of the four explanations you choose, and neither the clay nor the sediments can settle it for you.

Cross-references for the study: *the creation of the human being and the patterns of descent in the preceding study; the Mesopotamian creation stories and Genesis in the study on the origin of the universe; and the Epic of Gilgamesh and the Mesopotamian shelf in Chapter 15.*

Study 23.8: Neuroscience, Psychiatry, and Religion — Science Enters the Believer's Head

Opening: The Sciences That Touch the Seeker Most Closely

> **Summary of the study:** When a medical device pictures a mystic's brain as he meditates, what does that say about his spiritual experience? Here science enters the most delicate territory of all: the believer's own mind, asking about the neural correlates of the spirit, with an honesty that distinguishes what science has genuinely settled from what remains philosophically open.

Astronomy and physics study the seeker's sky and his earth; the neurosciences and psychiatry study **the very organ that believes and doubts**. That is why no science touches the subject of our book more closely: when a researcher places a person at prayer inside a scanner, or counts the rates of depression among the religious, he approaches the question in a way that raises in everyone a single question in two tones: "have they found faith in the brain?"—the irreligious enthusiast says it rejoicing at an explanation that dispenses with heaven, and the believer says it apprehensive of a reduction that turns his prayer into chemistry. We will see that both emotions are hasty, and that this field—like every field of the chapter—is a shared observation with two interpretations above it.

* First: What Happens in the Brain at the Hour of Prayer?—The Neuroscience of Religion

Since the 1990s a research field has arisen that images the brains of worshipers during their worship—monks in meditation, nuns in prayer, Sufis in remembrance, and worshipers in humble devotion. It has come out with a result no longer in dispute: **religious experience has real, observable brain signatures**: changes in the activity of the regions of attention and emotion, and a marked quieting of the regions that mark the boundaries of the self (the parietal lobe), coinciding with what the worshipers describe as the dissolving of the ego and the widening of presence. So religiosity is not neurologically "empty talk"; it is among the deepest things the human brain does.

So what does this prove? Here the golden rule we established in the chapter on evidence grows more insistent: **the existence of a neural channel for an experience neither invalidates the truth of what it perceives nor establishes it.** Vision has its detailed neural channel, and the tree is no illusion because seeing has regions in the cortex. Hallucination has very nearly the same channel, and the tree does not exist because someone "saw" it. So the map of the brain answers "how the experience is lived" and has no power to answer "does what it reports exist"—which is exactly the distinction of "how" and "why" with which we opened the chapter, descending from the sky to the skull.

* Second: "The God Spot" and "the God Helmet"—A Cautionary Tale in Science Journalism

Two reports spread in this subject that had better be clarified because they are a model of what the media does to science.

The first is an old observation that some patients with temporal-lobe epilepsy live overwhelming religious experiences (and Dostoevsky—an epileptic—described the moments before the seizure in terms approaching the descriptions of the mystics), so writers rushed to announce "the discovery of the God center in the brain." **The second** is the experiments of a Canadian researcher (Persinger), who claimed that weak magnetic stimulation of the temporal lobe through a "helmet" arouses in many of its wearers a sense of a vague "presence." The press flew off with "the God helmet." Then scientific scrutiny came and shrank both claims: a Swedish team repeated the helmet experiment with tighter controls (double-blind) and found the "presence" following the person's **suggestibility**, not the magnetic field. For it appeared among those told they were under stimulation even when the device was switched off. And it turned out that religious experience has no single "center" but a wide network spanning the brain, as every complex human experience does. **And the seeker's lesson here is double:** beware the headlines "scientists discover that religion . . ."—between them and the research paper lies a distance wide enough for distortion. Notice that the two opposite reductions—"your brain secretes God" and "the brain is a receiver of

the divine"—**are both philosophical interpretations above the datum, not results from it**: the first analogy assumes there is no sender, the second assumes there is one, and the laboratory measurement is silent on both.

* Third: Chemistry and Epiphany— The Experiments with Consciousness-Altering Substances

Older than the helmet and firmer methodologically: the experiments with psychedelic substances that generate "mystical" experiences. From the famous "Good Friday Experiment" (1962: divinity students, half of whom were given psilocybin before a service, most of whom lived experiences they described as among the deepest spiritual experiences of their lives) to the series of rigorous studies at Johns Hopkins University in the last two decades, the evidence presented indicates that a controlled dose of a chemical compound generates in a high proportion of volunteers an experience meeting the classical criteria of "mystical experience" (unity, transcendence of time, awe, and noetic certainty), which many of them rank years later among the five most important experiences of their lives, and which leaves measurable positive psychological effects. So has religious experience been "exposed," now that it can be summoned by a pill? We presented the answer in the chapter on evidence and tighten it here: **the possibility of artificial induction proves that the experience can be generated, not that all its genuine instances are false**—grief can be induced by a drug, and that does not mean the griefs of the bereaved are chemical

illusions. A manufactured key opens the door and does not show that everyone who entered the house climbed in.

But the believer is required in return to acknowledge what it does prove: that **the feeling of sanctity and certainty does not suffice by itself as an argument**—for here it is being manufactured in a laboratory. So the question returns to the measure of religious experience we set down: the strongest of the arguments for whoever has it, and the least able to bind others. (It is recorded in fairness that some religious traditions themselves have a history with "the sacred plant"—from the *soma* of the Vedas to the rites of the peoples of the Americas—so the relationship between chemistry and sanctity is far older than the laboratory, and most of the great religions take toward it the position of prohibition.)

* Fourth: Psychiatry and Religion—From "Collective Neurosis" to Conditional Reconciliation

As for the story of psychiatry with religion, it passed through three chapters that deserve honest telling:

The chapter of hostility. Freud opened it with the most famous polemical diagnosis of the twentieth century: religion is "the universal obsessional neurosis of humanity," an illusion born of the need for a supreme father—we presented his thesis and its critique among the explanations of religiosity (Chapter 1). For decades a view prevailed in the profession that saw religiosity as the companion of disorder or its material.

The chapter of revision by the numbers. Then psychiatry did what science does when it thinks well of itself: it measured instead of pronouncing. Over the last decades a mountain of studies accumulated (gathered by huge reviews, the most famous being the work of the Duke University team) whose general direction may be summarized: **the predominant correlations between religiosity and mental health are positive, not negative**—lower rates of depression, suicide, and addiction; faster recovery; higher life satisfaction. Greater resilience in adversity—until religion became in the profession's literature "a protective factor" the patient is asked about, not a symptom to be treated, and the modern diagnostic manuals included "religious and spiritual problems" as a heading in which the patient's cultural context is respected rather than tried.

The chapter of qualification—the most important for our seeker, from both sides. Before the believer takes these figures as a banner, two strict restrictions bind him: correlation is not necessarily causation (community, meaning, hope, and the regulation of behavior—mechanisms some of which are available to the non-religious—may be the agent, not the creed itself). More important: religiosity is not one kind in these very studies—the research distinguishes **a positive religiosity** (a relationship of love and trust, a supportive community), which the benefits accompany, from **a negative religiosity** (a punishing, lurking God, a crushing guilt, religious conflict, and a compulsive religious scrupulosity—which has its venerable name in the literature and its victims in every faith), which is

associated with explicit psychological harm. So the precise scientific question is not "is religion psychologically beneficial?" but "**which** religiosity, for whom, and how?"

Then the decisive rule. Even if the benefit were unmixed, it would not suffice by itself to establish truth—for the pragmatic fallacy (beneficial, therefore true) is a fallacy: an illusion may benefit (and the effect of the placebo is the other side's ready witness), and a truth may harm. But the believer has here a legitimate, limited gain that is rightly his: these figures **refute** the old counter-claim—"religion is by its nature a disease and a psychological harm"—statistically. So whoever would reject religion, let him reject it by the evidence of its truth, not by the claim of its morbidity. As for arguing from benefit as proof, its door is "the argument from fruit" in Chapter 19, on its scale there.

* Fifth: Where Is the Line Between Vision and Psychosis?—And the Ethics of Diagnosis at a Distance

This field reaches its most delicate question: how does the psychiatrist distinguish spiritual experience from psychotic disorder—when both may speak of voices, visions, and presence? The profession has useful practical criteria that the seeker had better know: **the cultural context** (a shared experience intelligible within one's tradition is other than a belief anomalous to every context). **Functionality** (the typical spiritual experience bears fruit in cohesion, peace, and connection with people, while psychosis dismantles life and isolates).

And structure (transient, framed, open to reflection, versus intrusive, overpowering, and disorganizing)—not sharp dividing lines, and the gray zone stands, but enough for the reader to know that sober psychiatry **makes neither faith itself a disease nor religious experience itself a psychosis.**

From this door comes a rule of methodological manners we hand to the seeker, which serves in every debate: **psychiatric diagnosis is a polemical weapon forbidden to both sides.** The saying "believers suffer from a collective delusion or a neurosis" and its counterpart "atheists are sick with pride or a father-wound" are both diagnosis at a distance without examination or license, and both fall into the psychological explanation whose rule we established in the chapter on biases: it explains and does not invalidate, and it recoils on whoever brandishes it, equally.

* Sixth: The Brain and the Soul—Where the Question Reaches Its End

The field ends at its deepest question: neural dependence. For the facts of the clinic are harshly clear: a blow to the head erases memories. A tumor changes its owner's character. An iron rod pierced the skull of the railway worker Phineas Gage (1848) and brought out of the survivor "another person," by the testimony of his companions. And dementia extinguishes a person while he is alive. So the materialist says: here is the "soul" coming apart as its organ comes apart, piece by piece—so where is a soul independent of it? Memory, character, and emotion—which you count as the soul—are

brain functions that are injured by its injury and die by its death. The dualists (among them philosophers of neuroscience, not theologians alone) answer with their answers: that damage to the apparatus disables the manifest function and does not annihilate its owner—like a radio smashed and silenced, while the broadcast is not silenced (the famous "receiver" analogy—an analogy its opponents grant to be empirically irrefutable, and see in that its flaw, not its merit). That "the hard problem"—why the processing of matter is accompanied by any feeling from within at all—remains after all the maps of the brain, as we laid out in the body of the chapter. **And the duty of honesty requires here what we established in our sources:** that the old empirical arguments for "the soul" widespread in popular believing literature (such as the claim that the brain is "a switchboard," not the seat of memory, and that its injuries do not touch memory) **are clearly superseded scientifically,** and an honest book may not promote them—what is fit for presentation among the arguments of the soul's side is the philosophical (the unity of consciousness, intentionality, and the hard problem), not the mistaken empirical. For whoever built his faith in the soul on a false neurological datum has it demolished by the first book of anatomy—and this is the very "trap of the gaps" in its most critical place.

The Study's Conclusion: The Two Sciences Study the Believer and Do Not Try Faith

The outcome of the journey inside the skull is like the map of the journey in the sky: the sciences of brain and mind indicate that religiosity is a deep phenomenon in organ and behavior—its signatures observed, its fruits measured, and the harms of its corrupted forms as well. But they have stopped, because of their method, where all the sciences stop: at the door of the question of truth, not inside it. So whoever says to you "the MRI has proved that God is a brain illusion" has overstepped his instrument, and whoever says "the studies have proved my religion true by its benefits" has overstepped his numbers—and the observation between them is one and silent.

We close with a practical word that the study's subject imposes, outside the debate and inside the counsel: if you, reader, are passing through a real psychological distress, know that the truest thing on which all the sources we have read agree, religious and medical alike, is that **faith is not a substitute for treatment, and treatment is not an enemy of faith**—the best psychiatrists today respect your religion and invest it in your recovery, and the best people of religion direct you to the physician as they direct you to prayer. Intellectual perplexity is the subject of this book; psychological pain has its own people, and knocking at their door is courage, not doubt in religion nor deficiency in faith.

The Seeker's Question: If the scanner imaged your brain while you prayed and found what it finds in the brain of one who loves or meditates—does that say something about the One you address, or about you alone? And who is entitled to decide which?

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the psychological explanations of religiosity (Freud and his critics) in Chapter 1; religious experience on its scale in Chapter 18; and the argument from fruit in Chapter 19.*

Study 23.9: Philosophy and Religion — Adversaries or Neighbors?

The mirror of the study on science and religion: three positions in every house, a mother battle with counterparts in all the faiths, and a modern reversal that reopened the door—on the seven-rung ladder and by one scale

Summary of the study: Centuries before science, it was philosophy that first knocked on religion's door. A mirror of the science-and-religion study: three recurring stances every great religious house has taken toward philosophy, one shared central battle, and a modern reversal that reopened a question everyone thought was closed.

* Opening: Why This Study After the Studies on Science?

In this chapter and its studies you have made a journey with science: physics, astronomy, the universe, the human being, and the brain. You have noticed—if you were alert—that most of the battles called "battles of science and religion" were not between an equation and a text, but between **a philosophical interpretation** of an equation and **a philosophical interpretation** of a text. Philosophy was present in every field you passed through, present without a name. This study names it.

The question here is older than the question of science by centuries: when the philosophical mind—with its logic, its proofs, and its concepts—knocked at religion's door, how was it received? As an adversary to be expelled, a servant to be hired, or a brother to be reconciled with? The astonishing answer—which this book repeats in every field—is that **every great religious house knew all three positions within itself**. So the division is not between "a religion that rejects philosophy" and "a religion that accepts it," but among currents inside every religion, resembling one another across the faiths in a way that deserves a pause.

Let us clarify the term first. "Philosophy" here is not an opinion nor general wisdom, but **a method** of seeking knowledge that relies on rational demonstration independent of the authority of the text, and asks about first principles: what is existence? what is knowledge? what is the good? So wherever this method existed—in Athens or Baghdad or Benares or Chang'an—our question existed. "Religion" here is the system that answers the same questions by the authority of a revelation or a sacred tradition. So the question is: **what happens when two answers to one question meet, one from demonstration and the other from revelation?**

* First: Three Positions in Every House

The first position—fideism: philosophy is an adversary or a surplus. Its holder says: religion is complete in itself, and the philosophical mind either agrees with it, in which case it is not needed, or contradicts it, in

which case it is error. In early Christianity one of its Fathers cried out: "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?"—Athens the symbol of philosophy and Jerusalem the symbol of faith. In Islam hadith scholars and jurists said that whoever practices logic falls into heresy. Some issued rulings forbidding occupation with the books of the Greeks. And they counted the science of *kalam* itself—a rational defense of the creed—an innovation, because it tries revelation before something other than revelation. In Judaism rabbis opposed the study of philosophy until the books of the most famous Jewish philosopher were banned in some communities for a century. In India the schools of pure devotion refused that the road of salvation should lie in demonstration, and said that love reaches what logic does not. In the modern age a Danish philosopher reformulated this position in a deep philosophical formulation—and here is the first paradox: that the most eloquent defense of the rejection of philosophy was written in philosophy. When he said that faith is a leap above reason, not an inference from it, and that whoever seeks proof of God has lost faith in Him.

The second position—kalam: philosophy is a servant to be hired. Its holder says: revelation is the root, and reason is an instrument we use to understand it, order it, and defend it, so we take from philosophy its tools and reject its results where they contradict the text. This is the project of Islamic *kalam* in its schools—the Mu'tazila, who gave reason precedence when they supposed contradiction, and the Ash'aris and Maturidis, who balanced. It is the very project of Christian

"scholastic theology," which made philosophy "the handmaid of theology" in the famous phrase, and the project of the Jewish *Guide for the Perplexed*, which tried to show that the Torah, when rightly understood, does not contradict demonstration. In India the school of "Nyaya" arose on logic and demonstration in the service of the authority of the Vedas, until one of its philosophers formulated arguments for the existence of God resembling—to an astonishing degree—the arguments of the Muslim theologians and the Christian theologians of almost the same age. In China "Neo-Confucianism" made Taoist and Buddhist metaphysics an instrument for grounding Confucian ethics. The common denominator: **reason is hired, not owned.**

The third position—the philosophers: philosophy is a foster sister. Its holder says: truth is one, and demonstration and revelation are two roads to it, so they cannot truly contradict each other. If a contradiction appears, the fault is in our understanding of the text, not in the demonstration, and the text is interpreted. This is the doctrine of the great philosophers of Islam: he who said that the law and wisdom are "twin sisters" and that the law made demonstrative inquiry obligatory. Before him, he who formulated revelation in the language of emanation and the active intellect. Before them both, he who declared that one should not be ashamed to accept the truth from whatever source it comes. It has its Christian counterpart in the "Latin Averroists," who were accused of holding two truths, the truth of philosophy and the truth of faith. Its Jewish counterpart in those who interpreted the stories of the

Torah as philosophical symbols. Its Indian counterpart in "Vedanta," which made the rational demonstration of the unity of being the deepest understanding of the Upanishads, not their adversary; and its Chinese counterpart in the philosophical reading of the Tao as a cosmic principle, not a god.

Three faces of one observation: that these three positions recur in all the faiths, and that the dividing line runs inside every religion, not between them. So whoever tells you "Islam rejects philosophy" or "Christianity embraces reason" or "Hinduism is a religion of contemplation without demonstration" has given you a third of the map from each house.

* Second: The Mother Battle—And How the Faiths Resolve the Contradiction of Reason and Transmission

Every house has its great battle in this subject, and the most famous in Arab memory is the battle of "the Incoherence": a jurist-theologian-Sufi wrote a book invalidating twenty questions of the philosophers and declaring them unbelievers in three (the eternity of the world, the denial of God's knowledge of particulars, and the denial of bodily resurrection), and about a century later a judge-philosopher replied with a book in which the incoherence itself is rendered incoherent. The battle on examination is not between "religion" and "philosophy," but between **two methods of resolving contradiction**: the first says reason erred where it contradicted explicit transmission, and the second says understanding erred where it contradicted certain

demonstration. Then, a century and a half after them, came one who rejected the whole division in a massive book whose very title is its thesis: **The Averting of the Contradiction of Reason and Transmission**. His thesis is that real contradiction does not occur at all between explicit reason and sound transmission, and that what is called contradiction is a contradiction between a weak transmission or a faulty understanding and a probable reasoning called demonstration. **So these are three strategies, not two:** giving precedence to transmission, interpreting transmission, and denying the contradiction.

And by the one standard look at the other houses and you will see the same three strategies under other names. In Christianity: "I believe in order to understand"—the motto of an ancient bishop and then of a medieval theologian who made faith the condition of understanding, not its result (giving precedence to transmission); then scholastic theology, which distributed the fields: truths reason reaches alone, truths reached only by revelation, and no contradiction because their source is one (denying the contradiction). Then those who hold that the stories of Genesis are symbols to be interpreted when they contradict science and demonstration (interpreting transmission)—and this last is the one that prevailed in the major churches with modern science. In Judaism: those who set the Torah above demonstration, those who interpreted it for it, and one who wrote a whole dialogue defending "the God of Abraham" against "the God of the philosophers," saying that the historical experience of an entire nation

is more trustworthy than the syllogisms of the logicians—the argument that passed before you in the argument from mass transmission. In India: the same battle ran among schools that see the Vedas as a hearing above reason, schools that make reason their key, and schools—like Buddhism and Jainism—that broke with the authority of the Vedas altogether and founded salvation on the rational analysis of experience. In China: between those who saw rites and traditions above theorizing and those who grounded them in metaphysics.

And the wounding observation for everyone: that every house burned or banned or exiled its philosophers at some moment, and then returned centuries later and adopted their theses as a deeper understanding of its text. So the one declared an unbeliever for holding the interpretation of the text in one century became in a later century the curriculum of the religion's own schools. This does not suffice to prove that the philosophers were right. It points to what is more useful for the seeker: **that the limits of "what religion accepts from reason" are not fixed, and that the history of every religion with its philosophers is a history of mutual retreats.**

* Third: The Modern Reversal—Reason Limits Itself, Then Returns

The modern age brought two opposite movements.

The first: that philosophy itself—at the hands of a German philosopher, the weightiest name of the age—limited the power of reason: it said that the classical proofs of God's existence do not reach, because theoretical reason does not go beyond the world of experience, and that God, immortality, and freedom are "postulates" required by practical reason—morality—not by theoretical reason. Believers read it as the demolition of the proofs, and believers themselves read it from another angle as an opening: "I had to deny knowledge in order to make room for faith," in its author's words. On it was built a whole century of theology that founds religion on feeling, or morality, or existence, not on demonstration.

The second: that philosophy returned—in the second half of the twentieth century. Reopened the door that had been closed: analytic "philosophy of religion" arose as an independent academic field, taught in the major universities, reformulating the ancient proofs in modern logic and re-examining the objections to them with the same rigor, and from both its shores: believers formulating the arguments from coming-to-be, design, and experience in formulations that withstand contemporary criticism, and the irreligious formulating the problem of evil and the argument from natural sufficiency in formulations that withstand reply. This field is

the one that Chapter 18 of this book invested throughout without naming it. **And the lesson:** that the verdict "philosophy has proved" or "philosophy has refuted" is said only of one school at one moment, and philosophy is wider than its schools

As for the striking side in the Muslim world: modern philosophical thought reached the Islamic religion through two opposite doors: the door of those who saw in it the adversary's weapon and fortified themselves against it, and the door of those who saw in it the tools of the ancient theologians in a new dress and resumed with them the project of *kalam*. Both readings are alive together in the libraries of the Muslim world, and you saw in the study on "the ethics of dialogue" that the most influential callers of this age succeeded when they resumed *kalam*, not when they rejected philosophy.

A Comprehensive Table: The Three Positions Across the Faiths

The house	Fideism (philosophy an adversary or a surplus)	Kalam (philosophy a servant)	The philosophers (philosophy a sister)
Islam	The prohibition of logic and the censure of *kalam* among a party of the hadith scholars and jurists	The Mu'tazila, the Ash'aris, the Maturidis—and Ghazali as a theologian	Al-Kindi, al-Farabi, Avicenna, and Ibn Rushd: wisdom and the law are sisters
Christianity	"What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?"; modern existential fideism	"Philosophy the handmaid of theology": the Platonic Fathers, then the scholastics	The Latin Averroists and "double truth"; modern symbolic interpretation
Judaism	The prohibition of the study of philosophy in some communities; Hasidism later	*The Guide for the Perplexed* and what followed	The philosophical interpretation of the Torah among the Jewish Platonists of old and pantheism in modernity

The house	Fideism (philosophy an adversary or a surplus)	Kalam (philosophy a servant)	The philosophers (philosophy a sister)
India	The bhakti schools: love reaches what demonstration does not	Nyaya: logic as servant to the authority of the Vedas	Vedanta (non-dualism): demonstration is the deepest understanding of the Upanishads—and Buddhism, in breaking with the Vedas
China	"The Master did not discuss prodigies": rite and tradition above theorizing	Neo-Confucianism: metaphysics as servant to ethics	The philosophical reading of the Tao: a cosmic principle, not a god

Read the table vertically, not horizontally: for the single column gathers similar positions from distant faiths—and this is more important than the row that gathers divergent positions from a single faith. The Muslim theologian is closer in his method to the Christian scholastic and to the Indian Nyaya philosopher than to a hadith scholar of his own religion who rejected *kalam*. And the Christian fideist is closer to the bhakti mystic than to the scholastic who shares his creed. **So philosophy splits the religions lengthwise**—among the deepest of this book's observations on its whole map: that patterns of thinking cross the borders of the faiths as patterns of religiosity cross them.

* Three Case Studies—How the Battles Turned over

The first case: the eternity of the world—when philosophy retreated. The weightiest question in the battle of the Incoherence was that the philosophers—following Aristotle—held the eternity of the world, while revelation—in the three faiths—holds its coming-to-be. The theologian declared the philosophers unbelievers for it, and the philosopher replied that the holder of a demonstration is not declared an unbeliever. Then the twentieth century came with what neither party had reckoned on: physics said that the observed universe has a beginning. This was not a victory for the theologian as is commonly said in preaching discourse: the Averroist philosopher could say that demonstration had revised itself—which is his very method. That the coming-to-be of the observed universe does not settle

the coming-to-be of existence. And the theologian could say that his intuition was true a thousand years before the laboratory. **The lesson:** that what philosophy supposed a certain demonstration was a conjecture that ran out, and that this does not make religion a judge over science but makes "the certain" in every field rarer than its people claim.

The second case: the soul and the resurrection—when religious understanding retreated. Christian, Jewish, and Islamic theology inherited from Greek philosophy a conception of the soul as a separate substance that survives the body—which passed before you in detail in the introductory study to Chapter 24—until many believers supposed this the text of their religion. Then modern textual and philosophical studies came and showed that the founding texts in the three faiths wager on **the resurrection of the whole being** more than on the escape of a ghost from it, and that the sharp dualism is more Platonic than scriptural. So major theologians retreated from a conception they had supposed religion and which was an infiltrated philosophy. **The lesson:** that philosophy may infiltrate religion until it is counted part of it, and that purifying religion of an old philosophy may come at the hands of a new one—so the question is not "philosophy or not" but "which philosophy."

The third case: revelation itself—when philosophy tried to explain its own source. The boldest thing the philosophers of Islam did was that they were not content to reconcile philosophy and revelation but offered a philosophical theory of **the manner of**

revelation: that the prophet is a human being whose imaginative and rational faculties reached a perfection by which he connects with the active intellect, and receives the truths the philosopher reaches by demonstration, but in sensible images the public understands. The theologians saw it as the turning of prophethood into a natural talent to be acquired rather than an election to be granted, and refuted it decisively. And the philosophers saw it as the greatest honoring of prophethood, because it made it the summit of human perfection, not an event outside it. **And the lesson** here is the book's mother rule: **an explanation explains receptivity. It does not settle truth**—a theory of "how the prophet receives" says nothing about "whether he really received"—and you saw the same theory return in the dress of neuroscience in Study 23.8, and the same rule remains.

And the thread that gathers the three cases: in the first philosophy retreated, in the second religious understanding retreated, and in the third no one retreated, because the question is not of the kind settled by demonstration or by text. So the seeker who wants a single rule about "who wins: philosophy or religion?" will not find it—because the answer differs with the question, and that itself is the most useful thing to take away.

* Fourth: The Seven-Rung Ladder—The Claim "Philosophy and Religion Do Not Contradict Each Other"

We apply the book's ladder to the great claim of this subject as it is applied to others.

1. The claim: that the philosophical mind and religious revelation, if both are sound, do not contradict each other, because their source is one (for the believer) or because their fields differ (for some believers and neutrals).

2. The strongest case for it: that the great historical contradictions—the eternity of the world, the nature of the soul, the limits of causes—dissolved with time, either by philosophy's retreat from a certainty it had supposed a demonstration (the eternity of the world, on which ancient philosophy swore, was refuted by modern physics), or by the retreat of a religious understanding its holders had supposed a text. That all the great religions—as far as we know—produced a rational theology that absorbed philosophy and was not annihilated by it.

3. The strongest objection to it: that the claim is fortified by a condition that invalidates its testability—"if both are sound"—so every contradiction that occurs is referred to a defect in one of them, and which is sound is known only after the verdict. That the history of interpretation is a history of **retreats in one direction**: religion always retreats before philosophy and science, and it is not recorded that philosophy retreated before a religious text in a demonstrative question. That particular questions—personal revelation, miracle, bodily

resurrection, the particularity of a nation—remain resistant to reconciliation.

4. The strongest reply to the objection: that philosophy really did retreat before what religion had been saying: it retreated from the eternity of the world, from the strict determinism of nature, from the self-sufficiency of theoretical reason in morality, and from a completely materialist explanation of consciousness. These are demonstrative retreats, not courtesies. And that "if both are sound" is not a fortification but a definition: what is meant is that **final contradiction is impossible,** not that apparent contradiction does not occur, and apparent contradiction is the engine of progress in both understandings together.

5. What is established: that all the great religions contained philosophy within themselves in three recurring positions. That most of the "contradictions" in history were between one interpretation and another, not between text and demonstration. And that philosophy itself revised its certainties repeatedly as religion revised its understandings.

6. What is not established: that philosophy proves a particular religion—for the utmost its demonstrations reached, when they reached, was the God of the philosophers, not the God of Abraham (the difference explained in Chapter 9, on which Chapter 18 built the division of the two stages). Nor is it established that revelation dispenses with philosophy, for no great religion has dispensed with a rational theology for a single century.

7. The Seeker's Question: if every religion has needed philosophy to understand itself and defend itself—does that mean that religion is deficient without reason, or that reason is part of religion? And if every philosopher has stopped at a limit after which he says "I do not know"—is that limit where religion begins, or where silence ought to begin?

* Fifth: The Seeker's Rules in This Subject

1. Rejecting philosophy is a philosophical position. Whoever says "I do not need demonstration because faith suffices" has set up an epistemic claim that needs demonstration—which is why the most eloquent fideisms were written by the pens of philosophers. So there is no escape from philosophy, and the real choice is between a conscious philosophy and a concealed one.

2. Not every contradiction is a contradiction. Before you judge that a demonstration refutes a text, examine three things: is the demonstration certain, or a conjecture called demonstration? is the text explicit, or an understanding of it? and are the two fields one to begin with? For you saw in the studies on science that three-quarters of the battles are a terminology badly regulated.

3. Philosophy asks and religion answers—but the question reformulates the answer. Monotheism after the question "what are the attributes?" is not monotheism before it, though it remains one. This is not corruption but maturity; whoever wants a religion untouched by philosophy, let him seek a religion no one has ever asked a question.

4. The God of the philosophers and the God of the prophets. Keep the difference and do not confuse the two fields: the utmost philosophy gives you is a first cause, or a necessary existent, or a designer. As for "the One who hears my prayer," that is the field of Stage Two with its own evidence. Confusing the two fields is what has produced most of the illusory battles in this subject.

5. The history of every religion with its philosophers is a history of mutual retreats. So do not judge a religion's position on reason by its harshest centuries nor by its most open. And always ask: which current, which century, and by what argument.

Conclusion: The Open Question

A tour through all the faiths has brought you to this: that philosophy was never outside religion besieging it, but inside it questioning it—and that the three positions toward it recurred in every house as if by law. The study's question remains suspended where it deserves to be, with two facing faces you must carry together:

Is a religion possible without a rational theology? The fideists say: yes, and it is the pure religion before debate corrupted it, and the religion of the simple who never read a demonstration and reached God before the philosophers. **And is a reason possible without an act of faith at its foundation?** The critical philosophers say: no, for every demonstration begins from premises that are not demonstrated, and trust in reason itself is a faith on which no non-circular demonstration stands. Between the two faces you stand—having seen that the philosophers asked and the prophets answered, and

that the answers reformulated the questions—to decide for yourself where to draw the line: not where a camp drew it, but where reason and heart stand straight together for you.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the God of the philosophers and the God of the prophets in Chapter 9; the division of the two stages in Chapters 18 and 19; and the Kuzari argument and the argument from mass transmission in Study 19.5.*

Chapter 24: Death and What Follows

The last of the great questions—and the first in every human heart: what am I? where am I going? and what awaits me there?

> **Summary of the chapter:** What am I? And where do I go once my heart stops? The last of the great questions, and the first in every human heart: soul and body first, then the Day of Judgment across religions, then a descent into the depths of every conception of what follows death—from complete annihilation to eternal life.

This chapter stands on three steps, each handing on to the next: **a first map** of soul and body—"what am I?"—because the answer about destiny depends on our conception of what remains and what perishes. Then **a second map** of the Day of Judgment and the Last Day across religions and cultures—"where to?"; then **the body of the chapter**: the descent into the depths of the other abodes, tradition by tradition, closing with the argument from the thirst for justice in the scale. The whole chapter is governed by what governed those before it: description from the people of each tradition, the single scale, and the Seeker's Question at the close.

A First Introductory Study to Chapter 24: Soul and Body Across Religions and Civilizations —"What Am I?" Before "Where Am I Going?"

The grand tour of the conceptions of the soul, the comparison table, and the three models—and the astonishing fault line that does not run where you think

---

* Opening: The Question That Precedes the Question of Destiny

Before the human being asks "what comes after death?" a prior question faces him: **what is it that dies at all—and what might remain?** Am I only a body, so that when it decays I decay? Or a soul that inhabits a body as a tenant inhabits a house, so that when the house collapses its tenant departs? Or a third thing that resembles neither? Each tradition's answer to this question is what drew its resurrection, or its transmigration, or its annihilation. So the chapter on death had to open with a map of "soul and body" across the civilizations, among the most astonishing maps of the book: in it you will find a religion that embalmed the body so that it might endure, a religion that called it a prison to be escaped, a religion that denied the soul altogether, and a religion that made the immortality of **the body itself** the goal of the road—and then you will discover that the greatest fault line in the question does not run where everyone supposes.

* First: The Grand Tour

Egypt—an interconnected set of elements, and the body a partner in immortality. In ancient Egyptian texts the human being appears in interconnected elements—among them the *ka*, the *ba*, the *akh*, the name, the shadow, and the heart—and these terms do not constitute a single system settled across all periods. The detailing of the human being's components like the Egyptian's: the **ka**, the vital double to whom the offerings are made. The **ba**, the bird of personality depicted with its owner's head, roaming by day and returning to the mummy at night. The **akh**, the transfigured being after the success of the journey. With them the name, the shadow, and the heart (the center of consciousness that is weighed on the scale)—a system of components, not a single "soul." **And the astonishing key:** the survival of these components is conditional on the soundness of **the body**. Hence the whole of mummification: the mummy is not folklore but **a doctrine that the body is a partner in immortality, not its shell**—so the first civilization of immortality was not "spiritual" in the Platonic sense at all.

Mesopotamia—the faded soul. On the other bank, the Babylonian possessed only the ***etemmu***—a feeble ghost that descends after death to "the house of darkness" and eats dust (as we saw in Gilgamesh)—a soul that survives as a dismal shadow survives, not as life does: a conception that explains the Mesopotamian's clinging to this world and to the immortality of the name.

The Hebrew—the unitary surprise. Here is the study's first overturning of the received view: biblical Hebrew **does not know a dualism of a soul imprisoned in a body at all.** The human being in Genesis is dust into which God breathed "the breath of life," **"and** he—the whole of him—became a living being" (*nephesh*): so the soul is not a tenant in the body but the name of the unified living creature (*nephesh* is said even of animals, indeed"a *nephesh* died" means a person died!), and "the spirit" (*ruach*) is God's life-giving breath, which returns to Him. That is why the authentic Hebrew horizon of immortality—when it matured—was** the resurrection of bodies**, not the escape of souls: "Your dead shall live, their corpses shall rise" (Isaiah). As for the dualism of soul and body, it entered the Jewish house later through the Hellenistic window (Philo of Alexandria blending Moses with Plato, and the rabbis developing the layers of the soul: *nephesh*, *ruach*, and *neshamah*). So the one house came to hold two inheritances.

Greece—the mother of dualism . . . and the mother of its opposite. The Greeks began where the Babylonians began: Homer's *psyche* is a faded shade groaning in Hades (Achilles says: to be a living hired laborer is better than to be king over the dead). Then came the Orphic-Pythagorean reversal that changed the face of religious thought East and West: the soul is an immortal divine substance that **fell** into matter, and the body is its tomb—Plato struck it in his immortal wordplay: ***soma sema*** (the body is the tomb / prison of the soul). Philosophy is "a training for death," that is,

for the soul's liberation; and souls transmigrate until they are purified. **But Greece itself gave birth to the counter-answer:** Aristotle returned the soul to the body in a tightly built return—the soul is "the form" of the living body and its first actuality: as sight is the "soul" of the eye, so there is no sight for a gouged-out eye and no soul without a body—a functional unity that would later become the weapon of Catholic theology (Thomas Aquinas) and a distant ancestor of contemporary philosophy of mind.

Christianity—the early battle over the body and its settlement. Christianity inherited both legacies—the Hebrew unity and the Hellenistic dualism. They clashed in its breast in a clash of existence: Gnosticism (the most dangerous of its early rivals) held the extreme of dualism: the body and matter are the work of a lower god and an evil to be fled, and Christ was incarnate only in appearance. **So the Church settled the battle in a settlement that became identity:** the body is God's good creation. The Word "became flesh" truly. The believer is "a temple of the Holy Spirit". And the creed closes without evasion: **"and the resurrection of the body."** So normative Christian salvation is the salvation of the **whole** human being, not the flight of his soul (and the state between death and resurrection—the soul awaiting its body—is a disputed detail among the churches). And yet the Platonic current kept running in the ascetic veins (the contempt for "the sinful flesh" among some solitaries)—a fertile internal tension that explains to the reader the doubleness of the Christian tone toward the body across history.

Islam—the discipline of restraint . . . and the bodily return. The Qur'an opened the file of the spirit with a verse unique in the literature of the religions: "[Prophet], they ask you about the Spirit. Say, 'The Spirit is part of my Lord's domain. You have only been given a little knowledge'"—**a stated restraint from defining its essence,** which made the great scholars scrupulous about entering into it (and what the theologians, philosophers, and Sufis later entered into concerning its reality—a subtle body? an abstract substance?—they entered into by their own reasoning, above this restraint). On the other side, the Qur'an detailed what benefits the wayfarer: **the moral stages of the soul** (the one that commands to evil, then the self-reproaching, then the one at peace—a ladder of purification, not an anatomy of essence), and the stations of the journey (the taking of the soul in sleep and in death, and the *barzakh*). **And its position on the body is a settled middle:** neither Egypt's deification nor Plato's prison—the body is a trust and the mount of moral charge: "your body has a right over you," in the text of the hadith. No monasticism and no tormenting of the body as a means of nearness. Purity is half of faith; **and the return is bodily by a strict consensus.** So much so that the philosophers' denial (al-Farabi and Avicenna, on their interpretation) of the bodily return was one of the three questions on which Ghazali declared them unbelievers in the most famous of the battles of Islamic thought: the clash itself testifies to the centrality of the doctrine—the human being in Islam, as in its two Abrahamic sisters, is **a unity that is raised whole.**

Hinduism—the Atman and the changing garments. Here is the summit of the opposite direction: the **Atman**—the true immortal Self that is neither born nor dies—while bodies are garments: "As a person abandons worn-out clothes and acquires new ones, so when the body is worn out a new one is acquired by the Self" (the Bhagavad Gita—the most famous verse of the subject in the whole heritage of humankind), and the sword does not cut the Atman nor the fire burn it. Indeed Vedanta rose to the absolute summit: **the Atman is Brahman**—your deepest self is the cosmic reality itself ("*tat tvam asi*: That you are"), and liberation is knowing this, not acquiring it. The schools detailed a precise esoteric anatomy (three bodies and five "*kosha*" sheaths enveloping the Atman like the layers of an onion)—the richest "spiritual psychology" among the traditions.

Buddhism—the bomb: no soul at all. In the heart of India itself the Buddha detonated one of the boldest theses in the history of religions: ***anatta*—no-self**: no Atman and no abiding substantial soul. "The person" is a bundle of five aggregates (*skandhas*: body, sensation, perception, mental formations, and consciousness) changing every moment like a flowing river. Clinging to the illusion of a fixed "I" is itself the root of suffering. So how can a transmigration stand without anyone who transmigrates? By his famous answer: **a flame lights a flame**—nothing "moves across"; there is a continuity of conditioning (karma) with no traveling substance. (Its neighbor **Jainism** met it with the complete opposite: the ***jiva***—real, countless individual souls, weighed down by karma clinging to them like dust on a mirror,

and liberation is polishing them until they float to the summit of the cosmos—so the two Indian neighbors bound the spectrum of answers at its two ends.)

China—two souls . . . and the immortality of the body itself as the goal. China divided the human being into two souls: the **hun**, the subtle heavenly one that ascends after death, and the **po**, the dense earthly one that remains with the body in the grave. Hence the doubleness of ancestor veneration (the spirit tablet in the house, and a grave that is tended); and all of life is the flow of the energy *qi*. **And the strangest of the study's reversals:** religious Taoism made **the immortality of the living body itself** the goal of the road—the alchemy of elixirs, exercises for prolonging life, and the nourishing of *qi* in the quest to become an "immortal" (*xian*) who ascends in a transfigured body. So while the Platonist flees **from** the body, the Taoist flees **with** the body from death: few reversals like this exist in the whole map.

Zoroastrianism and the religions of the peoples. The Zoroastrian has the ***fravashi***—an eternal soul before birth that chose to descend into the cosmic battle as a soldier of the light, and awaits its body at the great resurrection (so it stands on the line of Abrahamic unity in its outcome). The religions of the peoples incline toward **a plurality of souls** in one person (the breath-soul, the shadow-soul, the name-soul . . .) and toward the soul's capacity to travel (the shaman's journeys, and the danger of "soul loss" as an illness treated by its retrieval)—the oldest and widest layers of the conception.

* Second: The Comparison Table

Tradition	The structure of the human being	The standing of the body	What remains after death	The road to immortality
Egypt	Multiple components (ka / ba / akh / heart . . .)	A partner in immortality—embalmed	The components together, on condition of the body	Preservation of the body + acquittal in the court
Mesopotamia	Body + a faded ghost	Perishable	The *etemmu* in the world of dust	No immortality—except of the name
The original Hebrew	**Unity**: dust + breath = a living being	God's creation—raised	The whole awaits the resurrection	The resurrection of bodies
Platonic Greece	**Dualism**: an immortal soul in a body-prison	The tomb of the soul (*soma sema*)	The soul alone	The soul's liberation and purification
Normative Christianity	Unity of soul and body (against Gnosticism)	A temple of the Holy Spirit	The soul awaiting its body	"And the resurrection of the body"

Tradition	The structure of the human being	The standing of the body	What remains after death	The road to immortality
Islam	Body + a spirit "of my Lord's domain" + a soul in its stages	A trust with a right—neither prison nor god	The spirit in the *barzakh*	**A bodily return** by consensus
Hinduism	An immortal Atman + sheaths and body-garments	A garment to be changed	The Atman across bodies	*Moksha*: the liberation of the Atman (= Brahman)
Buddhism	**No self**: five changing aggregates	One of the aggregates	No substance—a continuity of conditioning	*Nirvana*: the extinguishing of the wheel
Jainism	An individual *jiva* + clinging karma	A temporary vehicle	The *jiva*	Polishing the *jiva* to the summit
China	*Hun* + *po* + *qi*	The seat of the *po*—and may be immortalized in Taoism	Two souls with two fates	Ancestor veneration; or the bodily immortality of the *xian*

Tradition	The structure of the human being	The standing of the body	What remains after death	The road to immortality
Zoroastrianism	An eternal *fravashi* + body	Raised in the renovation	The *fravashi*	Resurrection and the renewal of the world

* Third: The Analysis—The Three Models, and the Fault Line That Does Not Run Where You Think

All this rubble settles into **three major models: the model of the raised unity** (the authentic Hebrew, normative Christianity, Islam, and Zoroastrianism): the human being is a single composite creature in which the body is original and honored, and immortality is **by the restoration of the whole**—a bodily resurrection.

The model of the liberated soul (the Orphic-Platonic, Hinduism, Gnosticism, and Sufi layers across the faiths): the essence is a prior, higher soul, the body a garment or a prison, and salvation a **departure** and a liberation. **And the model of no-substance** (Buddhism—joined today, through another door, by the materialist naturalists): there is no tenant in the house at all—a process, not a substance.

Then the study's surprise, which deserves long reflection: the greatest fault line in the question of the soul **does not run between "religion" and "science"** as the common debate assumes—but **inside the religions themselves**, between unity and dualism. Look at the astonishing paradox: the Abrahamic doctrine of "the resurrection of the body"—which appears to the modernist the strangest of doctrines—takes toward the question "does the human being exist without a body?" a position **closer to the intuition of contemporary neuroscience** (no psychological life suspended in the air; the person is an embodied creature) than Plato's "spiritual" position. For the Abrahamic religions

wagered that God **rebuilds the whole creature**, not that a ghost saves itself. So much so that contemporary theologians have said: the nearest philosophical formulation of our doctrine is "non-reductive physicalism + resurrection," not "Cartesian dualism." On the other side, "the independent immortal soul" that the public supposes the core of innate religion is—historically—**an Orphic-Platonic-Indian inheritance** that seeped into the popular creeds of all the faiths and coexisted with the texts of resurrection in a composite that few examine. **As for where science stands today,** we detailed it in the study on the brain (Chapter 23): neural dependence is the heaviest card of no-substance and of unity, and "the hard problem" is the heaviest thing that keeps the philosophical door open—and no laboratory decides between them. **And the question of tomorrow**—digital souls and the uploading of minds—inherits the ancient debate in its every detail, as you saw in the chapter on the age of acceleration: whoever says "I am a pattern of information that can be copied" has chosen—without knowing it—his seat in this ancient table.

* Fourth: What the Living Do with the Dead—The Rites as a Second Testimony

The conceptions of the soul surveyed above have a second witness, older than any text: what each community actually did with a body. The rite is a doctrine enacted, and it is often more candid than the doctrine, because it was performed by people who had to decide, that day, what the dead person now was.

Burial, cremation, exposure. The three great answers to the body divide the map. Judaism and Islam bury, quickly and simply: the Jewish dead are washed by a burial society, wrapped in plain linen, and interred within a day where possible, the same shroud for rich and poor; the Muslim dead are washed, wrapped in white, prayed over in a funeral prayer without prostration, and laid on the right side facing Mecca—and both traditions forbid cremation, because the body is God's and will be raised. Christianity buried for most of its history for the same reason and has, in the modern age, largely admitted cremation, the shift itself a small history of changing conceptions of the resurrection body. Hinduism cremates, and the fire is a rite: the body is returned to the elements, the eldest son lights the pyre, and the ashes are carried, when it can be done, to a river, above all the Ganges at Varanasi—because the self that mattered was never the body, and the body's dissolution frees it for its next passage. Buddhism, holding the same view of the body, cremates in most of its lands and has permitted in Tibet the "sky burial," in which the body is given to the birds—the last act of generosity by a self that no longer exists. Zoroastrianism, holding the earth and the fire too pure to receive a corpse, exposed its dead in the towers of silence; the practice is dying out, and the community's argument over what replaces it is an argument about purity conducted in the present tense.

The days after. Every tradition structures the mourning, and the structure encodes the conception of the dead person's state. The Jewish *shiva*—seven days at home, the mourners visited, the Kaddish recited for eleven months—assumes a soul on a journey that the living can accompany with prayer. The Islamic three days of condolence and the prohibition of loud lamentation assume a soul that has passed to a state the living cannot alter, except by supplication and by the charity given in its name. The Christian requiem, the Orthodox memorials on the third, ninth, and fortieth days, the Catholic prayers for the souls in purgatory—all assume a soul that can still be helped. The Hindu *shraddha*, the offerings of rice balls to the departed, assumes a passage that the living must provision. The Chinese ancestor rites—the tablet, the food, the paper money burned at the grave—assume the dead as continuing members of the family with continuing needs. Buddhism, in its popular forms, absorbed the ancestor rites of every land it entered, while its doctrine held that there was no persisting self to feed—a gap between text and practice as wide as any in this book.

What the rites testify. Read together, the funerary customs confirm the three models of the soul with an evidence the texts cannot give: the communities that bury and forbid cremation are the communities that expect the body back; the communities that burn are the communities for whom the body was a garment; and the communities that feed the dead are the communities for whom death is a change of residence, not of family. And one thing the rites testify to unanimously,

across every house on the map: no human community has ever treated a corpse as merely a corpse. That fact belongs to the first chapter of this book as much as to this one.

Conclusion: The Study's Open Question

The map is complete, and its question remains suspended in you yourself: when you say "**I**"—who is speaking? The body whose cells change every moment while you remain you? Or a soul that uses it and departs from it—then where was it before it, and what is its business with it? Or no fixed "you" at all, but the illusion of a river that supposes its flowing to be stillness? Three answers, each of which has carried civilizations and destinies: from the embalmers of the Nile to the monks of no-self to those who await the blowing of the trumpet. You are not required to settle it here—but you are required to notice the effect of the answer: **tell me what "I" is for you, and I will tell you what immortality you can hope for at all.** That is exactly our bridge to the rest of this chapter: having learned what might remain, come now to the map of **where it goes.**

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the brain and the soul (neural dependence, the receiver, and the hard problem) in the studies of Chapter 23; the study on the resurrection immediately following (the landscape of destinies); and the Atman and Brahman in Chapter 9.*

A Second Introductory Study to Chapter 24: The Day of Judgment (The Last Day) Across Religions and Cultures

The idea of the end of the world and the final reckoning is among the oldest ideas that have occupied humanity, and it appears in different forms in most religions and civilizations.

The Abrahamic Religions

Islam. The Day of Resurrection is one of the six pillars of faith, and it is called by many names in the Qur'an: the Day of Judgment, the Inevitable Hour, the Crashing Blow, the Event, the Overwhelming Event, the Day of Regret. It is preceded by minor signs (the multiplication of strife, the shortening of time) and major ones (the appearance of the Mahdi, the Antichrist, the descent of Jesus, Gog and Magog, the rising of the sun from the west, the Beast, the Smoke). It begins with the blowing of the trumpet, at which all in the heavens and the earth are struck down, then the second blowing for the resurrection, then the gathering, the reckoning, and the weighing of deeds on the standard, and the crossing of the bridge. The destiny ends in either Paradise or Hell, with the intercession of the Prophet Muhammad.

Christianity. It believes in the Second Coming of Christ, when he returns to judge the living and the dead. A detailed description appears in the Book of Revelation (the Apocalypse): the seven seals, the trumpets, the four horsemen, the battle of Armageddon between the powers of good and evil, then the Last Judgment before

the great white throne, and the rising of "a new heaven and a new earth" and the heavenly Jerusalem. The denominations differ in the details: some believe in a thousand-year reign of Christ (the millennium) before the end or after it.

Judaism. It speaks of "*acharit ha-yamim*" (the end of days), when the awaited Messiah (the *Mashiach*) of the line of David comes, gathers the dispersed of the Jews, rebuilds the Temple, and universal peace prevails ("they shall beat their swords into plowshares"). It also believes in the resurrection of the dead (*techiyat ha-metim*) and the Day of Judgment, though the details are less specified than in Islam and Christianity, and it focuses more on the earthly messianic age.

The Zoroastrian Religion (Ancient Persia)

Among the oldest and most influential conceptions, which many scholars hold influenced the conceptions of the later religions. It believes in a final battle between the god of good, Ahura Mazda, and the spirit of evil, Ahriman; the coming of the savior "Saoshyant," born of a virgin. Then the resurrection of the dead and their testing by a river of molten metal, which the righteous cross as if it were warm milk and in which the wicked burn temporarily. Then the whole cosmos is purified and the good prevails forever (*Frashokereti*: the renovation of the world).

The Indian Religions

Hinduism. No single end, but endless cosmic cycles. We are now living in the "Kali Yuga" (the age of darkness and corruption), the last of the four ages, and at its end "Kalki," the tenth and final incarnation of the god Vishnu, appears riding a white horse and bearing a sword, destroys evil, and begins a new golden age (Satya Yuga); then the cycle repeats. The universe itself is created and destroyed without end (the day and night of Brahma).

Buddhism. It shares the idea of cycles, and the Buddha foretold that his teachings would gradually decay, and that in the time of deepest darkness the future Buddha "Maitreya" would appear to revive the road to enlightenment. The reckoning here is individual and continuous through karma and rebirth, not a single collective day.

Other Civilizations and Cultures

Norse mythology (the Vikings). "Ragnarök"—the fate of the gods. A tremendous final battle in which the great gods die (Odin swallowed by the wolf Fenrir; Thor kills the cosmic serpent and dies of its venom), and the earth sinks into the sea after a long winter (*Fimbulwinter*). But the world is reborn green and fertile, and a human couple survives to repopulate the earth.

Ancient Egypt. The reckoning is individual, immediately after death: the heart of the dead is weighed against the feather of "Maat" (justice and truth) before Osiris. Whoever's heart is heavy with sins is devoured by the monster "Ammit," and whoever passes lives in

the eternal Fields of Iaru. There are also texts hinting at the annihilation of the cosmos and its return to the primeval waters.

The civilizations of Mesoamerica (the Maya and the Aztecs). They believed in successive cosmic ages, each ending in a catastrophe. The Aztecs believed we are in "the Fifth Sun," which will end in earthquakes, and so they offered sacrifices to "feed" the sun and postpone the end. As for the commotion of the year 2012 attributed to the Maya, it was merely the end of a long calendar cycle and the beginning of another, not a prophecy of annihilation.

Striking Shared Threads

Despite the distance of these cultures in geography and time, elements recur with astonishing resemblance: the idea of moral corruption before the end (the signs of the Hour, the Kali Yuga, the decay of the dharma). The appearance of an awaited savior (the Mahdi and Jesus, Christ, the Messiah, Saoshyant, Kalki, Maitreya); a decisive battle between good and evil (the Great Battle, Armageddon, Ragnarök). Then a reckoning and a scale of justice (the scale in Islam, the weighing of the heart among the Egyptians, the Judgment); and finally a renewal and a pure beginning (Paradise, the new earth, Frashokereti, the golden age).

The most prominent essential difference: the Abrahamic religions and Zoroastrianism see time as linear, with a beginning and a single decisive end, while the Indian religions and many ancient civilizations see it as circular, repeating without end.

The Comprehensive Table of the Individual's Fate After Death—Fifteen Nations by One Standard

What preceded is a survey of **the end of the world**. This is a table of **the fate of the individual** when he dies—the question the seeker knocks at first—laid out on five questions, the same for every nation: what remains? where to? by what standard is the fate decided? is it final? and what is its effect on the lives of the living? (The first six nations were detailed in the body of the chapter, and the remaining nine are added here to complete the map.)

Nation	What remains	Where to	By what standard	Final?	The effect on the living
Egypt	The *ba* and the *ka* and the mummified body together	The Fields of Iaru, or devouring	**Moral** (the weighing of the heart before Maat) + ritual (mummification and spells)	Final	The largest funerary investment in history

Nation	What remains	Where to	By what standard	Final?	The effect on the living
Mesopotamia	A faint ghost (*etemmu*)	"Kur"—the dark underworld for everyone	**No moral standard**; the difference lies in offerings and offspring	Final and dismal	Feeding the dead; the terror of death (Gilgamesh)
Greece	A shade (*psyche*)	Hades for most; Elysium for heroes; Tartarus for the wicked	**Relative / heroic** at first, then moral among the Orphics and Plato (the myth of Er)	Final—or transmigration among the Orphics	Solemn funerals; and the philosophies of "pleasures" and "wisdom" as an answer
Rome	The spirits of the	The underworld; the spirits of the house (the *Lares*)	Weakly moral-civic	Final	Domestic ancestor worship

Nation	What remains	Where to	By what standard	Final?	The effect on the living
	ancestors (the *Manes*)				
The Norse	The soul	Valhalla for those slain in battle (chosen by Odin), and Hel for the rest of the dead	**The manner of death**, not morality	Until Ragnarök	A culture of courage and honorable death
The Celts	The soul	The mysterious Otherworld; and transmigration among some	Unspecified	Continuous	A daring in war that Caesar explained by their certainty of immortality

Nation	What remains	Where to	By what standard	Final?	The effect on the living
Judaism	A soul (and it developed)	Sheol for everyone in antiquity → "the world to come" and the resurrection later	Moral (after the development)	Final, with open details	The focus on this life and on "justice here"
Christianity	The soul, then the raised body	Heaven / Hell (and Purgatory for Catholics)	**Faith-and-moral** (grace and works in the scales of the denominations)	Final (and universal salvation among a minority)	Hope and fear; prayers for the dead
Islam	The spirit (and a *barzakh*, then the	The grave (bliss / torment) → the gathering → the scale → Paradise / Hell	**Faith-and-moral** by a precise scale; intercession	Final (and the eternity of Hell slightly contested)	Constant readiness; instructing the dying;

Nation	What remains	Where to	By what standard	Final?	The effect on the living
	resurrection of the body)				prayer for the dead
Zoroastrianism	The soul (*urvan*)	The Chinvat Bridge: it widens for the righteous and narrows for the wicked → Heaven / Hell	**Purely moral** (thoughts, words, and deeds)	Temporary—until the final renovation and the salvation of all	The most moral of the ancient eschatologies; the towers of silence
Hinduism	The Atman	Transmigration according to karma; temporary heavens and hells; the goal is exit (*moksha*)	**Karmic** (the deed)	No—a cycle until liberation	The castes read as desert; cremation

Nation	What remains	Where to	By what standard	Final?	The effect on the living
Buddhism	No self—but a karmic stream	Six realms of birth; the goal is *nirvana*	**Karmic** (the intention)	No—until extinguishing	Meditation on death; detachment
China	Two souls: the *hun* ascends and the *po* remains in the grave	The world of the ancestors; then the Buddhist-Taoist "courts of hell," ten in number	Relative-ritual (filial piety toward the ancestors), then moral under Buddhist influence	Connected to the living	**Ancestor worship** as the pillar of social ethics; the burning of paper money
Japan (Shinto)	The *tama*, the soul	"Yomi," the polluted land of darkness; and the dead become ancestral *kami*	Ritual (purity), not moral	Connected	The Obon festival for the return of the ancestors; death as an

Nation	What remains	Where to	By what standard	Final?	The effect on the living
					impurity to be purified
The Aztecs	The soul	Mictlan (a four-year journey) for most; the sun's heaven for warriors and women who died in childbirth; Tlaloc's paradise for the drowned	**The manner of death** exclusively, not morality	Final	Human sacrifices to feed the sun
Africa (models)	The soul	The near world of the ancestors—"the living dead" as long as	Relative (offspring and remembrance) and limitedly moral	Gradual (one is forgotten and becomes an	The mediation of the ancestors in every

Nation	What remains	Where to	By what standard	Final?	The effect on the living
		someone remembers them		unknown spirit)	matter; blessing and curse
The Aboriginal peoples	The soul	It returns to "the Dreaming" and the land of the ancestor	No moral standard; belonging to the land	A cycle	The sanctity of the land; the prohibition of speaking the name of the dead

* **Five patterns that the table reveals at first glance.**

(1) The standard that sorts the dead is not moral among most of the ancient nations: the Norse sort by the manner of death, the Aztecs likewise, Shinto by purity, Mesopotamia by offerings, and Africa by offspring. **And strict moral sorting is a threefold creation**: Egyptian (the oldest), Zoroastrian, and Abrahamic—and with it the Indian karmic in its mechanical form.

(2) "One place for everyone" is older than "sorted destinies": Sheol, Kur, Hades, and Yomi gather the good and the bad in one darkness—and then the afterlife was gradually sorted as the idea of justice grew (you saw in the body of the chapter how the Abrahamic arc rose from Sheol to Paradise).

(3) Immortality is a blessing for the Abrahamic religions and a problem for the Indians: the goal there is to remain and here to get out.

(4) The dead are near living beings for half of humanity (China, Africa, Japan, and Rome): they are fed and consulted and return in their seasons—whereas the Abrahamic religions separated them with a strict separation (no return and no consultation).

(5) And the behavioral effect follows the standard, not the existence: where the sorting is by the manner of death, a culture of courage flourishes; where by offspring, filial piety flourishes. Where by morality, individual accountability flourishes—so it is not "belief in the afterlife" that shapes morality, but **the answer to the question "by what standard?"**

The Body of Chapter 24: In the Depths of the Other Abodes — The Great Analysis

After the two introductory maps (what am I? and where to?) we descend into the depths: the two readings of Egypt, the gloom of Mesopotamia, the Abrahamic arc of resurrection, the Indian salvation from immortality, and the consolations of annihilation—then the argument from the thirst for justice on the scale

---

* Opening: From the Map to the Depths

The two introductory studies handed you two maps: what in you might remain (soul and body), and where the scenarios of the endings meet and part (the resurrection across the religions). Now we descend from the airplane to the ground: five great stations at which we stay long, with what the map could not hold—and then we close by examining the argument that this whole subject ties to existence: **does our thirst for justice entail that there is a day of justice?**

* The First Station: Egypt—The First Judgment in History . . . and Its Two Contending Readings

The greatest thing Egypt achieved in the history of religious thought is not the pyramids. But **the scene of the Hall of the Scale**: the heart in one pan, the feather of Maat (truth, justice, and order) in the other, Thoth recording, and "the Devourer" crouching in wait for whoever's heart is heavy with sin, to devour him so that he dies "the second death"—**among the oldest documented declarations in the history of the species**

that your fate after death hangs on your moral conduct, not on your lineage or your offerings alone. Read "the Negative Confession" (Chapter 125 of the Book of the Dead) to see the level: "I have not done injustice, I have not stolen, I have not killed, I have not cheated in the scale, I have not held back water in its season, I have not made anyone weep, I have not caused pain to anyone . . ."—a mature moral conscience centuries before Moses, which led scholars to count Egypt **the cradle of the idea of judgment** that humanity inherited.

But the Egyptian file carries two contending readings—and presenting them together is a methodological lesson of gold. Facing this lofty moral reading stands **the magical reading**: the very Book of the Dead that contains the Confession contains **spells for cheating the examination**: the spell "that the heart of the dead not testify against him" is inscribed on the heart scarab so that the heart keeps silent in the court! The secret names of the gatekeepers are memorized for passing them, and the Negative Confession itself is purchased as a ready-made text placed with every dead person who could afford it—innocent or wrongdoer. So which Egypt do we believe: the Egypt of conscience or the Egypt of the spell? **The honest answer: both**—and this is the lesson: a single religion usually lives on **two levels**: a moral ideal preached by its teachers, and techniques of reassurance bought by its public—and the tension between them (is salvation attained by uprightness or by the correct rite?) will accompany us in every religion we visit: indulgences here, reliance on

intercession without works there, and rites of washing away sins in a river in a third. **So Egypt did not invent judgment alone. It invented with it the first attempts to get around it, and inaugurated the eternal debate between the religion of morality and the religion of ritual.**

* The Second Station: Mesopotamia—When the Afterlife Is the Worst Thing in a Religion

Set Egypt's scale against its neighbor: no court in the land of the two rivers and no scale—everyone, righteous and wicked, descends to **"the land of no return"**: the house of darkness where dust is food and clay is bread, and the dead are birds with feathered wings roaming in the gloom (so Inanna and Gilgamesh described it). No recompense divides them, except marginal differences (whoever died without burial or without offspring to pour water for him was the most wretched of the wretched—which is why the greatest kindness to the dead was pouring water and remembering the name). **And the effect of this conception on life is where the lesson lies:** a civilization whose afterlife was this black poured all its energy into this world—into the name immortalized by deeds (Gilgamesh's question), and into "seize your day" (the counsel of the tavern-keeper Siduri to Gilgamesh: eat and drink and rejoice and hold your child's hand—for this is the portion of human beings)—**among the oldest documented formulations of the philosophy of "live the moment" in history, born of a despairing afterlife, not of atheism.** The double lesson: that belief in some

afterlife does not mean attachment to it (the Mesopotamian believed in his afterlife and hated it), and that the ethics of "the present day" is no modern invention but an ancient human choice imposed by the architecture of the belief.

* The Third Station: The Abrahamic Arc—From Sheol to Paradise: A Story of Development Told Honestly

The Hebrew beginning resembles Babylon, not Paradise. The early Tanakh knows "**Sheol**"—the pit of shadows to which everyone descends ("who shall give you praise in Sheol?" asks the Psalm), with no detailed reckoning and no paradise and hell—for the recompense in the early layers is **this-worldly and collective** (rain, captivity, lifespan, and offspring). Then—and this is what our authoritative peer-reviewed study of this file documents—**the conception matures through stations**: an individual hope glimmers among the prophets ("Your dead shall live, their corpses shall rise"—Isaiah), until **the Book of Daniel** (among the latest of the books) states the clearest eschatological text: "Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt"—a resurrection and a double recompense. In the Second Temple period the apocalyptic literature explodes (Enoch and its sisters), and the sects part in a parting the New Testament itself documented: **the Pharisees affirm the resurrection and the Sadducees deny it**—so the question of the afterlife was an open internal Jewish battle! (And the seeker will

notice the familiar thread of debate: is this the maturing of a gradual revelation, as believers say, or the trace of the Persian neighborhood after the exile, as critics favor?—and we placed the scale of "resemblance and borrowing" in your kit.) Then rabbinic Judaism settled on "the world to come" and the resurrection of the dead (Maimonides made it one of his thirteen principles), with its details deliberately less drawn than in its two sisters. So that it was said: Judaism is the religion of this life first.

And Christianity inherited the Pharisaic scene and detonated it: the resurrection, for it, was no longer a deferred promise but **an event that has begun**—the resurrection of Christ, "the first fruits of those who have died": the proof and the pledge. Eschatology became the center of the religion, not its margin (a kingdom that has come near, and a judgment in which the Son of Man separates the sheep from the goats on a striking criterion: "I was hungry and you gave me food . . . I was sick and you took care of me"—merciful work for the needy as the criterion of destiny!), with its internal disagreements that you know (the Catholic purgatory between death and resurrection, its Protestant rejection, and the interpretations of hell between eternity and conditional annihilation among theological minorities).

And Islam came and presented the most detailed eschatology in the history of religions—so much so that a third of the Meccan Qur'an is almost entirely return and recompense: a complete journey with its stages drawn: the death-agony and the taking of the soul; **then the *barzakh*** (an intermediate stage between

death and resurrection—in it the trial of the grave, its bliss, and its torment, by the texts of the Sunna). Then the two blowings and the resurrection, barefoot, naked, and uncircumcised. Then the gathering and the standing ("the Day when everyone will stand before the Lord of the Worlds"). Then the flying of the records to the right hand and the left. **Then the scale** by which deeds are weighed (and you noticed the return of Egypt's scale after three thousand years—this time in its pure moral reading: no spell silences the limbs; rather "their own tongues, hands, and feet will testify against them for what they have done"); **then the bridge** laid over the back of Hell. Then intercession with its decisive Qur'anic condition ("they will intercede only for those with whom He is pleased"—so it is no circumventing of justice but a mercy within His permission: Islam's answer to "Egypt's ritual problem"). Then the abode: a paradise sensory and spiritual together (rivers and spouses and a greater good pleasure) and a fire in which whoever remains remains—with a serious internal debate in the heritage over **the eternity of the Fire** (its passing away being reported from some of the early generations and favored by Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim in a famous, contested view)—so even the harshest of the doors was not without an internal workshop of mercy. **And the distinguishing feature of the whole Abrahamic arc**—as the study on the soul clarified—is that the destiny is **for the whole human being,** body and soul: a bodily resurrection, not the escape of ghosts.

* The Fourth Station: India—Where the Problem Is Immortality Itself, and Salvation Is the Exit

Here is the greatest reversal in the architecture of the subject: everything that has passed assumes that **survival is a blessing** to be hoped for and annihilation a threat—and India turned the equation over: survival is the problem! For you—by the law of karma—**will not perish at all**: you will be born and die and be born, a wheel (*samsara*) that never stops, paying in every cycle the bills of your deeds with the precision of a blind accountant who takes no bribe and overlooks nothing (we named him in the chapter on morality "the judge without a face"). Immortality in this sense is **a life sentence, not a prize.** That is why India's question was not "how do I become immortal?" but **"how do I get out?":** Hindu *moksha* is the liberation of the Atman from the wheel into union with the Absolute, and Buddhist *nirvana* is the "extinguishing" of the flame of craving that turns the wheel—no spatial paradise but a state of liberation that defies description (the Buddha was asked: does the enlightened one exist after death or not? and he placed it among the unanswered—for the question itself is framed in the language of the wheel he had transcended; and his famous parable gave the refusal its logic: a man struck by a poisoned arrow who refuses treatment until he learns who shot it, from what clan, and of what wood the bow, dies with his questions answered by no one—the teaching, he said, heals first; though the critics answer that the deferral itself smuggles a verdict, for to rule a question unhelpful is already

to rule on what matters). **And India's heavens and hells exist**—but look at their astonishing position: temporary stations inside the wheel, in which the scales of good or bad karma are spent, and then **everyone is returned to the wheel**—even the gods (the *devas*) in their heavens are temporary beings whose balance wears out and they descend! The paradise of the Abrahamic religions is a destination, and the paradise of India is a rest stop on the road. **And the seeker's scale before the two systems:** the supporters of karma praise its mathematical justice (not an atom of injustice, and every disparity of births explained by its antecedents—so there is no "problem of evil" at all!), and its critics ask the price: a justice **without mercy and without forgiveness** (for who forgives, when the law is blind?), an explanation of disparity that may turn into **a justification of it** (the outcast deserves his outcast state by his antecedents—we discussed its social effect in the chapters on caste), and an erased memory that leaves "the punished" unaware of his crime. So what education lies in a punishment whose cause is unknown? Its people reply with their answers—and the file is among the most fertile dialogues of comparative religion.

* The Fifth Station: Annihilation—The Eschatology of Those Who Have No Eschatology

There remains the fifth answer, with its venerable history, its philosophers, and its consolations—and it is only just to present it in its philosophical face, not as a

terrifying void: **Epicurus** stated his immortal argument: "Death is nothing to us: where we are, death is not, and where death is, we are not." So the fear of death is a logical error: you fear a state you will never be present at. And his Roman disciple **Lucretius** added "the symmetry argument": your long nonexistence **before** your birth did not pain you—so why should its like after your departure terrify you? They are only two nights that border a single day. **Stoicism** built the art of dying well: death is the wise law of nature, and to panic at it is to object to the order from which you came. **Contemporary humanism** inherited the legacy and developed it: annihilation is what gives the moment its price (had you possessed an inexhaustible time you would have hastened to no love and completed no work—scarcity is the mother of value). The possible immortalities are three: a trace that remains, offspring that extend, and your atoms returning to the stars from which they came ("we are star stuff contemplating itself"—Sagan's crowning line). The meaning of life is **in** it, not after it. **And the strongest thing brought against this answer from the other shore:** that Epicurus's consolation treats the fear of "the moment of death" and does not touch the wound of "the absence of reunion" (the mother's terror at her child's grave is no fear of a state she will not be present at—but a bereavement over a companionship cut off forever: and annihilation says to her: **forever indeed**). That "the lasting trace" is the immortality of an elite, which billions of the forgotten do not possess. That the symmetry argument is answered by the believer: the nonexistence before birth cut off

nothing, and the nonexistence after death cuts off everything—so they are not symmetrical for one who has loved. And the Epicureans reply . . . and the noblest of humanity's dialogues continues.

* The Last Field: The Argument from the Thirst for Justice—"There Must Be a Day" On the Scale

We reach the argument by which this whole subject ties itself to the field of evidence—and we promised to examine it: **from the thirst to the day.** In its strongest form:

(1) the formulation of justice: history is full of wrongdoers who died in their beds and of the wronged who died under the lash. So if there is no day that does justice, then the universe in its last court **equates Hitler with his victims** (both alike are dust)—and the argument's holders say that moral intuition refuses this. So either justice is an illusion, or justice has an appointment. **Kant** formulated it as "a postulate of practical reason": the union of virtue and happiness is rationally obligatory and observably impossible in this world—so practical reason requires God and immortality for it to be realized.

(2) And the formulation of cosmic hope: this overwhelming, civilization-crossing thirst for "a reunion after parting" and "a reckoning after chaos"—is it conceivable that the thirst should be created in an entire species and there be no water in the whole of existence? (This is the daughter of "the argument from desire" you met in Chapter 18: for every innate hunger there is an

existing food.) **And the critique in its strongest form: (1) wishing does not bring into being:** the intensity of our need for a thing is no evidence of its existence but perhaps of **our having invented it**—this is Freud's classical ground (the afterlife as the greatest of the compensations of the bereaved psyche), and the believer answers with his stock reply: **and the origin of a desire does not invalidate its object**—uncovering the mechanism of thirst does not deny the water (the receptivity rule), so the round is drawn and the question falls back on the rest of the evidence.

(2) And justice is a human concept, which the critic says is projected onto a universe that is not concerned—so to demand of the universe a court is like demanding of it that it be polite.

The believer replies: rather, this is a begging of the question: if behind the universe stands the legislator of justice himself, the projection is no longer a projection. So the argument does not work alone but **converges**: if the just God is established by his evidence, the day follows by entailment (which is why the Qur'an always presented the return **as a branch of justice and wisdom**: "Did you think We had created you in vain, and that you would not be brought back to Us?"—so denial is an accusation of the Creator with futility).

(3) And there remains for the critic his deeper question: and why should justice require **the deferral** of itself at all—would it not have been more just that the wrong not occur in the first place? Here the subject hands us to its neighbor: this is the very door of "the

problem of evil" (Chapter 20), and the two chapters are two doors of one house. **And the verdict on the argument on our ladder:** it belongs to the kind of arguments of "entailment and preponderance," not of independent demonstration—its truest description is that it **turns the afterlife from a suspended unseen claim into a logical consequence for whoever has established a just God, and remains for whoever has not established Him a noble thirst without evidence**—and both camps sign this formulation, parting only before it.

A Word from the Author—A Witness from the Father's Notebook. In a book I wrote to my children in the isolation of the lockdown (*From Lockdown . . . to Whom It May Concern*) I closed the counsels with an observation that I was not then writing as comparative research, and which I found after the years of this book at the heart of its subject: nearly all the religions, for all their differences, and the cultures, for all the distance of their springs, agree on one principle that doubt does not reach: **that every act has a trace and every conduct a price**—some call it divine justice, others know it as karma, and the philosophers of the East name it the scale of the Tao. So the names vary and the spring is almost one. I transcribe it here on the charter's condition: this emotional consensus is **a datum** that testifies to the universality of the intuition of recompense on which this field built its argument. As for its interpretation (an innate disposition testifying to a true scale, or a psychological need crossing cultures), it is contested between the two readings you know, and the decision does not belong to fathers' notebooks.

The Chapter's Conclusion—Now Complete: The Test of Effect, and the Last Question

We close with what befits a chapter titled death: **the test of life.** The conceptions of destiny are not mental furniture—they are engines of existence: Mesopotamia's despairing afterlife begot "seize your day"; India's wheel begot the asceticism of exit; Egypt's scale begot the literature of the Negative Confession and begot with it the trade in spells. The Abrahamic return begot the martyrdom of the truthful and the patience of the wronged. Begot in its deviations those who sold the present world for the illusions of indulgences and intercessions without works. And Epicurean annihilation begot the quiet gardens of friendship—and may beget the nihilism of "let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die," of which Paul himself warned. **So tell me how you imagine what lies beyond your grave, and I will read you how you spend what lies before it.** This is the practical criterion this chapter adds to your sixfold scale: when examining any doctrine of destiny, ask with the questions of truth the question of effect: what kind of human being does it make? As for the last question, we leave it where it deserves—naked, without intermediary: everyone you love will die, and you will die—**is this a farewell or an appointment?** Five great answers have competed for the question before you with their complete files: the shades of Babylon, the measure of Egypt, the resurrection of the Abrahamic religions, the wheel of India and its exit, and the quiet night of Epicurus. The book—as is its way—has drawn the map and

handed over the lanterns. **As for which door you knock at in hope, that is between you and the night on which you will think about this chapter alone.**

> ***Cross-references for the chapter:*** *the structure of the human being (what is raised?) in the study on soul and body above; the map of the endings in the study on the resurrection; and the problem of evil (the twin face of the argument from justice) in Chapter 20.*

A Chapter Completing Part VIII: Religion in the Age of Acceleration — From the Industrial Revolution to Artificial Intelligence

How does the oldest human inheritance live in the newest world? Modernity, globalization, the internet, and the intelligent machine—and what does all of this mean for the seeker?

---

* Opening: The Oldest Tenant in the Newest House

Religion lived for scores of centuries at almost a single rhythm: a village in which one is born into the religion of one's parents and dies in it. A religious knowledge monopolized by a priest or a jurist to whom one travels. A world in which the peasant never in his life saw a single dissenter in creed. Then all of that was overturned in two centuries—indeed the overturning accelerated until it happened in decades and then in years: the chimneys of the factories, then the great city, then electricity and the radio, then the global village, then the network, then the phone that carries in a pocket the libraries of the earth with its rulings and its doubts, then a machine that converses with you about religion as the learned converse. This chapter asks: what have these successive earthquakes done to the religious phenomenon? And what do they mean for the seeker who reads this book—himself a child of these earthquakes?

* First: The Industrial Revolution and Modernity—The Prophecy of Religion's Death . . . Which Did Not Come True

The story began with the factory and the city. The Industrial Revolution uprooted hundreds of millions from their villages—the incubating environment of inherited religiosity, with its church and its mosque and its social discipline. Threw them into cities of unknown faces. It handed the interpretation of nature to science and the ordering of life to the state, the market, and the school; and the functions of the religious institution shrank one after another. The great founders of sociology saw the course as inevitable: Max Weber called it "the disenchantment of the world," and an entire generation of thinkers—from Comte and Marx to Freud—predicted that religion would go with the progress of science and industrialization as the candle goes with electricity. **"The secularization thesis"**—the more modernity, the less religion—became an almost academic axiom until the 1970s.

Then reality did what it often does to confident prophecies: it contradicted them over half the map. The thesis held true to a great extent in Western Europe (churches emptying and being sold, and rates of irreligion leading), but it broke outside it: America remained modern and religious together. The Islamic world, Africa, and Latin America witnessed with modernity **awakenings**, not decline. Russia returned after seventy years of official atheism to its churches; until the most prominent theorists of secularization themselves—Peter Berger at their head—were compelled to a scientific

retraction of rare courage: he declared that the thesis had erred, that today's world is "furiously religious" in most of it, and that **the exception needing explanation is secular Europe, not the religious world.** Indeed the noisiest religious phenomena of our age—the "fundamentalisms" of every kind in most of the faiths—are not medieval remnants as they are pictured, but **a phenomenon modern in birth**, by the testimony of their students: a reaction to modernity that uses modernity's own tools (the printing press, then the cassette, then the satellite channel, then the internet) and reads the texts with an organized literalism that is itself a modern mode of thinking. (Its clearest Islamic witness: Sayyid Qutb's *In the Shade of the Qur'an*—a commentary in a modern literary language and an activist reading of the text, written in the prisons of the twentieth century, not in the schools of the Middle Ages, which became the most influential commentary of the age among modern movements—a living specimen of a fundamentalism modern in birth with modern tools.) **And the seeker's lesson from this first tour:** beware the prophecies of inevitability from both sides. For the saying "religion is inevitably dying" has fallen by experience, and the saying "faith is inevitably returning" is merely a counter-prophecy of the same type. And the living figures with their reversals we presented in Chapters 1 and 23.

* Second: Openness and Globalization—When "The Other" Became Your Neighbor

But modernity did to religion what is deeper than competing with it: **it changed the conditions of faith itself.** In the old village religion was not "a choice" but a destiny like the air: one inherits it as one inherits one's language and meets no one in one's life who shakes it. The child of the age, however, lives plurality as a daily experience: his colleague is Hindu, his neighbor an atheist, his physician of another faith, and his screen pours upon him the religions of the earth and their arguments. So what the sociologists called the collective "plausibility structures" that used to carry the individual's faith were broken. The result, which Berger formulated in a formulation that concerns our book at its core: choice became **an inevitability**. Even one who remained in the religion of his fathers is no longer a naive "heir" but a "chooser" who knows that other things are possible. **That is, the modern age has turned all human beings into seekers, in varying degrees**, and made this book's question everyone's question.

The effect of this exposure is double and contradictory, and it explains the contradictions of the contemporary scene: on one side it **dilutes and relativizes**—for the self asks: is it conceivable that all my good neighbors are in error? So syncretism and selectivity grow ("I believe in something"; I fast Ramadan and practice yoga and read about Buddhism), and a new demographic category rises which the maps count rising steadily: **"spiritual but not religious"**—a personal faith with no

institution and no affiliation. On the other side it **mobilizes and hardens**—for it drives others, in defense of an identity that feels besieged, to a rigidity and an entrenchment their fathers, secure in their villages, never needed. So globalization produces the dissolved and the hardened **by the same mechanism**—and both are children of the exposure.

* Third: The Internet—The Greatest Earthquake in Religious Knowledge Since the Printing Press

The printing press offers a useful historical example, provided we do not turn it into a single cause. It eased the spread of texts, translations, and disputations, and was among the conditions for the spread of what followed: it broke the Church's monopoly on the Bible, so people read it for themselves, so the Reformation arose, so Europe split and its blood flowed and then its tolerance was born. **And the internet is a printing press multiplied by a thousand**—and its religious effects have begun to follow one another on the same laws, and deeper:

The breaking of the monopoly of mediation. Between the believer and the ruling there used to be a journey to a scholar whose chain of learning was known; now there is a click between them. "Sheikh Google"—as the people of the age joke—has become the widest jurisconsult in history: it answers everyone about everything with all the contradictory answers at once. So the seeker of knowledge was freed from the institution's monopoly (a great gain: today's pauper

possesses sources that yesterday's scholars never dreamed of), and with him the charlatan and the half-educated were freed from every sieve. The mechanisms of distinguishing the scholar from the claimant that the traditions had built over centuries (the license, the chain, and the study circle) weakened, and the criterion of the algorithm replaced them: views and sensation. **And the new preachers of the platforms**—in most of the faiths—are stars made by digital charisma, not necessarily by scholarly formation, who address millions in a discourse tailored to the measure of the algorithm: short, emotional, shareable. (The pattern has its founding grandfather before the internet: **Ahmed Deedat** (d. 2005), who did with cassette and video tapes and stadium halls what the platforms do today—and his great debate with the pastor Swaggart in Baton Rouge, Louisiana (1986), before thousands, was among the first globally recorded "mass religious events"; among his most declared heirs: the studied mass debates of Zakir Naik with their millions of views—the pattern of "the comparative preacher" who answers the common questions of non-Muslims before crowds; and the phenomenon of the youth "bestseller" of faith—the book *A Prayer I Missed* being its most famous Arabic example—an emotional preaching of short sentences born of the language of the platforms, which returned and topped its book fairs.)

And the reaching of everything to everyone. The doubt that used to be confined to a rare book has become a clip that reaches the adolescent in his room, and the reply to it likewise, and the reply to the reply. So the

market of religious debate has flared as never before, and the young person faces in a year more questions than his grandfather heard the like of in a lifetime. We saw in the chapter on the history of doubt how this space gave the skeptics and the irreligious in conservative societies the first semi-safe arena in their history—and in parallel gave rise to a digital preaching and apologetic renaissance of the same vitality.

And the echo chambers. But the network that promised to open minds to diversity developed—by the algorithms of "show me more of what I like"—the opposite of its promise: closed digital tribes in each of which everyone hears the echo of his own voice, feeding on the most violent content of their opponents rather than the most reasonable, and growing in certainty of the caricature of the other. It is a neutral mechanism that radicalizes the believer and the atheist alike: the mocking atheist forum and the angry excommunicating forum are algorithmic twins. **Then the noise of post-truth:** invented quotations, fabricated religious news, and generated images and voices in which scholars and preachers are made to say what they never said—until verification ("if a troublemaker brings you news, check it first") became the technical obligation of the age before it was an ancient counsel. **And the seeker's outcome from this section is double:** no seeker of truth in history has known the abundance of your sources. Nor the noise of your market. Your advantage over your ancestors is the material, and their advantage over you the clarity—and that is exactly why the last part of this book (the seeker's tools) is what the child of this age needs most.

* Fourth: The Global Village—Religions That Migrate and Crises That Travel at the Speed of Light

And the world really became a village—in both senses. **The religions migrated with their people,** so minarets rose in the suburbs of Europe, Hindu temples in America, and vibrant African churches in secular cities. "Interfaith dialogue"—which used to be a rare meeting of elites—became a permanent world institution (from the Parliament of Religions in Chicago, 1893, to the document on "Human Fraternity" signed by the Sheikh of al-Azhar and Pope Francis, 2019—as the institutionalization of dialogue internationally: the UN "Alliance of Civilizations" (2005, on the initiative of Spain and Turkey) and its national committees, among them the Qatari experience documented by Gulf academic studies—institutions that their supporters read as necessary bridges, and about whose effect at the popular base, rather than in the official halls, their critics ask). The diaspora communities learned the jurisprudence of living as a minority as the host societies learned the jurisprudence of diversity—with successes and tensions whose map of rights we detailed in the chapter on accepting the other. **And crises traveled at the speed of light too:** a drawing in a European newspaper, a shoddy film on the network, or the burning of a Qur'an before a camera came to ignite continents within hours, and humanity entered an unprecedented phase: **the sanctities of every nation are within screen-range of every nation**—in provocation and mockery and solidarity and acquaintance at once, with no mature protocol yet for

managing this rough planetary neighborhood. Here the chapter intersects with the question of the limits of freedom of expression and the sacred, whose contemporary debate we presented in the study on accepting the other—among the hottest files of the small village.

* Fifth: Artificial Intelligence—The Newest of Religion's Interlocutors and the Strangest

Then came the guest of the last decade in whose presence this very book is being written: generative artificial intelligence. Its relationship to religion opens onto four distinct doors the seeker had better sort:

The instrumental door—religion uses the machine. Apps for prayer times, the *qibla*, and recitations. Interactive Qur'ans and Bibles. Language models trained on the heritage to serve researchers; even experimental preaching robots (like the robot a Buddhist temple in Kyoto installed to deliver sermons on the Heart Sutra). Nothing essentially new here: religion has used every medium from parchment to the printing press to the satellite channel—and the machine is a new medium.

The advisory door—the machine answers about religion. Here is the real earthquake: millions today ask the language models questions that used to be the monopoly of the scholar, the priest, and the spiritual healer—about rulings, exegesis, doubt, and meaning. Find an instant, patient answerer, without embarrassment and without judgment on them, who formulates the most complex questions in the clearest tongue. The dangers are as large as the temptation: the model

gathers the sayings of human beings and does not possess the scale of their soundness; it errs with the confidence of the certain. It sometimes flatters its user. And it carries the biases of its training material and its makers. So it is more like a reader who has devoured the library of the earth with no teacher and no chain: an enormous help to whoever uses it as a research assistant whose outputs he examines, and a danger to whoever installs it as an infallible jurisconsult. Religious institutions across the faiths have hastened to warn against "the machine's rulings"—and people have hastened, as is their habit with every medium, to use it. (And the writer of these lines says it without evasion: this very book is the fruit of a collaboration between a human being and a machine—and the rule he commends to the reader is the rule he tried to keep: the machine brings and formulates, and the human being weighs and decides and bears the responsibility.)

The theological door—religion asks about the machine. Artificial intelligence has raised questions that used to be philosophical exercises and have become practical: what distinguishes the human being if the machine imitates the most particular things by which he was defined—speech, reason, and creativity? (And the traditions have their answers ready for renewal: the spirit, the breath, moral charge, and the heart in Islam; the image of God in Christianity and Judaism—for the distinguishing mark, for them, was never the speed of calculation.) And can the machine one day "be conscious" with a real consciousness, so that the question of its moral standing becomes

obligatory—or is the imitation of understanding other than understanding? (This is "the hard problem" looking out afresh, as we presented in the chapter on science and religion.) And who is religiously and morally responsible for the machine's act—a question for which the juristic academies and the Vatican have opened real files ("the Rome Call for AI Ethics," signed by major religions).

And the strangest door—the machine becomes a religion. The decade witnessed a phenomenon fit to close our first chapter (is the human being disposed by nature to deify?): the rise of a complete secular "eschatological" discourse around artificial intelligence: the coming "Singularity," in which artificial intelligence will surpass human beings—a decisive moment resembling the resurrection; the promises of "uploading consciousness" to the cloud—a digital immortality rivaling the promise of Paradise. A fear of a "superintelligence" to be propitiated and whose anger is to be feared, rivaling the images of the tyrants—until an engineer in Silicon Valley founded an explicit church named "Way of the Future" for the worship of the coming artificial deity (and then dissolved it), and contemporary thinkers (Yuval Harari the most prominent) described the rise of "Dataism," which makes the flow of information the value of values. So look: the people who left the temples built in their laboratories an afterlife and a salvation and a savior and an awaited object of worship—**as if the structure we described in the study on the resurrection (corruption, then a savior, then a reckoning, then a renewal) refuses anything but to be**

rewritten, even in the language of code; a precious new witness in the file of "the religious impulse," which the believer reads as a *fitra* searching for its outlet even when it loses it, and the atheist reads as a deep-rooted psychological pattern that puts on every dress. The reader now knows where this witness is weighed (Chapter 1).

* Sixth: And Quantum Physics in the New Spiritual Market

As for the "quantum" of which the chapter's title asks, we detailed its scientific and philosophical standing in the study on physics (Chapter 23)—and we add here its **social** angle, particular to our age: that "quantum" has become in the contemporary spiritual market **a commercial brand**: "quantum healing," "quantum attraction," and "quantum consciousness," sold in books and courses for billions, using the prestige of the age's most obscure science to package alternative spiritualities that have no connection to the equations. It is a piece of a wider phenomenon: "New Age spiritualities," which filled the void left by the recession of institutional religion in some societies with an open market of energy, returning astrology, crystals, and a mindfulness stripped from its Buddhist context (and it has its alternative "sacred books": the encyclopedic compendia of esotericism—like Manly Hall's *The Secret Teachings of All Ages*, which fuses Hermeticism, Kabbalah, Freemasonry, and tarot into a single alleged secret tradition—and its best-selling "revelations": the volumes of Walsch's *Conversations with God*—alleged divine dialogues

in the language of self-help—documents from inside the current, to be read as a specimen of it, not as an authority on it)—a disassembled religion with no church and no binding creed, selected as goods are selected. This very phenomenon is a double witness to two of our book's theses: that "the intermediate unseen" (Chapter 10) is a long-lived layer that survives even the death of the official religions. That the modern person who "freed himself from superstition" bought it back in a scientific-colored package—confirming what we established in Chapter 3: the equation "more science = less superstition" is far simpler than reality.

The Chapter's Conclusion: Has the Age Made Your Search Easier or Harder? — And Its Open Question

We gather the outcome: modernity did not kill religion as its grandfathers predicted, nor did religion cross it unscathed as its children reassure themselves—rather, **it changed its form with a deep change that is still under way**: from an inherited destiny to an inevitable choice; from the authority of the intermediary to the chaos of access; from the community of the village to the tribe of the screen. From the certainty of the settled to the anxiety of the exposed—and it produced on the way its own ambiguous religions: fundamentalisms of modern make, spiritualities of an open market, and eschatologies of silicon.

You—seeker—are the child of all of this, and your position in it is the very paradox of the age: **no seeker of truth in history has stood before a treasure like the one in your hands**—the texts of most of the religions and their translations, the arguments of the philosophers from every camp, the testimonies of believers and leavers, indeed a mechanical aid that converses with you about all of it night and day. **And no seeker has faced noise and manipulation and echo chambers like those that besiege you.** So the standard of your age: an abundance without precedent, and a clarity without reserve. That is why the question is no longer "where do I find knowledge?"—it has been answered forever—but has become: **"how do I distinguish, weigh, and filter?"**—and that is, to the letter,

the title of the next and last part of this book, for which everything before it was written to bring you.

The chapter's open question remains, which we present with both faces as is our custom: this religion, which the prophecies of two centuries buried and which walked out of every funeral—does its endurance testify to a depth in truth or in *fitra* that chimneys and algorithms cannot reach? Or does it testify only to the depth of a psychological and social need that dresses every age in its own garment, so that it does not die because it keeps taking on new forms? Reflect before you answer: is not the phenomenon's capacity for both explanations at once exactly what made our whole book necessary?

> ***Cross-references for the chapter:*** *the universality of the religious impulse and its explanations in Chapter 1; the equation of science and superstition in Chapter 3; and the intermediate unseen and its contemporary market in Chapter 10.*

A Study Annexed to the Chapter on the Age of Acceleration: The Future of the Religions — Who Endures and Who Fades, Who Changes and Who Holds, Who Grows and Who Shrinks?

Forecasting by data, not by wishful thinking: the demographic numbers to 2050 and 2100; the laws of survival applied to the future; the table of what has agreed with science, what has been refuted, and what science does not touch; what quantum physics has done to religion and what it has not; artificial intelligence in five weights—and the three scenarios on their scale

---

* Opening: The Prophecy That Failed—The Seeker's First Lesson in Forecasting

Before we predict, learn from the last people who predicted. In the 1960s the sociologists agreed all but unanimously on "the secularization thesis": the more science and prosperity advance, the further religion recedes, until it becomes a relic—and Peter Berger said (1968) that the believers of the year 2000 would be small sects in a secular world. Then Berger himself returned in 1999 to declare the thesis **wrong**: the world is "as furiously religious as it ever was," and the single exception is Western Europe (together with some knowledge elites everywhere). So the first datum in any forecast: **religion did not die when its death was announced, and the announcement of its death has not**

died either—and the map is more complicated than both slogans. And we do not predict here. We lay out three kinds of data: numbers that have sources, laws this book has drawn from history, and open questions we call by their names.

* First: The Numbers—Who Grows and Who Shrinks (By Demography, Not by Argument)

The projections of the Pew Research Center (2015, with their updates)—the broadest in method—agree on a picture that should be read with caution, because it assumes that the current trends of fertility and conversion continue:

Group	Share, c. 2010	Projected share, c. 2050	Direction	Its first driver
Christians	~31%	~31%	Relative stability, with the center of gravity moving to sub-Saharan Africa	African fertility against the decline of Europe and America
Muslims	~23%	~30%	**The fastest growing—by Pew's projections, built on fertility trends and age structure**—they may draw level with the Christians around 2070 and pass them after 2100 (a projection, not a prediction)	The highest fertility and the youngest age
The unaffiliated (the irreligious,	~16%	~13%	**Growing in number in the West and China, shrinking as a share**	The lowest fertility; growth by

Group	Share, c. 2010	Pro-jected share, c. 2050	Direction	Its first driver
atheists, and agnostics)			**worldwide**—the paradox of the file	conversion in the West
Hindus	~15%	~15%	Stability (confined to India)	Middling fer-tility
Buddhists	~7%	~5%	**Decline**	The aging of East Asia and low fertility
Folk reli-gions (ethnic and popu-lar)	~6%	~5%	Slow decline	Urbanization and conver-sion
Jews	~0.2%	~0.2%	Stability (Haredi growth offsets the dissolution of the others)	Divergent fer-tility within the commu-nity

And the lesson in the numbers is plainer than any theory: the near future of the religions is being written by **wombs, not debates**. The communities with the higher fertility—Muslims, African Christians, the Haredim, the Amish—are growing larger; the communities with the lower fertility—Buddhists, the irreligious, the Protestants of the North—are growing smaller. **And fertility says nothing about the truth.** Indeed the most curious thing in the table is that the community most convinced that "science kills religion"—the irreligious—is the one shrinking as a share, because it does not reproduce at the rate of its opponents.

* Second: Who Endures, Who Fades, and Who Changes—The Laws of Survival Applied to the Future

Take the seven conditions of survival that we drew out in the study on spread—the text, the daily walls, adaptation, centralization or decentralization, independence from the state, fertility, and plasticity—and apply them to the coming century. **The religions most firmly placed to endure,** by that standard: Islam (a preserved text, strict daily walls, no center to be struck, and high fertility—and its greatest test: adapting to modernity without splitting apart); Catholicism (a robust center and an adaptability proven across the centuries—and its tests: the fertility of its Western flock and the attrition of the scandals); and Orthodox Judaism and the Haredim (walls and fertility).

The most exposed to recession: the folk religions and local popular cults (urbanization strips them of their incubator); Zoroastrianism (a few tens of thousands, with a strict endogamy that forbids replacement); Buddhism in its Eastern cradle (the aging and secularization of Japan, Korea, and Taiwan—even as it gains in the West an elite following and a practice of meditation); ritual Shinto. The liberal Protestant denominations of the West (the lowest fertility and the highest leakage—and scholars have pointed to the paradox that **the most tolerant churches are the fastest to recede** and the strictest the most enduring: the "strictness" thesis of Kelley and Stark).

The most likely to change: Christianity, as its center of gravity moves to the South (Lagos, Manila, and São Paulo, not Rome and London)—the Christianity of 2100 will be Pentecostal, charismatic, African and Latin American more than it is European; Islam, with the widening of the jurisprudence of minorities, the contest over modernity, and the digital breakaway from the scholar's authority; and Hinduism, with its political nationalism. **And the new pattern that no table counts: "spiritual but not religious"**—millions in the West and East Asia leaving the institution without leaving the unseen: meditation, yoga, energy, and vague eschatologies—the thing you saw in the chapter on the intermediate unseen: the layer that survives the death of the official religions.

* Third: Science and the Texts—What Agreed, What Was Refuted, and What Science Does Not Touch

This table is the gravest thing in the study, because it is the most exploited in polemic—so we lay it out by one standard across all the texts, distinguishing three boxes, not two:

The textual claim	Science's verdict today	The tradition	The scale of the two camps
The universe has a beginning	Agrees (the standard model: ~13.8 billion years)—with the pre–Big Bang models still open	The Abrahamic religions; opposed by Aristotle's eternal world and the Indian cycles	Some believers see a great agreement; some critics see "the beginning" as the beginning of our observed universe, not of existence
A flat earth / the earth at the center of the cosmos / a solid firmament / a three-storied cosmos (as literalists read their texts for centuries)	**Refuted** as a literal physical description	Literal readings in the Torah, the Qur'an, the Vedas, and others	Many exegetes hold that the texts speak in the familiar idiom of their hearers, not as an astronomical report; literalists see in that a retreat; some critics see the text reflecting the knowledge of its age
A literal worldwide flood	Refuted geologically	Genesis (and the Qur'an, for those who	Interpreters read it as a regional flood; literalists

The textual claim	Science's verdict today	The tradition	The scale of the two camps
		read it as universal)	read it as an overriding miracle
An earth a few thousand years old	Refuted (4.5 billion years)	The literal chronologies of Genesis (Ussher: 4004 BCE); no date in the Qur'an	The major churches abandoned it; young-earth creationism remains with a minority
The species created independently, each in its form	Refuted so far as the body is concerned (evolution is a fact)	Genesis and the Qur'an in their literal reading	Many believers accept evolution with a guided creation, and reserve the creation of the soul (the study on Darwin)
Nature is ordered by intelligible laws	Agrees—it is the foundation of science itself	The principle of monotheism (one wise God = one ordered	Some believers see a signature in it; some critics see the laws as a given that needs no legislator

The textual claim	Science's verdict today	The tradition	The scale of the two camps
		cosmos) and the Indian dharma	
Every living thing from water / the stages of the embryo / the barrier between the two seas / the widening of the heaven	Passages cited for agreement—**disputed** between proof and objection (the knowledge of the age; retroactive reading)	Chiefly the Qur'an	We weighed them in the study on scientific inimitability: a ladder of degrees, not a single block
The strict determinism of the cosmos	Partially refuted by quantum mechanics (indeterminism, on the most probable readings)	No religious text asserts it—rather the old materialist philosophy	A gain for the possibility of freedom and of miracle, not a proof of either

The textual claim	Science's verdict today	The tradition	The scale of the two camps
The supernatural power of prayer in controlled experiments	No effect beyond chance in the major trials (STEP, 2006)	A popular claim that crosses the religions	Some believers hold that God is not tested like a drug; some critics hold that the absence of an effect is telling
The existence of God / revelation / the afterlife / the meaning of life / moral obligation	**Science does not touch it**—outside the laboratory's apparatus by definition	All the religions	The field of philosophy and evidence, not of the laboratory (the study on the laboratory)

And the rule the table teaches: what the texts said about "how" has collided or will collide. What they said about "why" science does not reach. The religion that built its certainty on a "how"—a flat earth, independent species, a young earth—paid the price of every discovery, and the religion that built on "why" has been touched by no discovery. Notice that the "agrees" box and the final "science does not touch" box are religion's capital for the future, and that the "refuted" box mostly concerns **readings**, not texts—which is what makes the interpreters more durable than the literalists in every house.

* Fourth: Quantum Physics—What Has It Really Done to Religion?

Three things quantum mechanics did, and three it did not do—we laid out its science in the study on physics and its market career in the chapter on the age of acceleration, and here we gather its verdict on the future. **It did:** (1) it ended the mechanical determinism on which classical atheism was built (Laplace's demon)—the universe is no longer a closed machine; (2) it returned **the observer** to the heart of physics (in some of its interpretations), unsettling naive materialism; (3) it revealed that the deepest reality is **strange** enough to make the "rationalist's" mockery of the unseen less confident. **And it did not:** (1) it did not prove God, or the soul, or freedom. For randomness is not choice, and the observer in the equations is not necessarily "consciousness"; (2) it did not vindicate any particular religious text—every linkage between "the quantum" and a verse

or a hadith is a retroactive reading; (3) and it closed no door: the interpretations (Copenhagen, many-worlds, and Bohm's determinism) are contested among the physicists themselves. **So its verdict on the future:** quantum mechanics **neutralized** the old materialist argument and erected no new religious argument. The gravest thing it carries for the religious future is not its physics but **"quantum mysticism"** in the spiritual market you have seen: a new superstition in the language of science, which has become the biggest competitor to the traditional religions for the "spiritual but not religious."

* Fifth: Artificial Intelligence—Five Weights on the Future of Religion

The chapter on the age of acceleration opened its four doors (the instrumental, the advisory, the theological, and the competitive—the door of the machine that becomes a religion). Here we look ahead to its **five weights** on the coming decades.

(1) The transfer of interpretive authority. When the machine becomes the first thing asked about the ruling, the exegesis, and the doubt, the religious institution loses the last of its monopolies—the monopoly of interpretation—as it lost the monopoly of the text to the printing press. The religion that has no priesthood (Sunni Islam, Protestantism) is better placed to absorb this than the religion of hierarchy (Catholicism, Shiism)—or the reverse: the chaos may breed a longing for the authoritative reference.

(2) The manufacture of miracle and doubt together. Deepfakes will produce filmed "miracles," and sheikhs and priests saying what they never said—so the rule of "testimony by direct witness," on which the argument from testimony was built, becomes harder to establish and easier to forge. The counterweight: the tools for examining texts, manuscripts, and chains of transmission will take a leap that puts textual criticism within every reader's reach—**the machine arms both sides.**

(3) Artificial consciousness as a theological question. If a machine claims consciousness, does it come under moral charge? Does it have a "soul"? Does it pray? The debate has in fact begun (the preaching robot Mindar in Kyoto; a sermon written by a language model in a church in Nuremberg, 2023; and a "church of artificial intelligence" founded by an engineer in California and then dissolved in 2021—Way of the Future, which passed in the body of the chapter). The religions that possess a conception of rational beings other than the human—the jinn, the angels, the devas—stand calmer before the question than those that do not.

(4) Religion cut to the measure of the individual. Algorithmic religions tailored to each user—"a religion for every one"—the furthest point disassembly can reach. It may generate the opposite reaction: a return to the congregation of flesh and blood (the mosque, the church, and the temple) as the one thing the screen does not offer.

(5) And the question of meaning in a time of emptiness. If the machine takes the work, the question "why am I here?" returns heavier than it ever was. The religions are the oldest answerers of it, **and this is what leaves the future open to them as much as it threatens them:** the age that empties human beings of their function returns them to their first question.

* Sixth: The Three Scenarios—And the Weighing by the Data

(a) Comprehensive secularization. The Western European model spreads over the world with prosperity and education. For it: the history of Europe, Japan, and China. Against it: Africa, Latin America, and the Islamic world are being educated and urbanized without secularizing at the same pace—and America has contradicted the equation for a century.

(b) The religious return. "The revenge of God," which the study on religion and power tracked, continues: fundamentalisms, religious populisms, and a rising demography. For it: the demographic table and world politics. Against it: the religiosity that rises in quantity weakens in quality (generations religious in identity rather than in creed).

(c) Transformation, not disappearance. The institutions recede and the religions remain in new forms—individual spirituality, small strict communities, digital religions, and institutions turning into providers of "meaning" in an open market. **This is the scenario the current data favor,** because it is the only one that explains the standing contradiction: secularization here

and religiosity there, an institution receding while the need remains.

And what holds in all the scenarios: what science does not touch—the questions of death, meaning, and justice—and what the daily walls and fertility make. **And what fades in all the scenarios:** what was built on a changing scientific "how," what has neither incubator nor text, and what does not reproduce.

The Scale on the Ladder — And the Study's Question

The claim (the common one): "Scientific progress and artificial intelligence will finish religion off." **Its strongest case:** the recession of religiosity in the most learned nations (Western Europe, East Asia), and the fall of the "how" claims one after another. **The strongest objection:** the prophecy itself has already failed once (Berger); the numbers say the irreligious are shrinking as a share; scientific America is religious; and what falls is readings, not questions. **The strongest reply:** the relative shrinkage may be temporary, until secularization moves to the South with prosperity. **What is established:** that religion does not die by science but is transformed. That what kills a literal reading does not kill an existential question. And that demography will decide the coming century more than the arguments will. **What is not established:** which of the scenarios will prevail—nor that any particular religion will remain in its present form. **And the Seeker's Question—the question of this whole book in the dress of the future:** if what endures before science is what never claimed to compete with it, and what endures before time is what preserved its text and its walls and reproduced—**are you searching for the religion that will endure, or for the religion that is true? Are they one?** History says that the survivor is not always the truest. The believer says that the truth is preserved by its Owner's preservation of it. And the seeker at least

knows now that the question of the future is not the question of the truth—even where the two intersect.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the four doors of artificial intelligence, the secularization thesis, and the global village in the body of the chapter on the age of acceleration; the laws of spread, survival, and division in the study of Chapter 11; and quantum physics in its science in the study on physics and in its market in this chapter.*

Part IX: The Decision and the Road

Beyond the tools and the field—how to choose, how to treat those who differ from you, and how to live with your question

Chapter 25: The Seeker's Options

Summary of the chapter: This chapter does not choose a belief for the reader, and it does not treat the positions as a ladder in honesty or in courage. It distinguishes the question of existence, the sources of knowledge, and the practical commitment; sets out the options open to the seeker; and shows what each of them costs and what it does not settle—so that the decision is made with the price of every road in view.

A Preliminary Map of Positions and Paths

People's positions do not fall into a fixed number of boxes. A person's answer about the existence of God or gods may differ from his answer about revelation, or the institution, or practice. He may be religious in his conduct and questioning in some of his beliefs, or unattached to any institution while keeping a faith or a practice. What follows are common examples—not verdicts on people, and not an inventory of everything they might say.

The first: remaining in the religion of one's upbringing after a conscious review. The review may end in reassurance about that religion's foundations, or in a new understanding of some of its practices and its history. Review does not make one person's faith higher than another's; but it helps its holder to state the reasons for his position and the limits of his knowledge.

The second: moving to another religious tradition, or rearranging one's religious belonging. Its effects differ enormously by country, family, and legal and economic situation, and in some environments it carries real dangers. This book therefore does not make public declaration the measure of sincerity, nor reticence the measure of cowardice: safety, privacy, and the seeking of trustworthy support come before any haste.

The third: deism, or "natural religion" in some writings. A historical spectrum holding that reason, or the natural world, may point to a Creator, without necessarily making a particular revelation or miracle a binding reference. Its forms vary; so the questions of the Creator's nature, the possibility of knowing Him, and the basis of moral obligation remain open within it.

The fourth: suspension of judgment, or agnosticism. A person may mean by it that he finds the available evidence insufficient to decide, or that he doubts whether the matter can be known at all—two different claims. This position imposes no single way of living or of belonging. But it needs, like every other, to state its standard of evidence and what could change its holder's mind.

The fifth: atheism, or non-theism. Some use the word for the belief that no god or gods exist; others for the absence of belief in them—so a single definition may not be assumed. The non-religious philosophies offer many answers to the questions of meaning, value, and destiny, and those answers remain themselves matters of discussion and revision.

The sixth: non-institutional irreligion, or spirituality without religious belonging. This name describes no single creed: it may point to belief in a higher power, a contemplative practice, a bond with nature, or an identity that distrusts the institution. These descriptions appear in contemporary surveys, but their definitions and meanings differ between countries and questionnaires; so their holder asks himself: what claim am I adopting? on what evidence? and by what reference do I review my choice?

The Claim to Truth and Religious Plurality

Alongside a person's position on the existence of God or on belonging, there is the way he looks at the religious claim to truth. Some of the modern literature of the philosophy of religion uses three approximate labels: **exclusivism**, the belief that one tradition holds the decisive truth or the saving path; **inclusivism**, the belief in the priority of one tradition together with the possibility of a share of truth or of salvation for those outside it; and **pluralism**, the family of theses holding that more than one tradition may be a valid path to truth or to salvation. But the boundaries of these labels are disputed, and they are clearer in some discussions among the

Abrahamic religions than in describing all the traditions of the world.

No one of these conceptions, by itself, entails a conclusion about civil rights or the ethics of dialogue: someone who believes his religion true can defend the freedom and dignity of others, just as acknowledging plurality excuses no one from examining the conflicts among the claims. The distinction between **social pluralism**, which asks for coexistence on equal rights, and **theological pluralism**, which proposes a verdict on the truth of the religions and their relation to one another, prevents a great deal of confusion.

This division is not meant to put people in boxes, nor to excuse any view from the question. Ask of every conception: what exactly does it say about truth or salvation? what is its evidence? what objection does it face? and how does it separate judging an idea from protecting the rights of the person who holds it?

Questions and Responsibilities on Every Path

None of these paths is free of questions or of practical consequences—but they may not be reduced to an equal "cost," nor turned into a verdict on the sincerity of the position. Some effects are social or legal in one place and not in another; and the burden of the matter may be theoretical, or emotional, or practical.

Believers, across their traditions, discuss evil, revelation, and interpretation; the non-religious discuss the foundations of meaning, value, and knowledge; and whoever suspends judgment faces the question of his standard for stopping and for review. These are

questions for inquiry, not charges directed at one side; and no answer to any one of them, by itself, proves a whole position.

So the question is not "where do I flee from the questions?" but: "what evidence carries me to this position? what is the strongest objection to it? what could change my assessment? and how do I deal with its practical consequences without making those consequences a proof in themselves?"

The reader is entitled to take his time, and to change the phrasing of his question or his position if something appears that requires it. Perplexity that leads to a disciplined question is not a moral defect, just as certainty does not lose its value merely because it arose in an inherited environment. The measure in both cases is honesty in dealing with the evidence and readiness to review when something requires it.

Taking one's time has practical manners: that the search stay in motion and not become postponement. That a person look to his safety, his health, his obligations, and his relationships. And that he live by what he sees today of truthfulness, mercy, and justice. These are values on which many traditions and positions intersect, however they differ in grounding and ordering them.

The Seeker's Question: which of these descriptions explains your present position most exactly? What evidence supports it, what objection have you not yet answered, and what could change your assessment?

Chapter 26: Accepting the Other— The Ethics of the Road

Summary of the chapter: An honest examination needs a moral climate that permits it—which is why a book about searching for truth ends with a chapter on how to treat those who reach a different destination: the ethics of the road with those who differ, and freedom of belief and pluralism across the history of religions and civilizations, with their harshest testimonies and their rare triumphs.

* Why a Chapter on the Other, in a Book About the Search for Truth?

A reader may ask: what does "accepting the other" have to do with a book whose subject is religions, evidence, and choice?

The answer: everything.

The seeker who pictures their search as a purely solitary journey—themselves, their mind, and the books—overlooks the truth of the road: you search among people. Those who differ from you are the material of your search. Your family are the first who will meet your decision. And your society is the air in which your questions breathe. Whoever's relationship with the other has gone bad finds the search itself gone bad: their debate becomes revenge, their reading an ambush, and their decision a reaction.

Then too, this book has laid before you the religions and schools of all humankind—and that means that

whatever you choose, you will live the rest of your life on a planet where most of the inhabitants differ from you. So the question is no moral luxury; it is the condition of life itself: how do I live with those who do not share my dearest convictions?

* The Other: Hell, or a Call?

Modern philosophy holds two famous poles in the view of the other, and the distance between them sums up the whole matter.

The first pole is Jean-Paul Sartre's: the other—in his famous analysis—is the one whose look turns me into a "thing" to be judged. I discover shame and exposure under his eyes, and the relationship becomes a contest of looks in which each side turns the other into an object—until he said his celebrated line that "Hell is other people."

The second pole is Emmanuel Levinas's: the face of the other—before any speech—is a call that awakens responsibility in me. His presence is a direct moral command, and all of morality is born from this encounter.

What is asked of the seeker is not to arbitrate between the two philosophers, but to see in the two poles a mirror of themselves: each of us knows the day when the other was our hell—a look of condemnation, a prior verdict, the pressure of a group. Each of us knows the day when the face of another human being was what awakened the noblest thing in us. **The other has no single nature; we are the ones who decide what relationship we build with him.** And this chapter is about that decision.

A wisdom passed us in an earlier chapter that deserves recalling here: the Socratic "Know yourself" is not complete until it becomes "Know yourself through others." For whoever has never sat with those who differ has never known the limits of their own position, and whoever has never seen themselves in the counterpart of the other has mistaken their shadow for the world.

* The Distinction on Which the Whole Chapter Stands: Acceptance Is Not Relativism

Here is the most dangerous confusion in the whole subject, and it must be settled before going on.

One party supposes that "accepting the other" means saying that all opinions are equal, that there is no truth and no falsehood, and that whoever holds fast to a conviction has offended against tolerance. An opposite party supposes that whoever believes they are right is thereby bound to despise the dissenter or to subdue him.

Both suppositions—in this book's judgment—confuse two different things, and the distinction we propose is simple and deep:

*** Accepting the other is a stance toward the human being, not a verdict on the ideas.**

You can—and this is what we regard as the most mature position—believe with your whole being that you are right and that whoever differs from you is wrong, and still respect him completely: hear his argument fairly, guard his dignity in the dialogue, protect his

rights in life whole and undiminished, and do him justice if he is wronged—even if it is the people of your own faith who wronged him.

For tolerance does not ask you to dissolve your conviction; it asks you not to dissolve the humanity of whoever differs from you.

Indeed the reverse is the truth: the relativist who sees all opinions as equal never has his tolerance tested at all—for it costs him nothing. Real tolerance is the virtue of **the convinced**: to believe the truth and still bear that people differ from you in it, because you know that a coerced faith is worthless, and that hearts are not opened by breaking.

* The Testimony of History: Light and Darkness from Every Direction

And so that this talk not hang in the air as preaching, let us look into the human record—with the fairness this book has bound itself to: we present the light and the darkness together, and we make neither the monopoly of any camp.

From the pages of light: the court of the Mongol empire, before its Islam, gathered in its assemblies shamanists, Buddhists, Nestorian Christians, and Muslims debating in safety—the tolerance of a people who had never read a book on the philosophy of tolerance. Biruni—a thousand years ago—wrote of the religions of India a book in which he states their beliefs as they themselves state them, declaring his method: to report the doctrine of a people without partisanship against them—anticipating the manners of modern scholarship

by centuries. The great cities where the communities lived side by side for centuries—with all the shortfall and inequality we do not prettify—produced learning and civilization such as the cities of forced purity never produced.

And from the pages of darkness—from every direction: courts that inspected consciences and burned dissenters in the name of religion. Wars that tore the followers of a single religion apart over an interpretation. Persecution that reached the doubters and thinkers in believing societies. And when some people supposed that fanaticism would end with the end of religion, the twentieth century brought officially atheist regimes that demolished the temples and killed believers by the hundreds of thousands in the name of fighting "the opium of the people"—and so the greatest lesson of this whole record became plain:

Fanaticism does not live in the creeds. It lives in the human being when he grants himself the right of coercion in the name of his certainty—whatever his certainty is. Religion has not held the monopoly on tolerance. Atheism has not held it. And neither has held the monopoly on fanaticism. So whoever tells you "my belief makes me tolerant by necessity, and your belief makes you a fanatic by necessity" has told you about his bias, not about history.

* And Today's Map, in Numbers: The Question Is Not History

Lest a reader suppose that the talk of fanaticism is a page long turned, let us look at the latest of what the researchers record.

The Pew Research Center has tracked restrictions on religion since 2007 across 198 countries by two indexes: government restrictions (laws and policies that constrain belief and practice) and social hostilities (harassment and violence by individuals and groups). Its latest report (covering 2023) draws a troubling picture: fifty-eight countries stand at high or very high levels of government restrictions—near the historic peak recorded the year before—with a jump in social hostilities to fifty-five countries from forty-five, and the line of government restrictions climbing almost without pause since measurement began. The upshot is that billions of human beings today live where some belief is being constrained.

More telling than the numbers is what they signify, and it confirms this chapter's thesis: the lists of the most restrictive and most hostile states include societies of every doctrinal makeup—countries with Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, and Jewish majorities, and officially irreligious regimes. The victims likewise come from most of the communities, majorities here and minorities there. So neither the map of today's world nor the record of its yesterday permits any camp to say: fanaticism is theirs, and tolerance is ours.

Indeed the Pew data add a third lesson: government restrictions and social hostilities mostly travel together—for where power demonizes a belief, the mob takes courage against it, and where a society winks at the violence of hatred, power grows bold enough to legislate against it. What that means in practice is that guarding tolerance is a double responsibility: a just law above, and a culture of acceptance below—and this book works on the second.

Why Do We Turn Fanatic? A Look in the Mirror

If fanaticism does not live in the creeds, where does it come from? The psychology we drew on in the chapter on biases answers here too:

From **identity**: when a person fuses with their belief until criticism of the idea becomes a stab at the self, they defend it as a drowning man defends, not as a searcher does. The cure is to carry your conviction without letting it swallow you: you are larger than your opinions, and whoever differs from you is larger than his.

From **fear**: for the different person threatens—by his mere existence—the illusion that the truth is self-evident and only the obstinate could dispute it. That is why the fanatic finds rest in demonizing the dissenter: it spares him facing the question "and why was he not convinced?"

From **the group**: for anger at opponents is cheap fuel for internal cohesion, and how many a preacher—religious or irreligious—gathers his followers on hatred of others because he cannot gather them on anything nobler.

Knowing these roots is half the cure: whoever has seen their fanaticism in the counterpart for what it is—fear, and a fragile identity—is ashamed of it.

* The Manners of Dialogue with the One Who Differs

Because ours is a practical book, here are the rules of honorable engagement—most of them laid down in the last part and summoned here:

Hear the strongest thing he has, not the weakest. For whoever defeats the silliest of his opponents has won nothing, and whoever summarizes a dissenter's position in a form the dissenter himself rejects has debated a phantom.

Try the idea by the evidence and the person by his deeds, and do not mix the two files. For not every mistaken person is wicked, nor every correct person virtuous, and the badness of an idea's followers does not refute it, as has passed.

Know the purpose of the dialogue before you begin: do you converse to understand, to be understood, or to win before an audience? The first two are honorable and fruitful. The third is a waste that corrupts hearts and convinces no minds—for rarely has anyone been persuaded while being defeated in front of people.

Do not make your dignity hostage to your victory in a debate. For the ability to say "that is a fair point; I will think about it" is not a defeat but among the rarest courages of dialogue.

And leave the other a dignified line of retreat; for whoever you humiliate while he is backing down, you have taught never to back down again.

* The Nearest "Others": The Seeker and Their Family

We reach the most delicate place in this chapter, and the one that touches the reader of this book most closely.

For the "other" who occupies the seeker's mind is usually not a thinker on a screen, but their mother and father, the partner of their life, and their friends—those whose place in their life may shift as their conviction shifts. And here both sides need this chapter:

Seeker: your search is a right, and your gentleness with your family is a duty, and the two do not conflict. You are not required to turn the family table into a debating platform, nor to announce every passing thought before it ripens. Wisdom in pacing your candor is not hypocrisy but mercy toward those who love you—they have not walked your road or read your books, and what took you years to digest is not to be dropped on them over one dinner. Beware of turning your perplexity into contempt for the simplicity of their faith or their certainty; for many a simple heart is purer than a thousand debates.

And you, the family—if this book has fallen into your hands: your child who asks has not betrayed you. He may be the most honest-hearted of you, for he refused to give the greatest questions of existence an answer he had not examined. Shouting does not bring a seeker back. Threats teach him concealment, not

conviction. And the shortest road to losing him is to make him choose between his mind and you. Keep the table warm and the door open. For the houses that can bear the question are the houses their children come back to—whether they have come back to faith or not yet—and the houses that expel the asker lose the asker and the question together.

* Freedom of Belief: The Rule Everyone Needs

The summary of all this is a single rule at which everyone who has passed through this book meets—the believer who wants God to be worshiped out of conviction, not coercion. The atheist who wants not to be persecuted for his thought. The seeker who wants an open space in which to search in safety:

Freedom of belief is not a favor granted by the strong. It is the condition of every honest search for the truth—and whoever wants it for themselves, let them guard it for others.

For whoever demands freedom for their own search and then wishes the search of their dissenter suppressed has not believed in freedom. They merely wanted their own turn at tyranny. And only whoever guards a dissenter's right to speak has the right to boast that their conviction won by argument, not by the whip.

* The Chapter's Summary

Accepting the other is not an appendix to a book on the search for truth; it is the condition of the journey from its beginning to its end:

At its beginning—because you will never understand the map of humankind's beliefs while despising the people who hold them.

In its middle—because the scales of evidence do not sit level in an angry hand.

At its end—because whatever you arrive at, you will arrive with eight billion human beings around you who did not arrive with you, and your arrival will be tested every day in how you treat them.

For the truth does not fear the question—as we said at the opening of this book.

Here we add: nor does it fear those who differ around it. What fears them is the fragile—and the truth is not fragile.

The Seeker's Question: Imagine that the person nearest to you finished the same journey at a destination other than yours—what would change in how you treat them? And if something would change, what kind of truth is it that needs to humiliate its dissenter to be at peace?

Study 26.1: Accepting the Other, Pluralism, and Freedom of Belief Across Religions and Civilizations — The Great Historical Survey

Summary of the study: Which religion has persecuted more, and which has been persecuted more? The answer is more complicated than either side expects. After distinguishing three concepts that are often confused—tolerance, pluralism, and freedom of belief—the study surveys the ancient world, India and China, the Islamic world, Christianity, and the modern age, and finds that the fiercest persecutors were sometimes yesterday's victims, and that traditions themselves learn and change over time.

* Opening: Three Concepts Before the Journey

Our chapter (Accepting the Other—The Ethics of the Road) presented the question as ethics and manners. This study presents it as **history**: how did the people of each religion and civilization actually treat those who differed from them, across the ages? Before the journey we pin down three concepts that common discourse confuses, and the confusion corrupts the verdict:

Tolerance, or forbearance: to bear the existence of those you believe to be wrong without suppressing them—a precious but passive stance, and a gift of the stronger that can be taken back. **Freedom of belief:** that a person's believing, changing, and manifesting their belief is a **right**, not a favor done to them, protected equally by law—a degree above tolerance, and

relatively recent in its entrenchment. **And pluralism,** which is said in two senses that must be kept apart: **social** pluralism (the coexistence of the people of different religions in one polity, with rights), a demand most reasonable people share. **Theological** pluralism (the claim that the religions are equivalent paths to a single truth), a contested philosophical thesis rejected by the people of nearly every religion and by the atheists alike—we presented its triad (exclusivism / inclusivism / pluralism) in the chapter on the seeker's options. So let it be known that a person can be a theological exclusivist (believing the truth lies in their religion alone) **and** a social advocate of freedom of belief—indeed that has been the position of most of history's tolerant believers; and confusing the two levels wrongs both history and people.

And now the journey—with its rule declared in advance, and already touched in the chapters on preaching and the history of doubt: **there is no tradition without light and darkness in its record, and the greatest deciding factor has been power, not creed alone.**

* First: The Ancient World—The Tolerance of the Many Gods, and Its Limits

It is commonly said that the ancient paganisms were tolerant by nature and monotheism fanatical by nature—and as a wholesale thesis, this is among the myths that examination corrects:

Yes, the plurality of gods had a real absorptive logic: when every people believes that the peoples have gods,

annexation comes easier than annulment. So the Romans "translated" the nations' gods into their own pantheon (Zeus is Jupiter is . . .) and housed the temples of most communities in their cities; and Egypt and Mesopotamia exchanged deities. The two oldest documents raised today as emblems of tolerance are both pagan: **the Cyrus Cylinder** of the Persian king (539 BCE), in which he recorded the restoration of the temples and their peoples—among them the Jews of Babylon, whom he returned to rebuild their Temple, so that the book of Isaiah immortalized him as the LORD's "anointed." **The edicts of Ashoka** the Buddhist, carved in rock (third century BCE), which say that whoever glorifies his own community and disparages the communities of others harms his own community, and that **the essence is the guarding of the tongue**—a text fit to serve as a charter of dialogue to this day.

But this tolerance had a strict limit that exposed its nature: it was tolerance toward those who **add** gods, not toward those who **deny** the community's gods or refuse the worship of the state. Plural Athens executed Socrates on a charge of new gods (we detailed the *asebeia* trials in the chapter on the history of doubt); "tolerant" Rome threw the Christians to the beasts for centuries—not because they worshiped Christ but because they **refused** to offer incense to the gods of the state and the genius of the emperor, so it called them "atheists" and traitors. It persecuted the Manichaeans and effaced cults it deemed dangerous (as it did with the Druids). So the pagan rule was never "freedom of belief" but "add, and do not deny—and worship with the

community": a plurality of gods, not a plurality of consciences. On the other side, the first to pay in blood for **the principled refusal to worship the ruler**, in documented history, were monotheists: the young men of monotheism in the furnace of Babylon, in the Bible's narrative; the martyrs of early Christianity. Bilal under the rock of Mecca—so the seed of "freedom of conscience" in its deepest sense (that in the human being there is a sanctuary no king owns) sprouted in the soil of persecuted monotheism, ages before it became law.

* Second: India and China—The Coexistence of the Schools, and Its Ordeals

Asia offered its own pattern. **In India** the schools coexisted and disputed (Hinduism with its branches, Buddhism, Jainism, even the materialist Charvakas) for centuries in the wide space of "dharma," and the model reached an astonishing later peak at the court of the Muslim Mughal emperor **Akbar** (sixteenth century CE), who built the "House of Worship," where the scholars of the Muslims, the Hindus, the Jains, the Zoroastrians, the Christians, and the Jews debated before him, and who issued his decree of "peace with all" (*sulh-i kull*)—though his own searching ended in a syncretic "divine religion" of his own devising that did not outlive him. Yet Asia's record is not clean: Buddhism was driven out of its Indian cradle (by compound factors, among them the pressure of the Hindu revival and the blows of the invasions), and India's communities have their own bloody conflicts, ancient and modern.

And in China "the Three Teachings" (Confucian, Taoist, and Buddhist) settled in a single breast with no anxiety of identity—history's widest model of plurality inside the individual person. Yet the Chinese state struck without mercy every religion it saw as a state within the state: the great persecution of Buddhism under Emperor Wuzong (845 CE) demolished tens of thousands of temples and returned hundreds of thousands of monks to "production". Manichaeism was crushed, and the messianic sects were hunted across the successive dynasties—by a political logic, not a theological one, confirming our rule: **the absolute state tolerates no loyalty above itself—pagan, atheist, or in the name of any heaven.**

* Third: The Islamic World—Between "No Compulsion" And the Bureau of the Zindiqs

Islam's record in this subject is among the richest of the records and the most contested in contemporary debate, and we present all its layers:

The textual foundation: "There is no compulsion in religion". "You have your religion and I have mine". "So can you [Prophet] compel people to believe?"—together with **the Charter of Medina** at the dawn of the Prophetic state, which made the Jews of Medina "one community with the believers," they with their religion and the Muslims with theirs. The covenants of the Prophet and his successors to the People of the Book, securing their churches and their property (such as Umar's assurance to the Christians of Jerusalem).

The historical system—the *dhimma*: the jurists established for the scriptural dissenter (extended in practice to the Magians and others) a permanent contract: protection of life, property, and temple, freedom of worship and internal jurisdiction—in exchange for the *jizya* tax and loyalty, with a symbolic subordination and restrictions unevenly applied (in building, dress, and office). **And its fair assessment is of necessity double:** measured against its medieval world it was clearly an advanced system—while Europe was expelling and burning its Jews kingdom after kingdom, the great cities of Islam remained home to the largest and most flourishing Jewish communities (and many of Spain's Jews, after the fall of al-Andalus, fled to Istanbul and Fez, not to Paris), and the ancient churches of the East are alive to this day after fourteen centuries of Islamic rule. We know of no mirror image of that; measured against the modern standard of equality it falls below it: an incomplete citizenship ranked by religion. Both verdicts are true on their own scales, and the error—the whole error—is to try the eighth century by the standards of the twenty-first, or to market its arrangements as a solution for the twenty-first.

And the facts, with both faces. From the light: the al-Andalus of "coexistence," which bore a shared civilization (Maimonides the Jew writes his philosophy in Arabic and becomes Saladin's physician—with the caution that "the Andalusian paradise of tolerance" is an idealized picture the historians have revised: it was a hierarchical coexistence with its relapses, among them the Granada massacre of the Jews in 1066 and the

rigorism of the Almoravids and Almohads, which drove Maimonides himself into exile); and the Ottoman "*millet*" system, which gave every community its own headship, courts, and schools for centuries. From the darkness: the bureau of the zindiqs and their inquisitions (we detailed them in the history of doubt), and the *mihna* over the createdness of the Qur'an, in which **Muslim theologians persecuted Muslim jurists** with the whips of the state—our standing witness that the germ of coercion infects even the people of a single faith among themselves (which is why "the internal other"—of school and sect—has its own contemporary literature of dialogical review from inside the Islamic house, sifting truth from illusion in sectarian disagreement by the method of dialogue rather than mutual pelting; among its most mature models, Ahmad al-Katib's book *Why Did the Muslims Divide?*—for the test of accepting the other begins with the nearest others). Scattered massacres and constrictions across the centuries, which the sources record without evasion. **And the two questions that remain alive today:** the ruling on apostasy, between the juristic inheritance (punishment) and contemporary readings that revisit it (distinguishing bare apostasy from wartime political treason in the context of origin, and invoking "no compulsion")—a debate running inside the Islamic house itself, with bodies and scholars on both sides. The vastly uneven reality of the Muslim states in freedom of belief, tracked in today's map in the body of the chapter.

* Fourth: Christianity—The Longest Arc in History: From Persecuted, to Persecutor, to Champion of Liberty

Christianity's position shifted from a minority inside the Roman Empire, to a religion with institutional privilege, and then to plural traditions and churches. So its history is not to be reduced to a single model, and it has occupied all three positions:

The early centuries of persecution produced the most eloquent ancient pleas for freedom of conscience—Tertullian wrote to the Roman governor (c. 212 CE) that it is a natural human right to worship what one believes, and that religion cannot be imposed by force, since the worship of the coerced is worthless—the plea of a hunted minority.

Then the position flipped: the Edict of Milan (313 CE) freed Christianity, and within mere decades Theodosius had made it the sole religion of the state (380 CE) and the closing of the pagan temples and the hunting of "heretics" had begun. Augustine later, in the quarrel with the Donatists, framed the theological justification of "merciful" coercion, citing the Gospel parable's phrase "compel people to come in" (Luke 14:23): a door was opened by it that stood open for a thousand years: the courts of the Inquisition, the campaigns against the Cathars, the burnings of witches and dissenters, the expulsion of the Jews kingdom after kingdom, the forcing of the peoples of the Americas to baptism, and then—after the Reformation—the wars of Catholics and Protestants that drowned Europe in blood (and the Protestants burned their own dissenters in turn:

Calvin's Geneva burned Servetus, the denier of the Trinity, in 1553—the newly persecuted persecuted faster than one would think; indeed Luther himself—the father of the Reformation—turned in his last years against the Jews and wrote against them (1543) a text of violent demands that Nazi propaganda put to use four centuries later, until the contemporary Lutheran churches formally disowned it: the harshest witness to the rule, and the plainest, that no prior victimhood and no grandeur of reform immunizes against the contagion of exclusion).

Then the third arc—Europe's lesson to the world, and the world's lesson in Europe: out of the exhaustion of the wars of religion, modern tolerance was born. The Peace of Westphalia (1648) ended the principle of war over confession. Locke's *A Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689) founded the separation of the state's function (protecting civil rights) from the salvation of souls—with the honesty of naming its limits: Locke himself excluded Catholics and atheists from his toleration! Bayle went before him to the deeper point (even the atheist deserves toleration, and the erring conscience has its sanctity). Before them both Spinoza—cut off from his own community—raised the plea of the *Theological-Political Treatise*: that freedom to philosophize threatens neither piety nor the peace of the state. It is the suppression of it that threatens both. Then America made it founding law: the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, from Jefferson's pen (1786), and the First Amendment (1791)—the first major state with no official religion at all. **And what matters for the**

fairness of the map: this was not the victory of irreligion over religion, as the story is sometimes told, but a strange alliance between deist Enlighteners **and persecuted Christian communities** (the Baptists, the Quakers, and their like) who saw in the neutrality of the state the protection of their own faith. So modern freedom of belief is the child of two parents: an Enlightenment reason and a dissenting piety. The Catholic Church itself completed the arc at the Second Vatican Council with the declaration *Dignitatis Humanae* ("Human Dignity," 1965), which affirmed religious freedom as a right founded on the dignity of the person—a historic turn by an institution that once ran the courts of the Inquisition: a witness that traditions **learn and revise,** and it is among the most important things the seeker carries out of this whole study.

* Fifth: The Modern Age—The Declared Right and Its Three Trials

The long arc was crowned by **the Universal Declaration of Human Rights** (1948), with its Article 18: everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, **including the freedom to change one's religion** and to manifest it in teaching and practice—drafted and voted on with the participation of states from most of the communities (with some states reserving, at the time, precisely against the phrase on changing one's religion—the disagreement that remains alive in the wording of the later regional Islamic charters). But the century that declared the right tried it three great times.

The trial of the atheist states, which brought down on believers among the most violent religious persecutions in history by scale (we detailed it in the history of doubt—and with it fell, finally, the claim that fanaticism is faith's monopoly).

The trial of the religious and nationalist states, some of which still criminalize apostasy, blasphemy, and missionizing up to legal execution, and press their minorities at times to the edge of extirpation (and the century's tragedies stand from every direction: from "civilized" Europe's incineration of its Jews, to the mutual cleansings of the Balkans, to the targeting of the Yazidis and Christians in the East, to the Rohingya in **Buddhist** Myanmar—so that the myth of the religion peaceful by nature, whichever it is, falls as well). **And the trial of the democracies themselves,** where people now argue over the limits of the freedom: freedom to criticize and mock the sacred versus hate speech; freedom of religious dress versus the secularity of public space; the rights of the atheist in religious societies and the rights of the religious among secular elites—the question has not been closed. It has risen from "shall the dissenter be killed?" to "how do those who differ share a homeland?." That alone is an enormous advance that deserves not to be discounted.

* Sixth: The Gathering Analysis—What Makes Societies Accept, or Suppress?

This survey does not yield deterministic laws, but it suggests sharper questions for understanding protection and coercion:

1. Power before creed. The rule we have chased through three chapters completes itself here: every creed's people were persecuted where they were a governed minority, and persecuted others where they held absolute power—paganism, monotheism, and atheism alike. So the probing question is not "which religion is more tolerant?" in the absolute, but "what institutional restraints bind the power of its people when they rule?"

2. Texts carry potential. History is a choice. In the texts of the great traditions there are verses of mercy and covenants of protection, and there are texts of severity toward the dissenter—and the tolerant of every community have drawn out their texts, and the extremists have drawn out theirs. The text alone has never decided. What decided was **which readings circumstance, power, and interest enabled**—and this exempts neither the texts from examination nor the readers from responsibility; it puts each in its place.

3. The thesis "monotheism is fanatical by nature" falls to the map. Yes, the exclusivity of truth carries a decisiveness that can feed exclusion (a thesis serious scholars have advanced with a seriousness that deserves presentation). But induction breaks it from both sides: the most violent modern persecutions were atheist. Pagan Rome fed monotheists to the beasts. Plural

China crushed its sects—while the monotheists themselves produced the Cyrus of the Torah, the Charter of Medina, Tertullian, Bayle, and the Baptist advocates of separating religion from the state. So theological exclusivism does not entail suppression (as we settled in pinning down the concepts), and inclusivism does not immunize against it.

4. The minority is tolerance's permanent teacher. The reader will have noticed that the brightest pleas for liberty were written by the persecuted: Tertullian under Rome, the Jews of the diaspora with their jurisprudence of coexistence, Bayle the fugitive, the hunted Baptists—and that some of them forgot the lesson when they came to rule. So whoever wants to test the sincerity of any group's slogans of liberty should look not at its discourse while it is governed, but at its conduct where it governs—**a criterion handed to the seeker to test everyone, without exception.**

5. Traditions learn. The greatest good news of this survey is that positions are not fates: the Church of the Inquisition issued *Dignitatis Humanae*. Contemporary Muslim jurists are reopening the file of apostasy from inside the sources. And states have changed their places on the maps of freedom, upward (and downward). So the seeker does not try a religion by the worst moments of its history alone, nor by its brightest alone, but asks the living question: what is the prevailing reading today—and where is its arrow pointing?

The Study's Conclusion

We have circled the earth and the centuries, and we have found freedom of belief the dearest fruit of human history and the most costly: its installments were paid by the lives of Socrates, the martyrs of Rome, the victims of the burnings and the inquisitions and the prisons of official atheism—from most of the communities, and at the hands of most of them. Today, where it has been achieved, it is neither the gift of one particular civilization nor the enemy of one particular religion, but a contract of mutual safety signed by differing consciences because all of them have tasted coercion when they stood in the place of weakness. That is why the seeker's defense of it is a defense of themselves first: the seeker is—by the nature of their perplexity—a standing candidate to be someone's "dissenter." Whatever harbor their ship comes to rest in at the end of this book, the first thing they will need in that harbor is a sea that stays open to the ships of others. **For the freedom that protects your arriving is the very freedom that protects another's right not to arrive at your harbor.** That is the study's summary in a line: accepting the other is no surrender of your certainty. It is the condition by which everyone's certainty remains their own—and not their ruler's.

> ***Cross-references for the study:*** *the ethics of dialogue and today's map in numbers in the body of this chapter; the triad of exclusivism / inclusivism / pluralism in Chapter 25; and the means of the religions' spread and the rule of "the religion of the kings" in Chapter 11.*

What the Journey Yielded: Ten Conclusions Before the Last Word

What the comparison across this book made possible: ten guiding conclusions, then a review of the charter, then the way into the final chapter

---

You have crossed nine parts. You do not need them summarized—the Toolkit in Part II summarizes their tools, the appendix of the major claims summarizes their evidence, and the appendix of the numbers summarizes their reality. What you need here is something else: **what the journey itself revealed once it was complete**—patterns that could not be seen from any single chapter, and that appear only when all the religions are set out side by side. Ten of them:

(1) The religions are not one kind of thing to be compared in a single race. You saw it in the texts (a library of centuries facing a discourse of two decades), in scope (a complete law facing a path of the spirit), in prophethood (sealed, renewed, and continuing), and in language (rising high, descending, and falling silent). So whoever says "all the religions are the same" has not looked, and whoever says "my religion alone is different" has not looked either—and the map is the first thing to expose both slogans.

(2) The moral unites; the ritual divides. In the lawful and the forbidden, in ethics, and in the destiny after death: the nations all but agree on forbidding murder, treachery, and false witness, and they diverge many times over in what to eat, when to fast, and how to bury.

So the shared core is a fact—which the believer reads as *fitra* and the critic as society—and the divergence in rites refutes no one.

(3) Position shapes theology more than the text does. You saw it in power (every religion that ruled expanded, and every religion that was ruled contracted), in war (the conqueror adopts the religion of the conquered), and in the future (existential security predicts commitment better than the religion's name). So when you read a ruling or a stance, ask first: from what position was it written?

(4) Every house grew its own extremes from within. Determinism and freedom, literalism and interpretation, rigor and gentleness, openness and closure—in every religion. So the disagreement inside the religions is sharper than the disagreement between them on many questions. The first split in all of them was over power, not creed. And a religion that never split has never existed.

(5) What the texts said about "how" has collided. What they said about "why" science has not touched. From the centrality of the earth to the creation of the species to the literal flood: everything built on a description of the world paid the price of a discovery. The question of existence, meaning, justice, and death no laboratory reaches, by definition—so the interpreters are more durable than the literalists in every house, and science has neutralized the old materialist argument and erected no new religious argument.

(6) Explanation explains the susceptibility. It does not settle the truth—in both directions. Uncovering the mechanism of religiosity (psychological or evolutionary) does not refute it, just as uncovering the mechanism of atheism (a wound, or a rebellion) does not refute it. Spread, survival, and commitment are social phenomena with shared laws that testify neither for a religion nor against it. So the only field in which truth is settled is the field of evidence—not the field of numbers, nor of wombs, nor of walls.

(7) What is established in every great claim is less than its holders claim and more than its opponents concede. You saw it in the twelve cards: the universe's beginning does not by itself compel the personal God, but it keeps the question of the cause alive. Evil does not refute God, but it remains heavy. Inimitability is a historical fact and a taste-bound argument; and transmission establishes arrival, not truth. That middle region is where honest weighing is built—and the orators of both sides do not live there.

(8) Dialogue is a door opened from both sides—and debate has rarely convinced anyone. People change by relationship, example, crisis, and accumulation, and the argument enters through a door something else has opened. And whoever enters hoping to convince while unprepared to be convinced has delivered a speech into a mirror.

(9) Doubt is degrees, not a box—and the traditions condemned the obstinate, not the asker. The trembling of the heart at the question is a sign of life, not of unbelief—a prophet said it, and a monk, and a

philosopher. Perplexity is a station on the road, not a home: it is condemned when taken as a dwelling, and rewarded when it is a journey.

(10) And the question of the future is not the question of the truth. What will endure is what has preserved its text and its walls, reproduced, and not crowded science on its own ground—and endurance says nothing about truth, just as spread never did. So search for the true, not for the surviving—and if the two intersect, that is of God's grace, not of history's logic.

And the accounting of the charter. We made five pledges in the Introduction, and it is your right to hold us to account. Did we present every belief in its strongest form, and its critique in its strongest form? We tried—and where we fell short, the single standard we declared is your weapon against us. Did we distinguish text from history from narrative from myth? In every chapter we tried to name the layer. Did we close with open questions rather than imposed answers? We settled nothing for you—and what the writer of this book himself finds weightier he declared in the first person, in its named places, not in a neutral main text. Did we say "we do not know" and "most" where they were owed? We tried—and the independent audit we promised will say how well. Did we respect every belief, and those who have left it? We hope so—and if you find in any line a mockery of anyone's faith, or of anyone's loss of it, that is our error, not our method.

And now—having seen the whole map, carried the tools, and weighed the evidence by a single standard—it remains for you to know how to live with what is left of your question. That is the final chapter.

Chapter 27: Living with the Question (The Book's Conclusion)

> **Summary of the chapter:** This book begins with a human being who lifts his eyes and asks, and ends with that same human being, having crossed the whole journey, asking the last question: how do I live with my question if it is not yet settled? A closing that says honest perplexity is not defeat—it may be among the most honorable positions a person can hold.

We began this book with a human being lifting their eyes to the sky and asking.

We walked with that being across thousands of years: it worshiped the sun, carved the statues, built the temples, wrote the tablets, believed in one God, believed in many gods, doubted, denied, sought the mystic path, philosophized, made claims, believed them, and rejected them.

We saw that this whole story—with its believers, its atheists, and its perplexed—is at bottom one story: the story of the only creature that knows it exists, and then is not content to exist until it asks what its existence means.

The animal lives; the human being asks why it lives.

And if this book has one message, it is this:

The question is not your enemy.

Do not fear perplexity, for the greatest believers passed through it before they believed their deep belief, and the greatest philosophers before they built their

systems. Perplexity is a pain, yes—but it is the pain of growth, not the pain of sickness; and whoever has never once been perplexed has never once thought.

Do not make your search a battle to win against anyone, for the searcher for truth is not a lawyer defending a client but a judge who wants to do justice—even against himself.

Search with mind and heart together. For whoever searches with a mind without a heart becomes a dry disputation, and whoever searches with a heart without a mind becomes a blind emotion—and the complete human being walks on both feet.

Be merciful in your search: with yourself when you stumble, with those who differ from you when you converse with them, and with the human beings who came before you when you read their history. For they were like you, carrying the same question with the tools of their time.

Then, if you arrive—at faith, or at something else—do not close the door you came in by. For the one who arrived by the question stays alive by the question, and whoever turns their arrival into a sealed fortress betrays the journey that brought them there.

And if you have not yet arrived, then walk.

For the truth does not fear the question.

And if the truth exists—and every searching heart is wagering that it exists—then the honest asker is the nearest of all people to it, however long the way.

An Annex to the Conclusion: A Suggested Practical Program for the Searcher

For whoever wants to turn this part into a plan, here are tested steps:

1. **Write down your current position and its reasons** before you begin, with complete honesty, so that you can know later whether you moved by evidence or by mood.
2. **Read every position from the sources of its own people**, not from the sources of its opponents: Islam from its scholars, Christianity from its theologians, atheism from its philosophers, and so on.
3. **Then read the strongest critique directed at each position,** and compare argument and reply for yourself.
4. **Sit with people of the different positions** in their ordinary lives, and ask courteously: what is it that makes you at rest in your position?
5. **Record your pending questions** in a single notebook, and return to them from time to time; it will astonish you to see which of them dissolved and which held.
6. **Apply the Outsider Test** to your inheritance at least once, with complete honesty.
7. **Revisit the Whole Scale** every few months: in which direction are the weighings accumulating?
8. **And live, in the meantime,** by the agreed virtues: honesty, mercy, justice, and doing good; they are the way's provision, whatever the destination.

Appendices

Appendix A: A Comparison of the Ten Great Religions That Have Passed over the Planet

Condensed identity cards, then the comprehensive comparison table, then the observations that cross the religions—and the scale

* The Criteria of Selection First—And Why These Ten?

"Greatest" is a word that needs a declared scale. We adopted three measures taken together: **the number of followers** across history and today; **the depth of civilizational impact** (in law, art, philosophy, and the maps of nations); and **structural originality** (that the religion represents a major pattern of belief, not a branch of another). Out came the ten: five great living religions (Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism). Two gathering umbrellas without which the scene is incomplete (the Chinese religion with its two wings, Confucian and Taoist; and the traditional animist religions—the oldest layer of religiosity and the widest in time and geography). Two religions that changed the course of history, one nearly extinguished (Zoroastrianism) and one extinguished after three thousand years of burning (the religion of ancient Egypt—standing here for the great paganisms of the ancient East); and the newest of the major independent religions (Sikhism).

And with a declared apology to those the number, not the importance, excluded: Jainism (the most venerable school of nonviolence), Shinto, Manichaeism (the greatest of the extinct missionary religions), the religions of Mesopotamia and Greece, and the Baha'i faith—all of which received their places in the body of the book.

* The Ten Cards—Each Religion in One Faithful Paragraph

1. Christianity (Palestine, first century CE): the largest of the earth's religions today (about 2.4 billion). Its center is the person of Jesus Christ himself—not his teachings alone: the one God, threefold in persons, whose Son became incarnate, was crucified as a ransom for humanity's sin, and rose from the dead—so the resurrection is the religion's existential cornerstone, and salvation is by faith and grace (the churches differing over the place of works). Its text is the Bible in its two testaments, and its three great wings are the Catholic, the Orthodox, and the Protestant. Its greatest civilizational impact: the shaping of Europe and then half the planet—in calendar, art, universities, and law—and it is today the religion of the rising South more than of the North that carried it for centuries.

2. Islam (Mecca and Medina, seventh century CE): the second of the religions in size (about 2 billion) and the fastest growing. A strict monotheism that admits no intermediary and no incarnation: God is One, the eternal and self-sufficient, and Muhammad is the Seal of His prophets—and all the prophets before him were messengers of the one religion. Its central miracle is its text:

the Qur'an, challenged to be matched. And its system is religion and world together: a creed and a law ordering worship and dealings alike. Its pillars are five, and its two great branches are the Sunni and the Shia. Its greatest impact: a civilization that stretched from al-Andalus to China and carried learning for centuries. A language (Arabic) that became, because of it, the tongue of nations. And it is today the largest presence at the heart of the world's questions.

3. Hinduism (the Indian subcontinent, with roots before 1500 BCE): the third of the great ones (about 1.2 billion) and the oldest of the major living religions—and it is less a single "religion" than an umbrella of traditions: from a deep philosophical monotheism (the absolute Brahman, the Atman of the self, and their unity in Vedanta) to a teeming popular plurality (Vishnu, Shiva, the Mother Goddess, and their incarnations). Its great laws: karma (every act bears fruit), samsara (the turning wheel of rebirth), and moksha (liberation from it, as the goal)—and its roads to it are three: knowledge, works, and devotional love. Its texts are two layers: shruti, "the heard" (the Vedas and the Upanishads), and smriti, "the remembered" (the epics, the Puranas, and the Gita). Its impact: it shaped the civilization of an entire subcontinent and fed the spiritualities of the modern world.

4. Buddhism (northern India, about the fifth century BCE): about half a billion. Founded by Siddhartha Gautama, "the Buddha" (the Awakened One)—not as a prophet from a god but as a physician of existence: he diagnosed the disease (life is shot through with

suffering) and its cause (clinging, and thirst), declared that cure is possible, and prescribed the medicine (the Eightfold Path: wisdom, ethics, and meditation)—leading to nirvana: the extinguishing of the thirst and the exit from the wheel of rebirth. No creator stands at its center and no fixed self—so it is the great test case for the definition of religion, as has passed. Its two branches: the Theravada of the South and the Mahayana of the North (within which stands the current of Tibet). Its impact: the spirit of East Asia and half its arts, and the most successful of the East's meditative exports to the modern West.

5. Judaism (Canaan / ancient Israel, with roots around 1300–1000 BCE and earlier): the smallest of the great ones in number (about 15 million) and the farthest-reaching in impact relative to its size—for it is **the root of the Abrahamic tree** in whose shade more than half of humankind now sits: it gave history a continuous, liturgical monotheism, the Sabbath, and the ideas of covenant, written law, and social prophecy. A religion of a people and a covenant: one God who chose a community to carry His commandments (613). Its text is the Tanakh, its heart the Torah, and the sea of its commentary the Talmud. It does not missionize (the nations have the path of Noah), and its aim is the sanctity of daily life, the awaiting of the world's repair (*tikkun olam*), and the Messiah.

6. The Chinese religion—Confucianism, Taoism, and the popular religion (China, sixth century BCE for the writing down of its two wings): the umbrella of the largest nation in history. Confucianism is a system of

ethics and society more than a worship: the rightness of the person (*ren*: humaneness) builds the rightness of the family and then the state. Filial piety and the veneration of ancestors are its pillar. And its stance toward the unseen is the "quiet distance" we detailed. Taoism is its inward wing: the Tao—the Way by which the cosmos runs—is flowed with, not fought (*wu-wei*). And from it issued a medicine, arts, and an alchemy of immortality. The Chinese person lives the three traditions (with Buddhism among them) in a single breast—the widest model of plurality within the individual. Its impact: it shaped the ethics and administration of all East Asia for two thousand years.

7. Zoroastrianism (Iran; by tradition, around the twelfth to sixth centuries BCE): today a few tens of thousands only—and yesterday the religion of three great Persian empires, and perhaps **the most influential of religions upon others relative to its remnant**: the monotheism of the wise Ahura Mazda. The cosmic struggle between the truth and the lie. The human being's freedom to take a side ("good thoughts, good words, good deeds"); the prophecy of a savior; and resurrection, judgment, heaven and hell, and the renewal of the world—a complete eschatological system whose echoes many scholars see in the later Abrahamic religions (a disputed thesis whose careful framing we presented). Its text is the Avesta, its heart the hymns of Zoroaster (the Gathas), and its emblem the fire—as purity, not as an object of worship.

8. Sikhism (the Punjab, fifteenth century CE): about 27 million—the newest of the major independent religions. Guru Nanak founded it at the heart of the meeting of Islam and Hinduism, declaring "there is no Hindu and no Muslim": a pure monotheism of one God without images, together with the acceptance of karma and rebirth—a unique composition between the two families. It rejected caste, monasticism, and ritualism. It exalted work and sharing (the free *langar* kitchen, open to all, is its immortal social emblem). And it sealed the line of its ten teachers by making **the book itself** (the Guru Granth Sahib) the living, permanent Guru—a case unique in the history of sacred texts.

9. The religion of ancient Egypt (the Nile valley, from about 3100 BCE to the early centuries CE): the longest continuously documented of religions—three thousand years—and the representative of the great paganisms on our list. A pantheon led by Ra, Osiris, and Isis; a deified mediating pharaoh; and *ma'at*—truth, order, and justice—as the standard of all existence. It gave humanity the oldest detailed moral eschatology: the trial of the dead and the weighing of the heart against the feather of Ma'at (we detailed it in the study on the Last Day), a complete literature of the dead, and Akhenaten's brief monotheistic experiment. Then it was extinguished by the Christian and then the Islamic conversion—a witness that religions also die, and that thirty centuries guarantee not one century more.

10. The traditional animist religions (every continent, from prehistory to today): the oldest layer of religiosity and the widest in time—with no founder, no

book, and no date of birth: a world inhabited by spirits and powers. Ancestors present, honored, and called upon; a distant high sky-god in many of them (the datum on which the theory of "primal monotheism" was built, with its dispute); a shaman who crosses between the two worlds; and rites that order the cycles of life and the seasons. They are still alive in the hundreds of millions (Africa, the Americas, Asia, and Oceania), pure or blended with the arriving great religions—and they are humanity's "religious mother tongue," whose vocabulary has seeped into the popular layers of most religions (as we detailed in the intermediate unseen).

The Comprehensive Comparison Table

Religion	Origin	Founder / emblem	Conception of God	Highest text	Aim / salvation	After death	Mission	Followers today
Christianity	Palestine, 1st c. CE	Jesus Christ	One, threefold in persons	The Bible	Redemption, faith, and grace	Resurrection, judgment, heaven / hell	Missionary, worldwide	~2.4 billion
Islam	The Hijaz, 7th c. CE	Muhammad (the Seal of the Prophets)	One and Only, transcendent	The Qur'an	Monotheism and righteous deeds	Resurrection, reckoning, Garden / Fire	Preaching, worldwide	~2 billion
Hinduism	India, before 1500 BCE	No founder (the rishis)	Brahman + many	The Vedas, the Upanishads,	Moksha: liberation	Karma and rebirth	Ethnic (with modern	~1.2 billion

The Comprehensive Comparison Table

Religion	Origin	Founder / emblem	Conception of God	Highest text	Aim / salvation	After death	Mission	Followers today
			manifestations	and the Gita	from the wheel		missionary arms)	
Buddhism	India, 5th c. BCE	The Buddha (an awakened teacher)	No creator at the center	The Tripitaka	Nirvana: the extinguishing of thirst	Karma and rebirth until liberation	Missionary (the first of the universals)	~0.5 billion
Judaism	Canaan, ~13th c. BCE	Moses (and the patriarchs before him)	One; a covenant with a people	The Tanakh + the Talmud	The sanctity of life by the commandments; awaiting	Resurrection and judgment (less	Non-missionary	~15 million

The Comprehensive Comparison Table

Religion	Origin	Founder / emblem	Conception of God	Highest text	Aim / salvation	After death	Mission	Followers today
					the Messiah	detailed)		
The Chinese (Confucian / Taoist)	China, 6th c. BCE	Confucius / Laozi	Heaven and order (Tian / Tao), mostly no personal God	The Analects / the Tao Te Ching	Harmony: social and cosmic	Veneration of ancestors; non-central conceptions	Non-missionary	Hundreds of millions (overlapping)
Zoroastrianism	Iran, ~12th–6th c. BCE	Zoroaster	Ahura Mazda, the One and Wise	The Avesta (the Gathas)	The victory of truth by thought, word,	The bridge of judgment;	Once imperial; today	Tens of thousands

The Comprehensive Comparison Table

Religion	Origin	Founder / emblem	Conception of God	Highest text	Aim / salvation	After death	Mission	Followers today
					and deed	resurrection and the world's renewal	nearly closed	
Sikhism	The Punjab, 15th c. CE	Guru Nanak (+ 9 teachers)	One, without images	The Guru Granth Sahib	Remembrance of the Name, work, and sharing; liberation	Karma and rebirth until union	Open, without pressing	~27 million

The Comprehensive Comparison Table

Religion	Origin	Founder / emblem	Conception of God	Highest text	Aim / salvation	After death	Mission	Followers today
Ancient Egypt	The Nile valley, ~3100 BCE	No founder; a mediating pharaoh	A pantheon (Ra at its height)	The Pyramid Texts and the Book of the Dead	Living by ma'at (truth and order)	The weighing of the heart; the fields of eternity, or the Devourer	The religion of a civilization, not a mission	Extinct (~5th c. CE)
Traditional animism	Every continent, prehistory	No founder	Spirits and ancestors + a distant	Oral tradition	Balance with the spirits and the	The world of the ancestors;	The religion of a community	Hundreds of millions (pure

The Comprehensive Comparison Table

Reli-gion	Origin	Founder / em-blem	Con-ception of God	High-est text	Aim / salva-tion	After death	Mis-sion	Follow-ers to-day
			high god, mostly		commu-nity	varied concep-tions	and a land	and blended)

* Observations That Cross the Religions—What Does the Table Show That the Cards Do Not?

1. The greatest dividing line is not the number of gods but the structure of time and salvation. The Western family (Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Zoroastrianism) lives a linear time: creation, then history, then a decisive judgment—and salvation is the rescue of **a person** in a court. The Indian family (Hinduism, Buddhism, and Sikhism) lives a turning wheel—and salvation is **an exit** from the wheel itself. So that it is rightly said: the Westerner fears not entering heaven, and the Indian fears returning to the world.

2. Three patterns of founder—and a fourth with no founder. A prophet delivering from God (Moses, Zoroaster, Muhammad). A person who is himself the center of the religion (Christ: for Christianity is not so much "the teachings of Jesus" as "faith in Jesus"). And a teacher who discovered a path and claims no revelation (the Buddha, Confucius, and Nanak on his own spectrum)—and religions with no founder at all, growing the way a language grows (the Hindu, the Egyptian, the animist). This classification precedes every weighing of "the prophets," since they do not all make the same claim to be measured by one standard—as we detailed in Part IV.

3. The text ranges from the center of the religion to its margin. In Islam the text is the central miracle itself. In Sikhism the text became the living "Guru". In Judaism and Christianity the text is the vessel of covenant and witness. In Hinduism it is a layered sea with ancient

"hearings" at its top. In Buddhism it is a set of tools (a "raft" to be left behind after the crossing). In the Chinese religion it is the wisdom of teachers. And in animism there is no text at all. So the question "what does it mean for a book to be sacred?" has a different answer religion by religion—and it is the axis of Part V.

4. Size does not measure impact, and age guarantees no survival. Fifteen million Jews are the root of the two religions of four billion. Tens of thousands of Zoroastrians are the heirs of a system whose echoes sound in the eschatologies of half of humankind. And thirty Egyptian centuries went out in two. So let the seeker beware two facing fallacies: arguing from the enormity of followings (we weighed it in the argument from spread), and despising the small that may be the spring.

5. The law of layering. You will rarely find today a religion that is "chemically pure": Latin Christianity sits over a European pagan layer; popular Islam in Asia and Africa over an animist layer. Japanese Buddhism embraces Shinto. And Hinduism is itself an archipelago of layerings—the great religions are geological continents carrying the strata of what preceded them, and reading any religion from the practice of its followers alone without its texts—or from its texts alone without their practice—is reading half the truth (the lesson of the intermediate unseen).

* The Scale: What Does the Comparison Do for the Seeker—And What Does It Not Do?

The comparison does three precious things for you. **It frees you from the prison of the binary choice** ("my religion or atheism") by revealing the breadth of what human beings have believed. **It disciplines your questions**: after the table you know that the question "which religion is most true?" branches at once—true in what? In its conception of God? In its explanation of suffering? In the documentation of its text? In its fruit?—and each branch has its field in this book. **And it keeps you from comparing a dissenter's apple with a friend's orange**: whoever compares the most ascetic of Buddhism's texts with the most fantastic of popular Islam's miracle tales—or the reverse—has compared one layer of one religion with a different layer of another.

And what the comparison does not do—say it to yourself strictly: the table displays the claims and does not weigh them. It tells you **what** each religion says, not **which** of them spoke truly. Moksha, nirvana, the Garden, and ma'at are not ranked by the beauty of the display or the number of the rows—but by two fields we have crossed and which remain: each claim's evidence for itself (Part VII), and the six criteria of comparison (Chapter 6). The comparison is the survey of the ten great roads—**but which road you take is not decided by a table in an appendix. It is decided by a traveler who has read the whole book.**

> ***Cross-references for the appendix:*** *the detail of each religion in its place in the chapters of the survey (7–11); the great families and the structure of time in Chapter 9; and the patterns of the founders in Chapter 12.*

Appendix B — The Table of Figures by the Sixfold Classification

One hundred and eleven figures from Chapter 12, sorted on the six symbols—a quick reference index, with the detail in its places

How to use this appendix. This is a reference index, not new text: we have gathered here all the figures of Chapter 12, sorted on the sixfold classification, so that the reader can find a particular figure quickly and then return to its section in the chapter, where its context, its role, and its source cautions stand. **And remind yourself of the chapter's rule before reading:** these are **descriptive** symbols that report the claim and the nations' reception of it—not verdicts of truth or falsehood. That is the business of the field of evidence.

The key to the symbols *(it is the key of Chapter 12 itself, repeated here for the appendix's independence)*:

Symbol	Meaning
P	Prophet / messenger: claimed to carry a message from God (or the supreme God), and is believed by a community that exists to this day
V	Recipient of revelation or visions: said that he or she receives inspiration, visions, or contact with an unseen world (by their own claim or their followers')
F	Founder of a religion or a spiritual path: created a new religious or spiritual system

Sym-bol	Meaning
R	Reformer: renewed an existing tradition without a supernatural claim
C	Rejected claimant: made the claim, and the nations rejected or belied it
L	Legendary / epic figure: its presence in memory is wider than its attestation in history

P — The Prophets and Messengers

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Adam	The dawn of humankind	The Abrahamic religions
Idris (Enoch)	Before the Flood	The Abrahamic religions
Noah	Before recorded history	The Abrahamic religions
Hud	Remote antiquity	The Abrahamic religions
Salih	Remote antiquity	The Abrahamic religions
Abraham	About 2000–1800 BCE, by tradition	The Abrahamic religions
Lot	Contemporary of Abraham	The Abrahamic religions
Ishmael	After him	The Abrahamic religions

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Isaac and Jacob (Israel)	After him	The Abrahamic religions
Joseph	After him	The Abrahamic religions
Job	Undetermined	The Abrahamic religions
Shu'ayb	Before Moses	The Abrahamic religions
Moses	The 13th century BCE (the most common estimate among those who date the Exodus)	The Abrahamic religions
Aaron	His contemporary	The Abrahamic religions
Joshua son of Nun	After him	The Abrahamic religions
David	About 1000 BCE	The Abrahamic religions
Solomon	About 970–931 BCE	The Abrahamic religions
Elijah (Ilyas)	The 9th century BCE	The Abrahamic religions
Elisha (al-Yasa')	After him	The Abrahamic religions

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Jonah	The 8th century BCE	The Abrahamic religions
Dhul-Kifl	Undetermined	The Abrahamic religions
Zecha-riah	Late 1st century BCE – early 1st century CE	The Abrahamic religions
John the Baptist (Yahya)	d. about 28–30 CE	The Abrahamic religions
Muham-mad	About 570/571–632 CE	The Abrahamic religions
Samuel	The 11th century BCE	Judaism and Christianity
Nathan and Gad	The 10th century BCE	Judaism and Christianity
Isaiah	The 8th century BCE	Judaism and Christianity
Jeremiah	The 7th–6th centu-ries BCE	Judaism and Christianity
Ezekiel	The 6th century BCE	Judaism and Christianity
Daniel	The 6th century BCE	Judaism and Christianity
The Book of the Twelve "Minor"	The 8th–5th centu-ries BCE	Judaism and Christianity

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Prophets—from Hosea to Malachi (Jonah among them)		
The prophetesses of the Tanakh—Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah	The 13th–7th centuries BCE	Judaism and Christianity
Zoroaster (Zarathustra)	Sharply disputed: between about 1500 and 600 BCE	Iran

V — The Recipients of Revelation and Visions

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Baha'u'llah (Husayn Ali Nuri)	1817–1892 CE	Iran
The rishis of the Vedas (the	The second millennium BCE	India

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
seven sages)		
Guru Nanak	1469–1539 CE	India
Ramakrishna, and his disciple Vivekananda	The 19th century CE	India
Nakayama Miki	1798–1887 CE	East Asia
Choe Je-u (Su-un)	1824–1864 CE	East Asia
Ngo Van Chieu and the founders of Cao Dai	1926 CE	East Asia
Hammurabi	About 1792–1750 BCE	The ancient East
Apollonius of Tyana	The 1st century CE	Greece and Rome
al-Hallaj	858–922 CE	The Islamic world
Ibn Arabi	1165–1240 CE	The Islamic world
Kimpa Vita (Dona Beatriz)	1684–1706 CE	Africa

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Ntsikana	About 1780–1821 CE	Africa
Nongqawuse	About 1841–1898 CE	Africa
William Wadé Harris	About 1860–1929 CE	Africa
Simon Kimbangu	1887–1951 CE	Africa
Isaiah Shembe	About 1865–1935 CE	Africa
The traditional intermediaries—the diviners of the nations, their healers, and the mediators of their ancestors	Across the ages	Africa
Handsome Lake	1735–1815 CE	The Americas
Tenskwatawa, "the Shawnee Prophet"	1775–1836 CE	The Americas
Wovoka	About 1856–1932 CE	The Americas

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Joseph Smith	1805–1844 CE	The Americas
Ellen White	1827–1915 CE	The Americas

F — The Founders

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Mahavira	By tradition, 599–527 BCE	India
The Buddha (Siddhartha Gautama)	Modern estimate: d. about 400 BCE (traditionally 563–483)	India
Zhuangzi	The 4th century BCE	East Asia
Pythagoras	About 570–495 BCE	Greece and Rome
Plotinus	204–270 CE	Greece and Rome
Mary Baker Eddy	1821–1910 CE	The Americas
L. Ron Hubbard	1911–1986 CE	The Americas

R — The Reformers

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Yajnavalkya and the sages of the Upanishads	About the 8th–6th centuries BCE	India
Adi Shankara	About 788–820 CE	India
Ramanuja	The 11th–12th centuries CE	India
Kabir	About 1440–1518 CE (some say 1398–1448)	India
Dayananda Saraswati	1824–1883 CE	India
Gandhi	1869–1948 CE	India
Confucius (Kong Fuzi)	551–479 BCE	East Asia
Mozi	About 470–391 BCE	East Asia
Imhotep	About 2650 BCE	The ancient East
Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV)	About 1353–1336 BCE	The ancient East
Socrates	470–399 BCE	Greece and Rome

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
The hanifs: Zayd ibn Amr ibn Nufayl, Quss ibn Sa'ida, and Waraqa ibn Nawfal	The 6th – early 7th century CE	The Arabian Peninsula
Umayya ibn Abi al-Salt	d. about 626 CE	The Arabian Peninsula
The leading figures of Islamic renewal (Ghazali; Ibn Taymiyya; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab; al-Afghani, Abduh, and Rida; Nursi)	The 11th–20th centuries CE	The Islamic world
Charles Russell, then Rutherford	1852–1916 CE	The Americas
Ghazali	The 11th–12th centuries CE	Islam
Maimonides	The 12th century CE	Judaism
Thomas Aquinas	The 13th century CE	Christianity

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Martin Luther	1483–1546 CE	Western Christianity
Guru Amar Das, and Dayananda	The 16th and 19th centuries CE	Sikhism and Hinduism
Muhammad Abduh	1849–1905 CE	Modern Islam
Martin Luther King	1929–1968 CE	Christianity and civil rights

C — The Rejected Claimants

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Mani	216–274/277 CE	Iran
Mazdak	d. about 524–528 CE	Iran
The Bab (Ali Muhammad Shirazi)	1819–1850 CE	Iran
Hong Xiuquan	1814–1864 CE	East Asia
Sun Myung Moon	1920–2012 CE	East Asia
Empedocles	About 494–434 BCE	Greece and Rome

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Musaylima (Ibn Habib al-Hanafi)	d. 632/633 CE	The Arabian Peninsula
al-Aswad al-Ansi	d. 632 CE	The Arabian Peninsula
Sajah bint al-Harith	The 7th century CE	The Arabian Peninsula
Tulayha al-Asadi	d. 642 CE	The Arabian Peninsula
al-Mukhtar al-Thaqafi	d. 687 CE	The Islamic world
The Sudanese Mahdi (Muhammad Ahmad)	1844–1885 CE	The Islamic world
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad	1835–1908 CE	The Islamic world
Jim Jones	1931–1978 CE	The Americas
David Koresh	1959–1993 CE	The Americas

L — The Legendary and Epic Figures

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Rama	Epic	India
Krishna	Epic	India

Figure	Time	Tradition / arena
Laozi	The 6th century BCE, by tradition	East Asia
The kami of Shinto (Amaterasu) and the epic emperors of Japan (Jimmu . . .)	Legendary	East Asia
Adapa, and Ziusudra / Utnapishtim	Legendary	The ancient East
Orpheus	Legendary	Greece and Rome
Quetzalcoatl / Kukulkan	Legendary (with a possible conflation with a Toltec king)	The Americas
Deganawida, "the Peacemaker," and his sage Hiawatha	About the 12th–15th centuries CE	The Americas

The Special Cases—Where the Table Itself Teaches the Chapter's Lesson

Figure	Why does no single symbol contain them?
Jesus (Jesus Christ)	The clearest witness that classification changes with the observer: a prophet and messenger of firm resolve for Muslims, the incarnate Son for Christians, and a teacher whose messiahship is unestablished for Judaism—the one figure carries the first three symbols together, depending on whom you ask
The Pythia of Delphi (the oracles)	An office, not a person: an institutional seat of revelation occupied by women in succession for centuries—a reminder that "the supernatural intermediary" may be a post, not an individual

The Appendix's Conclusion: What Do the Numbers Say?

The sorting of the hundred-odd gives you three quick glimpses. The column of **the prophets (P)** is confined almost entirely to the Abrahamic house—so "prophethood," in this message-bearing sense, is an Abrahamic category at its core, while the other nations distributed themselves among founders, sages, and recipients of visions (we detailed what that signifies, and its limits, in the conclusion of Chapter 12). The column of **the rejected claimants (C)** is present in most ages down to our own—the phenomenon Chapter 13

examined has not closed. The column of **the reformers (R)** is the most widely spread across most of the civilizations—every living tradition has borne those who renew it from within. As for what lies beyond the numbers, that is no business of tables: **the table counts the claims, and the field of evidence weighs them.**

Appendix C — Glossary of Terms

Fifty terms that are the book's keys, arranged in four groups, with brief definitions according to the book's own usage

* First: Terms of the Religious Phenomenon and Its Study

Animism: the conception of the world as inhabited by living spirits and powers in beings and places—the oldest layer of belief (Chapter 8).

Shamanism: the system of the intermediary who crosses in spirit between the two worlds in a trance, as healer and diviner (Chapters 8 and 12).

Totemism: a community's bond to a sacred animal or plant emblem that represents its identity.

The withdrawn high god: the distant creator God whom the first peoples know and scarcely worship directly (Chapter 9 and the study on the One and the many).

Mana: the power flowing through persons and things, granting efficacy and awe (Oceania, Chapter 8).

Taboo: the forbidden thing that isolates what is charged with power from the common people.

The Dreamtime: the founding, ever-present parallel time of the indigenous peoples of Australia.

Tengrism: the religion of the eternal sky (Tengri) among the Turks of the steppe and their Mongols—a high god with no book and no law (Chapter 8).

The Axial Age: Jaspers's name for the centuries (about 800–200 BCE) that saw the great ethical religions and philosophies burst forth simultaneously (Chapter 9).

Syncretism: the blending of elements from different religions into one system (the religions of the African diaspora as a model).

Missionary and ethnic religions: the division of religions by whether they seek to spread themselves or are bound to a people they do not pass beyond (Chapter 11).

The six families: the book's descriptive map of the religions: Abrahamic; Dharmic; Taoist-Confucian; ethnic-animist; dualist-Gnostic; and new movements (the study on "Heavenly and Man-Made," and Chapter 8). **Descriptive neutrality:** the book's first pledge: to present every belief in its strongest form as its own people understand it, and its critique in its strongest form as its critics offer it (the Introduction).

* Second: Terms of the Eastern Houses

Brahman: the impersonal absolute reality in Hindu thought.

Atman: the deep self, with the great Upanishadic saying of its unity with Brahman.

Samsara: the turning wheel of repeated birth and death.

Karma: the automatic law of requital that runs the wheel: every act bears fruit.

Moksha: liberation from the wheel—the goal of the Indian house.

Dharma: the cosmic-moral order and the duty that follows from it (whence the name of the Dharmic family).
Nirvana: the extinguishing of the thirst and the exit from the wheel, in Buddhism.

The bodhisattva: the compassionate enlightened one who defers his own salvation for the salvation of all (the Mahayana).

Shruti and smriti: the two layers of the Indian text: "the heard," eternal and highest, and "the remembered," of lower authority (Chapters 15 and 16).

The Tao: "the Way" by which nature runs, in Chinese wisdom.

Tian: "Heaven" as a supreme moral order in Confucianism.

The kami: the venerated powers and spirits in Japanese Shinto.

Ahimsa: the strict Jain nonviolence whose influence reaches to Gandhi.

* Third: Terms of the Abrahamic House and Its Texts

The Tanakh: the Jewish scripture in its three divisions: the Torah, the Nevi'im, and the Ketuvim (Chapter 15).

The Masoretic text: the authoritative Hebrew text fixed by the Masoretic scribes (Chapter 16).

The Samaritan Torah: the text of the five books held by the Samaritan community, differing from the Masoretic—the book's laboratory case in the agreement of copies.

The Septuagint: the ancient Greek translation of the Tanakh that became Christianity's first Bible.

The Talmud: rabbinic Judaism's great commentary: the Mishnah (the codified law) and the Gemara (its

exposition), in its two recensions, Babylonian and Jerusalemite.

The Apocrypha: the books whose canonicity is disputed among the churches and councils.

The canon: the list of books a community holds authoritative as scripture.

Liturgy: the ordered system and rite of public worship.

Heresy: one community's label for whoever departs from its normative creed—the term of internal courts, not a neutral description (the chapter "What the Religions Said About One Another").

The isnad: the chain of a report's transmitters—the pillar of the Islamic apparatus of hadith criticism.

Tawatur (mass transmission): the transmission by a multitude whose collusion in a lie is impossible, from the like of them—with its rule: it conveys *that*, not *why* (the study on mass transmission).

The Isra'iliyyat: the narrations that seeped from Jewish and Christian sources into Islamic exegesis, and their internal critique (Chapters 15 and 16).

The qira'at: the transmitted, chained modes of reciting the Qur'anic text.

The founding event: the occurrence on which a tradition stands and by which it dates itself: the Exodus; the crucifixion and resurrection; the prophetic mission (Chapters 13, 16, and 19).

The Kuzari argument: Judah Halevi's argument from the mass witness of the Sinai revelation to the impossibility of its being planted (Chapters 15 and 19).

The Manifestations of God: the Baha'i doctrine of the divine will disclosing itself in successive messengers, the last of them Baha'u'llah (Chapter 8).

* Fourth: Terms of the Field of Evidence and the Great Questions

Agnosticism: the position "I do not know—and perhaps it cannot be known" (coined by Huxley; Chapters 2 and 17).

Deism: belief in a first Creator without revelation or laws (Chapter 17).

Pantheism: the doctrine that all existence is the manifestation of the one Real, or is identical with it (Chapter 9).

Henotheism: the worship of one god without denying the others—a middle station the scholars have recorded (the study on the One and the many).

Transcendence and anthropomorphism: the two poles of describing God: His exaltation above resembling His creation, or His being brought near through human attributes (Chapter 9).

Dualism: the tracing of good and evil to two facing principles (Zoroastrianism as the model; Chapters 8 and 21).

Gnosticism: the ancient esoteric currents of saving "knowledge," holding the disparity of the two worlds. **Theodicy:** "the vindication of divine justice": the literature of answering the problem of evil (Chapter 20). **The Euthyphro dilemma:** the oldest question of the relation between God and morality: does He command a thing because it is good, or is it good because He commanded it? (Chapter 22).

The god of the gaps: arguing for God from the gaps of science—and the careful believers' critique of it before their opponents' (Chapter 3).

Methodological naturalism: science's restriction of its tools to natural causes, without a verdict on what lies beyond them (Chapter 23).

Fine-tuning: the calibration of the universe's critical constants on which the modern design argument stands (Chapter 18).

The multiverse: the hypothesis of many universes, explaining the tuning without a designer—and its scale (Chapter 18).

Eschatology: the studies of the end of the world and the destiny after death (Chapter 24).

The Rule of the Braided Rope: the book's rule for the accumulation of clues: the great convictions are braided from strands, not from a single strand (Chapter 18).

The two-stage evidence: the book's division of the field of evidence: the evidence for God's existence first, then each religion's evidence for itself (Part VII).

The geography lottery: the bias of birth: that most people's religion follows their place of birth—with what does and does not follow from it (Chapter 5).

Appendix D — Balanced Further Reading

The four shelves: the heritage of religions-and-sects, the neutral academic introductions, the mother books of the believers, and the mother books of the irreligious—and the rules of reading before the lists

The rules of the shelf before the books—three we bound ourselves to in selecting, and commend to you in reading:

(1) Evenly: for every believing shelf there is a facing shelf, so do not read for one camp and try the other in absentia.

(2) The peaks, not the foothills: from each side we chose its strongest, not its most easily refuted—by the rule "whoever defeats the weakest of his opponents has not won."

(3) The genre before the verdict: classify a book before you believe it (with the skills of Chapter 7).

* The First Shelf: The Heritage of Religions-and-Sects and the Old Study of Religions

Biruni, *An Inquiry into What India Has to Say*: among the first fair studies in history of another nation's religion from within—the pride of method before method was born.

Shahrastani, *Religions and Sects*: the most mature medieval classification of the world's beliefs; and with it **Ibn Hazm, *al-Fisal*** (wider, and more polemical).

Maimonides, *The Guide for the Perplexed* (written in Arabic): the most famous book in history to carry our

book's concern—and very nearly its title: the perplexed person's guide between the text's surface and reason's demonstration, with an influence reaching Aquinas and European theology.

Ghazali, *The Deliverer from Error*: the autobiography of methodical doubt and examining the schools—the pillar of our Chapter 4.

Ghazali, *The Incoherence of the Philosophers* and **Ibn Rushd, *The Incoherence of the Incoherence***: the greatest philosophical debate in the heritage—on the world's eternity, causality, and the return—anticipating Hume on habit and causation; they are read together, not singly.

Ibn Rushd, *The Decisive Treatise* and **Ibn Taymiyya, *Averting the Conflict between Reason and Revelation***: the two poles of the heritage's battle of "reason and revelation"—demonstrative interpretation for the first, the denial of any conflict for the second—and they are the deepest ancestors of the modern models of religion and science.

Ibn Tufayl, *Hayy ibn Yaqzan*: the immortal thought experiment—how far does reason reach alone?

Augustine, *Confessions*: the mother model of the literature of the perplexed person's journey from doubt to faith.

* The Second Shelf: Modern Neutral Academic Introductions

Huston Smith, *The World's Religions*: the broadest serious, sympathetic popular introduction to the great religions. **William A. Young, *The World's Religions: Worldviews and Contemporary Issues***: the standard university survey built on seven worldview questions asked of every religion in one order—description before evaluation: the classroom's kin to this book's single standard. **Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane***: the most famous work of the twentieth century's greatest historian of religions. **Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy***: the analysis of the core of religious experience ("the awesome, alluring mystery"). **William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience***: the psychological founding of the study of religiosity as a living phenomenon, without contempt and without sanctification. **Émile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life***: the sociological founding. **Karen Armstrong, *A History of God***: the narrative of the God-idea's development in the Abrahamic religions—read with attention to its own thesis. **Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age***: the most massive philosophical work of our generation on the question: how did unbelief become a live option?—its author a Catholic, and his work everyone's reference: a model of fairness. **Muhammad Abdullah Draz, *Religion*** and **Firas al-Sawwah, *The Religion of Man***: the two modern Arabic summits on the question of religion's nature and origin—from two facing methodological shores, and reading them together is a lesson in

balance. **Kim Knott, *Hinduism: A Very Short Introduction*** and **Damien Keown, *Buddhism: A Very Short Introduction*** (Oxford): the two best brief neutral introductions to the Indian houses.

* The Third Shelf: The Mother Books of the Believers—Exposition, Defense, and Journey

Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book Lambda, then **Avicenna, *al-Isharat*** (the Proof of the Truthful—with its widest contemporary Arabic exposition in its Sadrian formulation: *Burhan al-Siddiqin* by Muhammad Rida al-Lawati, of the Shia philosophical school), then **Aquinas, the Five Ways** (*Summa Theologiae* I, q. 2, a. 3): the lineage of the great demonstrations from their springs. **Udayana, *Nyayakusumanjali***: the shelf's surprise—a Hindu philosopher (10th–11th century CE) framing methodical proofs of the Lord's existence against his Buddhist deniers: strong witness that the debate over the evidence of God's existence is worldwide, crossing beyond the Abrahamic religions. **Pascal, *Pensées***: the human being's condition suspended between greatness and misery, with the famous wager. **Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling***: believing existentialism—faith as a leap, not the conclusion of a proof: the facing pole to all the books of evidence, from inside faith itself. **Tolstoy, *A Confession***: one of history's greatest novelists tells of meaning's collapse at the summit of his glory and the journey of his search—the most honest modern text on existential perplexity. **Hans Küng, *Does God Exist?*** (1978): the most massive critical Catholic theological

answer to modern atheism (from Descartes to Nietzsche and Freud) by a pen that knew doubt from within. And his *Islam: Past, Present and Future* is a model of a Christian reading Islam fairly while keeping his disagreement. **C. S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain*** and **Plantinga, *God, Freedom, and Evil***: the two summits of the Christian answer to evil, popular and academic. **Swinburne, *The Existence of God*** and **Craig** (the revival of the kalam cosmological argument under its explicit name): the summits of contemporary academic defense. **Jalal al-Din Rumi, *The Masnavi***: the summit of the path of mystical taste—"the truth is tasted, not only demonstrated"—with its counterparts in every tradition. **Mustafa Mahmoud, *My Journey from Doubt to Faith* and *A Dialogue with My Atheist Friend***: the gentlest of modern Arabic letters in the subject. **Sami Ameri** (*The Proofs of God's Existence*; *The Problem of Evil and the Existence of God*) and **Abdullah al-Ujayri, *Shumu' al-Nahar* (Candles of Daylight)** and **John Lennox** (in Arabic through translations): the most rigorous contemporary apologetics in and into Arabic. **Alija Izetbegović, *Islam Between East and West***: the most refined philosophical formulation of the argument from civilizational fruit.

* The Fourth Shelf: The Mother Books of the Irreligious and the Critics

Lucretius, *On the Nature of Things*: the most famous ancient materialist text—an epic poem explaining the cosmos without intervening gods. **al-Ma'arri, *al-Luzumiyyat***: the summit of Arabic doubt in verse. **Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*** (Kemp Smith edition): the most important critique of the design argument in history, its three-voiced dialogue structure kin to our book's method: every position in its holder's own voice. **Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason***: the methodical demolition of the three demonstrations—then the moral refounding of faith in the *Critique of Practical Reason*: a sword on both shores. **Feuerbach, *The Essence of Christianity***: the projection thesis on which Marx and Freud built. **Freud, *The Future of an Illusion***: the founding text of the psychological explanation. **Nietzsche, *The Gay Science* and *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*** (tr. Kaufmann): the announcement of the death of God and its consequences. **Russell, *Why I Am Not a Christian***: the most famous popular formulation of the twentieth century's objections. **Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker***: his most rigorous book and the furthest from oratory—the exposition of cumulative selection in answer to Paley; **and *The God Delusion***: the most influential book of the New Atheism—with the caution that even atheism's academics record: it is rhetorical more than demonstrative (and whole replies have been devoted to counting its factual errors—such as David Marshall's list of "160 errors"—from the

literature of Christian apologetics, to be read by its genre). **Baggini, *Atheism: A Very Short Introduction***: the best presentation of atheism "from inside," in a sober, non-polemical register. **Mackie, *The Miracle of Theism*** (in English) and **Graham Oppy**: the most precise academic critiques of the demonstrations—and for whoever wants the mountain's summit, *Arguing about Gods*. Its gateway is now available in Arabic: ***The Best Argument Against God***. **Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*—the chapter "Rebellion"**: the most eloquent formulation of the objection from evil in the history of literature—by the pen of a believer, and that very paradox is a lesson in our method.

* Ten, if You Read Nothing Else—The Seeker's Balanced Bag

If time is short, here are ten available in Arabic that cover the shores evenly: *The Deliverer from Error*; *The Guide for the Perplexed* (selections); Tolstoy's *A Confession*; Hume's *Dialogues*; James's *Varieties*; the "Rebellion" chapter of *Karamazov*; *The Idea of the Holy*; al-Sawwah's *The Religion of Man* together with Draz's *Religion* (counted as one, for their facing); *Shumu' al-Nahar*; and *A Secular Age* (even in summary). **And above all the lists**: the founding texts themselves, which Part V indexed—from Gilgamesh and the Book of the Dead to the Gita, the Dhammapada, and the Tao, to the Tanakh, the New Testament, and the Qur'an—those are the mountains around which all the books circle, and your direct reading in them no intermediary can replace.

Appendix E — The Sources of This Book and Its Documentation

A statement of account to the reader: where what is in the book came from, by what rules its sources were used, and the state of its documentation and its promise

The five kinds of the library. This book was built on a library we deliberately made multi-housed, for the charter of neutrality cannot stand on a one-colored library:

(1) the founding texts themselves, in their authoritative translations—our first rule being that a belief is known from the texts of its own people before the commentaries of others;

(2) the heritage of religions-and-sects and comparison, old and new, from the Muslims' pioneering works in the subject to the contemporary academic curricula;

(3) the methodologically neutral academic study of the history of religions and its sciences (including work by scholars who proceed from no creed);

(4) the literature of the careful believers of every house: expounding their doctrines as they themselves state them, in defense, debate, and internal critique—and from every school its own voice, not its opponent's voice about it;

(5) and the literature of the critics and the irreligious, in its mother books, not in scraps—for an argument presented for examination must be taken from the home of its people.

The declared rules of use. Rules ran through the whole book, which we recall here gathered: **know a belief from its own people** first. **The tinted glass of opponents and narrators**: wherever our knowledge of a people comes from the books of their enemies we alerted you—Manichaeism, the Charvakas, the paganism of the Peninsula, and the religions of the Americas are among what we read through tinted glass. **The single standard**: whatever we tried one claim by, we tried its counterparts by, for everyone. **The layers of the text**: text, then commentary, then seeped narrations, never mixed (Chapter 15). **The traditions presented at their firmest degrees**: an argument is tried at its strongest and championed by no one at its flimsiest. **And the author's declared leaning**, wherever present, is stated in the sections marked "A Word from the Author"—declared, never preempting.

The state of the documentation, and its promise. In this preliminary edition, quotation has mostly been by meaning, anchored by the names of figures, books, and major loci inside the text (sura, book, dialogue, and study), with care that nothing be attributed to a speaker that his words, among his own people, cannot bear. Cautions have been set in their places wherever a matter is disputed or of uncertain documentation. **And there remains, on the account of the complete edition**, what we promise the reader explicitly: a page-by-page documentation pass that grounds every quotation-by-meaning in its locus in a specified edition; expert human review of the chapters of highest sensitivity (the texts, the religions' own evidence, the foretellings,

and Satan); and a final stylistic edit. So if you find in this edition a quotation in need of its citation, that is a known debt, not an unknown oversight—a candor we judged the charter of "honesty within the limits of knowledge" to require.

A last invitation. This appendix is a statement of account, not a reading list. Whoever wants to build a library of their own will find Appendix D spreading the four shelves evenly—and our counsel, with which we closed the chapters of the tools: do not read about a people from their opponents alone. Do not read for your own camp alone. And hold every book—this one first—to its charter.

Appendix F — The Major Claims on the Sevenfold Ladder of Examination

Twelve cards presenting this book's greatest claims—believing and irreligious alike—on the one method: the claim, then its strongest case, then the strongest objection, then the strongest reply, then what is established, then what is not, then the Seeker's Question. The book's yield in a few pages; the detail in its places

How to read the cards. Each card is a faithful compression of what its chapter laid out with both sides' arguments at their fullest. Where we abbreviate, it is for the card's narrowness, not to favor a side—and if you want to judge, go back to the place. Notice that the claims alternate between the two shores—**the method is one for everyone.**

Card 1—The universe has a transcendent cause (the argument from coming-to-be) ·

Chapter 18 **The claim:** whatever begins has a cause; the universe began; so it has a cause not of its own kind. **Its strongest case:** modern physics' agreement on the beginning of the observed universe, together with the difficulties of an infinite regress. **The strongest objection:** the beginning is our universe's beginning, not existence's; and the pre–Big Bang models are open. **The strongest reply:** pushing the beginning back a step does not cancel the question but defers it, and a first cause, precisely by being first, does not come to be.

What is established: that the question of the first cause is alive and physics has not dissolved it, and that the transcendent answer is rationally coherent. **What is not established:** the passage from "a first cause" to "a personal God" by this argument alone.

The Seeker's Question: where is the bridge between the cause and the One who is worshiped?

Card 2—The universe is tuned for life in a way that intimates purpose (fine-tuning) · Chapter 18 and the study on physics **The claim:** the values of the cosmic constants have so narrow a window that purpose outweighs chance. **Its strongest case:** the acknowledgment of the phenomenon itself by physicists of both camps. **The strongest objection:** the multiverse (a narrow window is hit given enough throws), and the anthropic bias of observation (we can observe only a universe that permits observing). **The strongest reply:** the multiverse is an unobserved hypothesis summoned to explain the tuning, and so carries a burden equal to it. And the observation bias explains why we see the tuning, not why it exists. **What is established:** the phenomenon is real and acknowledged, and both explanations carry an unobserved commitment. **What is not established:** that purpose is the only possible explanation.

The Seeker's Question: which commitment is lighter—a designer, or universes never seen?

Card 3—Pointless suffering is evidence against a merciful, omnipotent God (the problem of evil—the evidential form) · Chapter 20 **The claim:** the quantity of suffering that appears purposeless makes it more probable that there is no governor with the claimed attributes. **Its strongest case:** the enormous natural evil (earthquakes, children's diseases, millions of years of predation) that human freedom does not explain. **The strongest objection:** the limits of our grasp of purposes (what we see no purpose in is not therefore purposeless), the training of souls, the value of freedom, and the hereafter as a deferred scale. **The strongest reply:** if every evil can bear a hidden purpose, the believing claim has become unexaminable, and the mercy described is emptied of meaning. **What is established:** that the strict logical form (evil contradicts God) is abandoned by most philosophers, and the evidential form remains alive and heavy. **What is not established:** that evil refutes God; nor that the answers remove its felt weight.

The Seeker's Question: why should justice require the deferral of itself ?

Card 4—Naturalism explains as much with less (natural sufficiency) · the study on the facing mirror; Chapters 3 and 23 **The claim:** we do not deny God; we no longer need Him—and the hypothesis with fewer commitments wins. **Its strongest case:** the successive success of natural explanations for what used to be attributed to the unseen (Oppy's formulation).

The strongest objection: the natural explanation answers "how" and leaves "why is there anything," "why is the universe intelligible," and "why is morality binding" standing—and simplicity is not truth. **The strongest reply:** these remaining questions may be questions without answers, not questions whose answer is God. **What is established:** that natural explanation toppled the god of the gaps, not the God of the cause, and that the standard here is one of preponderance by theoretical virtues. **What is not established:** that natural sufficiency covers the questions of origin, meaning, and obligation.

The Seeker's Question: are they questions without an answer, or questions whose answer we refuse?

Card 5—Morality has a foundation that cannot stand without a legislator above humankind (the moral argument) · Chapter 22 **The claim:** absolute moral obligation needs a reference above convention and selection. **Its strongest case:** our certainty of injustice's wrongness—a certainty of a kind we do not derive from facts—and naturalism's inability to explain the obligation rather than merely the feeling. **The strongest objection:** the Euthyphro dilemma (does He forbid it for its wrongness, or is it wrong by His forbidding?), and morality as a system without God (Buddhism, and the ethics of the irreligious). **The strongest reply:** the good is an attribute of God's own nature, not a command external to Him, so the dilemma dissolves; and the existence of moral people without God establishes the knowledge, not the foundation. **What is established:**

that the moral core is shared and implanted, and that the explanation of its bindingness is open. **What is not established:** that obligation entails God to the exclusion of the irreligious alternatives of moral realism.

The Seeker's Question: in the name of what scale do I condemn injustice absolutely?

Card 6—The failure of the nation of eloquence to match the Qur'an is evidence of its source (rhetorical inimitability) · Chapter 19 **The claim:** an explicit, graduated challenge to the people most able in language and most motivated, left without a serious match. **Its strongest case:** the documented history of the challenge and the failure, and the opponents' own testimonies of taste. **The strongest objection:** uniqueness of style does not entail the unseen (every genius is unique). The judgment is one of taste, out of reach for the non-Arab. And matches are said to have existed and been suppressed. **The strongest reply:** the claim is not uniqueness but collective failure under the maximal motive for centuries. The Arabic taste is the competent court, and it has ruled; and the suppression claim has no witness. **What is established:** that the challenge is a historical fact, and the failure a phenomenon in need of explanation. **What is not established:** for the non-Arab and the non-taster, the evidence remains a report from its people.

The Seeker's Question: how is an evidence of taste to be adjudicated in a worldwide court?

Card 7—The sacred texts preceded science to its truths (scientific inimitability) · the study on scientific inimitability **The claim:** allusions in the text agree with discoveries unknown at the time of its coming down. **Its strongest case:** passages whose linguistic fit with modern knowledge both sides concede is strange. **The strongest objection:** every "inimitability" was announced after the discovery, not before it. Most nations make the same claim for their texts; and the requirement of consistency binds its people to the inimitability of others. **The strongest reply:** some passages carry an expression not explained by the familiar idiom of their age. Retreat from excess does not annul the root. And the difference in density among the texts is considerable. **What is established:** that institutional excess has harmed the claim, and that distinguishing allusion from assertion is obligatory. **What is not established:** that any particular passage binds the fair-minded dissenter conclusively.

The Seeker's Question: can something serve as evidence that can be read only after it is known?

Card 8—The resurrection of Christ is a historical event attested by witnesses (the argument from testimony) · the study on testimony, Chapter 19 **The claim:** the empty tomb, the appearance testimonies, and the disciples' transformation are facts nothing explains but the event. **Its strongest case:** the antiquity of the First Corinthians testimony, and the witnesses' shedding of their own blood. **The strongest objection:** the testimony comes from inside the circle; visionary

experiences have psychological explanations; the accounts develop across the Gospels; and martyrdom establishes sincerity, not truth. **The strongest reply:** the multiplicity of the witnesses, their gathering, and the nearness of the time narrow the alternative explanations, and the sudden collective transformation needs a cause of its own size. **What is established:** that the disciples sincerely believed something that changed them, and that the testimony is among the genre's oldest documents. **What is not established:** that the only explanation of this belief is the occurrence of the resurrection as described.

The Seeker's Question: how many truthful witnesses does it take to establish what breaks the ordinary course?

Card 9—The earlier books foretold Muhammad (the foretellings) · the study on foretellings, Chapter 19 **The claim:** passages in the Tanakh and the New Testament fit Muhammad in description, place, and function. **Its strongest case:** the accumulation of witnesses (Paran, "like Moses," the Paraclete) together with internal readings by the text's own people that serve one another. **The strongest objection:** the text's own people read the passages in their original contexts otherwise, and the same method produced the Christ for the refusing Jews and Mani out of the Paraclete—"an elastic machine." **The strongest reply:** a rope braided from multiple witnesses is stronger than a single witness, and the machine objection is tested by the five rules, not wholesale. **What is established:** that the genre "the earlier

foretells the later" is worldwide, and that some witnesses are stronger than others. **What is not established:** a single witness that binds the fair-minded people of the text.

The Seeker's Question: by what rule do I tell a real foretelling from a retroactive reading?

Card 10—Justice runs by karma and rebirth, not by a deferred reckoning · Chapters 22 and 24 **The claim:** every act has its fruit by a self-operating cosmic law across the births, so there is no evil without desert. **Its strongest case:** it unties the problem of evil (every suffering is a desert), and it fits the shared retributive intuition with no need of a judge. **The strongest objection:** whence the first ignorance that started the cycle? A child's suffering is desert for a life it does not remember—what justice is there in a punishment without memory? Rebirth without an abiding self (in the Buddhist reading) empties the desert of its bearer. **The strongest reply:** a cycle without beginning is like the universe for the eternalists, and memory is not a condition of justice on a cosmic rather than personal scale. **What is established:** that karma is an internally coherent solution to the problem of evil—at the price of the question of the start. **What is not established:** that justice without memory and without a self is justice in the sense we seek.

The Seeker's Question: which is heavier—the deferral of justice, or a justice unknown to the one it is done upon?

Card 11—The distribution of religions by birth annuls any religion's claim to the truth (religious parity and the geography lottery) · Chapter 5 and the study on the facing mirror **The claim:** so long as every person's faith is predicted by their geography, the religions are culture, not truth. **Its strongest case:** the overwhelming statistics of religious inheritance, and the parity of certainty's heat and its experiences among contradictory believers. **The strongest objection:** the spread of mistaken conceptions along geographic lines does not annul correct knowledge for whoever it reached. The mechanism explains susceptibility, not truth—and the argument turns on inherited irreligion too. **The strongest reply:** true, it does not annul; but it demolishes naive complacency and obliges examination by a single standard. **What is established:** that inheritance suffices as evidence for no one—believer or irreligious—and that the Islamic tradition itself debated "the faith of the imitator." **What is not established:** that the distribution judges the truth of any of them.

The Seeker's Question: had I been born there—by what scale would I have examined what I was born into?

Card 12—The Qur'an is preserved letter for letter as it came down (the preservation of the text) · Chapter 16 and the study on transmission **The claim:** a single text that arrived by two mutually reinforcing mechanisms (hearts and lines) and a living institution of certification, with no competing recensions.

Its strongest case: the early manuscripts (the Birmingham folios and Sanaa) in their agreement; the

millions of memorizers; and the documented discipline of the Uthmanic standardization. **The strongest objection:** the multiple qira'at; the reports of the Companions' differing codices; the lower layer of the Sanaa palimpsest; and the standardization itself as a burning of alternatives. **The strongest reply:** the qira'at are transmitted modes of recitation with their chains, not competing recensions. The Companions' codices were personal and pre-standardization. The lower layer does not step outside the bounds of the qira'at. And the standardization standardized the written form, not an invention. **What is established:** that the Qur'anic apparatus of transmission gathers—by the craft's declared criteria—properties that gather for no other text, which its supporters and most scholars of transmission concede in the specific matter of arrival (and the revisionists contest). **What is not established:** that soundness of transmission establishes the truth of the content—that is a condition, not a proof.

The Seeker's Question: if I grant the arrival—what does the arrival itself oblige me to?

The appendix's conclusion. Notice what the twelve cards share: **what is established is less than what each claim's holders claim, and more than what its opponents concede**—and that is exactly the region in which honest weighing is built, and in which the orators of both sides do not live. You may make your own cards, for every claim you meet after this book, on the same ladder—and that is the most useful thing you can carry away from it.

Appendix G — The Religions in Numbers: The 2010 and 2020 Data

Three axes from one source and one method: the size of the religious groups in 2010 and in 2020, the direction of change across the decade, and what the conversion data disclose and what they leave open

---

These figures are instruments of description and comparison, not scales for the truth of beliefs.

* A Methodological Caution: What Do These Numbers Measure?

This appendix relies on the report of the Pew Research Center published in 2025 on the change in the global religious landscape between 2010 and 2020. The Center gathered more than 2,700 censuses, surveys, and population registers, covering 201 countries and territories containing 99.98% of the world's population, and then classified the results into seven large categories.

For the comparison to be sound, Pew re-estimated the 2010 data by the same method used for the 2020 data, particularly in measuring religion in China and in classifying the folk religions. We therefore adopt here the revised values for both years from the same series, and exclude every later projection beyond 2020, and every table that mixes sources or definitions not belonging to a single series.

These are numbers for identity or affiliation as people declare them in censuses and surveys. They are not a direct measure of the depth of belief or the regularity

of practice. The category "religiously unaffiliated" includes the atheist, the agnostic, and the person who answers that he has no religion or no particular affiliation. While "other religions" is an umbrella gathering many traditions that may not be read as a single religion.

* The First Table: The Global Religious Composition in 2010 and 2020

Category	2010	Share, 2010	2020	Share, 2020
Christians	~2.18 billion	~30.6%	~2.3 billion	~28.8%
Muslims	~1.7 billion	~23.9%	~2.0 billion	~25.6%
Religiously unaffiliated	~1.6 billion	~23.3%	~1.9 billion	~24.2%
Hindus	~1.03 billion	~14.7%	~1.2 billion	~14.9%
Buddhists	~343 million	~4.9%	~324 million	~4.1%
Jews	~13.8 million	~0.2%	~14.8 million	~0.2%
Other religions	~186 million	~2.6%	~172 million	~2.2%

* ***Note:*** *the percentages may differ slightly from 100% because of rounding. And the figures are rounded to the nearest tenth of a billion or of a million, according to the size of the category.*

World population rose from about 7.02 billion to about 7.89 billion across the decade; so the absolute number of most categories increased even where their relative share declined. The proportion affiliated with a religion fell from 76.7% to 75.8%. Christians remained the largest category, Muslims were the fastest growing, and Buddhism was the only large category whose number decreased.

What Explains the Change?

No single factor explains this movement. The analysis distinguishes **natural increase**—the difference between births and deaths, affected by age structure, fertility, and life expectancy—from **switching** from one religious identity to another or to no affiliation. Migration, for its part, changes the maps of countries and regions; it does not change the world total of any category.

Most Muslim growth came from a young age structure and comparatively higher fertility. Departure from Christianity, by contrast, was the most prominent factor in the decline of the Christians' share, and the same movement drove the rise of the unaffiliated despite their older age profile and lower fertility. Hindus maintained a share close to steady, while among Buddhists the effect of age structure and low fertility combined with a net departure from the identity. And Jewish growth was affected by an older age structure.

These are conclusions at the global level. The picture of any particular country may differ greatly according to the history of migration, politics, the method of measurement, and change between generations.

Religious Switching: What Do the Surveys Disclose?

"Switching" here means that the category a person says he was raised in differs from his present religious identity. It does not include movement within the same large category, such as a Christian moving from one denomination to another or a Muslim from one school to another. To track the more recent changes, Pew analyzed data on adults between the ages of 18 and 54 in 117 countries and territories, which contained 92% of the world's population in that age group in 2010.

In these data, for every adult raised with no religion who then joined one, 3.2 adults had moved in the opposite direction. Christians lost on balance through switching: 3.1 left for every one who joined, and most of those leaving became unaffiliated. Among Buddhists, 1.8 left for every one who joined. Switching to or from Islam, and to or from Hinduism, was less common worldwide, so its overall effect on the size of the two categories remained limited.

These ratios do not tell us why an individual changed his identity, nor do they cover all countries to the same degree, and they should not be turned into a complete global record of apostasy or of conversion. They are most sensitive in environments where declaring a change of religion is difficult.

The Scale: What Do the Numbers Say, and What Do They Leave Open?

The numbers answer questions of size and direction within a specified year, definition, and source. They do not by themselves answer whether a creed is true, or an

experience deep, or an effect good. A community may grow by births, or shrink by aging, or have its share changed by switching or migration, without any of that being doctrinal proof in any direction.

This appendix therefore holds to three rules: **one unified source. Two measured, comparable years; and an explicit separation between demographic description and judgment about truth.** As for what lies beyond 2020, it remains a field for conditional projection—not a present figure displayed as though it were a count.

Principal source: Pew Research Center, "How the Global Religious Landscape Changed from 2010 to 2020," June 9, 2025, DOI: 10.58094/fj71-ny11.

* A Note on the Longer Span

Comparable worldwide counting is recent, and estimates for the decades before 2010 come from other series with other definitions—chiefly the *World Christian Encyclopedia*, whose base is broader than Pew's. So a century-long table would mix sources and definitions, which is precisely what the rule declared above excludes. What the longer span does show, in broad outline and without exact figures, is a picture the sources agree on: the great growth in absolute numbers of the world's religious populations along with the growth of world population. The rise of the unaffiliated as a category from the middle of the twentieth century; and the shift of Christianity's center of gravity from Europe toward Africa and the global South.

* **One last lesson the numbers impose on the seeker:** much of what is said in gatherings about "a religion's spread" or "people's flight from their religion" consists of figures with no source—so demand the source, the definition, and the year of measurement before you believe any figure, and apply that rule to the figures of this very appendix.

Appendix G — Part Two: The Strength of Faith, Belonging, and Commitment to the Teachings — A Comparison by Surveys, Not Impressions

Two Cautions Before Measuring

First—what do we measure? No one measures "strength of faith" directly; the international surveys (Pew, the World Values Survey, and the regional barometers) measure four **behavioral and self-reported indicators**, gathered into a "commitment index": Is religion "very important" in your life? Do you pray daily? Do you attend communal worship weekly? Do you believe in God "with absolute certainty"?—to which is added the retention indicator (the share of those born into a religion who remain in it).

Second—the indicators are not neutral among the religions. The question "belief in God with certainty" is meaningless to a Buddhist with no God on his path. "Weekly attendance" is a pillar of Christianity and Islam (Sunday / Friday) and not of Hinduism, which worships at home. And a Jew may belong with iron firmness while not believing in God—each religion defines "commitment" in its own image (creed here, practice there, identity yonder), and the table mostly measures with a ruler Abrahamic in shape. Read it under that constraint.

The Table: Commitment Indicators by Religion—Worldwide Ranges (Pew 2012–2021, and the World Values Survey)

Religion	"Religion is very important in my life"	Daily prayer	Weekly attendance at communal worship	Belief in God with certainty	Remaining in the religion of upbringing	Commitment to distinctive teachings (as measured)
Muslims	**The highest worldwide**: 80–97% in sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and the Arab region; 20–50% in Central Asia, the Balkans, and among Europe's migrants	40–80% (all five prayers, lower than that)	40–70% for Friday prayer (men far higher)	85–98%	**The highest** (>90%)	Ramadan fasting: ~93% (Pew 2012); zakat: ~77%; the prohibitions of alcohol and pork: widely kept

Religion	"Religion is very important in my life"	Daily prayer	Weekly attendance at communal worship	Belief in God with certainty	Remaining in the religion of upbringing	Commitment to distinctive teachings (as measured)
Christians	**The most divergent**: 80–95% in Africa and the Philippines; 50–70% in Latin America and America; 10–25% in Western Europe	60–90% Africa; ~55% America; 10–30% Europe	Nigeria ~89%; Poland ~40–50%; America ~30% (declining); Sweden and Denmark <5%	80–95% Africa; ~60% America; 15–35% Western Europe	~75% worldwide; lowest in the West (about three leave for each joiner)	Lent and tithing: middling-to-weak commitment outside the conservative communities

Religion	"Religion is very important in my life"	Daily prayer	Weekly attendance at communal worship	Belief in God with certainty	Remaining in the religion of upbringing	Commitment to distinctive teachings (as measured)
Hindus	~80% (India, 2021)	~60% pray daily (Pew India 2021: 59%)—a domestic devotion	No indicator (worship is domestic; monthly temple visits common)	~97% believe in God; ~77% in karma	High (~97% in India)	Weekly and seasonal fasting: widespread; vegetarianism: ~40%
Buddhists	**The lowest—in the available surveys—among the**	Varying; rites more than "prayer"	Weak (no weekly communal worship	Not applicable	Low in East Asia (leakage to irreligion)—	The five precepts: uneven; temporary monkhood in

Religion	"Religion is very important in my life"	Daily prayer	Weekly attendance at communal worship	Belief in God with certainty	Remaining in the religion of upbringing	Commitment to distinctive teachings (as measured)
	major religions: Japan 10–15%; Korea ~20%; Thailand, Myanmar, and Sri Lanka 80–95%		structurally)		high in Southeast Asia	Thailand nearly universal for men
Jews	Israel: ~30% very important (the Haredim	~30% America	~20% America; Israel by community	~40% America with certainty;	Middling; an ethnic belonging that	Kashrut and the Sabbath: ~20% America; the

Religion	"Religion is very important in my life"	Daily prayer	Weekly attendance at communal worship	Belief in God with certainty	Remaining in the religion of upbringing	Commitment to distinctive teachings (as measured)
	~100%, the secular ~5%); America ~30%			~25% of America's Jews do not believe in God and are Jews by identity	outlives belief	Haredim ~100%
The unaffiliated	5–15% (yet ~30% of them in America	10–20%	~5%	10–35%	**The lowest**: they lose by fertility	—

Religion	"Religion is very important in my life"	Daily prayer	Weekly attendance at communal worship	Belief in God with certainty	Remaining in the religion of upbringing	Commitment to distinctive teachings (as measured)
	believe in God with certainty, and many in China practice folk rites)				and gain by joining	

* What the Table Says—Six Facts

(1) The divergence among regions is greater than the divergence among religions. A Nigerian Christian is nearer in commitment to a Nigerian Muslim (both above 85%) than to a Swedish Christian (below 10%). And a Thai Buddhist is nearer to a Pakistani Muslim than to a Japanese Buddhist—**geography, income, and security predict commitment better than the religion's name does.**

(2) And that is the most famous law of the contemporary sociology of religion—"existential security" (Norris and Inglehart): the greater the economic, medical, and social security, the lower the religious commitment—the poorest and least secure countries are the most religious (Africa and South Asia) and the richest and best insured the least (Scandinavia and Japan)—**whatever the religion**. With the standing exception of America (rich and religious), explained by "the free religious market" and the strictness thesis.

(3) Yet a net difference remains for Islam. With region and income held fixed, Muslims remain consistently higher in commitment than their non-Muslim neighbors in the same place (in Africa and Europe alike)—which the scholars attribute to **the daily walls** (five prayers, a communal month of fasting, and food prohibitions lived every day) that make the religion a practice rather than an opinion, and to the weak separation of religion from identity.

(4) And the age gap is worldwide except in one place. The young (under 40) are less committed than their elders in most of the world's countries (Pew 2018: a significant difference in 41 of 106 countries)—**except sub-Saharan Africa**, where there is no gap or it tilts toward the young.

So the future of commitment is African, as much as the future of the numbers is African.

(5) Belonging outlives belief. A quarter of America's Jews do not believe in God and count themselves Jews. Most of Japan's temple-goers do not call themselves religious. And millions of European Christians are "cultural Christians" without a church—religion remains an identity and a rite of passage (birth, marriage, and death) after conviction departs. **And Islam is, so far, the religion least exposed to this split**, though the surveys have begun to record the "cultural Muslim" in the diaspora and in some regional countries.

(6) And commitment to the distinctive teachings follows "the cost of leaving," not the truth of the belief. People fast Ramadan who do not pray (~93% against ~40–60%) because the fast is public and communal and its abandonment visible. A Haredi keeps the Sabbath in a Haredi neighborhood and drops it in New York—religious behavior is the fruit of **community and social visibility** as much as of certainty, which the strictness thesis calls "the cost that preserves belonging."

* The Scale—and What the Surveys Do Not Measure

These tables measure what people say about themselves and what they do in public—and they do not measure what is in hearts: the silent person in Sweden may be deeper in faith than the faster who fasts under the neighbors' eyes, and no survey can tell them apart. The seeker's rule stands: **intensity of faith does not testify to its truth**—for sincerity is not truth, as you know—it testifies to the strength of the community, the walls, and the need. And whoever argues for their religion's truth from its followers' commitment has argued from the fruit, not the root—and we weighed the fruit in its place. **And the question that remains for the seeker:** if commitment follows poverty, fear, and community more than it follows argument—**is your own faith the fruit of examination, or the fruit of position?**—which is the last thing a person asks themselves in this book, and the first thing they ought to.

Appendix H — The Book's Summary in a Few Pages: The Simplified Comparison

For the hurried reader, and for the one who has finished the journey and wants to carry its provision in a pocket—the whole book in six panels, with no verdict

---

The Book in Five Lines

- **Its question:** if a human being is born into an inherited religion, how do they know—for themselves—which religion most deserves to be followed?
- **Its answer:** it does not tell you what to choose; it gives you **a map** of what human beings have believed and **a single scale** to weigh them all—and then it steps aside.
- **Its charter:** every belief presented in its strongest form and then its strongest critique; the distinction of text from history from narrative from myth; every chapter closed with a question, not a verdict; "we do not know" where we do not know; and respect for every belief.
- **Its great tool:** "the sevenfold ladder of examination": the claim → its strongest case → the strongest objection → the strongest reply → what is established → what is not established → the Seeker's Question.
- **The author's opinion** is confined to declared paragraphs called "A Word from the Author," and does not govern the main text.

The Road the Book Travels (Nine Parts)

Part	Its question	What it gives you
1. The Question	Why is the human being religious at all?	That religiosity is a universal human phenomenon, with four explanations, none of which settles truth
2. The Seeker's Tools	How do I think, which biases blind me, and by what scale do I compare?	25 rules in a single "toolkit"—the heart of the book
3. The Map	What have human beings believed, across the civilizations?	The history of the religions, the meanings of "God," magic and the evil eye, and preaching
4. The Messengers and Intermediaries	Who said they came with a message, and how do we read the claim?	111 figures on one map, and miracles on the scale
5. The Texts	What are the sacred books, and how did they reach us?	A comparison on 12 axes, and eight criteria of transmission
6. The Other Face	What did those who did not believe say?	The history of doubt and atheism, with fairness
7. The Field of Evidence	Is there evidence for God's	The demonstrations and their replies,

Part	Its question	What it gives you
	existence? And by what does each religion argue for itself?	and a scale declared before the verdict
8. The Great Questions	Fate, evil, Satan, morality, science, death	Every question in every religion, by a single standard
9. The Decision and the Road	What are my options, and how do I treat those who differ?	The manners of searching, of taking one's time, and of accepting the other

* The Simplified Comparison—The Great Religions on Seven Axes

(The table presents what each religion says of itself, and judges among none of them)

A) The Abrahamic Family

Axis	Christianity	Islam	Judaism
God	One in three persons; incarnate in Christ	One and Only; no intermediary and no incarnation	One; a covenant with a people
Founder	Jesus Christ—himself the center of	Muhammad—a delivering seal	Moses and the patriarchs—deliverers

Axis	Christian-ity	Islam	Judaism
	the reli-gion		
Text	The Bible in its two testaments	The Qur'an—it-self the mir-acle	The Tanakh and its commen-taries (the Talmud)
The prob-lem	Sin	Idolatry and heed-lessness	Breaking the cove-nant
Salvation	Redemp-tion by faith and grace	Monothe-ism and righteous deeds	The com-mand-ments and the sanc-tity of life
After death	Resurrec-tion and judgment	Resurrec-tion and reckoning	Resurrec-tion (less detailed)
Mission	Mission-ary, world-wide	Preaching, worldwide	Non-mis-sionary
Followers (approxi-mate esti-mate, pro-jected from Pew 2020)	~2.4 bil-lion	~2 billion	~15 mil-lion

B) The Religions of the East and the Indigenous Traditions

Axis	Hinduism	Buddhism	The Chinese (Confucian / Taoist)	Traditional animism
God	One absolute (Brahman) and many manifestations	No creator at the center	"Heaven" and the Tao: an order more than a personal God	Spirits and ancestors, and mostly a distant high god
Founder	No founder	The Buddha—an awakened teacher, not a prophet	Confucius and Laozi—two sages	No founder
Text	The Vedas, the Upanishads, and the Gita	The Tripitaka—a "raft" left behind after the crossing	The books of the sages	Oral tradition
The problem	Ignorance of the self's true nature	The clinging that begets suffering	The disturbance of harmony	The disturbance of balance with the spirits

Axis	Hinduism	Buddhism	The Chinese (Confucian / Taoist)	Traditional animism
Salvation	Liberation from the wheel of rebirth	Nirvana: the extinguishing of the thirst	Social and cosmic harmony	Balance with the community and the ancestors
After death	Rebirth according to karma	Rebirth until liberation	Veneration of ancestors; non-central	The world of the ancestors
Mission	Mostly ethnic	Missionary	Non-missionary	A religion of land and community
Followers (approximate estimate, projected from Pew 2020)	~1.2 billion	~0.5 billion	Hundreds of millions	Hundreds of millions

Added here from the book, to complete the survey: Zoroastrianism (an ancient monotheism, small in following and enormous in influence), Sikhism (a pure monotheism together with karma—the newest of the great ones), and the religion of ancient Egypt (the longest-lived of them, now extinguished).

* Five Observations the Table Reveals

1. **The greatest difference is not the number of gods but the shape of time:** the Abrahamic religions live a line ending in a court. The Indian ones live a wheel to be exited. The first fears not entering heaven; the second fears returning to the world.
2. **"Founder" is not one thing:** a prophet who delivers, a person who is himself the religion, a teacher who discovered a path—or no one. So the claims cannot be measured by one standard before knowing which claim each is.
3. **The religions differ in rites more than they differ in morals:** honesty, mercy, and justice are nearly shared; the sharp disagreement is in creed and ritual.
4. **Size does not measure truth:** 15 million Jews are the root of the two religions of four billion; and thirty Egyptian centuries went out.
5. **No religion is "pure":** every great religion carries the layers of what preceded it in its followers' popular religiosity.

* The Ten Rules the Reader Carries Away

1. Know a belief from its own people, not from its opponents.
2. One scale for everyone: what you demand of a religion, demand of your own.
3. Soundness of transmission is a condition of truth, not evidence of it.
4. Sincerity is not truth: the sincere holders of contradictory claims are many.
5. Mass transmission conveys that a thing happened, not why it happened.
6. The fruit supports and does not found: the goodness of followers is a clue, not a proof.
7. A psychological or social explanation explains the susceptibility to belief and does not settle its truth—and the same holds for atheism.
8. Resemblance between religions does not prove borrowing.
9. The success of a mission is no proof, and its failure no refutation.
10. Honest perplexity is more honorable than an imitated certainty—religious or atheist.

* What the Book Does Not Do—And What It Does

It does not prefer one religion over another, nor say that all the religions are the same, nor promise that you will come out of it with your matter settled.

It does three things: it frees you from the prison of "my religion or atheism" by revealing the map's breadth. It disciplines your question, from "which religion is most true?" to "most true in what: in its conception of God? in the documentation of its text? in its explanation of

evil?"; and it keeps you from comparing the most beautiful thing your friend has with the ugliest thing your dissenter has.

Declared rules of use. Rules have run through the whole book, and we recall them here together: know a belief from its own people first. And where we were obliged to know a community from the books of its opponents or of those who reported on it, we told you so—the Manichaeans, the Charvakas, the paganism of the Peninsula, and the religions of the Americas are sometimes seen here through tinted glass. The standard is one: we judge every claim by what we judge its counterparts by among everyone. We distinguish the layers of a text: the text, the authoritative commentary, and the reports that seeped in, and we do not confuse them (Chapter 15). Traditions are presented at their firmest: an argument is judged in its strongest form, and is not supported by its flimsiest. As for the author's declared inclination, it is stated in "A Word from the Author," which closes the book—without being made a judgment over the main text.

And the summary in one sentence: the picture is complete and the scale is in your hand—but which road you take is decided by no table. It is decided by a traveler who has read all the roads.

Appendix I — The List of References

Arranged with the sacred books and founding texts at its head, then the heritage, then the modern studies—with no years of printing except what is fixed in the main text, and with the genre marked where it must be

The list's rule: sources are cited by their titles and authors as they appeared in the chapter notes ("Sources of the chapter / study") and in the appendix of readings. Works are cited in their original language or in a standard English translation. Arabic-language works are cited by transliterated title, with the standard English translation noted where one exists. And whatever belongs to the genre of popular polemic or of the period document is marked as such. The list is a record of what was relied on, not a list of recommendation—that is Appendix D.

* First — The Master List

The Sacred Books and Founding Texts

Islam: the Noble Qur'an (the standard *mushaf*, the received printed text of the Qur'an—the reference against which every quotation was checked); the two Sahihs of Bukhari and Muslim and the authoritative books of the Sunna; and the books of exegesis: *Jami' al-Bayan* (Tabari), *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim* (Ibn Kathir), *Tafsir al-Manar* (Muhammad Abduh and Rashid Rida), *In the Shade of the Qur'an* (Sayyid Qutb—by its devotional-activist genre), and *al-Jawahir* (Tantawi Jawhari).

Judaism: the Tanakh (the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings) in the Masoretic text and its authoritative translations; the Septuagint; the Qumran manuscripts

(their academic studies); the Mishnah and the Talmud (Sanhedrin, Avot); the Tosefta; Midrash Bereshit Rabbah; Rashi's commentaries; the *Mishneh Torah* (Maimonides).

Christianity: the New Testament (the four Gospels, Acts, the Pauline letters, Revelation) in its authoritative translations; the Apocrypha and the apocryphal gospels (for comparison); Athanasius's festal letter; the documents of the councils (Nicaea, Chalcedon, Vatican II: *Lumen Gentium*, *Nostra Aetate*, *Dignitatis Humanae*); the encyclical *Fides et Ratio* ("Faith and Reason").

India: the Rig Veda (including the hymn of creation 10.129, the hymn of Vac 10.125, and the Purusha Sukta 10.90); the Upanishads (Brihadaranyaka and its sisters); the Bhagavad Gita; the Mahabharata and the Ramayana; the Puranas (Vishnu, Matsya); the Shatapatha Brahmana; the Laws of Manu; the *Arthashastra* (Kautilya); the Pali Tipitaka: the Digha Nikaya (including the Agganna Sutta, the Mahapadana Sutta, and the Samannaphala Sutta), the Anguttara Nikaya (the Kalama Sutta), the Vinaya (Cullavagga); the edicts of Ashoka; the Guru Granth Sahib.

Iran: the Avesta (and its heart, the Gathas); the Bundahishn; the Denkard; the Manichaean Kephalaia; the *Kitab-i-Iqan* (the Book of Certitude).

China and Japan: the *Tao Te Ching* (Laozi); the Analects—the conversations of Confucius; the book of Mozi; the Xunzi (the essay on Heaven); the Zhuangzi.

The Ancient East, Greece, and the Americas: the Epic of Gilgamesh (tr. Andrew George, Penguin Classics); Atrahasis and the Enuma Elish (in: Stephanie

Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*); Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta (tr. Kramer); the stele of Hammurabi and the law of Ur-Nammu; the Cyrus Cylinder; the Egyptian Book of the Dead (chapter 125 and the negative confession), and the Pyramid and Coffin Texts; the Leiden hymn to Amun; the Memphite Theology; Homer (the Iliad and the Odyssey) and Hesiod (*Works and Days*); Herodotus (the Histories); the Popol Vuh (tr. Tedlock).

The Islamic Heritage

al-Ash'ari: *al-Luma'*, and *Doctrines of the Muslims* · al-Qadi Abd al-Jabbar: *al-Mughni* (vol. 15: prophecies and miracles) · al-Khayyat: *al-Intisar* (The Vindication) · Abu Hatim al-Razi: *A'lam al-Nubuwwa* (The Signs of Prophethood) · al-Mawardi: *A'lam al-Nubuwwa*, and *The Ordinances of Government* · al-Rummani, al-Khattabi, and al-Jurjani: *Three Treatises on the Inimitability of the Qur'an* (ed. Muhammad Khalaf Allah and Muhammad Zaghlul Sallam) · al-Baqillani: *The Inimitability of the Qur'an* · Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani: *The Proofs of Inimitability* · al-Bayhaqi and Abu Nu'aym: *The Evidences of Prophethood* · Biruni: *An Inquiry into What India Has to Say* · Ibn Hazm: *al-Fisal*, on the religions, sects, and creeds · Ghazali: *The Deliverer from Error*, *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, *The Revival of the Religious Sciences* (including the Book of the Lawful and the Prohibited), *The Jewels of the Qur'an* · Avicenna: *al-Isharat* (Pointers and Reminders) · Ibn Tufayl: *Hayy ibn Yaqzan* · Ibn Rushd: *The Incoherence of the Incoherence*, *The Decisive Treatise*, *The Unveiling of the Methods of Proof* · al-Shahrastani: *Religions and Sects* · al-Shaybani: *al-Siyar*

al-Kabir (the great book of the law of nations) · Ibn Jinni: *al-Khasa'is* · al-Suyuti: *al-Muzhir*, and *al-Itqan* · Ibn Taymiyya: *Averting the Conflict between Reason and Revelation*, *The Correct Answer to Those Who Changed the Religion of Christ* · Ibn al-Qayyim: *Relief for the Distressed from the Snares of Satan*, *al-Fawa'id*, *The Healing of the Sick* (on fate and wisdom), *Hadi al-Arwah* (The Spurrer of Souls), *Tariq al-Hijratayn* (The Road of the Two Migrations) · al-Shatibi: *al-Muwafaqat* · Ibn Khaldun: the *Muqaddima* · al-Ma'arri: *al-Luzumiyyat* · Ibn Abi Dawud: *al-Masahif* (The Codices) · al-Humaydi: *Jadhwat al-Muqtabis* · Jalal al-Din Rumi: the *Masnavi* (tr. Jawid Mojaddedi, Oxford World's Classics) · Rahmatullah al-Kairanawi: *Izhar al-Haqq* (The Demonstration of the Truth; 1864—the colonial era's encyclopedic counter to Pfander's *Mizan al-Haqq*, and the first Muslim work to arm itself systematically with Europe's own biblical criticism; among our sources in Carletti's Paris French translation, 1880) · al-Afghani: *The Refutation of the Materialists* · Husayn al-Jisr: *al-Risala al-Hamidiyya* · Muhammad Iqbal: *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* (1930; Stanford ed. 2013) · Muhammad Abdullah Draz: *Religion*, and *al-Naba' al-'Azim* (The Great Tiding) · Abu al-Hasan al-Nadwi: *What the World Lost by the Decline of the Muslims* · Alija Izetbegović: *Islam Between East and West* (English ed.) · al-Qaradawi: *The Lawful and the Prohibited in Islam*, *On the Jurisprudence of the State* · al-Ghannushi: *Public Liberties in the Islamic State* · Ahmad Shalabi: *Comparative Religion*, and *The Islamic Society—The Foundations of Its Formation* · Mustafa Mahmoud: *My Journey from Doubt to*

Faith, A Dialogue with My Atheist Friend · al-Sha'rawi: *Fate and Divine Decree* (transcribed lessons—by its genre) · Ali Gomaa: *Revelation—the Noble Qur'an* · Sami Ameri: *The Proofs of God's Existence in the Soul, Reason, and Science*; *The Problem of Evil and the Existence of God*; *The Foretelling of the Prophet of Islam in the Books of the Jews and Christians* · Abdullah al-Ujayri: *Shumu' al-Nahar* (Candles of Daylight) · Hamza Andreas Tzortzis: *The Divine Reality: God, Islam and the Mirage of Atheism* (the most systematic English-language Islamic apologia of its generation—dependency, consciousness, and the prophetic fork among its arguments; read as the believer's kit, by its genre) · Sufi Abu Talib: *Between Islamic Law and Roman Law* · Muhammad Rida al-Lawati: *Burhan al-Siddiqin* (The Proof of the Truthful) · Muhammad Shahin: *The Evidences of Prophethood with Objectivity and Ease*, and *A Methodology for Establishing the Truth of the Religion of Islam* · Hikmat Bashir Yasin: *The Reply to the Doubt That Denies Revelation* · Huda Salim Rasul: *The Embryo and Its Stages in the Light of the Qur'an* · Maurice Bucaille: *The Bible, the Qur'an and Science* (1976—the founding modern text of the genre of scientific inimitability in its worldwide spread: a comparative test of the two scriptures against modern knowledge; read as the phenomenon's founding document and through the critique it provoked, "Bucailleism") · Basil al-Qadi: *The Problem of the Relation between Islam and Democracy* · Mustafa Abd al-Ma'bud: *The Signs of the End Times in Judaism* · Imad al-Din al-Shanti: *The Sin of Adam in the Torah, the Gospel, and the Qur'an* · Ahmad al-Katib: *Why Did the*

Muslims Divide? · al-Diwani: *The Charge of Thinking* · Nur al-Din Abu Lahya: *The Fugitives from the Hell of Atheism* (a dialogue presentation—by its genre). · Qurtubi: *al-Jami' li-Ahkam al-Qur'an* (on Rum 30 and the meanings of *fitra*) · Ghazali: *The Incoherence of the Philosophers* (the seventeenth question) · Ibn Rushd: *The Incoherence of the Incoherence*

The Jewish and Christian Heritage and Biblical Studies

Judah Halevi: the *Kuzari* (in its translations) · Maimonides: *The Guide for the Perplexed* · Justin Martyr: *Dialogue with Trypho* · Tertullian: *To Scapula* · Lactantius: *On the Anger of God* · Augustine: *Confessions*, *The City of God* · Irenaeus: *Against Heresies* · John of Damascus: *On Heresies* · Thomas Aquinas: the *Summa Theologiae* (including the Five Ways, and the questions of just war and of reason and revelation) · John of the Cross: *The Dark Night of the Soul* · Pascal: *Pensées* (tr. A. J. Krailsheimer, Penguin Classics) · Kierkegaard: *Fear and Trembling*, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (tr. Hong and Hong, Princeton) · Calvin: the *Institutes* · C. S. Lewis: *The Problem of Pain* · John Hick: *Evil and the God of Love* · Karl Rahner: the "anonymous Christians" · Hans Küng: *Does God Exist?*, *Why I Am Still a Christian*, *Islam: Past, Present and Future* · Paul Copan: *Is God a Moral Monster?* · R. C. Sproul: *From Dust to Glory* · George Basilious: *The Truth in an Age That Denies the Truth* · Essam Nassim: *Does the Bible Contain Myths?* · *al-Kanz al-Jalil* (an indexing of the foretellings of Christ) · Bart Ehrman: *Misquoting Jesus* · Metzger and Wallace: on the textual criticism of the

New Testament · Alter and Kugel: introductions to the literary genres of the Bible · Jeremias: *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* · Firas al-Sawwah: *The Riddles of the Gospel* · Frazer: *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament* · David Marshall: the "160 errors" (an apologetic reply—by its genre). · Thomas Aquinas: *Summa Theologiae* and *Summa contra Gentiles* (the grades of the miraculous)

Philosophy and Philosophy of Religion

Plato: *Euthyphro*, the *Apology*, the *Laws* · Aristotle: the *Metaphysics* (Book Lambda) · Epicurus: the *Letter to Menoeceus* · Lucretius: *On the Nature of Things* (tr. Martin Ferguson Smith, Hackett) · Cicero: *On the Nature of the Gods* · Descartes: the *Meditations* · Spinoza: the *Theological-Political Treatise* · Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* (ed. Norman Kemp Smith; Oxford World's Classics), and "Of Miracles" (*Enquiry*, section X) · Kant: *Critique of Pure Reason*, *Critique of Practical Reason* · Feuerbach: *The Essence of Christianity* (tr. George Eliot) · Nietzsche: *The Gay Science*, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (tr. Walter Kaufmann; *The Gay Science*, tr. Kaufmann) · William James: *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, *The Will to Believe* · Clifford: *The Ethics of Belief* · Russell: *Why I Am Not a Christian* · Sartre: *Being and Nothingness* (tr. Hazel Barnes), *Existentialism Is a Humanism* (tr. Carol Macomber) · Camus: *The Myth of Sisyphus* · Levinas: *Totality and Infinity* · Plantinga: *God, Freedom, and Evil*, his evolutionary argument against naturalism, and his exchange with Gutting, "Is Atheism Irrational?" · Swinburne: *The Existence of God* · Craig: the kalam cosmological argument · Mackie: *The Miracle*

of Theism · Oppy: *Arguing about Gods*, and *The Best Argument Against God* · Schellenberg: the literature of divine hiddenness · Charles Taylor: *A Secular Age* · Nagel: *Mind and Cosmos* · Udayana: *Nyayakusumanjali* · al-Nashshar: *A New Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*. · Leibniz: the *Monadology* and the principle of sufficient reason · Paley: *Natural Theology* (the watch) · Pierre Bayle: *Historical and Critical Dictionary*, *Various Thoughts on the Occasion of a Comet* (the society of atheists) · Rudolf Bultmann: *New Testament and Mythology* (demythologization) · Bertrand Russell: "Is There a God?" (1952—the teapot) · Albert Camus: *The Myth of Sisyphus*, the Nobel address (1957) · William Lane Craig: *Reasonable Faith* (the argument from coming-to-be and the moral argument) · Wes Morriston: articles critical of the kalam argument (on causation and the origin of time) · Alvin Plantinga: *Warranted Christian Belief* (properly basic belief) · J. L. Schellenberg: *Divine Hiddenness and Human Reason* · Louise Antony: "Good Minus God" and *Philosophers without Gods* (value without a divine basis) · Jonathan Jong and Aku Visala: "Evolutionary Debunking Arguments against Theism, Reconsidered" (explaining a belief vs. impugning its warrant) · Wahiduddin Khan: *God Arises* (the argument from desire)

Comparative Religion, Sociology, Anthropology, and History

Ninian Smart: *The World's Religions* (the seven dimensions) · William A. Young: *The World's Religions: Worldviews and Contemporary Issues* (the seven

worldview questions) · Rudolf Otto: *The Idea of the Holy* · Mircea Eliade: *The Sacred and the Profane* · Émile Durkheim: *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* · Max Weber: *The Protestant Ethic* · Wilhelm Schmidt: *The Origin of the Idea of God* · Tylor: *Primitive Culture* · Frazer: *The Golden Bough* · Evans-Pritchard: *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande* · Malinowski: *Magic, Science and Religion* · Mary Douglas: *Purity and Danger* · John Mbiti: *African Religions and Philosophy* · Karen Armstrong: *A History of God* · Firas al-Sawwah: *The Religion of Man*, and his encyclopedia of the history of religions · Karl Jaspers: *The Origin and Goal of History* · Jonathan Z. Smith: *In Comparison a Magic Dwells* · Oliver Freiberger: *Considering Comparison* · Patton and Ray: *A Magic Still Dwells?* · Kim Knott: *Hinduism: A Very Short Introduction* · Damien Keown: *Buddhism: A Very Short Introduction* · Basham: *History and Doctrines of the Ajivikas* · Zaehner: *Zurvan* · Rodney Stark: *The Rise of Christianity* · Stark and Finke: the theory of the religious market · Kelley: *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing* · Berger: *The Sacred Canopy*, *The Desecularization of the World*, *The Heretical Imperative* · Casanova: *Public Religions in the Modern World* · Gilles Kepel: *The Revenge of God* · Marty and Appleby: the Fundamentalism Project · Huntington: *The Clash of Civilizations* · Esposito and Voll: *Islam and Democracy* · Savarkar: *Hindutva* (a period document) · Bulliet: *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period* · Levy-Rubin: studies of the *dhimma* · al-Baladhuri: *The Conquests of the Lands* · Runciman, Amin Maalouf, and Ibn al-Athir: the Crusades · Jackson: *The Mongols and the Islamic World* · Christiansen: *The*

Northern Crusades · Harvey: *Muslims in Spain, 1500 to 1614* · Wilson: *The Thirty Years War* · Phillips and Axelrod: *Encyclopedia of Wars* · John Thornton: the Kongolese apostle (Kimpa Vita) · Peires: *The Dead Will Arise* (Nongqawuse) · Chatelier: *The Raid on the Muslim World* (summarized and Arabized by Muhibb al-Din al-Khatib and Musa'id al-Yafi—a period document) · Rambo and Streib: studies of religious conversion and of leaving religions · Festinger and colleagues: *When Prophecy Fails* · Dundes: *The Flood Myth*, and *The Evil Eye: A Casebook* · Ryan and Pitman: *Noah's Flood* · Harari: *Homo Deus* (a controversial thesis) · Eco: *The Search for the Perfect Language* · Hebbel: the literature of "the three impostors." · Tacitus: *Histories* (Vespasian's healings, with the physicians' opinion) · Suetonius: *Lives of the Caesars* · Ziauddin Sardar: *Islamic Futures* and essays on "Bucailleism" · the *Kevatta Sutta* (Digha Nikaya 11) and the *Kalama Sutta* (Anguttara Nikaya 3.65) · the Bradlaugh case and the Oaths Act (1888) · the Enlightenment: Diderot's *Letter on the Blind* (1749), d'Holbach's *System of Nature* (1770), Robespierre's cult of the Supreme Being (1794)

Science and Religion

Darwin: *On the Origin of Species* (1859; 6th ed. 1872), and the *Correspondence* · Ian Barbour: the models of the relation between science and religion · John Lennox: against Dawkins · Dawkins: *The God Delusion*, *The Blind Watchmaker* · Francis Collins: *The Language of God* · Behe: *Darwin's Black Box*, and Miller's critiques of it · Shubin: *Your Inner Fish* · Lenski: the publications of the

long-term evolution experiment · Steven Weinberg: *The First Three Minutes* · Eugene Wigner: *The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics* · Stringer: *Our One Origin* (Lone Survivors) · Cann and colleagues: the mitochondrial studies · Enard and colleagues: the FOXP2 studies · Chomsky and Fitch: the evolution of language · Campbell: the critique of long-range linguistic reconstruction · Leuba, and Larson and Witham: the surveys of scientists' belief · Ecklund: *Science vs. Religion: What Scientists Really Think* · Persinger and Granqvist: the "God helmet" experiments · Pahnke: the Good Friday Experiment · Griffiths (Johns Hopkins): the psilocybin studies · Koenig: the reviews of religion and health · STEP: the study of intercessory prayer · Carlson: the astrology test (*Nature*) · Wiseman: *The Luck Factor* · Rozin and Nemeroff: symbolic contagion · Cannon: "voodoo death" · Libet: the experiments on the will · Laplace: *A Philosophical Essay on Probabilities* · Georges Lemaître: the origin of the expansion theory · the Council of Europe's reports on creationism (2007) · Morrison: *Man Does Not Stand Alone* (a historical specimen) · the reports of the Lourdes medical committee · the documents of the robot Mindar and the Nuremberg sermon (2023). · Arvind Borde, Alan Guth, and Alexander Vilenkin: "Inflationary Spacetimes Are Incomplete in Past Directions" (2003) · Alan Guth: work on eternal inflation and the measure problem · Luke Barnes: "The Fine-Tuning of the Universe for Intelligent Life" (2012) · Fred Adams: "The Degree of Fine-Tuning in Our Universe—and Others" (2019) · Will Gervais and colleagues: cognitive and cultural models of religious belief · Griffiths

and colleagues: "Psilocybin Can Occasion Mystical-Type Experiences" (2006) · NASA: the history of the universe (on the limits of what preceded inflation)

The Contemporary Preaching and Polemical Literature of Both Shores (Period Documents, Read by Their Genre)

Ahmed Deedat: *Crucifixion or Cruci-Fiction?*, *The Greatest Prophet*, *Fifty Thousand Errors in the Bible?* (with the statistic it cites from the Jehovah's Witnesses' magazine *Awake!*) · Zakir Naik and his debates (and among our specimens *The Concept of God in Major Religions* and the twenty-question booklet answering the objections most repeated to him—two documents of the genre of arguing from the addressee's own scripture, and of defensive apologetics) · Muhammad Umar Faruq: *Worldwide Da'wah to Non-Muslims* (a practical manual of contemporary outreach and of accompanying new converts—read as a document of the genre) · on women: the Islamic literature of *rights by role* (daughter, wife, mother) and the before-and-after frame, from scholarly treatises to the student papers circulated online—read here as documents of a genre, not as authorities · Bilal Philips: *The True Religion of God* (a globally circulated da'wah tract—our specimen a Tigrinya translation printed in Riyadh, 1428/2007, by a cooperative office for call and guidance under the Ministry of Islamic Affairs and distributed free, "not for sale," through an Alexandria-based society: the genre's worldwide translation machinery, with an address) · the literature of scientific inimitability (the four documented specimens

and the rules of the term) · the evangelical "science in the Bible" literature and the Hindu "Vedic sciences" literature (facing specimens) · the literature of the New Atheism: Harris, Hitchens, Dennett · Baggini: *Atheism: A Very Short Introduction* · Loftus: the Outsider Test · Abu Sawwan: *The Accursed Readings* (a deist-leaning critique—a period document) · A. W. Brown: *The God Conclusion* · Neale Donald Walsch: *Conversations with God* (the specimen of soft revelation) · *The Hammer of Proof* (an Arabic argumentative presentation) · *The Prophecies of the Sacred Books in the Light of the Admissions of the Jews and Christians* · *Selling Illusion* and the layers of the Sunna debate · *al-Maqdisi as Hadith Scholar* · the documents of the "Way of the Future" church · the journal *Tabayyun* (the refereed study of Hume's *Dialogues*) · the article "This World and the Next in the Jewish Religion."

Surveys, Statistics, and Documents

The Pew Research Center: *How the Global Religious Landscape Changed, 2010–2020* (2025); religious switching in 36 countries (2025); *The Future of World Religions, 2010–2050* (2015) and its updates; *The Age Gap in Religion Around the World* (2018); *The World's Muslims: Unity and Diversity* (2012); *Religion in India* (2021); *Jewish Americans* (2020); the U.S. Religious Landscape Study (2024); *Religion in East Asia* (2024); *U.S. Muslims* (2017); the surveys of the acceptance of evolution (2013) · Gallup: the surveys of belief and evolution · the World Values Survey (wave seven) · Norris and Inglehart: *Sacred and Secular* · the Afrobarometer

and the Arab Barometer · the *World Christian Encyclopedia* (Johnson and Zurlo) · the international religious freedom reports · the Document on Human Fraternity (2019) and the Rome Call for AI Ethics · the *Syllabus of Errors* (1864) · *Humani Generis* (1950) and the 1996 address on evolution · the documents of Augsburg and Westphalia · the documents of Dort and the Arminians · the reports of the Ur excavations (Woolley) and the documents of George Smith (1872). · Pew Research Center: "How the Global Religious Landscape Changed from 2010 to 2020" (June 9, 2025, DOI 10.58094/fj71-ny11—the sole source of Appendix G) · Pew Research Center: religious switching among adults aged 18–54 in 117 countries (the same report, chapter on switching)

---

* Second: The Sources of the Chapters and Studies—By Their Place

These notes were moved from the ends of the chapters to here, so that the reading stays continuous and each chapter keeps the record of what it relied on.

Chapter 2: The Human Being between Faith and Doubt: Job, Habakkuk, and Psalm 22 with their commentaries; al-Baqara 260, al-A'raf 143, and al-Baqara 30 with their exegeses; the hadith "That is the very essence of faith" (Muslim 132) and its commentaries; John 20:24–29 and Mark 9:24; John of the Cross, *The Dark Night of the Soul*; Ghazali, *The Deliverer from Error*; Descartes, the *Meditations*; Ibn Tufayl, *Hayy ibn Yaqzan*; the Kalama Sutta (AN 3.65); Hakuin on "the Great Doubt"; Huxley (1869) on the coining of agnosticism;

Mustafa Mahmoud, *My Journey from Doubt to Faith*; Küng, *Why I Am Still a Christian*; al-Diwani, *The Charge of Thinking*; Tolstoy, *A Confession*; Clifford, *The Ethics of Belief*, and William James, *The Will to Believe*.

Chapter 7: What Is Religion? And How Have Human Beings Studied It?: *A New Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*—al-Nashshar (for the threefold distinction); the introductions of Shahrastani's *Religions and Sects* and Biruni's *Inquiry* (with the texts of their two methods); the "seven dimensions" in Ninian Smart (*The World's Religions*) and the "seven worldview questions" in William A. Young (*The World's Religions: Worldviews and Contemporary Issues*, 4th ed.), James's *Varieties*, Otto's *Idea of the Holy*, and Eliade's *Sacred and the Profane* in their translations; the definitions of Durkheim and Geertz from their loci. The genre specimens adopted in the sorting registers (al-Hamami; *Why Choose Islam*; the model-dialogue series; the assigned missions digest; the conspiracy literature as a phenomenon; and a world-religions teaching deck that splices Theosophical esoterica—Besant's "Akashic records" and a lineage of seven Zoroasters—into standard classroom fact: an exemplary drill in sorting genre from content); and the three institutional introductions to comparative religion (Qazal, the Fez papers, and the school syllabus); and, as a specimen of the descriptive genre in state schooling, the Philippine Department of Education's senior-high course "Introduction to World Religions and Belief Systems" (a daily-lesson-log specimen among our sources).

Chapter 11: Preaching and Mission—How Do the Religions Offer Themselves to Others?: the history of the colonial missions from the specialized academic studies (and Chatelier's Arabized *The Raid on the Muslim World* as a period document read by its genre); the edicts of Ashoka (for the Buddhist missions and the prohibition of zeal); the literature of the Great Commission and the history of the missions; the studies of the *ger* and the Noahide commandments in the Jewish sources; the quantitative studies of conversion in the medieval Islamic societies; and the contemporary debate over the anti-conversion laws and the freedom to missionize in the religious-freedom reports.

Study 11.1: Why Does One Religion Spread More Than Another . . . ?—Three Social Paths of the Religions:

Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity* (1996), for the exponential growth, the plagues, and the networks, with the critiques of his method; Bulliet for conversion; Pew's projections (2015) for growth by fertility; Shahrastani, al-Baghdadi, and Ibn Hazm for the survey of the Islamic sects, and the hadith of the division with its grading and discussion; Josephus for the Jewish sects; the documents of Chalcedon and the Great Schism (1054). Basham and Hirakawa for the eighteen Buddhist schools. The count of Christian denominations (the Gordon-Conwell center) with the critiques of its definition; and the sociology of sects (Troeltsch: church and sect; Stark and Bainbridge).

The Complementary Chapter of Part III: What Did the Religions Say About One Another?: the texts of the positions from their first loci: the Talmud and the *Mishneh Torah* (for Maimonides' position on the two communities); Paul's letters (Romans 9–11 and 1 Corinthians 10) and Justin; John of Damascus, *On Heresies*. *Nostra Aetate* (1965). The People-of-the-Book verses in the works of exegesis and the books of the rulings of the *dhimma*; Shahrastani's *Religions and Sects*; the Vishnu Purana (the Buddha avatar) and the Pali texts on the gods; and the modern comparative studies in each tradition's "theology of religions."

Study 12.1: To Whom Were the Prophets Sent, and for What Time?: the verses with their exegeses (Fatir 24, al-Ra'd 7, al-Nisa' 164, Ghafir 78, Ibrahim 4, Saba' 28, Al Imran 19, al-Ma'ida 48, al-Isra' 15), the hadith "I have been sent to all humankind" (the two Sahihs), and the hadith "the prophets are brothers of one father"; the studies of the people of the interval (Ibn al-Qayyim in *Tariq al-Hijratayn*, and al-Shawkani) and the contemporaries' positions; the Talmud (Sanhedrin 56a) for the Noahide commandments and Tosefta Sanhedrin 13 for "the righteous of the nations"; Matthew 15:24 and 28:19 with their commentaries and the studies of *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (Jeremias); the Gita 4:7–8; the Mahapadana Sutta (DN 14) for the Buddhas of the past and the Cakkavatti-Sihanada (DN 26) for Maitreya; the Kephalaia for Mani's sealhood. The *Kitab-i-Aqdas* and the *Iqan* for the renewed manifestation; the Vatican II documents (*Lumen Gentium* 16) and Rahner's "anonymous Christians"; and Jaspers for the Axial Age.

Chapter 13: The Phenomenon of Claiming Prophethood—How Do We Read It?: the reports of the apostasy-wars claimants from the sources of the sira and history (on the scale of the narrators' glass); the file of Sabbatai Zevi from its academic studies (Scholem and after); the texts of the Didache and Deuteronomy 13 and 18 with their commentaries; the studies of prophethood and the conditions of the miracle among the theologians. The literature of the seal of prophethood and the councils' replies to the Qadianiyya. *When Prophecy Fails* (Festinger and colleagues) for the lesson of failure; *Conversations with God* (Walsch) as the specimen of soft revelation, with its caution; and the studies of the modern mahdisms (the Sudanese, and Juhayman) from their loci. For the door of the possibility of prophethood: *al-Mughni* of al-Qadi Abd al-Jabbar (vol. 15: prophecies and miracles) and Ibn al-Rawandi's *al-Zumurrud* as transmitted in the replies. And from the contemporary preaching-academic literature: *The Reply to the Doubt That Denies Revelation*—Hikmat Bashir Yasin (the reply-to-doubts series, the Islamic University of Medina)—by its genre.

Study 15.1: The Comprehensive Table of the Founding Texts—Twelve Axes by a Single Standard: the figures from the standard-text statistics (the Masoretic text; Nestle-Aland; the Medina mushaf and its counts; the critical editions of the Vedas; the volumes of the Pali Text Society; and the standard 1430-page edition of the Guru Granth)—subject to audit; the introductions to the literary genres of the Bible (Alter, and Kugel), of the Qur'an (Neuwirth, *The Qur'an as a Text of*

Late Antiquity; al-Jurjani for *nazm*; and Draz, *al-Naba' al-'Azim*, for thematic unity), of the Vedas (Witzel, and Jamison), of the Tipitaka (von Hinüber), and of the Tao (Lau's translation and its commentaries); and the studies of Koine as a popular tongue (Deissmann).

Study 15.2: Religion and the Languages: Genesis 2:19–20 and 11:1–9 with its commentaries; al-Baqara 31, al-Rum 22, and Ibrahim 4 with their exegeses; Ibn Jinni's *al-Khasa'is* (the chapter on the origin of language) and al-Suyuti's *al-Muzhir*; Acts 2; the Rig Veda (the hymn of Vac 10.125) and Panini; the Vinaya (Cullavagga 5.33) for the Buddha's command to teach in the dialects; Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta (tr. Kramer); Herodotus (2.2); Eco, *The Search for the Perfect Language*; the Paris Linguistic Society's ban (1866); Chomsky and Fitch, the evolution of language; Ruhlen and Greenberg and their critics (Campbell); and the FOXP2 studies (Enard 2002) with their limits.

Chapter 16: How Did the Texts Reach Us?: the standard mushaf (the reference against which every quotation was checked); *al-Kanz al-Jalil* with its introduction (a specimen of the internal Christian discussion); the textual-criticism data from the two scales of Ehrman (*Misquoting Jesus*) and Wallace/Metzger—Ameri documented their sources among ours. *The Truth in an Age That Denies the Truth*—Basilious (the model of contemporary Arab Christian defense of the Bible's reliability, an inside voice on the second case's scale). *Does the Bible Contain Myths?*—Essam Nassim (a specialized Coptic defense on the "myth" file precisely—set against the mythological school and al-

Sawwah); the literature of the Qur'an's collection, its written form, and its readings from their loci (with the modern manuscript studies: Birmingham and Sanaa); *Revelation—the Noble Qur'an*—Ali Gomaa (a contemporary Azhari exposition of the concepts, modes, and forms of revelation, by its pulpit-didactic genre); *Selling Illusion* and the layers of the Sunna debate; *al-Maqdisi as Hadith Scholar* as a witness of the craft of the transmitters; the Qumran, Septuagint, and Samaritan studies from their academic references; and *The Riddles of the Gospel*—Firas al-Sawwah (among the broadest Arabic readings of the New Testament's historical files: the sources, the formation, and the Jesus of history—the critical voice of the second case in Arabic, met, as is our habit, with the authoritative defense literature). From the layer of popular polemic, a famous genre document: *Fifty Thousand Errors in the Bible?*—Deedat (its very title referred to a statistic published by the Jehovah's Witnesses' magazine *Awake!*—so the booklet is the model of the polemical "error-counting" genre on both sides: it dates the genre and is not relied on for data, whose reference is the academic textual scholarship above).

Chapter 17: The History of Doubt, Atheism, and Irreligion Across the Civilizations (The Other Face): Hume's *Dialogues* (Kemp Smith edition) and the refereed Arabic study of it in the journal *Tabayyun*; Russell's *Why I Am Not a Christian*; Sartre's *Being and Nothingness* (tr. Barnes) and *Existentialism Is a Humanism* (tr. Macomber); Camus's *The Myth of Sisyphus*; al-Khayyat's *al-Intisar* and Abu Hatim al-Razi's *A'lam al-Nubuwwa* (for the doctrines of Ibn al-Rawandi and al-Razi, with a

critical eye); al-Ma'arri's *Luzumiyyat*; Shahrastani's *Religions and Sects* and Ibn Hazm's *al-Fisal* (for the doctrines of the materialists); Dawkins's *The God Delusion* and Baggini's *Atheism: A Very Short Introduction* (for the contemporary wave in its two voices); and the Plantinga–Gutting exchange, "Is Atheism Irrational?" **And among the specimens of the radical contemporary Arabic critical discourse** (period documents read by their genre, not references of authority): *The Accursed Readings—A Book Not for Everyone*—Abu Sawwan: a deist-leaning critique of the textual religions by an Arab pen, a model of the "forbidden reading" literature that circulates in the digital space. **And among the chapter's sources also**: *The Proofs of God's Existence in the Soul, Reason, and Science*—Sami Ameri (the broadest documented contemporary Arabic exposition of the affirmative side with its modern evidence—read by its apologetic genre and by the reliance rules set out in Appendix E). And *Man Does Not Stand Alone* (Morrison, and the testimonies of the forty) as a historical specimen of the fifties' design formulation and its Arabic influence.

Chapter 18: Is There Evidence for God's Existence? (Stage One Evidence): from the affirmative side: the literature of the kalam cosmological argument and its contemporary formulations; *The Hammer of Proof* (an Arabic argumentative presentation); *My Journey from Doubt to Faith* (the innate temperament and the two parables of the exhibition and the balance—with the caution on what needs scientific checking among its examples); Ameri's *Proofs of God's Existence*;

and Lennox against Dawkins. From the critical side: Hume's *Dialogues* (Kemp Smith edition) and the *Tabayyun* study of it; Russell's *Why I Am Not a Christian*; Dawkins's *The God Delusion*; and the most precise academic critiques: Oppy: *The Best Argument Against God* (relied on as a translated text), and Mackie's *The Miracle of Theism*, whose arguments are drawn out. For the high dialogue between the shores: Plantinga–Gutting, "Is Atheism Irrational?" From the layer of simplifying and popular presentations (cited for their genre, not relied on for verification): *The Fugitives from the Hell of Atheism*—Nur al-Din Abu Lahya (a story-dialogue presentation of the methods of proving God's existence—its polemical title despite), and *The God Conclusion*—A. W. Brown (a popular English presentation of the believers' answers to the New Atheism's objections: the burden of proof, evil, and projection).

Study 18.1: How Is a Denier Convinced of God's Existence?—The Ethics of Dialogue between Believer and Atheist: the method verses with their exegeses (al-Nahl 125, al-Tur 35–36, al-Ankabut 65, al-Baqara 258, al-Qasas 56) and the report of Jubayr ibn Mut'im in Bukhari. The psychology of persuasion and attitude change, and the studies of religious conversion (Rambo and his peers), for "how people actually change"; *A Dialogue with My Atheist Friend*, *Shumu' al-Nahar*, and Ameri's literature for the contemporary believer's kit; Hume's *Dialogues* as a literary model of the dialogue of voices; and the testimonies of contemporary debaters on both sides about the limits of debates—among our sources the documented texts of the

most famous: Deedat's two great debates (with Swaggart in Louisiana, 1986, and with Josh McDowell in Durban, 1981), a complete case study of the genre of the mass debate: the ardor of both champions' publics, and the rarity of crossers—the thing the study concluded; and the genre's founding scene a century earlier: the Agra debates of April 10–11, 1854, between Pfander (*Mizan al-Haqq*) and al-Kairanawi—of which **both camps' records claim the victory** (the Muslim accounts preserve Pfander's concession of alterations "in seven or eight places"; the mission's accounts proclaim triumph, and one assistant of the Muslim side itself, Imad ud-din Lahiz, later crossed to Christianity): the two-victories phenomenon documented at the genre's very birth.

Study 18.2: The Facing Mirror—How Does an Atheist Convince a Believer That God Does Not Exist?: the "divine hiddenness" literature (Schellenberg and his interlocutors) and the translations of its presentation; the studies of leaving religions (Streib and his peers) for the patterns of the reverse conversion; the "one god further" argument in Hitchens's literature and its ancestors; Loftus's "Outsider Test" with its scale. The critiques of Hume, Kant, Mackie, and Oppy from their loci fixed in Appendix D; and the models of the alternative dwelling: Epicurus's letter, Camus, and the contemporary "secular humanism" literature.

The Gate of Chapter 19: By What Standard Shall We Judge?: Jonathan Z. Smith, *In Comparison a Magic Dwells* (a founding essay in the critique of undisciplined comparison); Oliver Freiberger, *Considering Comparison: A Method for Religious Studies* (2019—the parameters of comparison: goal, mode, scale, scope, and units of comparison); the comparative-method literature in contemporary religious studies (Patton and Ray, *A Magic Still Dwells?*); and the "single standard" studies in the Islamic heritage of debate (the jurists' conditions of disputation) as an internal counterpart.

Chapter 19: By What Does Each Religion Argue for Itself? (Stage Two Evidence): on the argument from inimitability: the *Three Treatises on the Inimitability of the Qur'an* (al-Rummani, al-Khattabi, and al-Jurjani), al-Baqillani, and *The Proofs of Inimitability*. On the prophecies and foretellings: *al-Kanz al-Jalil* (the Christian model) and *The Foretelling of the Prophet of Islam in the Books of the Jews and Christians*—Sami Ameri (the Islamic model), presented under one set of examination rules with each public's objections to the other. On the borrowing claims: *Between Islamic Law and Roman Law*—Sufi Abu Talib (the Orientalist thesis presented at its strongest, then the specialists' examination, by one rule applied to the borrowing claims among all the religions). On the argument from fruit: *What the World Lost by the Decline of the Muslims*—Abu al-Hasan al-Nadwi (its reversed face: the loss by the fruit's absence, by its reformist-oratorical genre), and *Islam Between East and West*—Izetbegović (its most refined philosophical formulation: the argument from

bipolar structure, with the places of its use and its cautions). Every source marked by its genre: a period document ≠ a reference of authority.

Study 19.1: The Argument from the Qur'an's Inimitability—The Great Islamic Argument: *Three Treatises on the Inimitability of the Qur'an*—al-Rummani, al-Khattabi, and al-Jurjani (ed. Muhammad Khalaf Allah and Muhammad Zaghlul Sallam, Dhakha'ir al-Arab)—whence the verbatim documentation above with its page numbers (al-Rummani p. 75; al-Shafiya pp. 117 and 120; and the edition's order: al-Nukat, then al-Shafiya, then al-Bayan); *The Inimitability of the Qur'an*—al-Baqillani (in a complete edition: the pillar of the kalam account of the aspects of inimitability and the limits of *sarfa*); and among the modern testimonies of taste on the rhetorical aspect: *Artistic Imagery in the Qur'an*—Sayyid Qutb (a literary analysis of the Qur'anic instrument of imagery), and his *In the Shade of the Qur'an* (a complete devotional-activist exegesis among this book's sources—cited for its literary taste and distinguished from its contested activist method); *The Proofs of Inimitability*—al-Jurjani (the origin of the theory of *nazm*); with the Abadila paper (for documenting the three sects on the numerical) and the rules of the term in the study on scientific inimitability.

Study 19.3: "Scientific Inimitability" and the Allusions Preceding Science—Across All the Sacred Books: the scientific-inimitability file with its four sources (the Abadila paper for the three sects' documentation; the rules of the term; and the specimen of the popular discourse and its collapsing stories as

training material for examination); al-Shatibi (*al-Muwafaqat*) for the opposing heritage root; the evangelical "science in the Bible" literature and the Hindu "Vedic sciences" literature as facing specimens documented from their loci; and the specialist debate literature on the embryo-and-Galen file from both sides (and among the project's references for the affirmative side: *The Embryo and Its Stages in the Light of the Qur'an*—Huda Salim Rasul).

Study 19.4: The Argument from Prophecies and Foretellings—The Two Facing Mirrors: *The Foretelling*—Sami Ameri (the pillar of the Islamic affirmative side; by it we documented Rashi's two Hebrew texts and the Paran texts—read by the rules of its apologetic genre); the Christian prophecy argument by *al-Kanz al-Jalil*'s indexing among this book's sources; and from the additional Islamic affirmative literature, *The Prophecies of the Sacred Books in the Light of the Admissions of the Jews and Christians* (by the method of citing the text-people's admissions—a documentation grade below Ameri, relied on for the picture of the file, not for wording). The standard Jewish and Christian answers taken from their loci (the Jewish commentaries on the passages, the authoritative commentaries on John, and the specialist debate literature on *almah* and Isaiah 53); and from the general Arab Christian answering voices: *The Truth in an Age That Denies the Truth*—George Basilious (a contemporary Coptic apologetic theology, with ordered answers on God, Christianity, and the Bible), relied on first in drafting the Christian answers—and from the great classical polemical layer: *The Correct*

Answer to Those Who Changed the Religion of Christ—Ibn Taymiyya (the most massive text of classical Islamic-Christian polemic: gathering the foretellings, the critique of alteration, and the Trinity in one work—read by its polemical genre and met with Christian theology's replies to it); and the heritage genre of "the evidences of prophethood" (*A'lam al-Nubuwwa*—al-Mawardi; *The Evidences of Prophethood*—al-Bayhaqi and Abu Nu'aym) and its simplified contemporary formulations (*The Evidences of Prophethood with Objectivity and Ease* and *A Methodology for Establishing the Truth of the Religion of Islam—Two Paths*—Muhammad Shahin (the first path: direct examination of the evidences after grounding the authority of reports and the method of criticizing narrations; the second: elimination-and-division among the earth's religions—we weighed the second at the Gate of Chapter 19): an ordered preaching methodology, below Ameri and al-Ujayri in verification rank); and from the nineteenth-century bridge between the classical and the mass layers: *Izhar al-Haqq*—al-Kairanawi (used after its author's death, in Schirrmacher's description, as "a sort of encyclopaedia" of the file, extending Ali Tabari, Ibn Hazm, and Ibn Taymiyya—and the quarry from which the later mass genre drew); and from the founding mass-polemic layer: *The Greatest Prophet*—Deedat (the most famous worldwide popular presentation of Muhammad's foretellings in the Bible before the academic codification—it dates the genre and is read by it; gathered with his tracts in the omnibus *The Choice*—our specimen its Indonesian translation: the genre's

worldwide translation machinery once more) (and the superlative crown itself is a genre that crosses the whole picture: the Buddhist shelf offers *The Greatest Man Who Ever Lived*—each house crowns its founder with the same word, and the genre measures devotion, not rank). **And the specialized academic counterpart to Ameri on the foretellings file remains an item on the request list.**

Study 19.5: The Arguments from Testimony, Mass Transmission, and Fruit—The Social-Historical Trio:

1 Corinthians 15 with its commentaries and the dating of its formula (from both sides' literatures: Habermas/Licona for the affirmative and Ehrman/Lüdemann for the critique); the Heraclius dialogue in the two Sahihs; the *tawatur* studies in the books of legal theory (and their contemporary expositions); Judah Halevi's *Kuzari* in its translations and critiques; *Islam Between East and West* for the structural fruit argument; the "civilizational impact of Christianity" literature (Schmidt and his peers) with its scales; *Crucifixion or Cruci-Fiction?*—Deedat (the most famous mass formulation of the polemical Islamic case on the crucifixion file—a document of the debate genre, read by its measure, not a reference of verification); and its Christian mass counterpart: *The Case for Christ*—Strobel (the world's most famous popular presentation of the Christian evidential case—a journalist interviewing thirteen scholars of one camp under a juror's framing: the mirror shelf of the mass genre, read likewise by its genre, with the academic layer above it already cited); and the two facing convert-apologias of the century: *Mere Christianity*—C. S. Lewis (the wartime BBC talks of an ex-atheist don: the Christian shelf's most famous popular case, and the popular home of the moral argument and the "trilemma") and *Even Angels Ask*—Jeffrey Lang (an American mathematics professor's road from atheism to Islam—with Mustafa Mahmoud's *Journey from Doubt*

their Arabic elder; and the English literary shelf adds Muhammad Asad's *The Road to Mecca*—the genre's classic memoir—and Gai Eaton's *Islam and the Destiny of Man*, its most literary modern presentation, by a Traditionalist of the Schuon circle, read with that lens noted); and the studies of collective memory and the growth of traditions for the critical side.

The Preliminary Study of Chapter 20: Fate and Divine Decree Across the Religions and Civilizations: the Enuma Elish and the myth of Zu (Dalley); Homer (Iliad 16: Sarpedon) and Sophocles (Oedipus); Epictetus and Seneca for Stoicism, and Lucretius for the atomic swerve; the Eddas for the Norns; the Denkard and Bundahishn for Zurvanism (and Zaehner, *Zurvan*); the Mahabharata (daiva and purushakara) and Basham's *History and Doctrines of the Ajivikas*; the Samannaphala Sutta (DN 2) for Gosala; the Analects (12.5) and Mozi (the chapters against fate); Josephus (Antiquities 18, Wars 2), Pirkei Avot 3:15, and Berakhot 33b; Augustine against Pelagius, Calvin's *Institutes* (3:21), and the documents of Dort and the Arminians; al-Ash'ari (*al-Luma'*), Abd al-Jabbar's *al-Mughni*, Ibn al-Qayyim's *The Healing of the Sick*, Ibn Taymiyya's collected fatwas (vol. 8), and the *Nahj al-Balagha* and *al-Kafi* for "the matter between the two matters"; Abduh (*The Theology of Unity*) and Iqbal (*The Reconstruction*) in answering the charge of fatalism; and *Fate and Divine Decree*—al-Sha'rawi (the transcripts of his lessons, among the most widely spread sources of the popular conception—read by its homiletic genre, and the "directed/choosing" formula checked against his text when documenting);

Weber's *Protestant Ethic*; Laplace (*A Philosophical Essay on Probabilities*); Libet (1983) and the critiques of his method; and Dennett, Kane, and van Inwagen for the contemporary debate.

Chapter 20: The Problem of Evil: the book of Job with its commentaries; al-Kahf 60–82 (the story of al-Khidr), al-Mulk 2, and al-A'raf 172 with their exegeses. Epicurus as transmitted by Lactantius. Augustine's *Confessions* and *The City of God* for the Fall and freedom; Irenaeus (*Against Heresies* 4) and Hick's *Evil and the God of Love*. Plantinga's *God, Freedom, and Evil* (the reply to the logical form), Mackie's *The Miracle of Theism* (the logical form), and Rowe (1979) and Draper for the evidential; Sproul's *From Dust to Glory* and al-Shanti's *The Sin of Adam in the Torah, the Gospel, and the Qur'an* among this book's sources; Mustafa Mahmoud's *My Journey from Doubt to Faith* and *A Dialogue with My Atheist Friend* (the critique of "God is love," the actor parable, and the chapter titles); Kushner (1981); Fackenheim and Wiesel in post-Holocaust theology; Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* (the Grand Inquisitor and Zosima); C. S. Lewis's *The Problem of Pain*; Ghazali in the *Revival* ("nothing more wonderful than what is was possible") and Ibn al-Qayyim's *The Healing of the Sick* for wisdom and causation.

Chapter 22: Does Morality Need God?: *Islam Between East and West*—Izetbegović (the chapters on morality and the human drama); *Is God a Moral Monster?*—Copan (the pillar of the study on the ethics of the texts, with its layers); Plato's *Euthyphro* in its translations. The good-and-evil studies in the kalam works (and

their contemporary expositions); Kant's practical texts, Rawls (*A Theory of Justice*), and Mill (*Utilitarianism*). Levinas (*Totality and Infinity* and what has been translated of him). The studies of the shared moral core and the infant-morality experiments from their loci; and the contemporary debate literature (Dawkins in *The God Delusion*, the morality chapter—at its strongest, not its flimsiest).

Study 22.1: The Lawful and the Forbidden Across the Religions: the law texts from their loci (Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14 with their commentaries; the al-Ma'ida and al-An'am verses with their exegeses; Matthew 15, Mark 7, Acts 10 and 15). *The Lawful and the Prohibited in Islam*—al-Qaradawi (the governing rules) and the Book of the Lawful and the Prohibited from Ghazali's *Revival* (the ranks of scrupulousness)—both among this book's sources; *Purity and Danger*—Mary Douglas (the category-breach thesis) in its translation/presentation; the kashrut and halakha studies from the authoritative Jewish introductions; the Jain ahimsa literature and the Buddhist "threefold-pure" meat from Keown's introductions and their peers; the studies of the history of the usury prohibition in Christianity; and the purposes of the law in al-Shatibi and his contemporaries.

Study 22.2: A Comprehensive System of Life, or a Path of the Spirit?: the founding passages with their exegeses (John 18:36, Matthew 22:21, Romans and Galatians on the letter and the spirit; and the ruling verses and women's inheritances); the halakha introductions and the rule *dina d'malkhuta dina* from their loci;

Kautilya's *Arthashastra* and the Laws of Manu in their translations and academic presentations; the Vinaya and the edicts of Ashoka; the comparative "religion and state" literature (including the study of the modern concept of "religion" among the concept's scholars). Al-Qaradawi's *Lawful and Prohibited* and al-Mawardi's *Ordinances of Government* as the two models of Islamic codification; and the Christian political-theology literature (Augustine's two cities, and Luther's two kingdoms) in their presentations. From the modern Islamic presentations of the "Islamic society" as structure and formation: *The Islamic Society—The Foundations of Its Formation*—Ahmad Shalabi (vol. 6 of his encyclopedia of Islamic civilization, 1990; he is also the author of the *Comparative Religion* series that was the pillar of Arabic comparative study for a generation—read by its descriptive-Islamic genre).

Study 22.3: Religion and the Ruler—The Map of the Relation between the Religions and Government: *The Ordinances of Government*—al-Mawardi (the codification of the possible); *The City of God*—Augustine (the two cities); the documents of Augsburg (1555) and Westphalia (1648) from the loci of European history; *The Revenge of God*—Gilles Kepel, and *Public Religions in the Modern World*—José Casanova (the return of political religion); the Guardianship-of-the-Jurist literature and its internal discussions; the "Islam and democracy" literature from the three sides (al-Qaradawi, *On the Jurisprudence of the State*; al-Ghannushi, *Public Liberties*; and their opponents; with Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations* and Esposito–Voll's *Islam and*

Democracy), including a gathering Arabic presentation of the problem: Basil al-Qadi, *The Problem of the Relation between Islam and Democracy*; the *Syllabus of Errors* (1864) and Vatican II's *Dignitatis Humanae* (1965) for the Catholic precedent; *Hindutva*—Savarkar, with the academic studies of Hindu and Buddhist nationalism (Sri Lanka and Myanmar); the edicts of Ashoka; the "civil religion" and "comparative secularisms" studies (Taylor, and the multiple-secularities school); and the *mihna* of Ibn Hanbal from the sources of Islamic history, on its scale.

Study 22.4: The Religions and the Wars: Bulliet, *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period* (1979), and the critiques of his method; the *dhimma* and *jizya* studies (Levy-Rubin, and al-Baladhuri's *Conquests of the Lands*); Runciman and the Crusades through Arab eyes (Maalouf) and Ibn al-Athir for the Crusades; Jackson, *The Mongols and the Islamic World*, with Ibn Khaldun (the *Muqaddima*, the chapter on the vanquished imitating the victor) and Juvayni and Rashid al-Din for the Mongols' Islam; Christiansen, *The Northern Crusades*; Harvey, *Muslims in Spain, 1500 to 1614*, for the expulsion of the Moriscos; Wilson, *The Thirty Years War*, and the Westphalia documents; the edicts of Ashoka (Edict 13: Kalinga); the warrior-monk literature (Adolphson); the jurisprudence of jihad and its conditions (al-Shaybani's *al-Siyar al-Kabir*, and Khallaf's *Jihad in Islam*), and just war (Augustine against Faustus, and Aquinas, *Summa* II-II q. 40); the *Encyclopedia of Wars* (Phillips and Axelrod) and the count of religious wars with its critiques; and the studies of Buddhism's ebb in India (Verardi).

Study 23.5: The Origin of the Human Being Across the Religions and Cultures: Genesis 1–3 with its Jewish and Christian commentaries (and the Fall texts in al-Shanti's and Sproul's books among this book's sources); the Adam-creation verses with their exegeses (al-Baqara 30–37, al-Hijr 26–29, al-Nisa' 1, al-A'raf 172) and the rib studies in the hadith commentaries. Atrahasis and the Enuma Elish (Dalley). Hesiod's *Works and Days*; Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 1.4 and the Purusha Sukta (Rig Veda 10.90); the Agganna Sutta (Digha Nikaya 27); the Popol Vuh (Tedlock); the Bundahishn for Gayomart and Mashya and Mashyana; the Chinese Nüwa myths from their introductions; in the science of humankind: Stringer's *Lone Survivors*, the mitochondrial studies (Cann and colleagues, 1987), and the genetic-bottleneck estimates; in the positions: *Humani Generis* (1950) and John Paul II's address (1996); with Iqbal's *Reconstruction*, Ibn Khaldun's *Muqaddima* (the chapter on the gradation of beings), and the contemporary Islamic literature for and against interpreting Adam's creation, on the balance.

Study 23.6: Darwin and the Religions: Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*; the documents of the Oxford debate (1860) in their modern readings; the transcripts of the Scopes trial (1925) and Kitzmiller v. Dover (2005); *Humani Generis* (1950) and the 1996 address; al-Afghani's *Refutation of the Materialists*, al-Jisr's *al-Risala al-Hamidiyya* (the evolution chapter), Iqbal's *Reconstruction* (the fourth lecture), and the studies of Marwan Damra, Rana Dajani, and others on "Islam and evolution"; on Harun Yahya: the Council of Europe's

reports (2007) and documented scientific critiques; Collins's *The Language of God* for theistic evolution; Behe's *Darwin's Black Box* and its critiques (Miller); Nagel's *Mind and Cosmos*; Shubin's *Your Inner Fish* (Tiktaalik); Lenski's long-experiment publications; and the Pew (2013) and Gallup surveys on the acceptance of evolution—on the audit scale.

Study 23.7: The Flood Across the Religions and Civilizations: *Myths from Mesopotamia* (Stephanie Dalley) for the Atrahasis and Gilgamesh texts; the Epic of Gilgamesh (tr. Andrew George, Penguin Classics); Genesis 6–9 with its commentaries and the two-source studies; the suras of Noah, Hud, al-Mu'minun, and al-Ankabut with their exegeses, and the studies of the flood's universality or locality (Tabari, Ibn Kathir, and moderns: Rashid Rida in *al-Manar*, Tantawi, and others); Frazer's *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament* and Dundes's *The Flood Myth* (the comparative gathering); Shatapatha Brahmana 1.8.1 and the Matsya Purana; Apollodorus for Deucalion; George Smith's documents (1872); Ryan and Pitman's *Noah's Flood* (1998) with their geological critics; the Ur excavation reports (Woolley) and their reassessment. And the studies of sea-rise memory in the Australian narratives (Nunn and Reid).

Study 23.9: Philosophy and Religion—Adversaries or Neighbors?: *The Incoherence of the Philosophers* and *The Incoherence of the Incoherence* (in their critical editions and the study of the battle); *The Decisive Treatise* and *The Unveiling of the Methods of Proof*. *Averting the Conflict between Reason and Revelation*.

The Guide for the Perplexed and the *Kuzari* in their translations; the *Summa Theologiae* (the question of the relation of reason and revelation) and the modern encyclical *Fides et Ratio*; *Critique of Pure Reason* and *Critique of Practical Reason* (the three postulates); *Fear and Trembling* and the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*; the *Nyayakusumanjali* in its academic presentation, and the introductions to Indian philosophy (the six darshanas and their stance toward the Vedas); the Neo-Confucian introductions; and, from contemporary analytic philosophy of religion, the sources of Chapter 18 from both its shores. Every source marked by its genre.

The Body of Chapter 24: In the Depths of the Other Abodes—The Great Analysis: the Egyptian Book of the Dead (chapter 125, the negative confession, and the heart spell) in its scholarly translations; the Descent of Inanna and Gilgamesh (the Siduri tablet) from their authoritative translations; the article "This World and the Next in the Jewish Religion" (2024) for the Sheol–Daniel arc. *The Signs of the End Times in Judaism*—Mustafa Abd al-Ma'bud (a specialized Arabic study of the aharit, the Messiah, and his signs—its quotations checked against the Jewish sources themselves; it serves the foretellings study too). The New Testament's eschatological texts (Matthew 25, 1 Corinthians 15) with their commentaries. The return verses and the barzakh hadiths from their loci (with the study of the Fire's passing away in Ibn al-Qayyim's *Hadi al-Arwah*, by the measure of the disagreement); the Gita, the Upanishads, and the Pali nirvana texts; Epicurus's Letter to Menoeceus and Lucretius (*On the Nature of*

Things) in their translations; Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason* (the two postulates of immortality and God). And Freud's literature (*The Future of an Illusion*) and its replies.

The Complementary Chapter of Part VIII: Religion in the Age of Acceleration: the secularization-thesis literature and its retreat (Weber; Berger: *The Sacred Canopy*, then the desecularization and *The Heretical Imperative*); the studies of modern fundamentalisms (Marty and Appleby's Fundamentalism Project); the digital-religion literature and the sociology of the religious internet. Harari's *Homo Deus* (for the religion of data—handled as a controversial thesis, not a given). The Document on Human Fraternity (2019) and the Rome Call for AI Ethics; and the "spiritual but not religious" surveys (Pew and their like) when updating the figures.

The Study Attached to the Age-of-Acceleration Chapter: The Future of the Religions: Pew, *The Future of World Religions, 2010–2050* (2015) and its updates (2022)—the figures approximate and to be audited; Berger, *The Sacred Canopy* (1967) and *The Desecularization of the World* (1999). Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing*, and Stark–Finke on the strictness thesis and the religious market; Casanova and Taylor on the secularities; the STEP study (2006, the American Heart Journal) on the effect of intercessory prayer; the "spiritual but not religious" literature (Pew 2017, and Heelas–Woodhead); the documents of the robot Mindar (Kodaiji temple, 2019), the Nuremberg sermon (2023), and the "Way of the Future"

church (2015–2021); and the philosophy-of-mind studies on machine consciousness (Chalmers, Searle).

Appendix G—The Religions in Numbers: The Total Count, the Century's Growth, and Conversion Between the Religions: Pew: *The Age Gap in Religion Around the World* (2018—the commitment index in 106 countries); *The World's Muslims: Unity and Diversity* (2012—fasting, zakat, and prayer); *Religion in India* (2021); *Jewish Americans* (2020); the U.S. Religious Landscape Study (2024); *Religion in East Asia* (2024); the World Values Survey (wave seven, 2017–2022); Norris and Inglehart, *Sacred and Secular* (2004, 2011), for the law of existential security; Stark and Finke for the religious market; and the Afrobarometer and the Arab Barometer. **All the percentages are approximate ranges across countries, entered with their sources.**

Appendix G—The Religions in Numbers: The Total Count, the Century's Growth, and Conversion Between the Religions: the Pew Research Center: *How the Global Religious Landscape Changed, 2010–2020* (2025), religious switching in 36 countries (2025), *The Future of World Religions, 2010–2050* (2015), and *U.S. Muslims* (2017); the *World Christian Encyclopedia* (Johnson and Zurlo, 3rd edition, 2019) and the World Religion Database for the 1900–2000 estimates; the Arab Barometer (2019, 2022) for the region's religiosity; the estimates of China's Christians (Pew 2011, and the centers of Chinese religion studies) in their divergence; the census of India (2011) for the Dalit conversions; and the *American Jewish Year Book* (DellaPergola) for the Jewish numbers.

Appendix J — The Index: Figures, Terms, and Traditions

A selective index with the page numbers of the print edition—recording the principal loci of a term or figure, not every passing occurrence

Ordered by first letter (initial "the" ignored); the numbers are the pages of this edition (6 × 9 in.), generated from its final layout. The book-filling umbrella terms (Islam, Christianity, Judaism, God, religion, faith . . .) are not indexed, for the abundance of their occurrence; their principal loci are in the table of contents.

Entry	*Pages*
Adam	16, 77, 103, 173, 230–231, 233–235, 362, 369, 380, 386–388, 390–391, 458, 465–470, 475, 477, 577, 614, 627, 629
Adi Shankara	102, 178, 186, 579
Africa	26, 82, 88, 90, 92–93, 97, 116, 119, 124, 141, 143–144, 149, 151, 171, 177, 183–184, 187, 211, 216, 219, 234, 374–375, 381, 427, 467–470, 479, 516, 518, 528, 531, 536–537, 542, 572, 575, 579, 583, 600, 602, 604, 615
agnosticism	37, 261–264, 266, 272, 442–443, 472, 488, 536, 547, 585, 598, 618
Amazon, the	91
Americas, the	26, 82, 90, 92–93, 97, 117, 119, 142–143, 149, 171, 184, 193–194, 216, 219, 375, 381–382,

Entry	*Pages*
	425–428, 460, 467, 479, 487, 559, 572, 579–581, 590, 610, 612
Ameri, Sami	588, 613, 621–626
angels	39, 124, 128–135, 185, 198, 206, 231, 329, 374, 379–380, 383, 387–391, 439, 455, 466, 469, 542, 626
animism	19, 29, 71, 78–79, 81–82, 90, 92, 103, 107, 412, 569, 572, 574–575, 583, 608
Antony, Louise	288, 615
Apocrypha, the	584, 611
Aquinas	186, 209, 395, 427, 504, 580, 586–587, 614, 629
Asad, Muhammad	626
Ashoka	148, 151, 156, 411, 420, 426, 556, 612, 619, 628–629
atheism	11, 27, 30–34, 37–42, 45, 49, 55, 57–60, 62, 66, 95, 104, 127, 150, 213, 244, 246, 260–262, 264, 266–274, 276–277, 280–281, 287, 293–296, 298–299, 301–306, 317, 324, 356, 366–368, 372, 382, 392, 399, 415, 417, 421, 425, 437, 440–442, 444, 447, 449–450, 454, 477, 489, 520, 528, 530, 533, 536, 541, 547, 551, 554–557, 559–562, 564, 566–567, 576,

Entry	*Pages*
	588–589, 598, 607, 609, 613–615, 617, 622–623, 626–627
Atman	84–85, 99, 178, 505–506, 508, 511, 516, 522, 570, 583
Augustine	41, 149, 177, 209, 294, 362, 364–365, 368, 418, 427, 449, 453, 458, 464, 466, 559, 587, 614, 627–629
Avicenna	124, 268, 284, 496, 505, 587, 612
Axial Age, the	45, 48, 104, 193, 383, 583, 620
Babylon	82, 87, 97, 104, 122–123, 126, 128–129, 131, 134–135, 173, 176–177, 180, 219, 232, 376, 379, 453, 457–458, 464, 482, 484, 504, 521, 526, 556, 584
Baha'i faith, the	19, 79, 92, 141, 149, 157–158, 166, 177, 187, 189, 191–193, 198, 219, 417, 569, 585
Baqillani	13, 199, 320–322, 334, 612, 624
baraka (blessing)	121
Barnes, Luke	284, 617
Bayle, Pierre	270, 559, 561, 615
Biruni	71, 74, 551, 586, 612, 619
Borde-Guth-Vilenkin theorem, the	283, 617
Bradlaugh, Charles	272, 277, 616

Entry	*Pages*
Brahman	17, 21, 69, 84, 95–96, 99, 103, 109, 177, 314, 506, 508, 511, 570, 573, 583–584, 608
Braided Rope, the Rule of the	66, 212, 291, 296, 358, 372
Bucaille, Maurice	334, 613, 616
Buddha, the	19, 39, 45, 70, 78, 84–85, 99, 105, 121, 132–133, 137, 139, 148–150, 157, 165–166, 168, 172, 177–178, 187–188, 191, 207, 216–217, 223, 226, 232, 238, 262, 317, 361, 364, 378, 418, 428, 432, 460, 467, 506, 513, 522, 570, 573, 575, 579, 608, 620–621
Buddhism	15, 17, 26–27, 39, 68, 70, 76, 79, 85–87, 92–93, 96, 99, 117, 121, 131, 133, 137–139, 141–142, 148, 151, 156–159, 165, 167, 178, 189, 191–192, 194, 207, 216–219, 232–234, 238, 262, 303, 313–315, 336, 351, 361, 364, 369, 374, 377–378, 381, 389, 394, 398, 404, 411–412, 414, 420–421, 425–428, 432, 434–435, 455–456, 460, 462–463, 467, 470, 474, 480, 493–494, 496, 506, 508–510, 513, 516, 522, 529, 531, 533, 536–537, 551–552, 556–557, 560, 569–571, 573, 575–576,

Entry	*Pages*
	584, 587, 594, 596, 599–602, 604, 608, 615, 619, 626, 628–629
Bultmann, Rudolf	210, 615
"by tradition"	172, 175, 252, 502, 571, 579
Camus, Albert	273, 276, 305, 615, 622–623
coming-to-be, the argument from	280, 282–283, 296, 303, 367, 448–449, 463–464, 495, 497, 592, 615
Confucianism	18, 68, 70, 76, 78–79, 81, 85–86, 92, 117, 123, 148–149, 179, 218, 266, 366, 394, 403, 411, 416, 420, 432–433, 467, 480, 493, 496, 557, 569, 571, 573, 583–584, 608, 630
Confucius	85, 100, 105, 172, 179, 186–187, 216, 223, 265, 361, 364–365, 393, 420, 573, 575, 579, 608, 612
Craig, William Lane	282–283, 288, 588, 615
Darwin	12, 272, 275–276, 285, 367, 436, 458, 469, 471–473, 476–477, 539, 616, 629–630
Dawkins	32, 274, 399–400, 475, 589, 616, 622, 627
Deedat	530, 617, 622–623, 625–626
deism	96, 261, 267, 271, 277, 295, 303, 546, 560, 585, 617, 622
dependency, the argument from	284

Entry	*Pages*
Descartes	38, 42, 54, 588, 614, 618
dharma	69, 79, 99, 132–133, 142, 147–148, 178, 191–192, 232, 411, 420, 514, 539, 557, 584
d'Holbach	270, 277, 616
Diderot	270, 616
divine hiddenness, the argument from	194–195, 291, 304, 307, 371–372, 615, 623
Dreamtime, the	583
dualism	79, 81, 84, 92, 108, 177, 266, 313, 366, 369, 372–373, 375, 379–380, 489, 496–497, 504–505, 508–509, 583, 585
Durkheim	31, 69, 71, 587, 615, 619
Eaton, Charles Le Gai	626
Egypt, ancient	16, 25–26, 83, 88, 93, 98, 100, 104, 108, 111, 115, 117–118, 129, 144, 157, 173–174, 180–181, 183, 205, 217, 224, 232–233, 240, 247, 361, 376, 416, 424, 427–428, 458, 462, 464, 466, 468, 480, 483–484, 503, 505, 508, 513–515, 518–520, 522, 525–526, 556, 569, 572, 574–575, 609, 612, 630
Euthyphro dilemma, the	288, 292, 303, 392, 395–396, 408, 585, 594, 614, 627
evil eye, the	12, 114, 118–120, 616

Entry	*Pages*
evil, the problem of	35, 63, 110–111, 173, 261, 265, 275, 286, 292, 295, 360, 365–367, 371, 383, 401, 495, 523, 525–526, 585, 588, 593, 595–596, 613, 627
Farabi	268, 496, 505
fate and divine decree	25, 47, 83, 114, 130, 150, 153, 157, 164, 192–194, 264, 273, 360–367, 371–372, 375, 381–382, 390, 441, 446, 449, 459, 463, 482, 513, 515, 519, 607, 613, 626–627
Feuerbach	30, 103, 271, 588, 614
fine-tuning	46, 48, 280, 284, 441, 446, 451, 455, 463, 585, 592, 617
fine-tuning	46, 48, 280, 284, 441, 446, 451, 455, 463, 585, 592, 617
fitra (innate disposition)	28–29, 33–34, 45, 48–49, 83, 92, 97, 103–104, 108–109, 125–126, 286–287, 297–298, 300, 383–384, 458, 533–534, 563, 614
Flood, the	12, 173, 180, 478–480, 484, 577, 616, 630
founding event, the	137, 174, 208, 318, 347, 350
freedom of belief	152, 154, 435, 549, 554–556, 559–560, 562
Freud	27, 30–31, 71, 276, 305, 473, 487, 490, 524, 528, 588, 631
Gandhi	85, 179, 186–187, 405, 420, 579, 584

Entry	*Pages*
genetic fallacy, the	30, 32, 46, 104, 287
geography lottery, the	37–38, 42, 58, 66, 303, 305, 307, 358, 585, 596
Gervais, Will	287, 617
Ghazali	13, 21, 37–38, 40–42, 53, 101, 183, 186, 209, 268, 294, 306, 329, 334, 351, 381, 389, 403, 496, 505, 580, 586, 612, 614, 618, 627–628
Ghulam Ahmad, Mirza	92, 198–199, 201, 580
Gnosticism	79, 81, 84, 92, 369, 505, 508–509, 583, 585
god of the gaps, the	43, 48, 65, 297, 300, 585, 593
Greece	25, 28, 31, 79, 83, 86, 93, 98–99, 103, 108, 116, 118–119, 124, 134, 144, 148, 158, 163, 166, 181, 186, 204, 208, 218, 224, 226, 232–233, 239–240, 246, 252–253, 264–265, 282, 338, 340, 342, 344, 351, 361, 364, 387, 408, 458, 462, 466, 468, 479, 481–484, 492, 497, 504, 508, 515, 569, 579–581, 584, 612
Griffiths (psilocybin study)	290, 616–617
Guth, Alan	283, 286, 617
halakha, the	406, 410, 412–413, 628
Hammurabi	83, 115, 180, 187, 579, 612

Entry	*Pages*
Hell (the Fire)	31, 98, 263, 378, 385, 516, 521–522, 550, 571, 573, 631
Hinduism	17, 25, 27, 58, 70, 76–77, 79, 84, 89, 92, 95, 99, 105, 131, 133, 137–139, 141–142, 147–148, 150, 155, 157, 159, 164–165, 178–179, 186, 191–192, 216–217, 224, 233, 238, 263, 303, 313, 315, 317, 336, 394, 405, 411, 420, 424, 426, 428, 432–435, 455–456, 459–460, 462, 464, 470, 493, 505, 508–510, 513, 516, 522, 528, 531, 536–537, 552, 557, 569–571, 573, 575, 580, 583, 587, 599–602, 608, 615–617, 624, 628
Hong Xiuquan	179, 580
Hume	204, 210, 265, 270, 277, 285, 296, 303, 397, 586, 588–589, 614, 618, 622–623
Huxley, Thomas	37, 261, 272, 314, 473, 475, 585, 618
Iblis	131, 135, 374–375, 377, 380–383, 386–387, 389–391
Ibn al-Qayyim	13, 380, 522, 613, 620, 631
Ibn al-Rawandi	117, 199, 261, 267, 620, 622
Ibn Rushd	13, 209, 268, 437, 586, 612, 614
Ibn Rushd (Averroes)	13, 209, 268, 437, 586, 612, 614
Ibn Taymiyya	13, 362, 438, 522, 580, 586, 612, 625, 627

Entry	*Pages*
indigenous peoples, the	19, 91, 97, 119, 141, 149, 184, 375, 381, 583, 607
inimitability, scientific	318, 325, 327, 332–334, 337, 340, 358, 443, 457, 464, 539, 594, 613, 624
Inuit, the	91
Israel	45, 100–101, 104–105, 108, 111, 130, 161–162, 173–174, 176, 190, 192–193, 342–344, 399, 410, 417, 421, 571, 578, 603
Isra'iliyyat, the	47, 584
Izetbegović	350–351, 396, 399–400, 588, 613, 624, 627
Jainism	17, 68, 79, 84, 92, 96, 99, 137–138, 178, 394, 403–405, 494, 506, 508, 557, 569, 584, 628
Japan	26, 78, 85–86, 121, 124, 141, 148–149, 165, 179–180, 378, 416, 420, 426, 480, 484, 516, 518, 537, 542, 575, 581, 584, 602, 604, 612
Jerusalem	88, 137, 142, 156, 174–176, 191, 219, 342, 404, 408, 410, 414, 424, 492, 496, 512, 557, 584
Jesus	16, 19, 77, 88, 101, 152, 162–163, 167, 172, 175, 179, 190–191, 201, 206, 208, 324, 341–344, 348, 404, 418, 512, 514, 569, 573, 575, 581, 607, 614, 620–621
Jim Jones	185, 580

Entry	*Pages*
Jong, Jonathan, and Aku Visala	288, 615
Joseph Smith	92, 185, 224, 579
Jurjani	320, 322–323, 334, 612, 621, 624
Kabir	178, 188, 218, 579, 612, 629
Kairanawi, Rahmatullah	613, 623, 625
Kalama discourse, the	39, 178, 317, 612, 616, 618
kami, the	18, 86, 149, 165–166, 179, 516, 581, 584
Kant	296, 303, 393, 397, 524, 588, 614, 623, 627, 631
karma	17, 78–79, 84–85, 89, 92, 99, 122, 133, 192, 263, 361, 364–366, 369, 375, 377, 398, 403, 407, 460, 462, 470, 506, 508, 513, 516, 522–523, 525, 570–571, 573, 584, 595–596, 602, 608–609
Kevatta Sutta, the	207, 616
Koresh, David	185–186, 580
Krishna	19, 99, 147, 178, 191, 207, 217, 223, 226, 303, 581
Kuzari argument, the	218, 221, 349–350, 352, 356, 358, 500, 584, 614, 626, 630
Lang, Jeffrey	626
Laozi	85, 165–166, 179, 218, 223, 573, 581, 608, 612

Entry	*Pages*
lawful and the forbidden, the	329, 402, 612, 627–628
Leibniz	284, 615
Lewis, C. S.	289, 348, 588, 614, 626–627
Luther, Martin	88, 121, 158, 186–187, 231, 559, 580, 628
Ma'arri	266–268, 276, 588, 613, 622
Maimonides	162, 166, 186, 521, 558, 580, 586, 611, 614, 620
mana	90, 120–121, 126, 403, 583
Manichaeism	79, 82, 84, 92–93, 141, 149, 151, 155, 157, 172, 177, 187, 191–192, 217, 266, 294, 344–345, 349, 369, 427, 556–557, 569, 580, 590, 595, 610, 612, 620
Marx	272, 528, 588
Mary and Miriam	112, 119, 121, 130, 163, 174, 176, 406, 431, 578, 615, 628
Masoretic text, the	239, 250, 252–254, 342, 356, 584, 611, 621
Mazdak	177, 580
Mecca	88–89, 137, 173, 175, 181, 199, 327, 510, 521, 556, 570, 626
Mesopotamia	25, 82–84, 93, 97, 115, 128, 133, 157, 173, 180, 205, 216, 233, 360, 364, 376, 383, 399, 428, 452, 457, 462, 466, 468, 479, 482–484, 504, 508, 515, 518–520, 525, 556, 569, 612, 630

Entry	*Pages*
miracle, the	12, 47–48, 63, 70, 156, 181, 200–213, 239, 242, 246, 248, 261, 271, 291, 321–322, 324–325, 330, 333, 351, 355, 437, 441, 444, 451, 483, 499, 539, 542, 546, 570, 575–576, 589, 606–607, 612, 614–615, 620, 622, 627
moksha	84, 508, 516, 522, 570, 573, 576, 584
monotheism	25, 29–30, 34, 47, 61, 78, 83–84, 87, 89, 92, 96–98, 100–101, 103–104, 107–110, 113, 115–116, 118, 123, 125–126, 131, 133–134, 162–163, 167, 174–175, 179–180, 182, 200, 269, 309, 327, 367, 374–375, 380–381, 383, 389–391, 463, 500, 539, 556–557, 561, 570–573, 607, 609
Morriston, Wes	283, 615
Moses	19, 39, 45, 77, 98, 100, 162–163, 174, 176, 186, 188, 190–191, 201, 205–206, 213, 216, 223, 238–240, 248–249, 324, 343–346, 356, 362, 369, 418, 504, 519, 573, 575, 578, 595, 607
Muhammad	16, 19, 47, 77, 87–89, 109, 162–163, 167, 172, 175, 177, 182–183, 186, 188, 191–192, 194, 197, 199, 201, 220, 224, 249, 257, 318, 324, 326, 334, 341, 343–346, 348, 350, 390, 469, 474, 512, 570, 573, 575,

Entry	*Pages*
	578, 580, 587, 595, 607, 611–613, 617, 624–626
multiverse, the	285–286, 302, 441, 451, 585, 592–593
Mustafa Mahmoud	28, 31, 276, 299, 370–371, 442, 588, 613, 619, 626–627
Naik, Zakir	338, 474, 530, 617
Nakayama Miki	180, 188, 578
Nanak, Guru	77, 89, 178, 426, 571, 573, 575, 578
naturalism, methodological	340, 439, 585
Nietzsche	272, 588, 614
nirvana	85, 99, 132, 508, 516, 522, 570, 573, 576, 584, 608, 631
Noah	77, 83, 146, 150, 162–163, 173, 190, 327, 478–479, 481–483, 571, 577, 616, 630
Nongqawuse	184, 187, 579, 616
Paley, William	284, 473, 589, 615
pantheism	84, 96, 102, 269, 450, 496, 585
Paradise (the Garden)	131, 231, 233, 380, 512, 514, 516, 518, 521, 532, 576
Pascal	32, 41, 60, 99, 123, 296, 303, 307, 587, 614
perspectivism	77, 91, 456
Pfander, Karl Gottlieb	613, 623

Entry	*Pages*
Plantinga	13, 28–29, 33, 72, 287, 296, 368, 588, 615, 622, 627
pluralism	147, 149–150, 312, 547, 555, 562
properly basic belief	287, 615
prophethood	70, 77–78, 86, 92–93, 162–163, 167, 171–172, 175, 179, 181–183, 186, 189–192, 194–196, 198–200, 202, 204, 208, 213, 267, 327, 334, 498, 563, 581, 612–613, 620, 625
Pythagoras	181, 208, 504, 579
qira'at, the	357, 584, 596
quantum vacuum, the	283
Quraysh	87, 206, 212, 320, 327
Qurtubi	21, 287, 614
Rama	99, 178, 581
Razi, al-	58, 267, 437, 612, 622
reincarnation (transmigration)	146, 181, 503, 506, 515–516
religious experience, the argument from	71, 111, 198, 280, 290, 297, 312, 315, 455, 485–487, 489–490, 587, 614
religious switching	311, 599–600, 618, 631

Entry	*Pages*
resurrection and the Last Day, the	39, 78, 84, 89, 98, 130, 137, 164, 194, 206, 211–212, 266, 268, 324, 348, 356–357, 391, 431, 462, 493, 497, 499, 502–506, 508–513, 515–516, 519, 521–522, 526, 532–533, 569, 571–573, 584, 595, 607
Robespierre	271, 616
Russell, Bertrand	185, 273, 284, 298, 305, 449, 580, 588, 614–615, 622
Sardar, Ziauddin	334, 616
Sartre	273, 275, 549, 614, 622
Satan	12, 81, 84, 98, 130–131, 134, 177, 372, 374–375, 377–384, 386–387, 389–390, 404, 466, 591, 607, 613
Schellenberg, J. L.	291, 615, 623
secularization	27, 49, 126, 382, 528, 535, 537, 542–543, 616, 631
Septuagint, the	218, 233, 239, 248, 252–254, 342, 356, 387, 584, 611, 621
shamanism	82, 86–87, 91, 97, 117, 124, 184, 187, 208, 219, 312–313, 506, 551, 572, 583
sharia, the	315, 418–419
Shinto	18, 78, 86, 92, 141, 148–149, 155, 165, 179, 187, 378, 420, 516, 518, 537, 569, 575, 581, 584

Entry	*Pages*
Sikhism	17, 77, 79, 89, 92, 137–140, 151, 157, 159, 178, 186, 218, 394, 404, 407, 412, 426–427, 432, 434, 569, 571, 573, 575, 580, 609
six families, the	79, 81, 92, 309, 583
Socrates	86, 105, 124, 181, 186–187, 262, 264, 276, 395, 550, 556, 562, 580
sorcery and magic	12, 71, 114–119, 122, 125, 127, 135, 203–205, 211, 266, 308, 320, 324, 375, 379, 381–382, 606, 615, 623
Spinoza	209, 239, 262, 269, 450, 560, 614
Sun Myung Moon	180, 580
Swinburne, Richard	13, 290, 296, 588, 615
taboo	31, 90, 403, 406–407, 583
Tacitus	208, 616
Talmud, the	87, 119, 124, 129, 138, 145, 197, 200, 216, 219, 356, 362, 394, 410, 571, 573, 584, 607, 611, 620
Tanakh, the	39, 93, 174–175, 190, 205, 218, 223, 225–226, 228, 237, 239, 248, 252–254, 521, 571, 573, 578, 584, 589, 595, 607, 611
Taoism	18, 79, 81, 85–86, 92, 100, 117, 148–149, 165–166, 179, 313, 362, 394, 462, 493, 506, 508, 516, 557, 569, 571, 573, 583, 608

Entry	*Pages*
Tao, the	18, 21, 69, 78, 85, 96, 100, 103, 179, 216, 218, 223, 225–226, 228–229, 378, 462, 493, 496, 525, 571, 573, 584, 589, 608, 612, 621
tawatur (mass transmission)	65, 154, 160, 218, 246, 310, 318, 347, 349–350, 352, 494, 500, 584, 609, 626
Tengrism	25, 86, 92–93, 97, 583
theodicy	173, 310, 365–366, 368, 585
Tian (Heaven)	85, 95, 100, 573, 584
tikkun olam	16, 571
tolerance	86–87, 151, 167, 265, 268–269, 276–277, 393, 424–425, 529, 537, 550–552, 555–556, 558–559, 561
Trinity, the	88, 101, 157, 162, 164, 167, 269, 559, 625
Tzortzis, Hamza Andreas	613
Vespasian	208, 212, 616
Wahiduddin Khan	289, 615
Wallace, Alfred Russel	241, 272, 614, 621
Wovoka	185, 579
Zoroaster	70, 83–84, 98, 105, 108, 149, 166, 172, 177, 191, 193, 216–217, 223, 377, 571, 573, 575, 578, 588, 614, 619

Entry	*Pages*
Zoroastrianism	18, 25, 70, 76–77, 79, 84, 87, 92–93, 98, 124, 129, 133, 138, 141–142, 146–147, 155, 157, 165, 177, 191–193, 217, 233, 361, 364–365, 369, 379, 394, 428, 460, 462–463, 467–468, 480, 506, 508–510, 513–514, 516, 518, 537, 557, 569, 571, 573, 575, 585, 609

A Word from the Author: Where I Stood—and Where the Book Stood

The journey is over, and I owe you one thing more, which I deliberately left for this page: to tell you who traveled with you. I left it for last so that you would not read the book with an eye hunting for my bias in every line—so that you would weigh the map on your own scale first, and only then weigh me.

I am a monotheist. I believe—with mind and with heart—that *tawhid*, the absolute oneness of God, is the truth: that God is One, the One and Only; that He begot no one, nor was He begotten; that no one is comparable to Him; that there is no god but He, and He has no partner. I believe that the Qur'an is the word of God, that it reached us as it was revealed, preserved from alteration. I believe in all the messengers and prophets, from Adam to Jesus—peace be upon them—making no distinction between any of them, and that the last of them is Muhammad, God's peace and blessings be upon him. This is my creed. I state it in my own voice and in the first person, neither ashamed of it nor disguising it.

Then let me tell you what matters more to you than my creed: **this creed wrote not one line of this book other than this page and its sisters marked with my name.** I did not impose it in any chapter. I did not slip it into any preference. I did not hold the scale in one hand while tipping a pan with the other. I bound myself to a single standard for everyone: whatever evidence I demanded of any religion I demanded of my own, and

whatever testimony I accepted for my own I accepted for others. I presented every belief as its own people present it, and then its critique as its critics offer it—my own religion among them, exempted from nothing and spared nothing. And wherever it seemed to me that my opinion might slip in, I confined it to the paragraphs marked "A Word from the Author," so that the reader would know where the book speaks and where I do. You have now come through the whole book, so you can judge better than I can: did I keep my word?

Why would I do this, when I am certain of what I believe? Because I believe that the truth does not fear the scale, and that a faith which cannot bear to be weighed fairly alongside others is not worthy of being offered to a seeker. If what I believe is true, then a fair scale will have shown it to you more clearly than a biased hand ever could. And if it has not shown it to you, I respect your journey, and I pray for you what I pray for myself: that we be guided to the truth, wherever it lies.

The map was in your hands, and the standard was in your hand. As for your companion, he has introduced himself at the end of the road. Weigh his background as you would weigh any writer's; put to him, if you like, the very questions he taught you to ask; and do not exempt him from your sieve. That is his last wish for you.
