The formulation of our problem demands some comment. A happier choice might have been "Attitudes towards the State". But the concept of state is alien to the political glossary of both Islam and Judaism. It is a loan word, a translation from the Greek polis or politeia, and was naturalized in Arabic and Hebrew only after Greek philosophy had gained a foothold in Islam and consequently in medieval Judaism. The concepts that will be dealt with, those that are native to Hebrew and Arabic, are e.g.: kingship (malkhut), rule (serā'dā), communal leadership (rabbdnut), the authorities (rāshūl), and equivalent Arabic terms, especially sultan. In early Islam, which is the period under consideration, sullān does not signify the person of the ruler, and this is especially true in religious literature. Rather, it stands for what we generally refer to as "the authorities". The corresponding Greek terms, familiar from the New Testament, are exousia and archontes.

By "Judaism" we refer to the flowering period of classical Judaism, from the first to the fifth century A.D. Later authorities, such as Maimonides (1135-1204), are also consulted whenever they express, in our opinion, the essence of classical Jewish tradition. "Islam" here means Islam full-grown, namely the period stretching from the second through the fifth centuries A.H. or, from Abū Yisuf, the counselor of Hariin al-Rashid and one of the earliest jurisconsults whose writings we possess, up to Ghazali, the fifth century's "Renovator of Islam". Again, some of the later authorities are consulted, for example, the sixteenth century mystic Sha'rani, the last great encyclopedist and religious genius of Islam who in typical fashion knots together the many strands which weave their way along the protracted religious history of Islam.

A comparative study, in which the characteristic attitudes of the two religions throw light on each other, has a good deal of merit in spite of certain inherent difficulties. The Judaism of that period was self-contained both in the ethnic sense and through its rejection of alien influences. It appears that it was more unified and had become
more crystalized than classical Islam. The community of Islam was in constant flux racially and it was receptive to the most divergent alien teachings. We may therefore assume at the outset that whenever Islam and Judaism share common ideas about authority, they would be formulated more consistently and with greater emphasis in Judaism than in Islam. On the other hand, early Islam was not subject to exile and foreign rule, which was the lot of Judaism and which fashioned the character of the latter in many respects. Therefore a comparison with Islam might help us to distinguish the essential from the accidental in Judaism. In order that this comparative study be not one-sided, views about the state in the Greco-Roman world on the one hand, and of the church fathers on the other, will be taken into account.

We should however point out a fact which at first glance contradicts what has just been said about the difference between Islam, which was possessed of political authority, and Judaism, which was not. Jewish religious writings manifest a more active interest in public life and in the problem of authority than the corresponding Islamic writings. Certainly it is not due to mere chance that neither the ninety seven books of Bukhari-e-the most sacred collection of Islamic oral tradition—nor the forty books of Ghazali's Ihya' 'ulil-r-r-a ("the Revivification of the sciences of religion")—Islam's Summa Theologica—contain a single book devoted to the problem of government. In Maimonides, on the other hand, the laws of kingship occupy a special and honored place in his great code—they form the last of its fourteen books.

This contrast is partially due to a circumstance which certainly is not accidental. The last of the Five Books of Moses discusses royal institutions and establishes several positive as well as negative precepts concerning them. Moreover, the Bible touches on the problem of kingship again and again. Consequently, no complete systematic account of the religion of Israel could ignore this subject. The Koran, on the other hand, says nothing whatsoever about the political regime and the religious duties pertaining to it. In keeping with this, it is hardly surprising that a well-known twentieth century Muslim Scholar, CAli 'Abd al-Raziq, states in his book Islam and the Principles of Government (Cairo, 1925) that the Caliphate is not an obligatory Islamic institution and that Islam as a religion had no theory with regard to the most preferable form of state and communal organization. At the time of its appearance, the book aroused