

## The Treatment of *Dhimmis* (Protected Religious Minorities) in Islamic Lands<sup>1</sup>

It is well known that Islam recognizes a category of people called “People of the Book” (*ahl al-Kitāb*), those religious communities which received revelations in the form of holy books prior to the advent of Islam. This status was given to Jews, Christians, and Zoroastrians, and later to Hindus. These peoples were to be allowed to practice their religion and were not to be made to choose between conversion to Islam or execution, the options offered to pagans. But in actual practice, continued existence in Muslim lands was not always allowed to religious minorities, and members of *dhimmis* were not always well treated.

**Early History of the Treatment of “Peoples of the Book.”** In 624 Muḥammad called upon the Qainuqā’, a Jewish tribe of Medina, to recognize his prophetic mission. When they refused, he besieged and overcame them. On the intercession of one of their protectors—a recent convert to Islam—their lives were spared, but they were expelled from the city, their lands and a part of their possessions being confiscated by the Muslims. The next year the Jewish Naḍīr tribe suffered a similar fate: Muḥammad burned down their palm groves and divided all their fields and houses among the community of the Believers.

In 627 the Meccans sent an army to besiege the Muslims in Medina, but eventually gave up the siege. Guided by the angel Gabriel, Muḥammad then turned his warriors against the Jewish tribe of the Quraiza, who had been neutral during the siege. Because the Jews refused conversion, Muḥammad attacked and overwhelmed them. Trenches were then dug in the marketplace of Medina, and the Jews—six to nine hundred of them, according to traditional Muslim sources—were led forth in batches and decapitated. All the menfolk perished in this way, with the exception of one convert to Islam. The Prophet then divided the women, children, houses, and chattels among the Muslims.<sup>2</sup>

In 628, taking advantage of a treaty of nonbelligerency (the Treaty of Hudaibiya) with the Meccans, Muḥammad attacked the oasis of Khaibar, which was cultivated by another Jewish tribe. The assailants came to the oasis at night and in the morning attacked the peasants as they were coming out to work in the fields, carrying spades and baskets.<sup>3</sup> Their palm groves were burned down. After a siege lasting a month and a half, the inhabitants surrendered under the terms of a treaty known as the *dhimma*. According to this agreement Muḥammad allowed the Jews to continue cultivating their oasis, on condition that they ceded to him half of their produce; he also reserved the right to break the agreement and expel them whenever he wished.<sup>4</sup> Later, all the Jewish and Christian communities of Arabia submitted to the Muslims under the terms of a *dhimma* similar to that granted at Khaibar. The peasantry were expected to provide assistance and provisions to the Muslim forces and pay a tribute in money or kind known as the *jizya*, to be distributed among the Prophet and his followers according to the circumstances of the conquest. In addition, they were to make available an area within their synagogues and churches, if required by the Muslims. For his part, Muḥammad was to respect their religious observances and to defend them. Thus, newly converted Bedouin permitted sedentary cultivators to continue tilling their own soil as share-croppers in exchange for a tribute.

---

<sup>1</sup> The source for almost all this information about the *dhimmis* is Bat Ye’or, *The Dhimmi: Jews and Christians under Islam*, original title of work: *Le dhimmi: Profil de l’opprimé en Orient et en Afrique du Nord depuis la conquête arabe* (Paris: Editions Anthropos, 1980), (Rutherford, [N.J.]: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1985).

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Ishāq, *Sīrat Rasūl Allāh (The Life of Muhammad)*, translated by A. Guillaume (London: Oxford University Press, 1955), 461-96.

<sup>3</sup> Ibn Ishāq, *Sīrat Rasūl Allāh (The Life of Muhammad)*, 511.

<sup>4</sup> Ibn Ishāq, *Sīrat Rasūl Allāh (The Life of Muhammad)*, 524-25.

The *dhimma* of Khaibar, which fixed the relationship between the Muslim victors and the vanquished local inhabitants, was to serve as a model for the treaties granted by the Arab conquerors to the conquered peoples in territories beyond Arabia. (Later ‘Umar expelled the Jews of Kaibar. Ibn Ishāq relates that ‘Umar resolved to expel them after he learned of Muḥammad’s deathbed statement: “Two religions shall not remain together in the peninsula of the Arabs.” Also according to Ibn Ishāq, ‘Umar explained to his forces that “the apostle had arranged with the Jews of Kaibar that we could expel them if we wished.”<sup>5</sup>)

In the Ottoman empire, a clause of the Hatti Humayun edict (1856), inserted on the insistence of the European powers, abolished the discriminatory status of *dhimmi* (*raya* in Ottoman terminology), but effective emancipation was granted them only somewhat later.<sup>6</sup>

**Aspects of the Dhimmi Condition. Discriminatory Taxes.** a) *Kharāj*. The rights of conquest first established at Kaibar led to the expropriation of the vanquished peoples by the transfer of their lands to the Islamic community. The *dhimmi* retained the right to cultivate his land in exchange for the payment of a tax to the Muslim ruler. This tax, called *kharāj*, transformed the former peasant-owner into a share-cropper, who tilled his land as a tenant, whereas the freehold ownership was confiscated by the ruler. In certain rural areas, the servile character of the *dhimmi*’s condition worsened with the passage of time. In 1884 Charles de Foucauld described areas in southern Morocco where the Jews and their families belonged body and soul to their Muslim master and were unable to leave him. As late as 1913, the Jews of Dadès in the Greater Atlas of Morocco were serfs, the property of their Muslim master.<sup>7</sup>

b) *Jizya*. In addition to the *kharāj*, the adult male *dhimmi* had to pay a poll tax, the *jizya* (Qur’ān 9:29). According to some jurists, this poll tax was to be paid by each person individually at a humiliating public ceremony in which the *dhimmi*, while paying it, was struck either on the head or on the nape of the neck. Possession of the receipt for the *jizya*—originally a piece of parchment worn around the neck or a seal worn on the wrist or on the chest—enabled the *dhimmi* to move from place to place. A *dhimmi* travelling without this receipt could be put in jail.

c) *Other Taxes*. *Dhimmis* also paid higher commercial rates and travel taxes than the Muslims. Apart from taxation, large sums were extorted from the *dhimmi* communities at the ruler’s pleasure. As late as the eighteenth century, Church leaders and notables in the Ottoman Empire were imprisoned and tortured until a ransom was paid for them. In Tripoli about 1790, Ali Burghul put the whole Jewish community to ransom, threatening it with a general massacre.<sup>8</sup> In several regions throughout Syria, Palestine, and Iraq the periodic insecurity that prevailed until the late nineteenth century forced the *dhimmi* communities to protect themselves from pillage and massacre by paying protection money to emirs, sheiks, and leaders of marauding bands. The necessity of having to pay for their security and survival became the norm for the *dhimmi* communities. In addition to ordinary taxes, the Jews of Hebron were accustomed to pay 5,000 piasters a year to an Arab sheikh for the protection of their lives and property; nevertheless, the same sheikh added a further ransom in 1852, threatening to attack and expel them from the town if it was not paid. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the pressure

<sup>5</sup> Ibn Ishāq, *Sīrat Rasūl Allāh (The Life of Muhammad)*, 525.

<sup>6</sup> Bat Ye’or, *Dhimmi*, 49.

<sup>7</sup> Charles de Foucauld, *Reconnaissance au Maroc (1883-1884)* (Paris, 1888), 398-400.

<sup>8</sup> N. Slouschz, *Travels in North Africa* (Philadelphia, 1927), 21.

exerted by European powers put an end to these ransoms, which had totally impoverished whole communities.

**Public Administration.** The exclusion of *dhimmis* from public office was based on several verses of the Qur'ān (such as 5:57, "O ye who believe, take not for friends or protectors those who take your religion for a mockery or sport") and on *hadiths* which said an infidel (non-believer in Islam) ought never to exert authority over a Muslim. In spite of this, *dhimmis* frequently did hold public office; because of their skills rulers found them indispensable. In the Middle Ages, the holding of high positions by *dhimmis* could lead to insurrections (e.g. Granada in 1066, Fez in 1275 and 1465, Iraq in 1291 and frequently in Egypt under the Mamluks: 1250–1517). The populace demanded their removal; the emirs sometimes tried to protect them by offering them the choice between resignation or conversion. A number accepted conversion to keep their positions.

**Inequality before the Law: Invalidity of the Dhimmi's Oath.** A *dhimmi* was not allowed to give evidence against a Muslim. To defend himself, the *dhimmi* was forced to purchase Muslim witnesses at great expense. The refusal of Muslim courts to accept the testimony of the *dhimmi* was based on *hadiths* which maintained that the infidels were of a perverse and mendacious character because they deliberately persisted in denying the superiority of Islam. The refusal to accept the *dhimmi's* testimony was particularly serious in view of the frequent accusations against Jews and Christians of having blasphemed the Prophet, Islam, or the angels—an offense punishable by death. In such a case, the *dhimmi* was in no position to contradict the testimony of the Muslim in court and could save his life only by conversion to Islam. Nevertheless, there were some exceptions to this rule and some cases are recorded where even in Muslim religious courts the testimony of *dhimmis* was accepted. In 1840 the Ottoman Empire introduced a new system of legal administration—one based primarily on French jurisprudence—which recognized the *dhimmis'* testimony.

Muslim law (Qur'ān 2:178) applies the law of retaliation only between equal parties. Therefore a guilty Muslim's punishment for a crime would be much less if the victim were a *dhimmi*, and, in practice if not in law, a *dhimmi* would often be sentenced to death if he dared to raise a hand against a Muslim, even in legitimate self-defense. Such penalties were reported by travelers in Persia and Yemen until the end of the nineteenth century and in North Africa until the European colonization. Sometimes collective punishments would be imposed. In Persia, at the end of the nineteenth century, a whole community was held responsible for the offense of one of its members. In 1866 in Fez, when a Jew wounded a Muslim who had tried to kill him, thirty Jews were immediately wounded in retaliation, and only vigorous action by the authorities prevented a general massacre. According to Slouschz, who in 1908 visited a Jabal Gharian (Libya), the accidental killing of a Muslim would condemn the whole Jewish community to death or exile.<sup>9</sup>

**Religion. a) Places of Worship.** The laws concerning places of worship depended on the circumstances of the conquest and the terms of the treaties. The construction of new synagogues, churches, and monasteries was forbidden by law, but the restoration of pre-Islamic places of worship was permitted, subject to certain restrictions and on condition that they were not enlarged. *Dhimmi* places of worship were not considered inviolable. They could be ransacked, burned, or demolished as acts of reprisal against the community on the pretext that

---

<sup>9</sup> Slouschz, *Travels in North Africa*, 146.

some of their members had exceeded their rights. Conversely, nineteenth-century European travelers give examples where, if Jews or Christians entered a mosque in North Africa, it was regarded as a capital offense. Their impure nature was said to defile the Muslim places of worship. In 1869 a Jew passing in front of the great Zaytuna Mosque in Tunis was killed on the charge of having intended to enter it. Solely because of the special relationship between Turkey and Great Britain, in 1862 the Prince of Wales became the first Christian since 1266 to be allowed to enter the Tomb of the Patriarchs in Hebron.<sup>10</sup> Under the British Mandate (1922–1948), Christians were henceforth given free access to the Tomb of the Patriarchs, but Jews were allowed to enter it only when Hebron was taken by Israel in 1967.

*b) Liturgy.* The ringing of bells, the sounding of the ram's horn (*shofar*), and the public exhibition of crosses, icons, banners, and other religious objects were all prohibited. Some theologians allowed religious processions of *dhimmi*s, but only in towns where they formed the majority.

*c) Persecutions and Forced Conversions.* The Qur'ān forbids forced conversions, but it happened nonetheless. In 704–5, the caliph Walīd I (705–715) assembled the nobles of Armenia in the church of St. Gregory in Naxcawan and the church of Xram on the Araxis and burned them to death. Others were crucified and decapitated and their wives and children taken into captivity. A violent persecution of Christians in Armenia is recorded from 852 to 855.<sup>11</sup> It is reported that in 1033, between 5,000 and 6,000 Jews were massacred in Fez, and in 1066 about 3,000 in Granada.<sup>12</sup> In Yemen the Jews were forced to choose between death and conversion in 1165 and 1678. The Almohad persecutions (1130–1212) in North Africa and in Muslim Spain put an end to what remained of the Christian population of North Africa. The Jews, who had been forced to accept Islam, formed a mass of “new converts” who practiced their former religion in secret. The Almohad inquisitors, doubting their sincerity, took away their children and raised them as Muslims. A similar law also existed in Yemen, where every Jewish orphan child had to be converted to Islam. The abduction of *dhimmi* children, mainly Christians, is well-known from the sixteenth century onward, particularly in the nineteenth century, because of the abundant documentation in consequence of the increased number of European consular agents accredited throughout the Ottoman Empire and in Morocco. As late as the early twentieth century, during the periods of the Armenian massacres, large numbers of children were carried off and brought up as Muslims. Records concerning Morocco, Algeria, and Yemen reveal that during changes of reign and times of instability, the Jewish quarters were regularly pillaged, some of the menfolk massacred, and many women abducted and held for ransom by the soldiers or by tribes from the surrounding regions. Eyewitnesses have described the destruction of the Jewish quarter at Fez in 1912 at the beginning of the French protectorate,<sup>13</sup> and at San'a in Yemen as late as 1948, after the assassination of Imām Yaḥya.<sup>14</sup> Such ordeals over the centuries have resulted in many conversions to Islam. Thus a number of Judeo-Berber tribes of the Atlas and Muslim families in Fez are known to be descended from Jews who accepted Islam to save

<sup>10</sup> C. Wilson, ed., *Picturesque Palestine, Sinai and Egypt* (London, 1882), 3:198-199.

<sup>11</sup> J. Muyltermans, “La Domination Arabe en Arménie,” extract from the *Histoire Universelle* of Vardan (d. 1271) (Louvain and Paris, 1927).

<sup>12</sup> H. Z. A. Hirschberg, *A History of the Jews in North Africa* (Leiden, 1974/1981), 1:128.

<sup>13</sup> David G. Littman, “Jews under Muslim Rule, II: Morocco 1903-1912,” *Wiener Library Bulletin* 29 (n.s.), no. 37/38 (1976): 16-19.

<sup>14</sup> L. Février, “A French Family in the Yemen,” *Arabian Studies* 3 (1979): 134.

their lives in 1165, 1275, 1465, and 1790–92. The Jews of Tabrīz were obliged to convert in 1291 and 1318, and those of Baghdad in 1333 and 1334. Throughout Persia forced conversions from the sixteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century decimated the Christian and, even more, the Jewish communities. In the reign of Shah Abbas II (1642–1666) a law of 1656 gave the convert to Islam, whether Christian or Jewish, exclusive rights of family inheritance. As a concession to Pope Alexander VII it was mitigated for Christians but remained in force for Jews until the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>15</sup>

***Segregation and Humiliation.*** Toward the end of the Middle Ages, with a few exceptions, special quarters had been set aside for infidels, outside of which they were not permitted to acquire either lands or buildings; both in size and appearance their houses had to be inferior to those of the Muslims, shabbier and smaller. Houses of *dhimmis* were demolished for being higher than authorized by tradition. A *dhimmi* was not permitted to have slaves who converted to Islam; he was also forbidden to possess weapons. Arab honorific titles and the use of the Arabic alphabet were forbidden to the *dhimmis*. Consulting them as physicians and pharmacists was discouraged, for they were generally suspected of poisoning Muslims; yet, due to their talents, these learned *dhimmis* often distinguished themselves at the courts of the caliphs.

The most degrading tasks fell to the *dhimmis*. In Yemen an edict of 1806, which remained in effect until they left for Israel in 1950, obliged the Jews to carry away dead animals and clean the public latrines, even on Saturdays (the Jewish Sabbath). In Yemen and Morocco the *dhimmis* were obliged to extract the brains and salt the decapitated heads of the sultan's enemies, which they then exposed on the walls of the town.

It was regarded as a grave offense for a *dhimmi* to ride a noble animal such as a horse or camel. Outside the towns he was allowed to ride on a donkey; but at certain periods this concession was restricted to special cases. In 1697 a Frenchman visiting Cairo noticed that Christians could ride only on donkeys and had to dismount when passing distinguished Muslims, "for a Christian must only appear before a Muslim in a humiliating position." The Spaniard Badia y Leblich, who traveled and wrote under the name of Ali Bey at the beginning of the nineteenth century, related that no Jew or Christian was allowed even to ride a mule in Damascus. When, under the lenient Egyptian occupation, the newly appointed French consul was authorized to ride through the streets of Damascus in 1833, riots broke out. The prohibition against riding a horse or camel was still in force for the Yemenite Jews in 1948, and it was specified that they had to sit sidesaddle when riding a donkey. In Yemen and in the rural areas of Morocco, Libya, Iraq, and Persia, up until the beginning of the twentieth century a Jew had to dismount from his mule when passing a Muslim. If he did not do so, the Muslim was justified in throwing him to the ground.<sup>16</sup>

*Dhimmis* were not permitted to group together to talk in the street. They had to walk with their eyes lowered and pass to the left of the Muslims, who were encouraged to push them aside. In Yemen it was an offense to screw up one's eyes on seeing a Muslim naked. When standing in

---

<sup>15</sup> W. J. Fischel, "The Jews in Medieval Iran from the 16th to the 18th Centuries: Political, Economic and Communal Aspects," Paper, International Conference on Jewish Communities in Muslim Lands (Institute of Asian and African Studies, Ben Zvi Institute, Hebrew University). (Jerusalem, 1974), 14; Ezra Spicehandler, "The Persecution of the Jews of Isfahan Under Shah Abbas II (1642-1666)," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 46 (1975): 331-56.

<sup>16</sup> David G. Littman, "Jews under Muslim Rule in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Wiener Library Bulletin* 28 (n.s.), no. 35/36 (1975): 71.

front of a Muslim, a *dhimmi* had to speak in a lowered voice and only when authorized to do so. Slouschz, in the early twentieth century, mentions that in Bu Zain in the Jabal Gharian (Libya), it was customary for Arab children to throw stones at Jewish passersby.<sup>17</sup> Travelers in Persia and Yemen at the beginning of the twentieth century noticed the low doors that forced the *dhimmis*—as an additional humiliation—either to bend down or knock their heads when entering their own houses. Touring the Black Sea region in the early nineteenth century, a traveler wrote, “At the village of Kourou-Chesné, the dark slate colour of the houses, approaching almost to black, indicates that they are occupied by *rayahs* [*dhimmis*], none of whom, except by express permission, are allowed to paint their dwellings with the gay colours in which the Orientals delight.”<sup>18</sup> In Bukhara a piece of cloth had to be hung on Jewish houses to distinguish them from those of Muslims; their height also had to be lower. Forced at certain periods to wear only black, the Jews of Bukhara had to crouch down in their shops so that their Muslim clients would see only their heads and not their bodies,<sup>19</sup> a practice that recalled the obligation in early sixteenth-century Damascus of keeping the threshold of the shops of Jews and Christians below street level.<sup>20</sup>

The locked doors of the *dhimmis*’ quarter were not always adequate to protect their inhabitants from rape and pillage. In Yemen the Jewish houses were like labyrinths, allowing fugitives to hide or put pursuers off their track. Local Jewish chronicles from North Africa give us a glimpse of the misery of the Jewish quarters, as well as of the terror and anguish that frequently gripped their inhabitants, who often became the defenseless victims of pillage and massacre.

The restrictions imposed on the *dhimmis*’ movements and places of residence varied according to regions and periods, but the restrictions imposed on foreign Christians could be even more stringent than those applied to the local *dhimmis*. In North Africa they were allowed to reside only in a few coastal towns, where they were grouped together in a *funduq* (inn) under the authority of a consul. If they wished to visit the interior of the country, they had to obtain special permits or disguise themselves as Jews. If they came to a town, they were regarded as too impure to stay in the Muslim section and so had to lodge in the Jewish quarter. Throughout the nineteenth century, Europeans who for reasons of security or because of discrimination had found shelter among the Jews left full and detailed descriptions of the wretched existence of the Jews. Despite anti-Jewish prejudice, the sight of so much suffering and injustice aroused the shocked compassion of Christian travelers.

There were many laws regulating the clothes worn by the *dhimmis* (color, shape, and dimensions), the shapes of turbans, footwear, and saddles, as well as the attire of wives, children and servants of *dhimmis*. Many sources attest that the *dhimmis* were still subjected to clothing regulations throughout the nineteenth century. Until 1875 the Jews of Tunisia could wear only a blue or black burnous; also their shoes and caps had to be black. In Tripoli (Libya) the Jews had to wear a distinctive blue badge. At the same period, throughout Morocco, with the exception of a few coastal towns, the Jews were obliged to go barefoot outside their quarter. Slouschz reported that at Zenaga in the Algerian Sahara in 1912, the Arabs allowed the Jews neither to

---

<sup>17</sup> Slouschz, *Travels in North Africa*, 153.

<sup>18</sup> J. Fuller, *Narrative of a Tour through Some Parts of the Turkish Empire* (London, 1829), 101.

<sup>19</sup> Izhak Ben-Zvi, *The Exiled and the Redeemed* (London, 1958), 86-87.

<sup>20</sup> E. Ashtor, “Levantine Jewries in the Fifteenth Century,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 3 (1975): 92.

wear shoes nor to ride an animal. In the Mzab (Southern Algeria) before the French colonization, Jews could leave their quarter only when dressed in black and were forbidden to emigrate.<sup>21</sup> Ali Bey mentioned that dark colors that the Jews and Christians were forced to wear in Jerusalem in the early nineteenth century.<sup>22</sup> An Anglican missionary, Wolff, who visited Bukhara in 1831–1834, mentioned that the Jews were obliged to wear a discriminatory badge.<sup>23</sup> In 1892 the clergy of Hamadan in Persia forced the Jews to wear a visible red circular patch on the upper part of their garment, and in 1902 they again made them wear a special costume. At the same time in Shīrāz, fanatical fundamentalists seized Jews in the streets, shaved their beards, cut off their hair, and made them wear the distinctive badge. In Teheran in 1897 the *mullahs* published a *fatwa* requiring the Jews to wear the badge and to cut their hair in order to distinguish themselves from the Believers. Under strong British pressure the Shah issued an edict forbidding its implementation.

These examples are intended to indicate the general character of a system of oppression, sanctioned by contempt and justified by the principle of inequality between Muslims and *dhimmis*. Superimposed on this pattern of daily life were calamities such as wars, famines, epidemics, and waves of fanaticism. These misfortunes afflicted the whole population, but especially the *dhimmis*. Singled out as objects of hatred and contempt by visible signs of discrimination, they were decimated during periods of massacres, forced conversions, and banishments. Sometimes it was the prosperity they had achieved through their labor or ability that aroused jealousy; oppressed and stripped of all their goods, the *dhimmis* often emigrated. Many *dhimmis* communities have been annihilated because, not being Muslims, hence unarmed, they could live only in a state of perpetual insecurity and contemptuous tolerance.

Of all the documents presented in Bat Ye'or's *The Dhimmi: Jews and Christians Under Islam*, I present only one, but one which expresses clearly prejudice against the *dhimmis*.

...know that just as the *dhimmis* are prohibited from building churches, other things also are prohibited to them. They must not assist an unbeliever against a Muslim, Arab, or non-Arab; or indicate to the enemy the weak points of the Muslims, such as the Muslims' unpreparedness for battle. The *dhimmis* must not imitate the Muslims in garb, wear military attire, abuse or strike a Muslim, raise the cross in an Islamic assemblage; let pigs get out of their homes into Muslim courtyards; display banners on their own holidays, or carry them at all, or keep them in their homes. Should they do anything of the sort, they must be punished, and the arms seized. Neither Jew nor Christian should ride a horse, with or without [a] saddle. They may ride asses with a packsaddle. They must not wear the *qabā* (full sleeved garment), silk garments, [or] turbans, but may wear quilted *qalansuwa* [conical bonnet] headgear. If they pass by a Muslim assembly, they must dismount, and they may ride only in an emergency such as sickness or leaving for the country, and their path is to be made narrow. They must not imitate the garb of the men of learning and honor, or wear luxurious garb, silk, or, say, fine cloth. They must be distinguished from ourselves in attire, as the local custom of each area may have it, but without adornment, so that it indicates their humiliation, submission, and abasement. Their shoelaces must not be like ours. Where closed shoes are worn, not laced footwear, their shoes should be coarse,

<sup>21</sup> Slouschz, *Travels in North Africa*, 351-52.

<sup>22</sup> Ali (Domingo Badia y Leblich) Bey, *Travels of Ali Bey in Morocco, Tripoli, Cyprus, Egypt, Syria and Turkey, Between the Years 1803 and 1807, Written by Himself* (London, 1816), 2:242.

<sup>23</sup> J. Wolff, *Researches and Missionary Labours (1831-1834)* (London, 1835), 177.

of unpleasant (unadorned) color. The Companions [of the Prophet] agreed upon these points in order to demonstrate the abasement of the infidel and to protect the weak believer's faith. For if he sees them humbled, he will not be inclined toward their belief, which is not true if he sees them in power, pride, or luxurious garb, as all this urges him to esteem them and incline toward them, in view of his own distress and poverty. Yet esteem for the unbeliever is unbelief.

In *al-Ashbāh wa-l-nazā'ir*, it says:

Deference for the unbeliever is unbelief. He who greets a *dhimmi* is guilty of unbelief. He who says to a Magian "O Master" in deference, is guilty of unbelief. That is so because they are the enemies of our beloved, the Lord of the Messengers; and he who honors the enemy of his beloved has humiliated his beloved. That is why it is not permissible to install infidels as officials. To let them gain sway over a Muslim by empowering them to beat, imprison, or oppress him in order to exact money turns the infidel into [a] tax collector from a Muslim, all on behalf of a chieftain or dignitary who, for the sake of worldly affairs and in disregard of punishment in the hereafter, fears not the consequences of endowing unbelievers with power over believers. If the infidel has behaved this way, he has violated the covenant [*dhimma*] with the Muslims as mentioned above, and is subject to death.

...It is prohibited to assign them a seat of honor in a session attended by Muslims, to show friendship for them, to extend greetings to them.

If you greeted one whom you considered a Muslim, only to learn he was a *dhimmi*, withdraw your word, pretending "he answered my salutations." If one of them salutes, he is answered with "Same to you" only. If you correspond with one, you say: "Salutation to him who follows right guidance." But avoid congratulating, consoling, or visiting them, unless you expect the person visited to convert to Islam. If you do expect so, visit him and proffer Islam to him.

Infidels are prohibited from raising a structure higher than that of a Muslim neighbor, even if the Muslim's structure is very low and the Muslim is reconciled to the infidel's high building. They are forbidden to buy a Qur'ān, or a book of Islamic law or of prophetic tradition, or to take one as a pledge. Neither would be correct. One should not rise in their honor to start saluting them, as mentioned above. If a Muslim accompanies the greeted infidel, direct the salutation at him, and do not indulge in "How are you, how have you been, how do you feel?" One may say "May God honor and guide you," meaning toward Islam. One may say "May God give you long life, much wealth and progeny," because it implies the payment of many poll taxes. Just as Muslims must be clearly different from infidels in life, so their graves must be clearly distinguished from those of the infidels, and must be remote from them.

Shaykh al-Damanhuri (Egyptian theologian and head of al-Azhar, d. 1778)<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Bat Ye'or, *Dhimmi*, 203-04.