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BĀB, BĀBĪS.—*Bāb* (باب =‘Gate’ in Arabic)

was the title first assumed by Mīrzā ‘Alī Muḥam-

mad, a young Sayyid of Shīrāz, who in a.d. 1260

(= a.d. 1844) began to preach a new religion,

which spread through Persia with extraordinary

rapidity, and, in spite of violent persecutions, cul-

minating in the execution of the founder on July

9, 1850, and of some twenty-eight of his principal

disciples on September 15, 1852, has continued to

gain strength until the present day. Both the

history and the doctrines of this religion present

so many remarkable features, that the subject has,

almost from the first, attracted a great deal of

attention, not only in the East but in Europe, and

latterly in America; and the literature dealing

with it, even in European languages, is very ex-

tensive; while the Arabic and Persian writings,

manuscript, lithographed and printed, connected

with it are so numerous and, in some cases, so

voluminous, that it would hardly be possible for

the most industrious student to read in their

entirety even those which are accessible in half

a dozen of the best-known collections in Europe.

An exhaustive treatment of the subject is there-

fore impossible, and we must content ourselves

with a sketch of the most important outlines of

the history, doctrines, and literature of the religion

in question.

1. Antecedents.—In order to understand properly

the origins and developments of Bābī doctrine, it

is, of course, essential to have a fair knowledge of

Islām, and especially of that form of Islām (the

doctrine of the *Ithnā ‘ashariyya* division of the

Shī‘a, or ‘Sect of the Twelve’ Imāms), of which

Persia has from the earliest Muhammadan times

been the stronghold, and which, since the 16th

cent. of our era, has been the State religion of that

kingdom. Information on this subject must be

sought elsewhere in this Encyclopaedia under the

appropriate headings; but, even for the most ele-

mentary comprehension of the early Bābī doctrine,

it is essential to grasp the Shi‘ite doctrine of the

Imāmate, and especially the Messianic teaching

concerning the Twelfth Imām, or Imām Mahdī.

According to the Shī‘ite view, the prophet Mu-

hammad appointed to succeed him, as the spiritual

head of Islām, his cousin ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, who,

being married to Fāṭima, was also his son-in-law.

‘Alī’s rights were, however, usurped in turn by

Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān; and though he

was elected Khalīfa after ‘Uthmān’s death, he was

assassinated after a brief and troubled reign of

five years (a.d. 656-661). His eldest son, al-Ḥasan,

the second Imām, abdicated five or six months

after his father’s death in favour of the Umayyad

Mu‘āwiya. His younger son, al-Ḥusayn, the third

Imām, attempted to regain his temporal rights by

a rash revolt against the Umayyads, but perished

on the fatal field of Karbalā (Kerbelā) on Muḥar-

ram 10, a.h. 61 (Oct. 10, a.d. 680), a day still

celebrated with wailing and mourning in all Shī‘ite

communities, especially in Persia. The nine re-

maining Imāms all lived in more or less dread of

the Umayyad, and afterwards of the ‘Abbāsid

khalīfas, and many of them died by poison or other

violent means. They were all descended from

al-Ḥusayn, and, according to the popular belief,

from a daughter of Yazdigird III., the last Sāsānian

king, who was taken captive by the Arabs after

the battle of Qādisiyya, and given in marriage to

al-Ḥusayn. This belief, which was prevalent at

least as early as the 3rd cent. of the Hijra, since

it is mentioned by the historian al-Ya‘qūbī (ed.

Houtsma, ii. 293, 363), undoubtedly explains, as

remarked by Gobineau,\* the affection in which

the Imāms are held in Persia, since they are re‑

garded as the direct descendants not only of the

prophet Muḥammad, but also of the old royal

house of Sāsān. The Divine Right of the Imāms

to the temporal supremacy of which they had been

unjustly deprived, and the absolute dependence

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

of the faithful on the spiritual guidance of the

‘Imām of the Age,’ thus became the two most

characteristic and essential dogmas of all the

various Shī‘ite sects. ‘Whosoever dies,’ says

a well-known Shī‘ite tradition,’ without recog-

nizing the Imām of his time, dies the death of a

pagan.’

Now, according to the ‘Sect of the Twelve,’ the

Twelfth Imām, or Imām Mahdī, was the last of

the series. But since, according to their belief,

the world cannot do without an Imām, and since

this last Imām, who succeeded his father in A.H.

260 (= a.d. 873-4), disappeared from mortal ken

in a.h. 329 (= a.d. 940-1), it is held that he never

died, but is still living in the mysterious city of

Jābulqā, or Jābulsā, surrounded by a band of

faithful disciples, and that at the end of time

he will issue forth and ‘fill the earth with justice

after it has been filled with iniquity.’ This Mes-

sianic Advent is ever present in the mind of the

Persian Shī‘ite, who, when he has occasion to

mention the Twelfth Imām, or Imām Mahdī (also

entitled *Ḥujjatu’llāh*, ‘the Proof of God,’ Baqiy-

yatu’llāh, ‘the Remnant of God,’ *Ṣāḥibu’z-Zamān*,

‘the Lord of the Age,’ and *Qā’imu ‘Alī Muḥammad*,

‘He who shall arise out of the house of Muḥam-

mad’), always adds the formula فرجه الله عجّل

(‘May God hasten his glad Advent!’).

Now, in connexion with Bābī doctrine, it is to be

noticed first of all that the ‘Manifestation’ (رظهو)

of Mīrzā ‘Alī Muḥammad the Bāb took place, as

already said, in a.h. 1260, exactly a thousand

years after the succession of the Imām Mahdī to

the Imāmate, or, in other words, at the completion

of a millennium of ‘Occultation’ (غَيبَت). For

the Imām Mahdī, according to the Shī‘ite belief,

appeared in public once only, on his accession,

when he performed the funeral service over his

father, after which he became invisible to the bulk

of his followers. During the first 69 years of the

millennium of ‘Occultation,’ however, his instruc-

tions and directions were communicated to his

followers, the Shī‘a, through four successive inter-

mediaries, each of whom bore the title of *Bāb*, or

‘Gate.’\* This period is known as ‘the Minor

Occultation’ (صُغْرى غَيبَت). In a.h. 329, how-

ever, this series of ‘Gates,’ or channels of com-

munication between the Imām and his followers,

came to an end, and such communication became

impossible. This later and longer period (which,

according to the Bābī view, lasted from a.h. 329

to a.h. 1260) is known as ‘the Major Occultation’

(كُبْرى غَيبَت).

It was in this sense, then, that Mīrzā ‘Alī Mu-

ḥammad, at the beginning of his career, declared

himself to be the *Bāb*, or ‘Gate,’ viz., the gate

whereby communication, closed since the end of

the ‘Minor Occultation,’ was re-opened between

the Hidden Imām and his faithful followers. He

did not invent this term, nor was he even the first

to revive it, for it was used in the same sense by

ash-Shalmaghānī, a Messiah of the 10th cent. of

our era, and by others.† So far as recent times

are concerned, however, it was the Shaykhī school,

founded by Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsā’ī (b. a.d.

1733, d. a.d. 1826) which revived the idea that

amongst the faithful followers of the Twelfth

\* For their names, and a fuller account of the whole matter,

see the present writer’s tr. of the *Traveller’s Narrative*,

ii. 296 ff.

† For a full discussion of this matter, see the note on the

meaning of the title ‘Bāb’ in the tr. of the *Traveller’s Narra-*

*tive*, ii. 226-234.

Imām there must always exist one, whom they

entitled Shī‘a-i-Kāmil (كامَل شِيعَهٔ),’the Perfect

Shī‘ite,’ who was in direct spiritual communication

with him. Neither Shaykh Aḥmad nor his successor

Sayykh Kāẓim of Rasht (d. a.d. 1843-1844) made

use of the title ‘Bāb,’ but their conception of ‘the

Perfect Shī‘ite’ was practically identical with the

idea connoted by that title. To this Shaykhī

school, or sect, belonged not only Mīrzā ‘Alī

Muḥammad himself, but Mullā Ḥusayn of Bush-

rawayh, Qurratu’l-‘Ayn, and many others of his

first and most zealous disciples. On the death of

Savyid Kāẓim his followers were naturally im-

pelled by their doctrine concerning ‘the Perfect

Shī‘ite’ to seek his successor. There were two

claimants, Mīrzā ‘Alī Muḥammad, who on May 23,

1844,\* within a short time of Sayyid Kāẓim’s

death, announced himself to be the ‘Bab,’ and

whose followers were consequently called ‘Bābīs’;

and Hājjī Muḥammad Karīm Khān, a scion of

the Qājār Royal Family, who was recognized, and

whose descendants are still recognized, by the con-

servative or stationary Shaykhīs as their spiritual

head. It is in the teachings of the Shaykhī

school, therefore, that the immediate origins of

early Bābī doctrine must be sought; but no

European scholar has yet made a critical study

of the works and doctrines of Shaykh Aḥmad and

Sayyid Kāẓim. Those who desire somewhat fuller

information on this subject may be referred to

the *Traveller’s Narrative*, ii. 234-244. A full and

critical study of the Shaykhs doctrines would, how-

ever, form an indispensable preliminary to such a

philosophical history of the Bābīs as must some

day be written.

2. History of the movement during the life of

the founder.—The first period of Bābī history

begins with the ‘Manifestation’ on May 23, 1844,

and ends with the martyrdom of the Bāb at Tabrīz

on July 9, 1850. The detailed history of these

six years will be found in the translations of the

*Traveller’s Narrative* (Camb. 1891) and the *New*

*History of … the Bāb* (Camb. 1893), while a fairly

complete bibliography of earlier works on the sub-

ject, both European and Oriental, is given in the

former work (ii. 173-211). In the *JRAS* for 1889

(vol. xxi. new ser. pp. 485-528 and 881-1009) are

also discussed critically various matters connected

with both the history and the doctrines of the sect.

Of the three chief histories composed in Persian

by members of the sect, the earliest and most

instructive is that written between 1850 and 1852

by Ḥājjī Mīrzā Jānī of Kāshān, who must have

finished it only a little while before he was put to

death among the twenty-eight Bābīs who suffered

martyrdom at Ṭihrān (Teheran) on September 15,

1852. Of this work the only complete manuscript,

so far as the present writer can ascertain, which

existed (until he caused it to be transcribed for

himself) was Suppl. Pers. 1071 in the Bibliothèque

Nationale at Paris, one of the MSS brought from

Persia by M. le Comte de Gobineau, the talented

author of *Les Religions et les philosophies dans*

*l’Asie Centrale*. Another MS in the same collec-

tion (Suppl. Pers. 1070) contains the first third of

it, while the *New History* (جَدِيد تاريخ) is a re-

cension made (about a.d. 1875-1880) by Mīrzā

Ḥusayn of Hamadān, containing many additions,

but also remarkable for some extremely important

omissions and alterations. There is thus sufficient

material for an edition of this most important docu-

ment, which the present writer is now (1908) print-

ing. The *Traveller’s Narrative*, the third of the

three principal systematic accounts compiled by the

\* This date, and even the exact hour of his ‘Manifestation,’

is given by the Bāb in two passages of the Persian *Bayān*

(Wāḥid ii. 7, and vi. 13). See *Trav. Narr*. ii. 218-226.

Bābīs of their history, is not only later, but deals

less with the early history of the movement than

with the biography and writings of Bahā’u’llāh, to

whose son ‘Abbās Efendi (also called ‘Abdu’l-Bahā)

its authorship is ascribed. The accounts of Bābī

history given by Muhammadan writers (notably

by the Lisānu’l-Mulk in the *Nāsikhu’t-Tawārīkh*

and by Riẓā-qulī-Khān in his supplement to

the *Rawẓatu’ṣ-Ṣafā*) must, as a rule, be used

with great caution, but exception must be made

in favour of the late Sayyid Jamālu’d-Dīn al-

Afghān’s article on the Bābīs in Buṭrusu’l-Bustāni’s

Arabic encyclopaedia the *Dā’iratu’l-Ma’ārif* (Bei-

rut, 1881), and of a more recent history compiled

in Arabic by a Persian doctor named Za’īmu’d-

Dawla, and published at Cairo in a.h. 1321 (a.d.

1903-4),\* from both of which, in spite of the pre-

judice against the Bābīs which they display, im-

portant facts may be gleaned.

A very brief summary of the events of this first

period (a.d. 1844-1850) is all that can be given

here. The Bāb himself, who was only twenty-

four years old at the time of his ‘Manifestation,’†

and not thirty when he suffered martyrdom, was

a captive in the hands of his enemies during the

greater portion of his brief career, first at Shīrāz

(August-September 1845—March 1846), then at

Iṣfahān (March 1846—March 1847), then at Mākū

near Urumiyya, and, for the last six months of

his life, at the neighbouring castle of Chihrīq. He

enjoyed the greatest freedom at Iṣfahān, where the

governor, Minūchihr Khān, a Georgian eunuch,

treated him with consideration and even favour;

but he was able to continue his writings and to

correspond with, and even receive, his followers

during the greater part of his captivity, save,

perhaps, the last portion. He himself, however,

took no part in the bloody battles which presently

broke out between his followers and their Muslim

antagonists. Of these armed risings of the Bābīs

the chief were in Māzandarān, at Shaykh Ṭabarsī

near Bārfurūsh, under the leadership of Mullā

Ḥusayn of Bushrawayh and Ḥājjī Mullā Muḥam-

mad ‘Alī of Bārfurūsh (autumn of 1848 to summer

of 1849); at Zanjān, under Mullā Muḥammad ‘Alī

Zanjānī (May-December 1850); and at Yazd and

Nirīz, under Āghā Sayyid Yaḥyā (summer of 1850),

while a second rising at Nirīz seems to have

occurred in 1852.‡ Amongst other events of this

period to which the Bābīs attach special import-

ance, and of which they have preserved detailed

accounts, is the martyrdom of ‘the Seven Martyrs’

at Tihrān, which also took place in the summer of

1850.§ During the later period of his career Mīrzā

‘Alī Muḥammad discarded the title of Bāb’ (which

he conferred on one of his disciples) and announced

that he was the *Qā’im*, or expected Imām, and even

more than this, the Nuqṭa (نُقْطه),or ‘Point.’ It is

by this title (*Hazrat-i-Nuqṭa-i-Ūlā*, ‘His Holiness

the First Point’), or by that of *Ḥaẓrat-i-Rabbiyu’l-*

*A’lā*, ‘His Holiness my Lord Most High,’ that he

is generally spoken of by his followers, though

latterly the Bahā’īs, desiring to represent him as

a mere forerunner of Bahā’u’llāh—a sort of John

the Baptist—seem to have abandoned the use of

these later and higher titles. But from the Bāb’s

own later writings, such as the Persian Bayān,

as well as from what is said by Mirza Jānī and

other contemporary writers, it is clear that he was

regarded as a divine being, and that in a very

full sense, as will be shown when the doctrines

\* This work Is entitled *Miftāḥu Bābī’l-Abwāb* (‘the Key of the

Gate of Gates’).

† The most reliable evidence points to October 9, 1820, as

the date of his birth. Mīrzā Ḥusayn ‘Alī, afterwards known as

Bahā’u’llāh was a year or two older (see *Trav. Narr*. ii.

218 ff.).

‡ See *Trav. Narr.* ii. 253-261. § ib. ii. 211-218.

of the Bābīs are discussed, when the term ‘Point’

(*Nuqṭa*) will also be explained. The circumstances

attending the execution of the Bāb at Tabrīz on

July 9, 1850, and especially his strange escape

from the first volley fired at him,\* are fully

recorded in the histories already mentioned, and

need not be recapitulated here. His body, after

being exposed for several days, was recovered by

his disciples, together with that of his fellow-

martyr Mīrzā Muḥammad ‘Alī of Tabrīz, wrapped

in white silk, placed in a coffin, and concealed for

some seventeen years in a little shrine called

Imām-zāda-i-Ma‘ṣūm between Ṭihrān and Ribāṭ-

Karīm. At a later date it was transferred to

‘Akkā (St. Jean d’Acre) by order of Bahā’u’llāh,

where it was placed in a shrine specially built for

that purpose.†

3. Period of Subḥ-i-Ezel’s supremacy (a.d. 1850-

1868).—Before his death the Bāb had nominated

as his successor a lad named Mīrzā Yaḥyā, son

of Mīrzā Buzurg of Nūr, and half-brother of the

afterwards more famous Mīrzā Ḥusayn ‘Alī, better

known as Bahā’u’llāh. Mīrzā Yaḥyā was, accord-

ing to Mīrzā Jānī, only 14 years old at the time of

the Bāb’s ‘Manifestation,’ so that he must, have

been born about a.h. 1246 (= a.d. 1830-1831). His

mother died when he was a child, and he was

brought up by his step-mother, the mother of his

elder half-brother Bahā’u’llāh, who was about 13

years his senior.‡ Mīrzā Jānī, our oldest, best, and

most unprejudiced authority (since he was killed

in 1852, long before the schism between the Ezelīs

and Bahā’īs took place) reports Bahā’u’llāh as

saying that he did not then know how high a

position Mīrzā Yaḥyā was destined to occupy.

At the early age of 15, about a year after the

‘Manifestation,’ he was so attracted by what he

heard of the Bāb and read of his writings, that

he set off for Khurāsān and Māzandarān, met

Janāb-i-Quddūs (*i.e*. Mullā Muḥammad ‘Alī of

Bārfurūsh) and Qurratu’l-‘Ayn, and, with Bahā-

’u’llāh, attempted to join the Bābīs who were

besieged at Shaykh Ṭabarsī, but was prevented

by the governor of Amul. In the fifth year of

the ‘Manifestation’ (a.h. 1265 = a.d. 1849), shortly

after the fall of Shaykh Ṭabarsī, the Bāb, having

heard of Mīrzā Yaḥyā’s youth, zeal, and devotion,

declared that in him was fulfilled the sign of the

Fifth Year given in the tradition of Kumayl,

‘A Light shining from the Dawn of Eternity,’

conferred on him the title *Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel* (‘the Dawn

of Eternity’), sent him his own rings and other

personal possessions, authorized him, at such time

as he should see fit, to add 8 *wāhids* (or ‘Unities’

of 19 chapters each) to the *Bayān*, and appointed

him his successor. On the Bāb’s death, therefore,

Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel, as we shall now continue to call him,

was recognized with practical unanimity by the

Bābīs as their spiritual head; but, owing to his

youth and the secluded life which he adopted

the practical conduct of the affairs of the Bābī

community devolved chiefly on his elder half-

brother Bahā’u’llāh, or Janāb-i-Bahā, as he is

called by Mīrzā Jānī. There seem to have been

some rival claimants, notably Mīrzā Asadu’llāh

of Tabrīz, entitled ‘Dayyān,’ who was, according

to Gobineau (p. 277 f.), drowned in the Shattu’l-

‘Arab by some of the Bābīs who wished to put

an end to his pretensions; and, according to Mīrzā

Jānī, certain other persons, such as ‘the Indian

believer’ Sayyid Baṣīr, Āghā Muḥammad Karawī,

and a young confectioner entitled ‘Dhabīḥ’ (ذَبِيح

\* See, however, the *New History*, p. 301, n. 1 *ad calc*., which

contains a correction of a detail given by Gobineau.

† See the *Traveller’s Narrative*, ii. 46, and n. 1 *ad calc.*

‡ The date of Bahā’u’llāh’s birth is given in Nabīl’s rhymed

chronicle as 2 Muḥarram, a.h. 1233 (= November 12, 1817). See

*JRAS*, 1889, p. 521.

قُناد), claimed to be theophanies or Divine Mani-

festations.\* Mīrzā Jānī actually exulted in this

state of things, declaring that just as the tree

which bears most fruit is the most perfect, so the

religion which produces most divine or quasi-Divine

Manifestations thereby shows its superiority to

other creeds. But none of these persons appears

to have had any considerable following, and for

some time Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel enjoyed, nominally at least,

an uncontested supremacy.

For two years (July 1850-August 1852) little

was heard of the Bābīs; but on August 15, 1852,

three or four adherents of the sect made an attempt

on the life of Nāṣiru’d-Dīn Shāh as he was leaving

his palace at Niyāvarān to go out hunting. The

attempt, which appears to have had no counten-

ance from the leaders of the Bābīs, failed, but led

to the fierce persecution of the sect, of whom some

twenty-eight prominent members, including the

beautiful poetess Qurratu’l-‘Ayyn, Mullā Shaykh

‘Alī, called ‘Janāb-i-‘Aẓīm,’ Āghā Sayyid Ḥusayn

of Yazd the Bāb’s secretary Sulaymān Khān, and

our historian Ḥājji Mīrzā Jānī, were among the

most conspicuous victims. The object being to

make all classes participators in their blood, the

doomed Bābīs were divided among the different

classes and gilds, beginning with the ‘ulamā, the

princes of the Royal House, and the different

Government offices, and ending with the royal

pages and students of the Dāru’l-Funūn, one

victim being assigned to each, and a rivalry in

cruelty was thus produced which made that day,

Wednesday, September 15, 1852, equally memor-

able and horrible to all who witnessed it. The

fortitude of the Bābī martyrs, and especially the

death-ecstasy of Sulaymān Khān, produced a pro-

found impression, and, as Gobineau says, probably

did more to win converts to the new faith than all

the previous propaganda.†

Bahā’u’llāh and Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel both escaped death

on this occasion, though the former was arrested,‡

and a price was set on the apprehension of the

latter.§ Both ultimately escaped to Baghdad,

where they arrived about the end of 1852, Bahā’u-

’llāh, who was imprisoned in Tihrān for four months,

arriving soon after his half-brother.‖ For the

next eleven or twelve years (1853-1564) Baghdad

was the headquarters of the sect, of which Ṣubḥ-i-

Ezel continued to be the ostensible head, and is

even implicitly acknowledged as such by Bahā’u-

’llāh in the Īqān, composed by him in 1861-1862.

In the *Traveller’s Narrative* (ii. 54ff., especially

pp. 55 and 62-63 of the translation), which contains

the official Bahā’ī version of these transactions, it

is implied that the nomination of Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel was

a mere blind, that Bahā’u’llāh was from the first

intended, and that his ‘Manifestation’ took place

in a.h. 1269 (= a.d. 1853), which the Bābīs call

the year of ‘after a while’ (حَين بَعَد سنة, for

حَين, ‘while,’ = 8 + 10 + 50 = 63, and the year

‘after’ is ‘69). Ostensibly, however, his claim to

be ‘He whom God shall manifest’ dates from A.H.

1283 (a.d. 1866-1867), the end of the Adrianople

period, which agrees with Nabīl’s statement¶ that

he was fifty years old when he thus manifested his

true nature, for he was born in a.h. 1233 (= a.d.

1817).

\* Another such claimant, according to Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel, was

Ḥusayn of Mīlān, who perished in the persecution of 1852 (see

the *Traveller’s Narrative*, ii. 330f.), while two other claimants,

Siyyid Ḥusayn of Hindiyān and Shaykh Isma‘īl, are mentioned

(see also p. 357 f. of the same, where other pretenders are

named).

† For further details see the *Traveller’s Narrative*, ii 323-

334.

‡ ib. pp. 51-53 and 327. § ib. p. 374 f.

‖ See *JRAS*, 1889, pp. 945-948.

¶ *JRAS*, 1889, pp. 984 and 988, verse 10.

The records of the Baghdad period are compara-

tively scanty, but the propaganda went steadily

on, though conducted with a caution and prudence

foreign to the early days of the sect. About a

year after his arrival at Baghdad, Bahā’u’llāh

retired alone for two years into the highlands of

Turkish Kurdistān, living chiefly at a place called

Sarkalū, and occasionally visiting Sulaymāniyya.\*

By the Bahā’īs this retirement is regarded as a

kind of preparation and purification; by the Ezelīs,

as due to annoyance at the opposition which he

encountered in his plans from several prominent

Bābīs of the old school. Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel, a man of

modest and retiring disposition, seems to have

lived in great seclusion both before and after this

event, and the disputes which appear to have

occurred at this period seem to have been chiefly

between Bahā’u’llāh and his adherents on the one

hand, and Mullā Muḥammad Ja‘far of Nirāq,

Mullā Rajab ‘Alī *Qahīr*, Sayyid Muḥammad of

Iṣfahān, Sayyid Jawād of Kerbelā and the like on

the other. Ultimately, owing to the hostility of

the Persian Consul at Baghdad, Mīrzā Buzurg

Khān of Qazwīn, and Mīrzā Ḥusayn Khān *Mu*-

*shīru’d-Dawla*, the Persian Ambassador at Con-

stantinople, the Turkish government was induced

to expel the Bābīs from Baghdad, where their

proximity to the Persian frontier, and to the

Shī‘ite shrines of Kerbelā and Najaf, afforded

them great opportunities of proselytizing among

their countrymen. This took place in the spring

or early summer of 1864. They were first taken

to Constantinople, where they remained for four

months, and thence banished to Adrianople, where

they arrived about the end of the year above men-

tioned. There they remained for nearly four years

(Dec. 1864-August 1868), and there it was that in

a.h. 1283 (a.d. 1866-67) Bahā’u’llāh publicly an-

nounced that he was ‘He whom God shall mani-

fest,’ foretold by the Bāb, and called on all the

Bābīs to recognize him as such, and to pay their

allegiance to him, not merely as the Bāb’s suc-

cessor, but as him of whose Advent the Bāb was a

mere herald and forerunner.

This announcement, which naturally convulsed

the whole Bābī community, was gradually accepted

by the majority, but was strenuously opposed not

only by Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel but by a considerable number

of prominent Bābīs, including more than one of

the original 18 disciples of the Bāb known as the

‘Letters of the Living’ (حَىّ حُروف). The strife

waxed fierce; several persons were killed;† charges

of attempted poisoning were hurled backwards and

forwards between the two half-brothers;‡ and at

length the Turkish government again intervened

and divided the two rival factions, sending Ṣubḥ-i-

Ezel with his family to Famagusta in Cyprus, and

Bahā’u’llāh with his family and a number of his

followers to ‘Akkā in Syria, which places they

respectively reached about the end of August

1868. To check their activities, however, and

provide the government with the services of a

band of unpaid informers, they caused four

Bahā’īs with their families and dependents to

accompany Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel, and four of the Ezelīs to

accompany Bahā’u’llāh. All of the latter were

killed, one before they left Adrianople, and the

other three soon after their arrival at ‘Akkā. Of

the Bahā’īs at Famagusta, one died in 1871 and

one in 1872, while the third escaped to Syria in

1870. The fourth, Mushkīn Qalam, a celebrated

calligraphist, remained in Cyprus for some time

after the British occupation, but finally left on

\* Traveller’s Narr. ii. 64 f., 356 f. Nabīl says that he was 38

years of age when he withdrew, and 40 when, he returned.

† See *Traveller’s Narrative*, ii. 362-364.

‡ ib. pp. 359 f. and 365-369.

Sept. 14, 1886, for ‘Akkā, where the present writer

met him in April 1890. The Famagusta exiles

numbered in all thirty persons, of whom full par-

ticulars are preserved, in consequence of the allow-

ances to which they are entitled, in the State

Papers of the Island government, which are epi-

tomized in the *Traveller’s Narrative* (ii. 376-389).

Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel and some of his family are still (1908)

residing at Famagusta, while descendants of some

of the other exiles are also living in the island in

various capacities. Concerning those banished to

‘Akkā the same detailed information is not avail-

able, but their number appears to have consider-

ably exceeded that of the Ezelīs.

4. Period of Bahā’u’llāh’s supremacy (a.d. 1868-

1892).—The schism which divided the Bābīs into

the two sects of Bahā’īs and Ezelīs, though its

beginnings go back to the earlier period of which

we have just spoken, now became formal and

final, and henceforth we have to consider two

opposed centres of Bābī doctrine, ‘Akkā in Syria,

and Famagusta in Cyprus. Although there is

much to be urged in favour of Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel’s posi-

tion, it cannot be denied that practically his influ-

ence is very slight and his followers very few.

When the present writer visited him in 1890, apart

from his own family only one of his adherents, an

old man named ‘Abdu’l-Aḥad, whose father was

among the Bābīs who perished at Zanjān in 1850,\*

was resident at Famagusta. In Persia very few

Ezelīs were met, and those chiefly at Kirmān.

One of Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel’s sons-in-law, Shaykh Ahmad

of Kirmān, was a man of considerable talent and

learning, but he was put to death at Tabrīz in

1896 on a charge of complicity in the assassination

of Nāṣiru’d-Dīn Shāh in May of that year. He

was the author of the *Hasht Bihisht*, a lengthy

treatise on the philosophy, doctrine, and history

of the Bābī religion, from the polemical portions

of which, directed against Bahā’u’llāh, extracts

are cited in the *Traveller’s Narrative* (ii. 351-373).

Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel is still (July 1908) alive and well; but,

interesting as he is historically and personally, he

can no longer be reckoned a force in the world,

though as a source of information about the early

history and doctrines of the Bābīs he is without a

rival, and speaks with a freedom and frankness

not to be found at ‘Akkā, where policy and ‘the

expediency of the time’ necessarily play a much

larger part. Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel may, in short, in his

island seclusion, be compared to Napoleon I in St.

Helena—a man who has played a great role in

stirring events and times, but whose active life

and power to mould men’s thoughts and deeds have

passed away. His writings are numerous, but

little known or read outside his immediate circle,

and no one has yet devoted himself to the study

of the large collection of those acquired by the

British Museum in recent years, through the instru-

mentality of Mr. C. Delaval Cobham, lately Com-

missioner at Larnaca in Cyprus. Of Bābīism as a

living force, affecting both East and West, ‘Akkā

has been the centre for the last forty years, and

seems likely so to remain; and thither we must

now divert our attention.

The claim of Bahā’u’llāh to be a new and tran-

scendent ‘Manifestation’ of God steadily and

rapidly gained ground among the Bābīs, and in-

volved a complete re-construction of the earlier

Bābī conceptions. For if, as Bahā’u’llāh declared,

the Bāb was a mere precursor and harbinger of his

advent, then, in the blaze of light of the New Day,

the candle lit by Mīrzā ‘Alī Muḥammad ceased to

merit attention, and, indeed, became invisible.

The Bahā’īs, as a rule, show a marked disinclina-

\* In *JRAS*, 1897, pp. 781-827, the present writer published

tr. of a memoir on the insurrection at Zanjān, written for him

by this old man.

tion to talk about the Bāb or his early disciples,

or to discuss his life or doctrines, or to place his

writings in the hands of the inquirer, while latterly

they have avoided calling themselves Bābīs, pre-

ferring to be known simply as Bahā’īs. The Bāb’s

doctrines were, in their eyes, only preparatory,

and his ordinances only provisional, and Bahā’u-

’llāh was entitled to modify or abrogate them as

seemed good to him. The real question at issue

between Ezel and Bahā was admirably described

by Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, lately British Minister at

Tihrān, as entirely similar to that which divided

the respective followers of St. Peter and St. Paul

in the early days of the Christian Church—the

question, namely, whether Christianity was to be

a Jewish sect or a new World-religion. The old

Bābī doctrine, continued unchanged by the Ezelīs,

was in its essence Shī‘ite; for, though the Bābīs

put themselves outside the pale of Islām by re-

jecting the finality of the Qur’ān and the mission

of Muḥammad, as well as by many other in-

novations both in doctrine and practice, their

whole thought is deeply tinged with Shī‘ite con-

ceptions, shown, for example, even by their hetero-

dox views as to the ‘return to the life of the

world’ of the Prophet Muḥammad, his daughter

Fātima, and the Twelve Imāms, and their identifi-

cation of their own protagonists with one or other

of these holy personages.

A wholly different spirit pervades the teachings

of Bahā. His religion is more practical, his teach-

ing more ethical and less mystical and meta-

physical, and his appeal is to all men, not especi-

ally to Shī‘ite Muhammadans. His attitude

towards the Shāh and the Persian government

is, moreover, much more conciliatory, as is well

seen in the celebrated Epistle to the King of Persia

(Lawḥ-i-Sulṭān) which he addressed to Nāṣiru’d-

Dīn Shāh soon after his arrival at ‘Akkā.\* This

letter, of which a translation will be found in the

*Traveller’s Narrative* (ii. 108-151 and 390-400),

was sent by the hand of a young Bahā’ī called

Mīrzā Badī‘, who succeeded in carrying out his

instructions and delivered it in person to the

Shāh, for which boldness he was tortured and put

to death.‡ At the same time Bahā’u’llāh ad-

dressed other letters (called by the Bahā’īs *Alwāḥ-*

*i-Salāṭīn*, ‘Epistles to the Kings’) to several other

rulers, including Queen Victoria, the Tsar of

Russia, Napoleon III, and the Pope.‡

For a complete history of the sect during this

period full materials are not available, but generally

speaking it may be said to consist, so far as ‘Akkā

itself is concerned, of alternations of greater and

less strict supervision of the exiles by the Ottoman

government, gradual development of organization

and propaganda, and the arrival and departure of

innumerable pilgrims, mostly Persians, but, since

the successful propaganda in the United States,

including a good many Americans. In Persia,

where the religion naturally counts most of its

adherents, there have been sporadic persecutions,

to which the Bahā’īs, in accordance with Bahā’s

command, ‘It is better that you should be killed

than that you should kill,’ have patiently sub-

mitted. Among these persecutions may he especi-

ally mentioned, since the execution of Mīrzā

Badī‘ in July 1869, the following. About 1880

two Sayyids of Iṣfahān, now known to their co-

religionists as *Sulṭānu’sh-Shuhadā* (‘the King

of Martyrs’), and *Maḥbūbu’sh-Shuhadā* (‘the Be-

loved of Martyrs’), were put to death by the

clergy of that city.§ In October 1888, Āghā Mīrzā

Ashraf of Ābāda was put to death in the same

\* Probably in the summer of 1809 (see *Trav. Narr*. ii. 392).

† See *Trav. Narr*. ii. 102-106.

‡ Extracts from these, translated into English, will be found

in *JRAS* 1889, pp. 953-972.

§ See *JRAS*, 1889, pp. 489-492; *Trav. Narr*. ii. 166-169.

place, and his body mutilated and burned.\* In

the summer of the following year, seven or eight

Bābīs were put to death with great cruelty, at the

instigation of Āghā-yi-Najafī, in the villages of

Si-dih and Najaf-ābād near Iṣfahān.† On Sept.

8, 1889, a prominent Bahā’ī named Ḥājjī Muḥam-

mad Riẓā of Iṣfahān was stabbed to death in broad

daylight in one of the chief thoroughfares of ‘Ishq-

ābād (Askabad) by two Shī‘ite *fida’īs* sent from

Mashhad for that purpose. The assassins were

sentenced to death by the Russian military tri-

bunal before which they were tried, but this sen-

tence was commuted to one of hard labour for life.

This was the first time in the fifty years during

which the sect had existed that condign punish-

ment had been inflicted on any of their perse-

cutors; their rejoicings were proportionately great,

and Bahā’u’llāh made the event the occasion of two

revelations in which Russian justice was highly

extolled,‡ and Bahā’s followers were enjoined not

to forget it. In May 1891 there was a persecution

of Bābīs at Yazd, in which seven of them were

brutally killed (on May 18), while another, an old

man, was secretly put to death a few days later.

In the summer of 1903 there was another fierce

persecution in the same town, of the horrors of

which some account is given by Napier Malcolm

in his *Five Years in a Persian Town* (Lond.

1905).

One of the most interesting phenomena in the

recent history of the Bahā’īs has been the pro-

paganda earned on with considerable success in

America. This appears to have been begun by a

Syrian convert to Bahāism named Ibrāhīm George

Khayru’llāh, who is the author of many English

works on the subject, and is married to an English

wife. He seems first to have lectured on the sub-

ject at Chicago about 1892, for in the Preface to

his book, *Behā’u’llāh* (Chicago, 1900), he says (p.

vii.) that he ‘began to preach the fulfilment of the

truth which Christ and the Prophets foretold over

seven years ago.’§ Born in Mount Lebanon, he

lived twenty-one years in Cairo, and was then

converted to the Bahā’ī doctrine by a certain

‘Abdu’l-Karīm of Ṭihrān. Afterwards he settled

in America and became naturalized as a citizen

of the United States. The propaganda which he

inaugurated seems to have been at its height in

1897 and 1898, and there is now a community of

several thousand American Bahā’īs, a considerable

American literature on the subject, and a certain

amount of actual intercourse between America and

the headquarters of the religion at ‘Akkā. More,

will be said on this subject presently.

5. From the death of Bahā’u’llāh until the pre-

sent day (a.d. 1892-1908).—Bahā’u’llāh died on

May 16, 1892, leaving four sons and three daugh-

ters. Differences as to the succession arose be-

tween the two elder sons, ‘Abbās Efendi (also called

*‘Abdu’l-Bahā*, ‘the Servant of Bahā,’ and (*Ghuṣn-i*-

*A‘zam*, ‘the Most Mighty Branch’) and Mīrzā

Muḥammad ‘Alī (called *Ghuṣn-i-Akbar*, ‘the Most

Great Branch’). Bahā’u’llāh left a testament,

entitled Kitābu ‘Ahdi, which was published, with

some introductory remarks and a Russian tr., by

Lieut. Tumanski in the *Zapiski* of the Oriental

Section of the Imperial Russian Archaeological

Society, viii. (1892). In this important document

he says:

‘God’s injunction is that the Branches (*Aghṣān*), and Twigs

\* See *Trav. Narr*. ii. 189 and 400-406.

† ib. i. 406-410.

‡ See *Trav. Narr*. ii. 411 f. The texts of the revelations

were published by Baron Rosen on pp. 247-250 of *Collections*

*Scíentifiques de l’Institut des Langues Orientales*, vi. (St. Peters-

burg, 1891).

§ It was at the ‘Parliament of Religions,’ held at Chicago in

1893, that the Bahā’ī doctrines first began to arouse consider-

able attention in America.

(*Afnān*),\* and Kinsfolk† (*Muntasabīn*) should all look to the

Most Mighty Branch (*Ghuṣn-i-A‘ẓam*, *i.e*. ‘Abbās Efendi).

Look at what We have revealed in my (*sic*) Most Holy Book

(*Kitāb-i-Aqdas*): “When the Ocean of Union ebbs, and the

Book of the Beginning and the Conclusion is finished, then

turn to Him whom God intendeth (*man arādahu’llāh*), who is

derived from this Ancient Stock.” He who is meant by this

blessed verse is the Most Mighty Branch: thus have we made

clear the command as an act of grace on our part. Verily, I

am the Bountiful, the Gracious. God hath determined the

position of the Most Great Branch (*Ghuṣn-i-Akbar*, *i.e*. Mīrzā

Muḥammad ‘Alī)‡ after his position. Verily, He is the Com-

manding, the Wise. Verily, we have chosen the Most Great

after the Most Mighty, a command on the part of One All-

knowing and Wise. … Say, O Servants! Do not make the

means of order a means of disorder, nor an instrument for [pro-

ducing] union into an instrument for (producing] discord …

Thus far, then, it would appear that, in face of

so clear a pronouncement, no room for dissension

was left to Bahā’u’llāh’s followers. But almost

immediately, it would seem (for the history of this

fresh schism has not yet been dispassionately in-

vestigated, though much has been written on

either side, not only in Persian but in English),

the old struggle between what may be described

as the ‘stationary’ and the ‘progressive’ elements

broke out. ‘Abbās Efendi apparently claimed

that the Revelation was not ended, and that

henceforth he was to be its channel. This claim

was strenuously resisted by his brother Mīrzā

Muḥammad ‘Alī and those who followed him,

among whom were included his two younger

brothers, Mīrzā Badī‘u’llāh and Mīrzā Ẓiyā’n-

’llāh,§ Bahā’u’llāh’s amanuensis, entitled *Janāb-i*-

*Khādimu’llāh* (‘the servant of God,’ Mīrzā Āghā

Jān of Kāshān), and many other prominent Bahā’īs,

who held that, so far as this manifestation was

concerned, the book of Revelation was closed, in

proof of which view they adduced the following

verse from the *Kitāb-i-Aqdas*, or ‘Most Holy

Book’: ‘Whosoever lays claim to any authority‖

before the completion of a millennium is assuredly

a liar and a calumniator.’ The dispute has been

darkened by a mass of words, but in essence it is

a conflict between these two sayings, viewed in the

light of the supernatural claim—whatever its exact

nature—which ‘Abbās Efendi did and does ad-

vance. On the one hand, Bahā’u’llāh’s Testament

explicitly puts him first in the succession; on the

other, being so preferred, he did ‘lay claim to an

authority’ regarded by the partisans of his brother

as bringing him under the condemnation equally ex-

plicitly enunciated by Bahā’u’llāh in the *Kitāb*-

*i-Aqdas*. As in the case of the previous schism

between Bahā’u’llāh and Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel, so here

also the conflict was between those who held that

every day of Theophany must be succeeded by a

night of Occultation, and those who felt that the

Light by which they had walked could not be ex-

tinguished, but must rather increase in brightness.

And, as before, the conservative or stationary party

was worsted. For a time a certain equilibrium seems

to have been maintained, but steadily and surely

the power and authority of ‘Abbās Efendi waxed,

while that of his brother waned. Very bitter feel-

ing was again aroused, and this time over a large

area; for not only Persia, but Egypt, Syria, and

America were involved. Ibrāhīm Khayru’llāh,

the protagonist of the Bahā’ī faith in America,

finally espoused the cause of Muḥammad ‘Alī;¶

\* ‘The Branches’ (*Ghuṣn*, pl. *Aghṣān*) are Bahā’u’llāh’s de-

scendants; the ‘Twigs’ (*Afnān*) are the Bāb’s kinsfolk.

† Or perhaps ‘adherents’ is meant by *Muntasabīn*.

‡ *i.e*. We have placed ‘Abbas Efendi first, then Mīrzā Mu-

hammad ‘Alī.

§ One of these brothers subsequently died, and in 1903

the other joined ‘Abbas Efendi and renounced his previous

allegiance.

‖ *i.e*. authority to promulgate fresh revelations, and enact

new or repeal old ordinances.

¶ According to his own statement (*The Three Questions*, p.

23), he visited ‘Akkā and was well received by ‘Abbās Efendi,

but was not allowed to hold intercourse with the other brothers.

Only seven months after his return to America did he denounce

‘Abbās Efendi and declare his allegiance to Muḥammad ‘Alī.

but missionaries, including the aged and learned

Mīrzā Abu’l-Faẓl of Gulpāyagān, were sent out

in the beginning of 1902 to the United States to

oppose him,\* and at one time he professed to be

in fear of his life.

6. Doctrine.—A full discussion of Bābī and

Bahā’ī doctrine, even were the time ripe for it,

would far exceed the limits of an encyclopaedia

article. Before proceeding to set forth such a

sketch of its most salient features as is possible

within these limits, we must call the reader’s

attention to one or two general considerations.

(1) The Bāb’s own doctrine underwent considerable develop-

ment and change during the six years (a.d. 1844-1850) which

elapsed between his ‘Manifestation’ and his death, and to

trace this development it would be necessary to examine all

his voluminous writings in a much more careful, detailed, and

systematic manner than has yet been done. To mention only

a few or the chief substantive works which issued from his pen,

there is the *Ziyārat-nāma* (of which Gobineau quite misunder-

stood the nature when he described it as the *Journal du*

*Pèlerinage*, for it is a devotional work designed for the use of

pilgrims to the shrines of the Imāms) and the *Ṣaḥifatu*

*Bayna’i-Ḥaramayn*, both composed in the year of the ‘Mani-

festation. Then there is the *Dalā’il-i-sab‘a* (‘Seven Proofs’),

and a number of Commentaries (*Tafāsir*) on different *sūras* of

the Qur’ān, notably the *Commentary on the Chapter of Joseph*

(also called *Qayyūmu’l-Asmā*), and the Commentaries on the

sūras entitled respectively *al-Baqara*, *al-Kawthar*, *al-‘Aṣr*,

etc., all of which belong to the earlier period before the Bāb

announced that he was not merely the ‘Gate’ leading to the

hidden Imām, but the Imām himself, nay the ‘Point’ (*Nuqṭa*)

of a new Revelation. Of his later writings, to all of which, as

we shall see, the name *Bayān* (‘explanation,’ ‘utterance’) is

applied, the Persian *Bayān* is, perhaps, the most systematic,

but there are also several Arabic *Bayāns*, a *Kitābu’l-Aḥkām*,

or ‘Book of Laws’ (tr. by Gobineau at the end of his *Religions*

*et Philosophies dans l’Asie Centrale*), and one or two ‘Books of

Names’ (*Kitābu’l-Amnā*). Few of these books are easy reading,

and he who has read even one or two of them will be inclined

to agree with Gobineau’s judgment, ‘le style de Mirza Ali

Mohammed est terne, raide et sans éclat’; while some are so con-

fused, so full of repetitions, extraordinary words, and fantastic

derivatives of Arabic roots, that they defy the most industrious

and indefatigable reader. The works of Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel closely

resemble those of the Bāb, but the Bahā’ī writings, especially

In the later period, are much clearer and easier of compre-

hension, besides which the tendency of Bahā’ī thought was

to avoid abstruse metaphysics and unintelligible rhapsodies,

and to treat chiefly of ethical subjects.

(2) As there has never been anything corresponding to a

‘Church Council’ among the Bābīs, the greatest divergence

of opinion will be found among them even on questions so

important as the Future Life. All agree in denying the Resur-

rection of the Body as held by the Muhammadans; but while

certain passages in the Persian Bayān seem to indicate that

the spirits of the deceased continues to take an interest in his

earthly affairs, and while certain sayings of the older Bābīs

lend colour to the assertion of their enemies that they inclined

to the doctrine of Metempsychosis (*Tanāsukh-i-Arwāḥ*), gener-

ally held in abhorrence by the Musulmāns, other Bābīs under-

stand the ‘Return (*Rij’at*) to the life of this World’ in a less

material and more symbolic sense, while some disbelieve in

personal Immortality, or limit it to those holy beings who are

endowed with a spirit of a higher grade than is vouchsafed to

ordinary mortals.

(3) It must be clearly understood that Bāhīism is in no sense

latitudinarian or eclectic, and stands, therefore, in the sharpest

antagonism to Sūfīism. However vague Bābī doctrine may

be on certain points, it is essentially dogmatic, and every

utterance or command uttered by the ‘Manifestation’ of the

period (*i.e*. by the Bāb, Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel, Bahā’u’llāh, ‘Abbās Efendi,

and Muḥammad ‘Alī respectively) must be accepted without

reserve. Tolerance is, indeed, inculcated by Bahā’u’llāh:

‘Associate with [those of other] religions with amity and

harmony’ is one of the commands given in the *Kitāb-i-Aqdas*.

But the same book begins as follows: ‘The first thing which

God has prescribed unto His servants is Knowledge of the

Day-spring of His Revelation and the Dawning-place of His

(71) Command, which Is the Station of His Spirit in the World of

(72) Creation and Command. Whosoever attaineth unto this hath

attained unto all good, and whosoever is debarred therefrom is

of the people of error, even though he produce all [manner of

good] deeds.’ In other words, works without faith are dead.

The Bāb himself, and his immediate followers, were still less

inclined to tolerance; according to the *Bayān*, no unbelievers

were to be suffered to dwell in the five principal provinces of

Persia, and everywhere they were, as far as possible, to be

subjected to restrictions, and kept in a position of inferiority.

The Bābīs are strongly antagonistic alike to the Ṣūfīs and to

the Muhammadans, but for quite different reasons. In the

\* Several American papers describing this mission are in the

present writers possession. One (*The North American*, Feb.

16, 1902) gives portraits of Mīrzā Abu’l-Faẓl, his companion

Hājjī Niyāz of Kirmān, and of ‘Abbās Efendi himself, and

heads its leading article ‘Astonishing Spread of Babism.’

case of the Ṣūfīs they object to their latitudinarianism, their

pantheism, their Individualism, and their doctrine of the

‘Inner Light.’ With the Muhammadan outlook they have

really more in common; but, apart from the natural resent-

ment which they feel on account of the persecutions which

they have suffered at the hands of the *‘ulamā* of Islām, they

condemn the refusal of the Muslims to see in this new ‘Mani-

festation’ the fulfilment of Islām, and, in short, regard them

much as the Christians regard the Jews. For similar reasons

the Bahā’īs detest the Ezelīs, whilst among the former the

followers of ‘Abbās Efendi dislike and despise the followers of

his brother Muḥammad ‘Alī.

According to the Bābī conception, the Essence

of God, the Primal Divine Unity, is unknowable,

and entirely transcends human comprehension,

and all that we can know is its Manifestations,

that succession of theophanies which constitutes

the series of Prophets. In essence all the Prophets

are one; that is to say, one Universal Reason or

Intelligence speaks to mankind successively, al-

ways according to their actual capacities and the

exigencies of the age, through Abraham, Moses,

David, Christ, Muḥammad, and now through this

last Manifestation, by which the old Bābīs and

the present Ezelīs understand the Bāb (whom

they commonly speak of as *Ḥaẓrat-i-Nuqṭa*, ‘His

Holiness the Point’; *Ḥaẓrat-i-Rabbiyu’l-A‘lā*, ‘His

Holiness my Lord the Supreme,’ etc.), while the

Bahā’īs, who reduce the Bāb’s position to that of

a mere forerunner, or herald (*mubashshir*), com-

paring him to John the Baptist, understand Bahā-

’u’lláh. In essence all the Prophets are one, and their

teaching is one; but (to use one of the favourite

illustrations of the Bābīs) just as the same teacher,

expounding the same science, will speak in different,

even in apparently contradictory, terms, according

to whether he is addressing small children, young

boys and girls, or persons of mature age and

ripe understanding, so will the Prophet regulate

his utterances and adjust his ordinances according

to the degree of development attained by the

community to which he is sent. Thus the material

Paradise and Hell preached by Muḥammad do not

really exist, but no more accurate conception of

the realities which they symbolize could be con-

veyed to the rough Arabs to whom he was sent.

When the world has outgrown the teaching of one

‘Manifestation,’ a new ‘Manifestation’ appears;

and as the world and the human race are, according

to the Bābī view, eternal, and progress is a uni-

versal law, there can be no final Revelation, and

no ‘last of the Prophets and seal of the Prophets,’

as the Muhammadans suppose. No point of the

Bāb’s doctrine is more strongly emphasized than

this. Every Prophet has foretold his successor,

and in every case that successor, when he finally

came, has been rejected by the majority of that

Prophet’s followers. The Jews rejected their

Messiah, whose advent they professed to be

awaiting with such eagerness; the Christians

rejected the Paraclete or Comforter whom Christ

foretold in prophecies supposed by the Muham-

madans to have been fulfilled by the coming of

Muḥammad; the Shī‘ite Muhammadans never

mention the Twelfth Imām, or Mahdī, without

adding the formula فرجه الله عجّل (‘May God

hasten his glad Advent!’), yet when at last after

a thousand years the expected Imām returned (in

the shape of the Bāb), they rejected, reviled,

imprisoned, and finally slew him. The Bāb was

determined that, so far as it lay in his power to

prevent it, his followers should not fall into this

error, and he again and again speaks of the

succeeding Revelation which ‘He whom God shall

manifest’ (ٱلله يُظْهِرُه مَن) shall bring, and of

other later Revelations which in turn shall succeed

that *ad infinitum*. Indeed, he goes so far as to

say that if any one shall appear claiming to be

‘He whom God shall manifest,’ it is the duty of

every believer to put aside all other business and

hasten to investigate the proofs adduced in support

of this claim, and that, even if he cannot convince

himself of its truth, he must refrain from repudi-

ating it, or denouncing him who advances it as an

impostor. It is these provisions, no doubt, which

have always given so great an advantage to every

fresh claimant in the history of Bābīism, and

have placed what may be called the ‘Stationary

Party’ (e.g. the followers of Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel and, later,

of Muḥammad ‘Alī) at so great a disadvantage.

From what has been said above, the Western

reader may be tempted to think of the Bābī

doctrine as embodying, to a certain extent, the

modern Western rationalistic spirit. No mistake

could be greater. The belief in the fulfilment of

prophecies; the love of apocalyptic sayings culled

from the Jewish, Christian, and Muhammadan

Scriptures and traditions; the value attached to

talismans (especially among the early Bābīs); the

theory of correspondences, as illustrated by the

mystical doctrine of the Unity and its manifesta-

tion in the number 19, and the whole elaborate

system of equivalences between names, based on

the numerical values of letters, point to a totally

different order of ideas, and are, moreover, in-

grained in the true Bābī doctrine, as distinguished

from the same doctrine as presented to and under-

stood by most American and European believers.

Even the practical reforms enjoined or suggested

by the Bāb are generally based on some quite

non-utilitarian ground. Thus the severe chastise-

ment of children is forbidden, and consideration

for their feelings enjoined; but the reason for this

is that when ‘He whom God shall manifest’ comes,

he will come first as a child, and it would be a

fearful thing for any one to have to reproach

himself afterwards for having harshly treated the

august infant. This and other similar social

reforms, such as the amelioration of the position

of women, are not, as some Europeans have

supposed, the motive power of a heroism which

has astonished the world, but rather the mystical

ideas connected with the ‘Manifestations,’

‘Unities,’ numbers, letters, and fulfilment of

prophecies, which to European rationalists appear

so fantastic and fanciful. But, above all, the

essence of being a Bābī or a Bahā’ī is a boundless

devotion to the ‘Person of the Manifestation,’ and

a profound belief that he is divine and of a different

order from all other beings. The Bāb, as we have

seen, was called by his followers ‘His Holiness my

Lord the Supreme,’ and Bahā’u’llāh is called not

only ‘the Blessed Perfection’ (*Jamāl-i-Mubārak*),

but, especially in Persia, ‘God Almighty’ (*Ḥaqq*

*ta’ālā*). Then also there are differences of opinion

as to the degree of divinity possessed by the

‘Person of the Manifestation,’ and not all the

faithful go so far as the poet who exclaims: ‘Men

call thee “God,” and I am filled with angry

wonder as to how long thou wilt endure the shame

of Godhead!’

Something more must now be said as to the

‘Point,’ the ‘Unity,’ and its manifestation in the

nnmber 19, and other kindred matters. The idea

of the ‘Point’ (نُقْطه) seems to rest chiefly on

two (probably spurious) Shī‘ite traditions. ‘Know-

ledge,’ says one of these, ‘is a point which the

ignorant made multiple.’ It was this ‘point of

knowledge’—not detailed knowledge of subsidiary

matters, but vivid, essential, ‘compendious’ know-

ledge of the eternal realities of things—to which

the Bāb laid claim. The second tradition is

ascribed to ‘Alī, the first Imām, who is alleged to

have declared that all that was in the Qur’ān was

contained implicitly in the *Sūratu’l-Fātiḥa*, or

opening chapter of the Qur’ān, and that this in

turn was contained in the *Bismi’llāh* which stands

over it, this in turn in the initial B (ﺏ) of the

Bismi’llāh, and this in turn ‘in the Point which

stands under the ﺏ; ‘and,’ ‘Alī is said to have

added, ‘I am the Point which stands under the

ﺏ.’

Now the formula الرَّحِم الرَّحمَن ٱلله بِسْمِ

(‘In the Name of God the Merciful, the Forgiving’)

comprises 19 letters, which, therefore, are the

‘Manifestation’ of the ‘Point under the ﺏ,’ just

as the whole Qur’ān is the further ‘Manifestation,’

on a plane of greater plurality, of the *Bismi’llāh*.

Moreover, the Arabic word for ‘One’ is *Wāḥid*

(واحِد), and the letters composing the word

*Wāḥid* (و = 6; ا = 1; ح = 8; د = 4) give the sum-

total of 19. This ‘first Unity’ of 19 in turn mani-

fests itself as 19 x 19 (192) or 361, which the Bābīs

call the ‘Number of All Things’ (شَئ كُلِّ عَدَد),

and the words *Kullu shay* (‘All Things’) are

numerically equivalent to (ك = 20 + ﻞ = 30 + ﺵ

= 300 + ﻯ = 10) 360, to which, by adding ‘the

one which underlies all plurality,’ 361, ‘the

Number of All Things,’ or 192, is obtained.

To the number 19 great importance is attached

by the Bābīs, and, so far as possible, it is made the

basis of all divisions of time, money, and the like.

Thus the Bābī year comprises 19 months of 19

days each, to which intercalary days ‘according

to the number of the H (ﮪ),’ *i.e*. 5, are added to

bring the solar year (which they proposed to

restore in place of the Muhammadan lunar year)

up to the requisite length. The same names

(*Bahā*, *Jalāl*, *Jamā*l, etc.) serve for the months

and the days, so that once in each month the day

and the month (as in the Zoroastrian calendar)

correspond, and such days are observed as festivals.

The year begins with the old Persian *Naw-rūz*, or

New Year’s Day, corresponding with the Vernal

Equinox, and conventionally observed on March 21.

The month of fasting, which replaces the Ramaḍān

of Islām, is the last month of the year, *i.e*. the 19

days preceding the *Naw-rūz*. The Bāb’s idea of a

coinage having 19 as its basis has been abandoned,

along with many other impracticable ordinances,

some of which are explicitly abrogated in the

*Kitāb-i-Aqdas* or others of Bahā’u’llāh’s writings.

The ‘Unity’ is also manifested in the divine

attribute *Ḥayy* (حَىّ), ‘the Living,’ which equals

8 + 10 = 18, or, with the ‘one which underlies all

plurality,’ 19. The Bāb accordingly chose 18

disciples, who, with himself, constituted the

‘Letters of the Living’ (حَىّ حُروف) or ‘First

Unity.’ The choice of Mīrzā Yaḥyā, ‘Ṣubḥ-i-

Ezel’ (‘the Dawn of Eternity’), by the Bāb as his

successor, was probably also determined by the

fact that the name *Yaḥyā* (يَحْيى = 36) was a

multiple of 18, on which account Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel was

also called *Wāḥid* (يَحْيى), which is numerically

equivalent to 28 (the number of the letters con-

stituting the Arabic alphabet), and signifies

‘unique,’ *i.e*. manifesting the Unity.

The importance attached by the Bābīs to the

numerical equivalents of words is seen elsewhere,

and especially in their habit of referring cryptically

to towns connected with their history by names

of an equivalent value. Thus Adrianople, called

in Turkish Edirné (ادِرْنه), is named *Arẓu’s-Sirr*

(*السِّرّ ارضُ*), ‘the Land of the Mystery,’ both

words, Edirne and Sirr, being numerically

equivalent to 260. So Zanjān (زَنْجان = 111) is

called Arẓul’-A‘lā (الاعلى ارْضُ = 111), and so on. Other

strange expressions with which the Bābī writings

(especially the earlier writings) abound constantly

puzzle the uninitiated reader, who will have to dis-

cover for himself that, for example, the expression

‘the Person of the Seven Letters’ (الحُروف ذات

السَّبَعة) is one of the titles of the Bāb, whose name,

‘Alī Muḥammad, consists of seven letters. Even

in Bahā’u’llāh’s works such obscure terms occur as

*al-Buq’atu’l-Ḥamrā*, ‘the Red Place,’ which means

‘Akkā, and the like.

The Bāb laid down a number of laws, dictated

in many cases by his personal tastes and feelings,

which have practically fallen into abeyance. Such

are his prohibition of smoking and the eating

of onions (though these are still observed by the

Ezelīs), his regulations as to clothing, forms of

salutation, the use of rings and perfumes, the

names by which children might be named ‘in the

*Bayān*,’ the burial of the dead, and the like. The

laws enacted by Bahā’u’llāh in the *Kitāb-i-Aqdas*,

with the exception of the law of Inheritance, are

simpler and more practical, and the whole tone of

the Bahā’ī scriptures (which, of course, according

to the Bahā’ī view, entirely abrogate the Bāb’s

writings) is more simple, more practical, and more

concerned with ethical than metaphysical questions.

Historically, there is much to be said in favour of

Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel’s claim, since he was certainly nomi-

nated by the Bāb as his immediate successor, and

was equally certainly so recognized for a good

many years by the whole Bābī community; while,

assuming the Bāb to have been divinely inspired

(and this assumption must be made not only by

every Bābī but by every Bahā’ī), it is difficult to

suppose that he should choose to succeed himself

one who was destined to be the chief opponent of

‘Him whom God shall manifest.’ Yet practically

it cannot be doubted that the survival and exten-

sion of the religion formed by the Bāb were secured

by the modifications effected in it by Bahā’u’llāh,

for in its original form it could never have been

intelligible, much less attractive, outside Persia;

and even there, when once the ferment attending

its introduction had subsided, it would probably

have sunk into the insignificance shared by so

many Muslim sects which once played an im-

portant rôle in history.

At the present day there are a few Bābīs of the

old school who call themselves ‘Kullu-shay’īs,’ and

decline to enter into the Ezelī and Bahā’ī quarrel

at all; there is a small, and probably diminishing,

number of Ezelīs; and a large, but indeterminable

number of Bahā’īs, of whom the great majority

follow ‘Abbās Efendi (‘Abdu’l-Bahá), and the

minority his brother Muḥammad ‘Alī. Latterly

the followers of Bahā’a’llāh have shown a strong

disposition to drop the name of Bābī altogether,

and call themselves Bahā’ī, and to ignore or

suppress the earlier history and literature of their

religion. Alike in intelligence and in morals the

Bābīs (or Bahā’īs) stand high; but it is not certain

to the present writer that their triumph over

Islām in Persia would ultimately conduce to the

welfare of that distracted land, or that the toler-

ance they now advocate would stand the test of

success and supremacy.

Literature.—An exhaustive treatment of the literature of

this subject would have to deal with the following divisions:

i. Bābī Scriptures, all in Arabic or Persian, regarded by

all or by certain sections of the Bābīs as revelations, and in-

cluding:

(a) Writings of Mīrzā ‘Alī Muḥammad the Bāb (a.d.

1844-1850).—These were divided by the Bāb himself into

‘five grades’ (*Shu‘ūn-i-Khamsa*, *خَمْسة شُوُونٔ*,

viz. verses (*āyāt*, آيات, supplicatlons (*munājāt*,

مُناجات), commentaries (*tafāsīr*, تَفاسِير, scien-

tific treatises (*Shu’ūn-i-‘ilmiyya*, *عِلْمِيّة* *شُوُونٔ*, or

*ṣuwar-i-‘ilmiyya*,  *عِلْمِيّة*.*صُوَر*), and Persian writings

(*Kalimāt-i-Fārsiyya*). The term Bayān applies especially

to the writings of the ‘first grade,’ and includes all the

āyāt, or verses in the style of the Qur’ān, produced by the

Bāb during his whole career. To special collections of such

verses the term *Bayán* is also applied, and in this sense

there are several Arabic *Bayāns* and one Persian *Bayán*,

which last is, on the whole, the most systematic and in-

telligible of the Bāb’s writings.\*

(b) Writings of Mīrzā Yahyā, ‘Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel.’—Of these one

of the earliest (composed before 1865, since it is men-

tioned by Gobineau, whose book was published in that

year) is the *Kitāb-i-Nūr*, or ‘Book of Light.’ A list of

some of Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel’s writings, drawn up by himself, will

be found in *Traveller’s Narrative*, ii. 340 ff. Others are

described in the ‘Catalogue and Description of 27 Bābī

Manuscripts’ by the present writer, published in *JRAS*,

1892 (xxiv. 483-493, 600-662, etc.). In the last few years

the British Museum Library has, through the good offices

of Mr. Claude Delaval Cobham, lately Commissioner at

Larnaca in Cyprus, been enriched by an extensive collec-

tion of manuscript works by Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel.

(c) Writings of Mīrzā Ḥusayn ‘Alī ‘Bahā’u’llāh.’—One at

least of these—a polemical work in Persian named *Īqān*,

‘the Assurance’—was composed about a.d. 1858-1859,

during the Baghdad period, that is to say, previously

to Bahā’u’llāh’s ‘Manifestation.’ The remainder belong

chiefly to the period intervening between that event

and Bahā’u’llāh’s death (a.d. 1866-1892). Since every

letter (*lawḥ*, لَوح = ‘tablet’) written at Bahā’u’llāh’s

dictation—and many were written every day—is regarded

by his followers as a revelation, it would be manifestly

impossible for any human being (except, possibly, his

amanuensis) to enumerate them. The most important

of his books, besides the earlier *Īqān*, the *Sūra-i-Haykal*,

the *Alwāḥ-i-Salāṭīn*, or ‘Letters to the Kings’ (includ-

ing the letter sent to Nāṣiru’d-Dīn Shāh, as above de-

scribed, in a.d. 1869), are the *Kitāb-i-Aqdas* (which con-

tains the most systematic and compendious statement

of the doctrines, laws, and ordinances promulgated by

Bahā’u’llāh), the *Lawḥ-i-Bashārāt*, the *Kalimāt-i-*

*Maknūna*, and, lastly, the final Testament (*Kitābu ‘Ahdī*)

already mentioned. Several ‘authorized’ collections of

these and other Bahā’ī scriptures have been lithographed

in the East. The *Kitāb-i-Aqdas* has been printed at

St. Petersburg, in 1899, with a Russ. tr., by Captain

Tumanski, who also published the *Kitābu ‘Ahdī* in 1892.

In the same year Baron Victor Rosen published the *Lawḥ-i-*

*Bashārāt*. The whole of the Epistle to Nāṣiru’d-Dīn Shāh

and portions of the other Epistles to the Kings have been

translated by the present writer in the *JRAS*, 1889, and

in *Traveller’s Narrative*, ii.; and a French translation of

the *Īqān* (‘Livre de la Certitude’) was published by M.

Hippolye Dreyfus and Mīrzā Ḥabību’llāh Shīrāzī in 1904.

(d) Writings of ‘Abbās Efendi (now called ‘Abdu’l-Bahā).

—Of these mention may be made of the *Mufāwaẓāt*

(مُفاوَضات), or ‘Outpourings,’ recently published in

the original Persian, and in Fr. and Eng. translations,

by Miss Laura Barney and M. Hippolyte Dreyfus.

(e) Writings of Mīrzā Muḥammad ‘Alī, the brother and

rival of ‘Abbās Efendi.

ii. Devotional, Doctrinal, and Apologetic Works by

companions and disciples of the Bāb, Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel, Bahā’u’llāh,

‘Abbās Efendi, and Mīrzā Muḥammad ‘Alī, of which in recent

times a considerable number have been composed in English

by American believers and a smaller number in French. Many

of the early Bābīs, such as Mullā Muḥammad ‘Alī of Bārfurūsh

(Janāb-i-Quddūs), left writings which have been preserved in

manuscript.† Mīrzā Abu’l-Faẓl of Gulpāyagān, a devoted fol-

\* See the *Traveller’s Narrative*, ii. 335-317, especially the

definitions from the Persian *Bayān* given on p. 344 f. concern-

ing the ‘five grades’; see also *JRAS* xxiv. (1892) 452 f.

† For description of such a collection of the writings of

Janāb-i-Quddūs, see *JRAS*, 1892, 483-487.

lower of Bahā’u’llāh, composed, about a.d. 1887, a Persian tract

called *Istidlāliyya*,\* in which he endeavoured to prove to the

Jews that the advent of their expected Messiah was fulfilled by

the ‘Manifestation’ of Bahā’u’Ilāh; and he also wrote and pub-

lished in Cairo a Persian work of 731 pages entitled *Kitābu’l-*

*Fara’id*, in which he replied to attacks made on the Bahā’īs by

Shaykh ‘Abdu’s-Salām. In defence of Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel’s position

and in elucidation of the primitive Bābī doctrine and the philo-

sophical ideas underlying it, there is the very rare and in-

structive *Hasht Bihisht*† of Shaykh Aḥmad of Kirmān (called

Rūḥū), who was put to death at Tabrīz about 1896. There is

also a considerable literature, manuscript and lithographed,

connected with the controversy which arose after the death of

Bahā’u’llāh between his sons,‡ and this controversy is reflected

in numerous English printed works produced in America by the

respective partisans of the two brothers.

iii. Historical Works written by believers (such as the

*History of Mīrzā Jānī of Kāshān*, the *New History*, the

*Traveller’s Narrative*, and part of the *Hasht Bihisht*), or by

opponents (such as the account given by the official historians

of the Persian Court, Riẓā-qulī-Khān and the Lisānu’l-Mulk, in

the supplement to the *Rawẓatu’s-Ṣafā* and the *Nāsikhu’t-*

*Tawārīkh* respectively), or by more or less impartial observers,

Asiatic or European. Among the most valuable of those

written in the East from a hostile, or at least a critical and not

very friendly, point of view, mention should especially be made

of Sayyid Jamālu’d-Dīn’s art. in the *Dā’iratu’t-Ma’ārif*, or

Arabic Encyclopedia, of Buṭrusul-Bustāni, and of Mīrzā

Muḥammad Mahdī-Khān Za’īmu’d-Dawla’s *Miftāḥu Bahi’l-*

*Abwāb*, also in Arabic, published at Cairo in a.h. 1321 (a.d.

1903-1904). This last, though written in the form of a history,

is rather polemical than historical, but It contains important

information obtained from original oral sources, and a certain

number of *pièces justificatives*. Another more purely polemical

work, composed in Persian by a Christian convert to Islām,

named Ḥusayn-qulī, dedicated to some of the *mujtahids* of

Kerbelā and Najaf, entitled *Minhāju’ṭ-Ṭālibīn fī raddi’l-*

*Bābiyya*, and lithographed at Bombay in a.h. 1320 (a.d. 1902),

also deserves mention.

iv. Bābī Poems.—From the time of Qurratu’l-‘Ayn, the

Bābī heroine who suffered martyrdom in a.d. 1852, until the

present day, poetry of a religious and often of a rhapsodical

character has been produced, though not in very great abund-

ance, by Bābī writers. The most celebrated Bābī poets since

the time of Qurratu’l-‘Ayn are Nabīl, ‘Andalīb, Na‘īm of Ābāda,

and Mīrzā Yaḥyā *Sar-Khush*; but their poems are sporadic, and

there does not seem to be any considerable collection of Bābī

poems, either from one or from diverse pens.

v. Polemical Works.—Some of these have been incidentally

mentioned above under classes ii. and iii., but there exist

others, such as the *Rajmu’sh-Shaytān fī razā’ili’l- Bayān*

(‘Stoning of the Devil, on the vicee of the *Bayān*’), by Hājjī

‘Abdu’r-Rahīm, lithographed (without date or place of issue)

about a.d. 1892. This tract professes to be written in refutation

of a Bābī apology entitled *Kitābu’l-Imān fī idhhāri-Nuqṭati’l-*

*Bayān* (‘the Book of Belief, setting forth the Point of Revela-

tion,’ *i.e*. the Bāb), which apology is incorporated in the

refutation. There are, however, reasons for believing that,

under the guise of a weak and unconvincing refutation, the

writer’s object was to argue in favour of the Bābī doctrine, as

held by the elder Bābīs and the Ezelīs, since he speaks respects

fully of the Bāb ‘on account of his holy lineage,’ makes the

refutation of Ṣubḥ-i-Ezel depend on that of the Bāb (whom he

does not effectively refute), and practically confines his attacks

to Bahā’u’llāh.

vi. The English and French Writings of American and

French believers in Bahā’ism (for only in the latter days of

Bahā’u’llāh did the doctrines of which the Bāb was the origin-

ator spread beyond Asia) may conveniently be placed in a

separate class. The chief of those which have come into the

present writer’s hands (and there are, no doubt, many others

with which he is unacquainted, for Bahā’ism is now active in

America, and has its centres, associations, schools, and endow-

ments) are, in chronological order, as follows:

Ibrāhīm George Kheiralla (*i.e*. Khayru’llāh) assisted by

Howard MacNutt, *Behā’u’llāh* (‘The Glory of God’), 2 vols.,

Chicago, 1900; *Facts for Behaists*, tr. and ed. by I. G. Kheir-

alla (this pamphlet deals with the dispute between ‘Abbās

Efendi and his brother Muḥammad ‘Alī, and supports the

claims of the latter), Chicago, 1901; Ibrāhīm George Kheiralla,

*The Three Questions* 26 pp. of English and 15 pp. of Arabic

*pièces justificatives* (n.d.); Stoyan Krstoff Vatralsky, *Mo-*

*hammedan Gnosticism in America: the origin, history, char-*

*acter, and esoteric doctrines of the Truth-knowers* (from

*AJTh*, Jan. 1902, pp. 57-78), Boston, 1902; Gabriel Sacy,

*Le Règne de Dieu et de l’Agneau, connu sous le nom de*

*Babysme*, Cairo, 1902; *Le Livre des Sept Preuves* (a tr. of the

\* *JRAS*, 1892, pp. 701-705. † ib. pp. 685-695.

‡ Of works belonging to this class the two following (pub-

lished in a.h. 1318 and 1319 [a.d. 1900-1901 respectively]),

of which the present writer happens to possess copies, are in

defence of Mīrzā Muḥammad ‘Alī and against the claims of

‘Abbās Efendi. The first is entitled *Ityānu’d-Datīl li-man*

*yurīdu’l-Iqbāla ila siwā’i’s-sabīl*, and the second appears to be

from the pen of Mīrzā Āqā Jān of Kāshān, called *Khādimu’llāh*

(‘the Servant of God’), who was for many years Bahā’u’llāh’s

amanuensis, and was afterwards among the most prominent of

the supporters of Mīrzā Muḥammad ‘Alī and the opponents of

‘Abbās Efendi.

Bāb’s *Dalā’il-i-Sab‘a*), tr. by A. L. M. Nicolas, Paris, 1902;

*The Revelation of Bahā’u’llāh*, compiled by Isabella D. Brit-

tingham, U.S.A., 1902; Myron H. Phelps, *The Life and*

*Teachings of Abbās Effendi*, with Introduction by Edward G.

Browne, London and New York, 1903; *Le Livre de la Certi-*

*tude* (a tr. of the *Īqān*), tr. by Hippolyte Dreyfus and Mīrzā

Ḥabibu’llāh Shīrāzī, Paris, 1904; *Le Béyon Arabe, le livre*

*sacré du Babysme de Séyyèd Ali Mohammed dit le Bab*, tr. from

the Arabic by A. L. M. Nicolas, Paris, 1905; Arthur Pillsbury

Dodge, *Whence? Why? Whither? Man Things Other*

*Things*, Westwood, Mass., 1907. One Ezeli manifesto, con-

sisting chiefly of extracts from the *New History*, the

*Traveller’s Narrative*, and other works by the writer of this

article, has also appeared in America under the title of *A*

*Call of Attention to the Behaists or Babists of America*, by

Angust J. Stenstrand, and is dated from Naperville, Ill.,

Feb. 13, 1907; Miss Laura Clifford Barney, who at differ-

ent periods spent a considerable time at ‘Akkā, and has

also travelled in Persia, collected orally the answers of ‘Abbās

Efendi to a number of questions which she put to him on all

sorts of subjects, and to which he replied from time to time.

These replies have been published in the original Persian, in

English, and in French almost simultaneously. The Persian

text is entitled *An-Nūru’l-abhā fī Mufāwaḍati ‘Abdi’l Bahā*,

and on the English title-page *Table Talks, collected by Laura*

*Clifford Barney*, London, 1908. The English version is entitled

*Some Questions answered ... from the Persian of ‘Abdul-*

*Bahā*, translated by Miss L. C. Barney. The French version,

translated from the Persian by Hippolyte Dreyfus, is entitled

*Les Leçons de St. Jean d’Acre ... recueillies par Laura*

*Clifford Barney*, Paris, 1908.

EDWARD G. BROWNE.