INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

UMI®
800-521-0600

The Ḥadīth in Christian-Muslim discourse in British India, 1857-1888.

Alan M. Guenther
Institute of Islamic Studies
McGill University, Montreal

Submitted November, 1997.
A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts.

Table of Contents

Abstract

In the development of Islam in India in the nineteenth century, the impact of the interaction between modernist Muslims and Christian administrators and missionaries can be seen in the writings of three Evangelical Christians on the role of the Ḥadīth, and the responses of Indian Muslims. The writings of Sir William Muir, an administrator in the Indian Civil Service, were characterized by European Orientalist methods of textual criticism coupled with the Evangelicals' rejection of Muḥammad. In his response, Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, an influential Muslim modernist, supported the traditional perception of the Ḥadīth but also initiated a new critical approach. The writings of Thomas P. Hughes and Edward Sell, missionaries with the Church Missionary Society, tended to portray Islam as bound by this body of traditions, with the rejoinders of Sayyid Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī presenting an increasing rejection of the religious authority of the Ḥadīth and an impassioned defense of Islam.

Résumé

L'impact de l'interaction entre musulmans modernistes et administateurs et missionnaires chrétiens sur le développement de l'islam au 19^{e} siècle en Inde peut être mesuré par trois textes de chrétiens évangéliques portant sur le rôle des ḥadīths et par les réactions suscitées par ces textes venant de musulmans indiens.

Les écrits de Sir William Muir, un administrateur de la fonction publique indienne, étaient caractérisés par des méthodes de critique textuelle orientalistes et européennes jumelées à un rejet de la part des évangéliques de la figure de Mahomet. Dans sa réplique, Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, un moderniste musulman influent, a appuyé les positions traditionnelles entourant la nature des ḥadīths, tout en initiant lui-même une nouvelle approche critique.

Les écrits de Thomas P. Hughes et d'Edward Sell, missionnaires affiliés à la Church Missionary Society, avaient tendance à dépeindre l'islam comme étant nécessairement lié à cet ensemble de ḥadīths, alors que les répliques de Sayyid Amīr 'Alī et Chirāgh 'Alī proposaient un rejet de l'autorité religieuse des ḥadīths et une défense passionnée de l'islam.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor and thesis supervisor, Prof. Sajida Alvi for her invaluable suggestions in defining my topic and including additional sources, her careful criticism of each stage of the work, her assistance with some Urdu translation and transliteration, and her encouragement throughout this period of research. I am also grateful to Prof. Donald P. Little for his helpful comments on an earlier version of the first chapter submitted as a paper in his class on early Muslim historiography.

I would also like to thank Salwa Ferahian, Stephen Millier, and Wayne St. Thomas of the Institute of Islamic Studies Library, Maria and the others of the Inter-Library Loans department, Jeremy Thompson of the Church Missionary Society office in England, the librarians at the Religious Studies Department and the Presbyterian College at McGill, the librarians at Wycliffe College Library, University of Toronto, at Andover-Harvard Theological Library, and at the Archives of the Montreal Diocese of the Anglican Church of Canada, for their assistance. I am also thankful to Ann Yaxley and Dawn Richardson of the Institute of Islamic Studies office for taking care of many of the technical details as well as for their encouragement in general. I would like to thank Roxanne Marcotte for her assistance in the French translation of the Abstract. For financial assistance, I would like to thank the Institute of Islamic Studies for the Fellowships I received for the years 1995-1997.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the encouragement of my parents, other family members, my room-mates, and numerous friends and classmates as well as their patience, and prayers during my research. A special thanks is due to Sevak Manjikian and Tariq Jaffer for their assistance and review of my work as part of the "Thesis Club."

Preface

Transliteration

The standard used for the transliteration of both the Arabic and the Urdu in this thesis is the *American Library Association-Library of Congress Romanization Tables: Transliteration Schemes for Non-Roman Scripts*. Washington, DC: Library of Congess, 1991, pp. 4, 202.

Names of modern authors have not been not been transliterated, rather the spelling as presented in their publications has been retained in order to facilitate the locating of their works. The names of historical personages including the nineteenth century authors discussed in this thesis have been transliterated according to the standard given above.

The spelling and terminology of early authors such as the versions of the name of Muḥammad and the various terms for Islam have also been retained, since these help to demonstrate the perceptions being analyzed. Diacritical marks contained in their writings, however, have been standardized according to the ALA-LC standard; for example, â, à, etc. have all been rendered ā.

Abbreviations

The abbreviations used are the following:

•*AR*	*Andover Review*
•*BFER*	*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*
•*CMI*	*Church Missionary Intelligencer*
•CMS	Church Missionary Society
•*IER*	*Indian Evangelical Review*
•MAO College	Mohammadan Anglo-Oriental College

Introduction

Problem to be discussed

This thesis studies the nature of the interaction of Christian administrators and missionaries with the Muslim modernists in India in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Its purpose is to examine how both groups viewed each other and how each responded to the other's assessment. A related problem is to discover what the sources of these perceptions or misperceptions were, and to what extent the interaction comprised a new source to inform and change those perceptions. The thesis addresses the question of the effect this interaction had on the religious discourse of each group, specifically with regard to perceptions of the Ḥadīth, the body of authoritative traditions regarding the Prophet Muḥammad. Why the Ḥadīth figured so prominently in these inter-religious discussions, and how beliefs regarding this institution changed during this period is examined.

The value of this discussion is its contribution to the understanding of the development of religious ideas both in the Muslim community and in the Christian community in India during the period just after the Revolt of 1857, with a special focus on the evolution of the perceptions of the Ḥadīth material and of its continuing role in Islamic belief and practice. The thesis elucidates the role of Evangelical Christians as a major component in the encounter of the Muslim community in India with the West, and identifies the area of Muslim thought where Evangelical Christian writings had the most impact. It also demonstrates that the distinctive beliefs of the Evangelicals were the major force shaping the world-view of the administrators such as Sir William Muir (1819-1905) and of the missionaries such as Thomas P. Hughes (1838-1911) and Edward Sell (1839-1932) interacting with Muslims in the nineteenth century. As such, this examination of the interaction contributes an important but neglected account in the historical record of Muslim-Christian relations in the Indian subcontinent, and enables current missionary activity and attempts at dialogue between the two communities to be seen in a broader historical context.

Background

History of Protestant Christianity in India

According to early Christian legends, Christianity arrived in India as early as the time of the Apostle Thomas, one of the twelve disciples of Jesus. Other references to church leaders of western Asia or Europe having contact with Christians from India continue sporadically in subsequent centuries.[1] Western Europeans first became involved in India in a more continuous manner with the arrival of the Portuguese at the end of the 15th century. While Roman Catholic missions gained a prominent presence during the Mughal period (1526-1720), the Protestants had a very limited role prior to the nineteenth century. The Dutch and Danish mission organizations had been involved in small attempts at evangelism in the eighteenth century, the latter establishing a colony at Serampur, near Calcutta, that was later to provide assistance in the initial English missionary advance.

The history of English Protestant missionary activity in India is closely tied to the history of Evangelicals in the Indian civil service.[2] Beginning in the 1730's with the conversion and preaching ministry of men such as George Whitfield, John and Charles Wesley, and Jonathan Edwards, the Evangelical movement had spread across Britain as well as North America. The movement had its roots in the Reformed tradition embodied in the Dissenting Church, and was stimulated by Pietism from continental Europe.[3] Though Evangelical distinctives were to be found within a range of denominations, Evangelicals were at first shut out of positions of power within the Church of England and other elite institutions. However, as the eighteenth century drew to a close, their presence began to be felt at all levels of society, including positions of power.

One of the Evangelicals who was to play a major role in assisting the establishment of Christian missions in India who rose at this time was Charles Grant (1746-1823). He spent many years in India with the East India Company, ending with his being an advisor to Lord Cornwallis. The East India Company had made limited provision for chaplains to accompany its employees to take care of their spiritual well-being in the eighteenth century, and as long as the Company was involved only in trading, its rela-

tions with an occasional missionary were cordial. However, once "it came to assume a political role the Company's attitude as also of its servants in India, towards the missions gradually changed from encouragement to indifference and eventually to hostility."[4] The Company sought to avoid antagonizing any indigenous religious community to ensure a peaceful environment in order to safeguard their interests. Grant was an exception, and deplored the lack of missionary interest among his fellow officials. When in 1793, he sought to introduce a bill in the British parliament with the help of fellow Evangelical, William Wilberforce, to allow greater freedom for missionary activity in India, the bill was opposed and ultimately rejected by those in England and in India who feared that such efforts might endanger the peace and security of the Company's possessions in India.[5] Hence early British missionaries such as William Carey were not permitted to land in British India, but had to seek sanctuary at the Serampur mission station in Danish territory.

Upon his retirement from India, Grant moved to Clapham in England where he joined the influential Clapham Sect,[6] including such men as Wilberforce and Charles Simeon.[7] Through their leadership, the Evangelicals exercised greater influence in the British Parliament, resulting in a reversal of the 1793 decision through the passing of a bill in 1813 that opened the way for missionaries to freely work in British territories in India. This group assisted in the support of the early Evangelical chaplains and missionaries in India, including Henry Martyn who made a direct contribution to the interaction of Muslims and Christians in North India through his writings and travels through that area,[8] and Thomas Thomason whose son James became Lt.-Governor of the North West Provinces, 1843-1853, and trained William Muir and other Evangelical administrators during that time. The influence of Charles Grant in Britain's policies in India was considerable when he became the Director of the East India Company in 1794 and one of its Chairmen for six years during the period from 1804 to 1816.[9]

The origin of the Church Missionary Society (C. M. S.), the mission agency with which Muir was related most closely and under whose direction both Thomas Patrick Hughes and Edward Sell went to India, had links to the work of Evangelicals in the Indian civil service. Grant and others of the Clapham Sect were involved in establishing

and leading the organization in 1799.[10] As missions interest had been stimulated by the revivals connected with the Evangelical movement, the need was felt for an organization that held to the principles of the Anglican Church and reflected the convictions of the Evangelical part of that communion. Its beginnings were small, having to seek its first missionary candidates from a training school in Berlin, but as the Evangelical influence in the Church and society grew, CMS rapidly expanded as well.

Definition of the term Evangelical

The movement termed "Evangelical" is best described by delineating the doctrinal emphases that characterized those within the movement as distinct from other individuals and trends in the Christian church, since it was in the realm of beliefs that they perceived themselves to have a distinct identity and a crucial and corrective contribution to make in the reformation of the Church. More than just a social phenomenon of institutions and shared ritual, such religious movements are also characterized by dogmatic belief, faith, and passion which work together to spur to action both communities and individuals.[11] In outlining the history and various sectarian expressions of the Evangelical revival of the eighteenth century, the CMS historian Eugene Stock describes the substance of Evangelical preaching as such:

> It was above all things doctrinal, one may say dogmatical. They believed they had definite truths to set forth, and they set them forth definitely. They taught that men were dead in sins and guilty before God; that Christ died to save men from sin's penalty, and lives to save them from sin's power; that only faith in Him could give them His salvation; that absolute conversion of heart and life was needed by all, and that the Holy Ghost alone could convert and sanctify them.[12]

In the following century, the movement faced new theological challenges such as the Higher Critical approaches to understanding Scripture which spread from Germany into England and beyond. In response to this, the Evangelicals developed a strong stand on the infallibility of the Christian Scriptures. This became significant in the Indian context when Muslim scholars gained access to the writings of European critics and used those arguments as evidence of the corruption of the Bible, in their controversies with the missionaries. It was the distinctive beliefs of the Evangelicals that were the

major force shaping the world-view of those administrators such as Muir and of the missionaries interacting with Muslims in the nineteenth century.[13]

The emphasis on individual spiritual rebirth was what distinguished the message of the Evangelical missionaries from that of Nestorian and Jesuit missionaries in India. While all proclaimed salvation through faith in Christ, Evangelicals began with a foundational emphasis on the sinfulness and vanity of all other religious paths.

> "The intense spiritual ordeal in course of which the 'sinner' emerged from a state of abject despair into one of repentance and reliance on Christ's mediating and atoning powers, tended to set the 'reborn' Evangelical apart from, not only Catholics and Eastern Christians, but also and more immediately, from those merely 'nominal' Protestants who wore their faith too lightly, the Evangelicals thought, to recognize their own state of sin."[14]

The Evangelicals were then strongly motivated to point out to others the error of their ways and the new and better way to salvation through repentance and faith in Christ. However, though they could not conceive of additional spiritual truth beyond the boundaries of a final revelation in Jesus Christ, they were unusually receptive to the latest findings of Orientalist scholarship as it was made available in the middle of the nineteenth century. Powell's description of Carl G. Pfander (1803-1868) could equally apply to Muir, Sell, Hughes, or a number of other Evangelical writers, both administrators and missionaries, in India at that time. His study of the Arabic language and the Qur'ān had resulted in "a readiness and an ability to modify his views as Orientalist study of Islam proceeded in the nineteenth century, but only within the circumscribed confines permitted to him by his Evangelical preconceptions."[15] Evangelicals also shared his propensity to be "more receptive to new and challenging scholarship on Islam than he was to historical and critical study of the Biblical sources."[16] Thus, their writings demonstrated a greater knowledge and utilization of primary Muslim sources than those of some of their European counterparts to whose liberal attitudes towards Islam and to whose apologetic defenses of the Prophet they were reacting, while at the same time revealed an unwillingness to apply the same critical tools to their own religious convictions. This latter tendency was a point emphasized repeatedly by Muslim writers such as Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān (1817-1898) and Sayyid Amīr 'Alī (1849-1928).

Evangelicals in the 1850's

From the bill opening the door to Christian missions in 1813, missionaries arrived in steadily increasing numbers from a variety of denominations, from both Britain and North America. Christian missions in the North West Provinces, situated between Behar in the east and the Punjab in the west, however, began tentatively in the early 1800's, with several of the early efforts almost disappearing before being revived or re-established from the 1830's to the 1850's.[17] The famine of 1837 resulted in a renewed missionary presence as organizations took part in relief efforts and the establishment of orphanages.[18] Shortly thereafter, the arrival of Pfander, a CMS missionary, in 1841, the publication of his book, *Mizān al-Ḥaqq*, in Urdu in 1843 and again in 1850, and his subsequent controversy and public debates with Muslim *'ulamā'* culminating in the "Great Debate" in Agra in 1854, greatly increased the visibility of missionary endeavors in the area.[19]

Pfander arrived in India from the Russian Caucasus in 1839, and had set out to translate his books into Urdu.[20] Upon the invitation of the CMS, he moved to Agra in 1841 to begin evangelization efforts in the aftermath of the famines. The Agra *'ulamā'* responded to his writings with books of their own, attacking especially the doctrine of the Trinity.[21] As his writings were circulated to a wider area, and as Pfander directly sought out contacts with other religious leaders, *'ulamā'* from Lucknow also entered the controversy. Again the focus of the reply was on the Trinity, but this time "the traditional apologetic and polemical armory was to be subordinated to an overriding philosophical argument about the role of reason in determining religious truth."[22] In subsequent encounters, Muslim controversialists continued to rely on this recourse to reason, and began to incorporate elements of European learning and criticism of Christian Biblical sources.[23] As the center of controversy shifted to Delhi as a result of conversions at Delhi College, others such as Muir became more directly involved in the interaction. The controversy reached its climax with a public debate between the missionaries and the religious leaders of the Muslim community in Agra in 1854. Here the focus of the discussion turned out be the issue of *taḥrīf*, the corruption or changing of the Christian

Scriptures. Muslim controversialists used the findings of European scholars engaged in Higher Criticism of the Bible to confound the missionaries.[24] This also proved to be the conclusion of the first phase of prolonged face-to-face encounters between the two groups. Pfander subsequently relocated to Peshawar, while other missionaries and others such as Muir tended to avoid such high profile encounters.

William Muir served in the British civil service in India from 1837 to 1876. He had been trained at Haileybury College and in India became a disciple of the Evangelical administrator, James Thomason (1804-1863). He was posted to the Agra region shortly after Pfander's arrival and became a close friend to Pfander and to the other missionaries. He was one of the founders of the North India Christian Tract and Book Society which published some of his writings. He prepared a detailed review of the controversy between Pfander and the Muslim *'ulamā'* for the *Calcutta Review*.[25] He played an active role as an administrator in the Revolt of 1857, an event that was to have a significant impact on not only the British government in India, but also on the Muslim and missionary communities as well. It was during this time that he wrote his biography on the life of Muḥammad, which contained the lengthy introduction on the authenticity of the Ḥadīth which is examined in the first chapter.[26]

The two missionaries examined in this thesis, Thomas P. Hughes and Edward Sell, arrived after the Revolt. Both departed for India after completing their training in the Church Missionary College--Hughes arriving to work in Peshawar in 1864 and Sell arriving to work in Madras a year later. The work among the Pathans of the Peshawar area had been begun by CMS in the previous decade and received the stimulus of Pfander's assistance after the debate in Agra. Hughes adapted to the work quickly, and soon was writing numerous articles on the missionary work in the area. As his understanding of the Muslims and their religious practice increased, he addressed other perceptions of Islam as contained in the writings of European Orientalists. This project eventually developed into his *Dictionary of Islam*. Sell likewise became involved in a writing career focusing on Islam. He had been assigned to Madras for the express purpose of targeting Muslims in his teaching and evangelistic efforts. He, too, attempted in his writings to connect the current practice of Muslims to the broader historical streams

of Islamic institutions. These writings of Hughes and Sell constitute the sources analyzed in the second chapter.

Time period: 1857-1888

The time period chosen for this study, 1857 to 1888, covers the aftermath of the Revolt of 1857. This was a time of political turmoil for the indigenous communities of the Indian subcontinent, particularly the Muslims. The British took over the responsibility of direct rule from the East India Company and abolished the remaining vestiges of the Mughal government in northern India, exiling the last ruler, Bahādur Shāh Ẓafar (d. 1857) in punishment for his having supported the insurgents. This event coupled with further reprisals by the British against other Muslim leaders who were held largely responsible for the rebellion, deeply affected the Muslim community's self-perception and prompted new strategies for dealing with the altered circumstances. Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān rose to prominence at this time and led those who sought accommodation with the new rulers while at the same time defending the interests of the Muslim community and working towards its revitalization. The end of the era of confusion and disarray resulting from the Revolt, and the beginning of a new one characterized by increasing political confidence and a growing "nationalist" consciousness was heralded by the formation of the Indian National Congress in 1885. Although a few Muslims took part in the Congress effort, more followed the lead of Aḥmad Khān in rejecting this forum in favor of the Mahommedan Educational Congress,[27] formed in 1886. He also organized the United Indian Patriotic Association in 1888 to oppose the Congress.[28]

The situation of the Christian missionary organizations also underwent a change during this period. The Revolt of 1857 led to an outcry in Britain against the evangelistic efforts of the missionaries in India, who were blamed for the unrest of the general population culminating in the Revolt. Missionaries and their supporters reacted strongly, defending their work and disclaiming any responsibility for the disturbances, arguing that it was the *neglect* of evangelism that had led to such a deterioration of affairs in India. Queen Victoria's proclamation of governance with religious neutrality and tolerance after the Revolt was interpreted by evangelical administrators such as Sir

William Muir to allow for the private support of Christian missions, resulting in a resurgence of missionary activity, especially in the newly acquired province of the Punjab. It was early in this period that Hughes and Sell arrived in India to begin their missionary careers. By the end of this period, the generation of missionaries who had experienced the Revolt and assisted in the re-establishment of the missionary outreach was retiring and leaving India, most notable retirements of this generation were those of T. V. French in 1888 and Robert Clark in 1891.[29] After 1885, the missionary organizations faced another major turning point when large communities of "Untouchables" sought to affiliate themselves with the Christians, causing a major re-evaluation of their focus of ministry from that time onward. A factor altering the Christian-Muslim interaction in northern India also at the end of this time period was the rise of Mirza Ghulām Aḥmad (1839-1908), with his declaration of prophethood in 1889.

In the area of Ḥadīth studies, the closing of the 1880's brought a significantly new development as well. Shiblī Nu'mānī (1857-1914), a Muslim scholar at Aligarh made his first major contribution in 1889 with the publication of his book, *Sīrat al-Nu'mān*, a defense of Abu Ḥanīfa (d. 767) against the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth, signaling a shift of concern from examining merely the history of the collection of traditions to analyzing the history of their application. In Europe, a scholar who was to have a major impact on the Orientalist perspective of the Ḥadīth, Ignaz Goldziher (1850-1921), began publishing his *Muhammedansche Studien* in 1889. This thesis will therefore focus on the development of Ḥadīth studies prior to this point, concentrating on that generation of writers, both Orientalists and Muslims, for whom Muir and Aḥmad Khān were major authorities.

The year 1888 is a fitting terminus for the study of the writings of Muir, Hughes, and Sell. Muir had left India in 1876 but had continued his involvement in its affairs as a member of the India Council. In 1888 he resigned from the Council to take up responsibilities as Principal at Edinburgh, though he continued his research and writing on the early history of Islam. Hughes resigned from the CMS in 1884, left England and took up pastoral duties in New York. In 1885 he published his *Dictionary of Islam*, and in 1888 he had several articles published in an American journal which reflected a markedly different evaluation of Islam than his earlier writings. Sell, on the other hand, continued his

service in India for almost fifty more years; but it was in 1888 that he returned briefly to England on account of his ailing wife, who passed away within a few months.

The discussion in the Muslim community regarding the role and authority of the Ḥadīth cannot be confined to these dates. Major developments had been initiated by the teachings of Shāh Wali Ullāh (1702-1762) in the eighteenth century and continued into the twentieth. However, it was during this period that Aḥmad Khān began to exercise influential leadership in the north Indian Muslim community, not only in the political realm, but also in the educational and religious discourses as well. He had left the Civil Service in 1876 to devote himself to the vision of establishing an educational institution integrating the Western scientific and modern approaches with a revitalized Islamic perspective. He had been active in promoting his reformed approaches to Islam and Muslim life along with those of his contemporaries in the journal *Tahẕīb al-Akhlāq* from 1870-1876. He was also knighted with the KCSI (Knight Commander of the Star of India) in 1888, in recognition of his service to the government. During these decades, Sayyid Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī (1844-1895) also began to write and contribute to the modernization of Islam in India. This emerging scholarship and response to Evangelical Christian writings about Islam is also part of this study.

Ḥadīth as the focus of study

The Ḥadīth has been chosen as the focus of this study because of its fundamental importance to all aspects of Muslim doctrine and practice, as well as its centrality in the thought of reform movements within Islam. Although the modernists such as Sayyid Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī, whose writings are covered briefly in this thesis, focused explicitly on the practices and institutions of Islam in their writings, their ideas were predicated on a fresh approach to the Ḥadīth that had its roots in earlier movements. An analysis of the development of Muslim beliefs concerning the Ḥadīth is part of the larger discussion of the role of the Sunna and the authority of the example of the Prophet Muḥammad in Islam, a discussion that was receiving renewed attention in the Indian subcontinent towards the end of the eighteenth century. While a major catalyst for change within the Muslim community has been its encounter with Western European

and American ideologies and research methodologies, this renewed assessment of the authenticity, content, authority, and method of handling of the Ḥadīth can not be solely attributed to this encounter. It had its roots in reform movements from within the Muslim community particularly through the influence of Shāh Wali Ullāh of Delhi. From his teachings and those of his descendants, a number of diverse reform movements of the nineteenth and twentieth century trace their roots.[30]

Wali Ullāh's eldest son, Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz (1746-1824) and his brothers continued their father's teachings, producing a number of influential leaders such as Sayyid Aḥmad of Rae Bareli (1786-1831), and eventually giving rise to the modernist school within the Muslim community in India in the late nineteenth century. 'Abdul 'Azīz continued his father's practice of appealing to fundamental religious sources, basing his *fatāwa* or judicial opinions more on valid Ḥadīth than on the decisions of the established schools of law.[31] The leaders of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth movement were trained in the ideas of Wali Ullāh and his sons, carrying the rejection of all else but the Ḥadīth and Qur'ān to an extreme. In this context, modernists who were seeking to come to terms with Western ideas of rationalism and historical criticism found the freedom to extend their reconstruction of Islam to other aspects of Muslim practice which they found incompatible with the modern Islam they envisioned. The contribution of Aḥmad Khān, the leader of the modernists, was primarily in the promotion of Western-style education, particularly the founding of the college at Aligarh. He also led the way for Muslims in combining the European methods of criticism of the Ḥadīth with the traditional methods of evaluating a tradition's authenticity and authority. Two others who built on the conclusions of Aḥmad Khān and argued forcefully for Islam's flexibility to adapt to modern challenges were Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī. Though the focus of their study was not Ḥadīth, they did severely criticize Muir's handling of that material, and attributed his negative conclusions to his incorrect assessment of the veracity of traditions compiled by early historians in Islam. An examination of their approach to Ḥadīth is important for understanding the presuppositions underlying their ground-breaking reconstructions of Islam.

The approach of the European Orientalists to the subject of Ḥadīth was of quite a different nature, arising from completely different motivations and presuppositions.

Muir was one of the first, building on the previous works by Gustav Weil and Aloys Sprenger, to prepare a thorough critique of the Ḥadīth, as well as a new system to evaluate authentic material within the traditions. He considered the topic important enough to devote almost the entire first volume of his four-volume biography of Muḥammad to this matter. It was to this section that Aḥmad Khān chose to respond in detail in his book, *A Series of Essays on the Life of Muhammad*.[32] Utilizing the critical tools of textual criticism, Western scholars of the Orient, like Muir and those who followed him, were concerned with determining the authenticity of individual traditional accounts. Theirs was not an attempt to determine authoritative law but to attempt to reconstruct an accurate history of Muḥammad and early Islam, as well as to develop an understanding of the Muslim communities they encountered in their increasing travel and trade, and in their expanding empires. The motivations for this study of the Oriental "Other" has come under increasing scrutiny in recent years, and has been variously analyzed in the light of post-modern approaches to knowledge. As a result of the importance of the Ḥadīth in the development of reform movements in the Indian Muslim community, in the Orientalist evaluation of the history of Islam, and in its relevance in modern post-Oriental and post-colonial discourse, the analysis of Christian and Muslim scholars in this thesis will focus on what they wrote on this topic.

Methodological framework

The problem of determining the nature of the Christian-Muslim interaction and their assessments of each other is approached through the textual analysis of the writings of Evangelicals, both in the British government in India and in the missionary organizations working there, on the topic of Ḥadīth, from 1857-1888. Earlier writings of each author are compared with his subsequent ones to determine what development in his thinking had occurred. The choice of Ḥadīth as the focal point of this study was partly determined by the Evangelicals' emphasis on the Ḥadīth as the keystone of Islamic history and current practice. The fact that it was also contested in its every aspect by the Muslim modernists who interacted with them makes it an invaluable starting point of analysis of the encounter between the two. The major writers whose works are examined in detail are an administrator with the British regime, Sir William Muir, and

two missionaries, Thomas P. Hughes, and Edward Sell, all of whom were soon recognized by the missionary community, and to a lesser extent by European Orientalists, as authorities on Islam. The response of influential Muslim modernists such as Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, Sayyid Amīr 'Alī, and Chirāgh 'Alī is interspersed not only to clarify the specific nature of the Orientalism of the Christian scholars, but also to provide an example of Muslim responses to specific charges and to trace the changes that the encounter was producing in the thinking of both groups. Close attention is given to the extent they acknowledged, utilized, or opposed each other's writings, and to the other writers and books used by the authors as their sources.

The first chapter contains a detailed examination of the writings of Muir and Aḥmad Khān on Ḥadīth as found primarily in the introduction to the former's biography of Muḥammad and in the latter's essays written in response. It begins with their biographical details in order to provide the appropriate cultural context and educational training that influenced the perceptions of each. Both writers' evaluations of the Revolt of 1857 are presented to highlight their respective views on the role Christian missions as a cause of the unrest, and the role of the British government in religious matters. Their contributions to the wider Muslim-Christian interaction are also detailed prior to the examination of their work on the Ḥadīth, which forms the major portion of the chapter. Muir based his reconstruction of early Islamic history and the character of the Prophet on his critical evaluation of the traditional material. This critical basis combined with his Evangelical presuppositions formed the foundation of Muir's negative perception of Islam, and must be studied to understand the subsequent Evangelical representation of Islam. The point-by-point response by Aḥmad Khān from a position consistent with the traditional Muslim view provides not only an appropriate contrast, but also the structure of a Muslim evaluation of Christianity. Evidence for Aḥmad Khān's movement to a more modernist position as a result of his encounter with European thought in general, resulting in the evaluation of the Ḥadīth from a rationalist basis and in the rejection of miracles, is also noted.

The second chapter follows a similar pattern in dealing with the writings of the missionaries Hughes and Sell, and the Muslim intellectuals, Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī.

After a brief account of their biographical details, their ideas concerning the Ḥadīth are presented. The major portion of the analysis is devoted to the former two, beginning with their perception of Islam in general and their ideological motivations, and progressing to their specific views on the importance and role of Ḥadīth in Islam and the Muslim community of India at that time. Hughes' and Sell's treatments of the writings of Aḥmad Khān as well as those of Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Ali, and how their thought was influenced by those writings receives special attention. The Muslim evaluation of the Christian writings is likewise examined.

Literature review

Primary sources

Muir left a considerable legacy of writings on early Islam and its spread in the following centuries, beginning with his biography of the Prophet, *The Life of Mahomet*.[33] His other histories published as result of his continuing scholarly activity after his retirement from the Indian civil service were his *Annals of the Early Caliphate* (1883), *The Caliphate, Its Rise, Decline, and Fall* (1891), and *The Mameluke; or, Slave Dynasty of Egypt, 1260-1517* (1896). However, it was in the first work that he dealt with the matter of Ḥadīth criticism in detail, and which therefore forms the focus of this study. Subsequent editions (1877, 1894) of the biography contained a summary of the original four volumes but without the extensive footnotes, and with a few other minor alterations. The section on the Ḥadīth remained intact as an appendix, with the responses by Aḥmad Khān, Amīr 'Alī, and Chirāgh 'Alī having no noticeable effect on its content. Muir also published smaller summaries of the life of Muḥammad and of Islam as a religion in a less academic and more popular style.[34] In these latter works, his negative assessment of the religion and its Prophet is quite explicit, as he seeks to convince his readers of Islam's inferiority to Christianity.

Prior to its publication as a multi-volume work in 1861, Muir's writings on Muḥammad had been printed in the *Calcutta Review*.[35] This journal was a convenient forum for the publication of his reviews of the writings and correspondence between Pfander and his *'ulamā'* counterparts in controversy in 1845 and 1852, as well as his re-

views of biographies of Muḥammad in English and Urdu in 1852 and of Sprenger's critical biography and essay on sources in 1868.[36] These early essays reveal Muir's attitudes towards interaction with Muslims on a polemical level, and his motivations for developing his own approach to the Ḥadīth. Muir directly participated in the controversy in several of his writings. He had published an account of a debate between a Hindu convert, Rām Chandra and the Qāẓī of Delhi, Maulānā Ulfat Ḥusayn entitled *Baḥṣ Mufīd al-'Āmm*, in which he promised to defend the assertion that the Qur'ān contained no declaration that the Old and New Testaments had been abrogated by God or interpolated by man. He wrote *The Testimony borne by the Coran to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures* to fulfill this promise,[37] as well as to reply to the opponents of Pfander who had in the 1854 debate rejected the authenticity and authority of the Christian Bible.[38] These studies were later included in a slightly revised version in his *The Corān: Its Composition and Teaching; and the Testimony it Bears to the Holy Scriptures.*[39] It was translated into Urdu by Raja Shiv Prasād (1823-1895) and published by the North India Tract Society in 1861 as *Shahādat-i-Qur'ānī bar Kutub-i-Rabbānī.* Muir's other contributions to the controversy included the translation of two Arabic documents defending Christianity in a predominantly Muslim context. The first of these was an abridged version of the record of a ninth century encounter between a Christian and a Muslim entitled, *The Apology of al Kindy: Written at the Court of al Mamun (circa A.H. 215, A.D. 830), in Defense of Christianity against Islam: With an Essay on its Age and Authorship*, which Muir had read before the Royal Asiatic Society and had first published in their journal. The other was a translation of a work of an Arab Christian entitled, *Sweet First Fruits: A Tale of the Nineteenth Century, on the Truth and Virtue of the Christian Religion.*

In addition to his works on Islam, Muir also published several works related to his work in the Indian government and his service to the Christian community. He published his correspondence from the time of the Revolt of 1857 as *Records of the Intelligence Department of the Government of the North-west Provinces of India during the Mutiny of 1857*, and his biography of his mentor, James Thomason, in *The Honourable James Thomason, Lieut-Governor N.-W. P. India, 1843-53.* A few of his speeches have

been preserved in the Indian nineteenth-century newspaper, *The Pioneer*.[40] These sources provide further insight into his convictions regarding the involvement of government servants in religious matters. His works on behalf of the Indian Christian community included an Urdu history of the Christian church,[41] and a couple of essays on the Indian liturgy and the use of the Psalter in the Indian church.[42]

Aḥmad Khān's works need no such detailed listing here, since his writings have received more scholarly attention.[43] His first writings after the 1857 Revolt were in defense of the Muslim community. He sought to communicate that the Revolt was not a Muslim holy war, but had arisen from genuine and perceived grievances among the Indian population.[44] When Sir William Wilson Hunter published his book. *The Indian Musalmans: Are They Bound in Conscience to Rebel against the Queen* in 1871, at a time when a number of Muslims were on trial for political crimes, Aḥmad Khān responded with a review of the book which first appeared as a series of articles in *The Pioneer* from Nov. 1871 to Feb. 1872 and later as a monograph, arguing for the loyalty of Muslims to the British government.[45] While seeking the prosperity of the Muslim community under British rule, he also sought to reconcile the two communities in religious matters. In addition to a couple of small tracts regarding the term used for "Christians" and on the permissibility of eating with them, he began a series of works comprising a commentary on the Christian Bible, presenting a Muslim view of inspiration and preservation of the text. He completed only three volumes, the first being a discussion of the Muslim perception of inspiration in general and of the inspiration of the Christian Bible in particular. The next two volumes contained verse-by-verse commentaries of the first eleven chapters of Genesis and the first five chapters of the Gospel of Matthew respectively.[46] He began the journal, *Tahẓīb al-Akhlāq*, in which he propounded his new vision of Islam. Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī were also contributors to this journal.

Aḥmad Khān's response in 1870 to Muir's biography of Muḥammad and critique of the Ḥadīth was expressed in his book, *A Series of Essays on the Life of Muḥammad*, which he later printed in a revised version in Urdu as *Al-Khuṭubāt al-Aḥmadīyah 'alā al-'Arab wa al-Sīrah al Muḥammadīyah* in 1887. In this he responded not only to Muir's

perception of the Ḥadīth, but also to matters of Muslim genealogy and other aspects of Arabia prior to the coming of Muḥammad. The research for this volume had been conducted in England, and references to a number of European authors are therefore to be found throughout the book. But his special concern to answer the negative portrayal of Islam and its early history in Muir's *Life* is especially evident, particularly in the appendices to certain of the essays where Aḥmad Khān critiques Muir's ideas in detail. This constitutes the major source for the analysis of Aḥmad Khān's perspective of the Ḥadīth at this time in his life. His subsequent writings, especially his multi-volume commentary on the Qur'ān, demonstrate the change occurring later in his theological ideas which were challenged by Muslim *'ulamā'* as well as by Christians,[47] but are beyond the discussion of this thesis.

The missionaries Hughes and Sell each wrote two or three major works for which they received acclaim. However, numerous journal articles or booklets that they authored are largely forgotten. Yet these papers most clearly show the evolution of their thought. Within five years of Hughes' arrival in India, portions of his reports were being published in the CMS journal, *The Church Missionary Intelligencer*.[48] With the start of 1873, his voice began to be heard in a greater variety of forums. In addition to writing a couple of articles for the *Indian Evangelical Review*,[49] he gave a report at the General Missionary Conference at Allahabad, and edited a government textbook for examinations in the Pushto language.[50] His articles were all primarily narratives of individuals or groups of people he had observed, yet his perspective of Muslims and his assumptions regarding how to relate to them can be detected. The most significant piece of writing from this time was his review of a biography of Muḥammad written by fellow Englishman, R. Bosworth Smith.[51] Hughes developed the ideas he expressed in this review into his book, *Notes on Muhammadanism*, published the following year in 1875, when he returned to Britain for a furlough.[52] This volume consisted of a series of short articles on various facets of the faith and practice of Islam as Hughes had encountered it in north western India, and it was to this that writers such as Chirāgh 'Alī responded. On his return to India, he stopped in Egypt to broaden his understanding of Islam, subsequently revising his book.[53] Although he continued to write accounts of various groups he en-

countered in his ministry[54] and his linguistic work,[55] he was also preparing a dictionary of Islam that would include the material from his *Notes*, but in expanded form and with a great number of additional topics.[56] This *Dictionary* was published in 1885, a year after he left the CMS and moved to the United States to take up pastoral duties in churches in the state of New York. While there, he continued to write about Islam, composing a romance/adventure novel about life in Afghanistan under a pseudonym, and writing a series of articles on aspects of the Islamic faith for *The Andover Review* and in several other journals.[57] These later articles reflect a definite shift in his thinking towards a more positive view of Muslim spirituality and of the character of Muḥammad. He censured the harsh missionary polemic against the Prophet and counseled a recognition of Islam's strengths. This shift could possibly have been the result (or the cause?) of the fact that he was no longer working as a missionary in an Islamic context. One of these later articles published in 1892 in response to a Muslim writer on the future of Islam demonstrates this new trend quite explicitly.[58]

Edward Sell had a much longer writing career, publishing one of his final books, *Islam in Spain*, in 1929, at the age of 90 years. His numerous writings after 1908 were short booklets on selected periods of Islamic history and on various Islamic sects or those with Islamic roots.[59] However, it was for his first book *The Faith of Islam*, that he is best remembered.[60] Sell based this book on a series of five articles which he wrote for *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* from 1878 to 1881.[61] Although the first article began as a review of a recent book on Islam, the style quickly shifted to become an explanation of the institutions and doctrines of Islam for the English reader. *The Faith of Islam* had the same focus, and it was to this that Chirāgh 'Ali and Amīr 'Alī responded in their books. In a manner similar to Hughes, some of his later writings hint at an evolution in his thinking, explored in the third chapter of this thesis.[62] The modernists whom he had rejected as not representing "true" Islam, he later commended for bringing a favorable development into Islam. He did not, however, leave the missionary vocation, but continued on, writing about Islam, as well as a lengthy series of commentaries on the Christian Scriptures. Some of his more notable writings, though outside of

the time frame of this thesis, were *The Life of Muḥammad, Essays on Islam* and *Religious Orders of Islam.*[63]

The writings of Amīr 'Ali were primarily in English, interacting with English authors and seeking to explain or defend Islam to a English audience. His pioneering *Spirit of Islam* is still read today for its insightful reconstruction of Islam. This particular book had its origins in Amīr 'Alī's first work, *A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed,*[64] which was written towards the end of his first stay in England. In it, he set out to correct the misperceptions of Islam that he had noticed in the writings of Europeans, a chief target being Muir and his biography of the Prophet. Two books that were the product of his continuing legal career upon his return to India, were his *Tagore Law Lectures* on property and its disposition in 1884, and his earlier lectures on *Personal Law of the Mohammedans* in 1881; these were later published as a set on *Mohammedan Law* as volumes one and two respectively.[65] In the introduction to these volumes, he explicitly stated his evaluation of the authority of the Ḥadīth and its use in Muslim law. These two early writings fall within the designated time period of this study and are included in the analysis. Amīr 'Alī continued to write on the history of Islam, publishing his book, *A Short History of the Saracens*, in 1889.[66] He contributed numerous articles and letters to journals such as the *Nineteenth Century*, which have been edited in several collections.[67] These too were primarily apologetic in nature, defending Islam and demanding better treatment for Muslim communities in India and Turkey. Others of his later works included *Islam* and *Ethics of Islam.*[68]

The writings of Chirāgh 'Alī were similar in nature to those of Amīr 'Ali, except for the fact that the early ones were in Urdu.[69] He also was responding to criticisms of Islam and Muḥammad, often with more pointed and specific replies than those of Amīr 'Alī. His first, *Ta'liqāt* was written in 1872 in response to a polemical treatise[70] by 'Imād ud-Dīn, a Christian convert from Islam. Chirāgh 'Ali responded to his attacks on the traditions regarding Muḥammad's miracles by analyzing the nature of those traditions and comparing their reliability with those of Jesus Christ as contained in the Gospels.[71] He wrote a number of other books in Urdu responding to specific attacks on aspects of Islamic history, such as the wars of Islam, slavery, and the numerous wives of

the Prophet. These, along with an English biography of the Prophet, seem to have existed only in manuscript form and were never published. Similar topics were also covered in shorter writings which have been compiled,[72] and in articles which he wrote for Aḥmad Khān's journal, *Tahẓīb al-Akhlāq* during the period from 1873-1876. However, the two writings which climaxed his response to Western criticism of Islam were in English--*The Proposed Political, Legal and Social Reforms under Moslem Rule*[73] and *A Critical Exposition of the Popular "Jihad"*.[74] In these he addressed the perceptions of Islam by Muir, Hughes, Sell and others, clearly indicating his own approach to the traditions of the Ḥadith. Hence, these are analyzed along with the writings of Christians.

Secondary literature

Recent discussions on colonial discourse,[75] as part of the broader post-modernist deconstruction of the writings of the past, are having a considerable impact on the research of the encounter of European and Asian cultures. The interaction of Evangelical Christians with Muslims in India is a distinct subdivision of that discourse. Such post-colonial approaches to the study of non-European history and of culture consist of a "distinctive amalgam of cultural critique, Foucauldian approaches to power, engaged 'politics of difference,' and post-modernist emphases on the decentered and the heterogeneous."[76] This approach was given a major impetus by Edward Said's characteristic blend of these elements in his *Orientalism* in 1978, and have now become a paradigm for a new generation of historians and anthropologists, and have caused the re-evaluation of paradigms in a number of other fields as well. Said has focused the attention of researchers on the presuppositions of European and American historians and authors who wrote on the "Orient" in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, arguing that such writers not only were influenced by their being members of a society that established power structures to dominate parts of Asia and Africa, but actually served to promote and perpetuate those structures. By creating a discourse about the Orient, he writes, they imposed limitations on thought and action that united their network of interests in those regions.[77]

Though Said's frame of reference has been primarily the Middle East, other scholars have extrapolated his ideas, drawing on the same theoretical perspectives, and applied them to the British presence in India. Ronald Inden describes Western writers on India of the past two centuries as "gaining control of knowledge of the East."[78] Social scientists and other experts have determined the way of researching and writing about India in a way that the knowledge of the Orientalist is "privileged in relation to that of the Orientals, and it invariably places itself in a relationship of intellectual dominance over that of easterners."[79] A critique of Orientalist writings, according to Inden, is not so much a matter of correcting biases and prejudices in order to posit a more accurate image of the Orient, as it is an effort to confront "the question of knowledge and its multiple relations to power in Orientalist representations of Asians."[80] His expressed purpose is "to reproduce a world that is more egalitarian and multi-centred" by returning the capacity to have true knowledge and to act to the Oriental, the one represented as the "Other" by the Orientalist with his privileged knowledge.[81]

The first step in this process is to deconstruct the discourse and historicize the knowledge of the Orientalist. Inden categorizes Orientalist writings as commentative, interpretative, and hegemonic. The commentative writings consist of descriptions given in a frame that characterizes the Oriental as Other, based on Western epistemological assumptions of empiricism and rationalism. Interpretative writings attempt to present a rational explanation for the radical difference of the Other from the Western Man, concentrating on one factor to the exclusion of others and often relying on naturalistic explanations of race or environment beyond the consciousness and activity of the Other. Inden applies the characteristic of hegemonic to those texts dealing with the issue in the broadest of terms and exercising leadership in the field for decades to come.[82]

In the examination of the writings of Muir as well as those Hughes and Sell on their perception of Islam and of the Ḥadīth in particular, this colonial discourse analysis can offer some insight. Certain of their works could be considered "hegemonic" in Inden's sense in that they are accounts "seen in the period of [their] predominance, to exercise leadership in a field actively and positively."[83] Muir's *Life*, Hughes's *Dictionary* and Sell's *The Faith of Islam*, became standard reference works in Orientalist studies in

general, and in missionary circles in particular. However, it would be difficult to characterize their explanations of the difference of the Other as relying on the naturalistic categories such as evolutionism, functionalism, utilitarianism, and behaviorism as proposed by Inden.[84] In this Inden seems to slip into the same fault of reductionism he so readily finds in Orientalists.

Other post-Orientalist writers also, while decrying the essentialization and reductionism of the Orientalists, have a similar tendency to reduce the writings on India, Islam, or other aspects of the "Orient" to a few essential elements which are then criticized, a characteristic which has led some critics to term Said, for example, "an Orientalist-in-reverse."[85] These essential elements tend to coalesce around the aspect of colonial exercise of power, to the exclusion of other motivations. In Dane Kennedy's analysis, this essentializing is no less distorting than that of the Orientalists. "In Said's *Orientalism* and much of the scholarship it has inspired, the West is seen as an undifferentiated, omnipotent entity, imposing its totalizing designs on the rest of the world without check or interruption."[86] Kate Teltscher, in her book *India Inscribed*, states that while her methods are indebted to Said's *Orientalism*, she agrees with the numerous writers who also criticize Said on this point, citing missionaries as one example of those having constructed images of India differing from other colonial constructions and even from those of rival mission organizations.[87] A more nuanced approach is required to account for the distinctive world view of Evangelical administrators such as Muir and missionaries such as Hughes and Sell.[88]

Post-modernist scholarship has insisted that all voices be heard, accompanied by a deconstruction that demonstrates the context from which each arises. The danger of labeling writers or their ideas as "imperialist" or "colonialist" or even "Evangelical," and thereby ignoring them without examination would be to ignore their contribution to the development of modern Orientalist thought and also to the recent developments within Islam in India. Again, to dismiss all these writings as belonging to the realm of pure untruth on the basis of their origin in strongly held religious belief is to make them unavailable to critical examination. Aijaz Ahmad's comment regarding such a trend generally in colonial discourse analysis is highly relevant:

> What is lost sight of in this kind of reading is that archive is a collection neither of truths nor untruths, that it is simply a vast historical resource for helping us understand our own past, and that we need to approach that archive now with the same kind of scepticism, respect and scholarly care, subjecting it to that same objective scrutiny, that we shall reserve, let us say, for Abul Fazl's *Akbarnama* or the Puranic sources.[89]

It is valuable, then, to study the writings of Muir, Hughes, Sell and others, not with the primary focus on how "true" their perceptions were (though part of a historian's work is to judge the accuracy of a given record), but with an analysis of how they were influenced by their own unique set of presuppositions, how they interacted with others having different presuppositions, and how both were changed in the encounter.

In a recent article, C. A. Bayly argues "for a reappraisal of the role of the British factor in modern South Asian history."[90] He shows how recent contributions to the study of Indian history seeking to create a post-colonial history or to recover subordinated voices end up reaching contradictory conclusions as to the strength of the British Empire and colonialism's continuing influence on modern Indian society. After this brief survey, he advocates the assimilation of new perspectives from other areas of British studies, one of which is the study of the role Evangelical Christianity played in the social and political life of Britain, and, subsequently, in India. This factor has been to a large degree ignored or over-looked in analyses of the British administration in India. While in the eighteenth century, the deism of influential officials and writers led them to search in the religions of India for "clues to the religious sensibility and fundamental knowledge of which God planted in all men," the Evangelicals which followed in the nineteenth century "encouraged a more derogatory view of Hinduism and Islam."[91] Bayly notes the multifaceted involvement of many British officials in various religious enterprises and the effect their Evangelical convictions had on their policies, as well as how the perception and interpretation of these policies by the populace comprised a key factor in the Revolt of 1857. The Evangelical influence within the Indian Civil Service, particularly in the North West Provinces and the Punjab, has been analyzed by Peter Penner in his book, *The Patronage Bureaucracy in North India*.[92] He places the influence

of the faith of the administrators in the context of the other factors affecting their policies, presenting a well-balanced perspective.

Somewhat in contrast to Barbara D. Metcalf who advocates an approach to the history of Islam in India that seeks alternatives to religion as the "pre-eminent explanatory variable in such areas as policy, social allegiance, and creative expression, "[93] Bayly argues that the religious element in the Revolt can not easily be dismissed as research continues to recover the political discourse of the rebels. "It is, of course, true that many of the British desired to see the outbreak as a 'Muhammadan conspiracy' or an outburst of fanaticism. But this is no reason for dismissing the manifest importance of religion and culture in rebel ideology."[94] Again unlike Metcalf who presents the colonial historians as taking religion as central to defining the fundamental properties of non-Christian cultures while seeing the West as being "beyond religion in public life,"[95] Bayly stresses the very public religion of the Evangelical administrators, who were instrumental in writing a number of the colonial histories of India or Islam. The problem with determining the motives for the Revolt, as he sees it, is that "historians have sought to see 1857 as a 'progressive' force and this has seemed difficult to square with the religious themes with which it is permeated. However, if post-modernism has taught us anything, it is that modernity and religion are not incompatible."[96] This principle applies not only to the motivations of Muslims in the Revolt of 1857, but also to the colonial administrators with Evangelical convictions in India. When discussing the Muslim groups of nineteenth century India in an earlier monograph, *Islamic revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, Metcalf provides a broader historical context with her thorough research on the Deoband movement, including their involvement in controversy with missionaries.[97] Her account is not limited to the Deoband movement, but also provides a helpful summary of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth and their involvement in the controversy as well.[98]

Increasingly, scholars are reconfiguring the post-Orientalist critique to account for this multiplicity of voices of the colonialists. Saurabh Dube in his analysis of the Evangelical encounter in colonial Chhattisgarh, Central India, states, "It is an insidious and pernicious naiveté -- shared by several historians and theorists of colonial discourse -- which assumes the working of a seamless web of colonial interests with a uniform

Western mentality."[99] Geoffrey A. Oddie, who has written extensively on missionaries in India also addresses this limited scholarly attention paid to the way Christian missionary attitudes and practice might or might not constitute a distinctive form of Orientalism, suggesting that the Evangelicals and missionaries had a separate agenda they wished to pursue.[100] His definition of the term includes its unique world view:

> The term 'Evangelical' was generally used to describe those Protestants (Anglicans, Non-conformists and others) who believed that the essential part of the Gospel consisted in salvation by faith through the atoning death of Christ and who denied that either good works or the sacraments had any saving efficacy. They usually believed in the infallibility and over-riding importance of the Scriptures and were united in their stand against rationalism and the theories of evolution which seemed to undermine the literal truth and authority of the Bible.[101]

Difference in theology was less along denominational lines and more between those of Evangelical convictions and those missionaries with "High Church" tendencies, espousing a more liberal theology and a greater commitment to sacramentalism and liturgy.[102] Oddie notes a shift in the last quarter of the century in which the beliefs of individual missionaries were more difficult to categorize according to this dichotomy. "The new liberalism and flexibility in theological thinking, increasingly evident in church circles, was therefore already beginning to modify the attitude of at least some missionaries in India in the 1880's and 1890's; and, even if they still considered themselves 'Evangelicals,' their theological position was more nebulous and less clear-cut than the dogmatic position of Evangelical missionaries of the previous generation."[103] This shift is noted in the writings of individual missionaries, as the later writings of Sell and Hughes are compared with their earlier ones. Oddie, in a later paper goes on to argue for an even further nuanced view, differentiating between the views of missionaries.

> While recognising that we need to draw a distinction between the different European interest groups (administrators, merchants, Utilitarians, missionaries and others) it is also essential to recognise that these categories are still far too simplistic . . . . It is not enough to discuss any of these groups as if they were an undifferentiated mass. For example, the historian has to be open to the possibility that Catholic missionary agendas and attitudes were different from those of Protestant missionaries. British Protestant missionaries have to be distinguished from their counterparts from Europe or the United States, as do Evangelical Protestant missionaries from others such as Anglican

> missionaries who adopted a more High Church or Catholic position. And while the great majority of the British Protestant missionaries were Evangelicals bound together by common assumptions, a common theology and sense of purpose, there were, as already implied, important differences among them. These were more than differences of strategy or method as they encompassed fundamental differences in the analysis and understanding of Indian religion and society.[104]

In the new "Afterword" of the 1994 edition of *Orientalism*, Said himself recognizes the need for such differentiation, claiming that his book *is* "quite nuanced and discriminating in what it says about different people, different periods and different styles of Orientalism."[105] He seems to be agreeing with some of his critics when he states his belief that individual effort is "at some profoundly unteachable level both eccentric and, . . . original; this despite the existence of systems of thought, discourses, and hegemonism (although none of them are in fact seamless, perfect, or inevitable)."[106] It is fitting, therefore to look at certain administrators like Muir as individuals, or at Evangelical missionaries as distinct from the greater colonial enterprise, and examine their writings to see what their unique contribution was in constituting the identity of the Orient.

Although missionaries have already been included at certain points in the discussion of Evangelicals, they deserve a separate treatment as a distinct subset of the Evangelical movement. While administrators with Evangelical convictions or sympathies were distinct from their fellow colonialists in some aspects, in their profession they shared the same objectives of maintaining British rule in India. The missionaries, on the other hand, shared the religious convictions of the Evangelical administrators but not their occupational aims and objectives. Aside from a certain amount of shared racial prejudice and other Orientalist biases, then, the missionaries form a distinct group in current historical research. Certain scholars such as Dharmaraj would dispute that assertion, arguing that the "Christianization" by the missionaries and the "civilization" by the colonizers should be considered two sides of the same coin.[107] Others, such as Brian Stanley, maintain that an examination of the historical record demonstrates a disjunction between the "imperialism" of the British government and the aims and ministry of the British Protestant missionaries of the nineteenth century.[108] Vishal Mangalwadi

adds his voice to the debate in a series of letters addressed to Arun Shourie, arguing that while the British colonialists sought economic gain in India, the only conspiracy the missionaries were guilty of was a conspiracy to bless India.[109] The analysis of the writings of two missionaries, Hughes and Sell, demonstrates that a more nuanced approach recognizing the unique contribution of the missionaries is justified.

Writing about Christian missionaries in history is often polarized, with missionary publications presenting missionaries as heroes single-handedly and against tremendous odds accomplishing their objectives, and revisionists more recently stressing "the collaboration, incidental or intentional, of the missionaries in the cultivation of such now out-of-fashion notions as imperialism, capitalism, colonialism, racism, cultural arrogance and ethno-centricism."[110] At times, their role in providing Europe a picture of the Orient has been presented in an essentialist construct such as that given by Prakash, describing the evolving perception of India: "As the genuine respect and love for the Orient of William Jones gave way to the cold utilitarian scrutiny of James Mill, and then to missionary contempt, the picture changed."[111] However, as the earlier quote by Oddie regarding various forms of Orientalism demonstrated, this overly-simplified approach is being replaced by a more detailed and nuanced scholarly scrutiny of missionary attitudes. Oddie insists that "whatever the reason or reasons for the neglect of this subject, there can be little doubt that missionaries and missionary societies played an extremely important part in shaping European attitudes towards the Orient, including attitudes towards India and its people."[112]

Said tends to neglect the role of missions and missionaries in the colonial enterprise. When he does discuss missionary efforts, he presents them as an outgrowth of Britain's need to identify or, if necessary, to create interests in the Islamic territories which it then was authorized to safeguard.[113] He quotes Tibawi to support this idea; but Tibawi does not directly identify those missions as developing as an apparatus for tending imperialist interests, but rather describes them more accurately as an outcome of a religious revival in England in the form of the Evangelical movement which fostered an enthusiasm to "propagate the knowledge of the Gospel among the Heathen."[114] This distinction between the imperialist aims of the colonial government and those of

the missionaries with an overt religious foundation is crucial to a proper understanding of the contribution of the latter to the shaping of European attitudes toward the Orient.

Naturally, the missionaries would find more points of agreement and co-operation with those officials who shared their Evangelical convictions. John C. B. Webster notes that "Evangelicals in the Punjab saw its evangelization as a national responsibility" and were active in promoting the cause of missions, especially that of the CMS.[115] Such support was welcomed by the missionaries, as the tribute of the missionary and mission historian, M. A. Sherring (1826-1880), regarding Muir and other sympathetic officials in the *Indian Evangelical Review* in 1874 demonstrated.[116] Webster concludes in his study of British missionary ideologies that:

> British missionaries, while motivated by a desire to convert India to Christianity, functioned within rather than challenged the prevailing ideological consensus concerning India and the British role there. All agreed that the empire existed for the good of Christian missions, not the other way around, and evaluated the Raj's policies accordingly. All recognized also that Christian missions contributed in various ways to the permanence and stability of the Raj.[117]

He also points out that their guiding objective was to convert India rather than to civilize it.[118] This emphasis also comes through in the writings by the Evangelical administrator, Muir; his advocating the enlightenment of India tends to be in the context of evangelization rather than civilization. He saw the coming of men such as Thomason at the beginning of the nineteenth century as bringing a time when "the dark incubus of idolatry, superstition and bigotry began gradually to receive the light and teaching of the Gospel."[119] Therefore, it is evident that while there were connections between the promotion of the empire and the promotion of religion, this link was not automatic. Missionaries had reservations about close co-operation with governments based on past experience and on their theology. But where officials were willing to endorse (usually privately) missionary goals, either because of a common Evangelical faith or a growing mutual familiarity, their assistance was welcomed.[120]

John C. B. Webster, in another book, *The Christian Community and Change in Nineteenth Century North India*, has provided a comprehensive history of Christian missionary activity in northern India.[121] He provides details concerning the various mission-

ary organizations starting their work in the North West Provinces and in the Punjab, but does not limit his focus to the encounter with Muslims. As a historian, his works have primarily focused on the American Presbyterian involvement in north India, but this volume is broader in scope, including other Protestant endeavors as well. His excellent bibliographical essay on sources for research on missionary activity in the Punjab in the nineteenth century documents the diversity of activity occurring in that area.[122] A fellow Presbyterian, James P. Alter has furthered scholarship in this area by his work, *In the Doab and Rohilkhand: North Indian Christianity, 1815-1915.* [123]

The interaction of Christians with Muslims in British Colonial India has been receiving more attention in recent years. Avril Powell's *Muslims and Missionaries in Pre-Mutiny* has presented an over-view of the Muslim-Christianity controversy from the start of Muslim history, giving a more detailed treatment of the missionary involvement in India.[124] She provides a helpful history of the Roman Catholic efforts during the Mughal period and the initial efforts of Protestant organizations in northern India in the early nineteenth century.[125] Her focus, however, is on Pfander and his interaction with Muslim leaders in north-western India in his writings and public debates, as has already been discussed. This carefully researched work contains a wealth of detail regarding the personalities involved, both from the Christian side as well as from the Muslim *'ulamā'*. She has also traced the development of the major themes of the interaction, specifically the corruption of the Christian scriptures and the effect of literary and historical critical methodologies. Although her analysis ends with the aftermath of the 1854 debate at Agra and the later Revolt in 1857, the effect of this interaction continued into the next centuries and certainly shaped the approaches of both Muir and Aḥmad Khān to the matter of inter-faith dialogue.[126] Another writer who has given a thorough analysis of various groups working among the Muslims in India is Lyle L. Vander Werff in the second chapter of his book, *Christian Mission to Muslims*, describing the unique contributions of the Anglican, Scottish Presbyterian, American Presbyterian, and interdenominational organizations and of specific individuals within them.[127] Though he considers the apologetic approach a major contribution of the Anglican groups such as the CMS, he does not deal with Hughes and Sell.

Monographs or even journal articles on the Christian authors under study in this thesis are rare. Buaben and Bennett have both researched the attitude of Muir in light of recent perspectives on Europeans writing on Islam.[128] Buaben closely follows the thought of Norman Daniel in his analysis and concludes that Muir is continuing the mediaeval rhetoric against Muḥammad and Islam.[129] As does Daniel, he discounts the distinct break with the past perceptions of Islam that Muir was striving for, and the fact that he used primarily original source materials, or the very recent Orientalist writings of Weil and Sprenger that were based on new research of Arabic sources as well. Bennett is also critical of Muir, contrasting his confrontational approach with the more conciliatory approach of British writers such as Bosworth-Smith. He admits that Muir used more original sources, but disapproves of his consistently negative evaluation of Islam. His research of Muir's ideas is more thorough than that of Buaben or Daniel, and is enhanced through an evaluation of Muir within the context of five of his contemporaries who also wrote about Islam. All three writers tend to define the objectivity of a Christian scholar of Islam in proportion to his positive assessment of it, reflecting the current trend of conciliatory approaches in Muslim-Christian dialogue. Another scholar who has written on Muir is Avril Powell, but her work is unavailable to this writer.[130] There is currently no secondary literature available on either Sell or Hughes, though Bennett does make a few scattered references to them in his book.

None of the above writers has analyzed the interaction of Muir with the Muslim intellectuals on the subject of Ḥadīth. Several works on Aḥmad Khān, however, include considerable discussion on the matter, since his *Essays* in reply to Muir constituted a major part of his scholarship. Baljon was first to contribute an analysis of Aḥmad Khān's developing ideas concerning the role of tradition in Islamic faith and practice.[131] Dar, in his *Religious Thought of Sayyid Ahmad Khan*, also devotes several chapters to Aḥmad Khān's interaction with Christians and one to his response to Muir.[132] Troll expanded these two analyses through a fresh and detailed examination of the writings of the two men in his *Sayyid Ahmad Khan: A Reinterpretation of Muslim Theology*.[133] Since all three are focusing their attention on Aḥmad Khān, their analysis of the motivations and ideology underlying Muir's work is limited. However, they contain excellent

analyses of the impact of this interaction on the development of Aḥmad Khān's thought.[134] Aziz Ahmad presents Aḥmad Khān as the key figure in establishing the trend of Islamic modernism in India, but when discussing his views on the Ḥadīth describes only the later stages of his thinking where his conclusions did not greatly differ from those of the Orientalists regarding reasons for fabrication, the rational criticism of content, the Qur'ān as the ultimate authority, and the scarcity of Ḥadīth with unquestioned reliability.[135] He has, in the same volume, presented a critique of the writings of Chirāgh 'Alī and their radical contribution to the modernist trend in India.[136] Similar studies on the interaction of Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī with Western writers can be found in unpublished theses completed at the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University by Abdullahil Ahsan and A. N. M. Wahidur-Rahman respectively.[137] The latter scholar has published a summary of his analysis of Chirāgh 'Alī's thought regarding the Ḥadīth in the journal, *Hamdard Islamicus*.[138] Both scholars emphasize the movement of these Muslim intellectuals towards a position where they rejected much of the authority of the Ḥadīth. They point to the influence of contact with Western ideas, but also describe the vehemence with which the Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī opposed the negative image of Muḥammad and Islam presented by people like Muir and the missionaries.

Another recent study on the changes in perception of the Ḥadīth among Indian Muslims as well as the Arab world in general is Daniel Brown's *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought*.[139] He ably traces the developments in the late nineteenth century to their roots in the movements to reform in the previous century. His insistence that the modernist tendency to discount the authority of the body of traditions was not entirely attributable to the incursion of Western ideas, provides a helpful balance to studies which emphasize the important role of the encounter, although Brown does recognize the place it has. A broader view of how the Muslims of the latter half of the nineteenth century dealt with history in general, including the historical traditions that made up the Ḥadīth, is Aslam Syed's, *Muslim Response to the West*.[140] His study is particularly helpful in that he provides the context of historiographical thought in India in which Aḥmad Khān, Amīr 'Alī, and Chirāgh 'Alī wrote.

Notes

[1] Stephen Neill. *A History of Christianity in India : The Beginnings to AD 1707*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984, pp. 26-49. Neill has researched a detailed history of Christianity in India in this volume, with a thorough history of the Protestant missionary movement in his subsequent volume, *A History of Christianity in India, 1707-1858*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. Samuel Hugh Moffett has recently published the first volume of a new project, *A History of Christianity in Asia*, v. 1. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992, incorporating more recent data as well. A study contemporaneous with the writings under analysis in this thesis would be M. A. Sherring. *The History of Protestant Missions in India from their Commencement in 1706 to 1881*. Rev. ed. by Edward Storrow. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1884. For his description of the advance of various missionary organizations into north-west India see pp. 164-184.

[2] For an excellent bibliographic essay on Evangelicalism in Britain and the Evangelical missionary movement, covering sources until 1984, see Stuart Piggin. *Making Evangelical Missionaries 1789-1858: The Social Background, Motives and Training of British Protestant Missionaries to India*. Evangelicals & Society from 1750, no. 2. [Abingdon]: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1984.

[3] D. W. Bebbington. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989, p. 34. See also Vishal Mangalwadi. *Missionary Conspiracy: Letters to a Post-Modern Hindu*. Mujssoorie, U. P.: Nivedit Good Books Distributers Pvt. Ltd., 1996, pp. 254-282.

[4] Raj Bahadur Sharma. *Christian Missions in North India, 1813-1913: A Case Study of Meerut Division and Dehra Dun District*. Delhi, India: Mittal Publications, 1988. p. 23.

[5] Ibid., pp. 23-24. See Mangalwadi. *Missionary Conspiracy*, pp. 136-186 for a detailed description of Grant's role in introducing Evangelical missions to India.

[6] For the Clapham Sect, see Ernest Marshall Howse. *Saints in Politics: The "Clapham Sect" and the Growth of Freedom*. [Toronto]: University of Toronto Press, 1952. Embree characterizes the Clapham Sect as having analyzed the world in terms of their Evangelical beliefs and then setting out to change it, using their powers of organization, their professional contacts, and their wealth. Ainslie Thomas Embree. *Charles Grant and British Rule in India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962, p. 205.

[7] Eric Stokes. *The English Utilitarians and India*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959, p. 27.

[8] Avril Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries in Pre-Mutiny India*. London Studies on South Asia No. 7. Richmond, Surrey, UK: Curzon Press Ltd., 1993, p. 89-101.

[9] Embree. *Charles Grant*, p. 205. For a thorough examination of the growth of Christian missions in relation to the British government see Arthur Mayhew. *Christianity and the Government of India: An Examination of the Christian Forces at Work in the Administration of India and of the Mutual Relations of the British Government and Christian Missions, 1600-1920*. London: Faber &Gwyer Limited, 1929.

[10] Kenneth Scott Latourette. *A History of the Expansion of Christianity. Vol. 4. The Great Century in Europe and the United States of America A. D. 1800-A. D. 1914*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1941, pp. 70-71.

[11] Andrew Porter. "Religion and Empire: British Expansion in the Long Nineteenth Century, 1780-1914." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 20, 3 (Sept., 1992), pp. 374-375.

[12] Eugene Stock. *The History of the Church Missionary Society*, vol. 1. London, Church Missionary Society, 1899, p. 36.

[13] In a recent monograph on Evangelicalism, Alister McGrath summarizes modern Evangelical distinctives thus: "[Evangelicalism] finds its identity in relation to a series of central interacting themes and concerns, including the following: 1. A focus, both devotional and theological, on the person of Jesus Christ, especially his death on the cross; 2. the identification of Scripture as the ultimate authority in matters of spirituality, doctrine and ethics; 3. An emphasis upon conversion or a "new birth" as a life changing religious experience; 4. A concern for sharing the faith, especially through evangelism." This definition is consistent with the historical emphases of the movement, and would accurately reflect the convictions of those of that persuasion working in India in the nineteenth century. Alister McGrath. *A Passion for the Truth: The Intellectual Coherence of Evangelicalism.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995, p. 22. For further discussion on the evolution of the meaning of "Evangelical," see: Bebbington. *Evangelicalism*, pp. 1-17.

[14] Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, p. 76.

[15] Ibid., p. 145.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Sherring. *The History of Protestant Missions.* See also Webster. *The Christian Community*, pp. 4-6; Powell, *Muslims and Missionaries*, pp. 87-89.

[18] Powell, *Muslims and Missionaries*, pp. 159-163; Webster. *The Christian Community*, p. 180. Later, in his evaluation of the causes of the 1857 Rebellion, Aḥmad Khān included Muslim suspicion of missionary motives in this effort as one of those causes. See chapter 2. For the history of the Anglican missions in the Meerut district, see Raj Bahadur Sharma. *Christian Missions*, pp. 81-114; for American Presbyterian work, see James P. Alter. "American Presbyterians in North India: Missionary Motives and Social Attitudes under British Colonialism." *Journal of Presbyterian History*, 53 (1975), pp. 291-312; idem. *In the Doab and Rohilkhand: North Indian Christianity, 1815-1915.* Rev. and completed by John Alter. Delhi: I. S. P. C. K., 1986. For bibliographic essays on Christian missions in the Punjab, see Ganda Singh. "Christianity in the Panjab: A Bibliographic Survey." *The Panjab Past and Present*, 1, 2 (Oct., 1967), pp. 368-388; and John C. B. Webster. "Mission Sources of Nineteenth-Century Punjab History." *Sources on Punjab History*, eds. W. Eric Gustafson and Kenneth W. Jones. Delhi: Manohar Book Service, 1975, pp. 171-218.

[19] Powell, *Missionaries and Muslims*, pp. 132-262.

[20] Ibid., p. 132.

[21] Ibid., pp. 170-171.

[22] Ibid., p. 173.

[23] Ibid., p. 189.

[24] Ibid., pp. 242-262.

[25] These were later published: Sir William Muir. *The Mohammedan Controversy; Biographies of Mohammad; Sprenger on Tradition; The Indian Liturgy; and the Psalter.* Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1897, hereafter referred to as *Life.*

[26] Sir William Muir. *The Life of Mahomet: With Introductory Chapters on the Original Sources for the Biography of Mahomet and on the Pre-Islamite History of Arabia.* Osnabruck: Biblio Verlag, 1988, rpt. of the 1861 London edition.

[27] This was later changed to Mahommedan Educational *Conference* to avoid confusion with the Indian National Congress; see Shan Muhammad. *The Right Honourable Syed Ameer Ali: Personality and Achievements.* New Delhi: Uppal Publishing House, 1991, p. 93.

[28] Ibid., pp. 99-100. Responses by other Muslims including Sayyid Amīr 'Alī and the Central National Mahommedan Association are described in ibid., pp. 47-59. The British political leadership in

India also changed in 1888 with the appointment of Lord Lansdowne to succeed Ripon as the Viceroy and Governor General of India.

[29] For their biographies, see Herbert Birks. *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Valpy French, First Bishop of Lahore.* 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1895. Henry Martyn Clark. *Robert Clark of the Panjab, Pioneer and Missionary Statesman.* New York: F. H. Revell, 1907. T. V. French had been assisted Pfander in the 1854 debate at Agra: Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, pp. 238-242.

[30] Concerned with the disintegration of Muslim power in India after the death of Aurangzēb in 1708, he sought to stop the process of decline. In emphasizing the body of traditions, rather than the accepted body of classical scholarship, as the source of authority in determining religious law, Wali Ullāh encouraged the repudiation of *taqlīd*, or blind obedience, and the revival of *ijtihād*, or independent judgment by qualified persons in determining religious law. He accepted the standard division of Ḥadīth into those with authority over faith and morals and those dealing with secular matters, but was also concerned about the spirit of the law, not just its form. The classical approach elevated *ijma'*, the consensus of the community, over the Sunna, culminating in the establishment of the four authoritative legal schools for the Sunnis. By re-invigorating the study of Ḥadīth, he found the authority to challenge received legal doctrine. See Daniel W. Brown. *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought.* Cambridge Middle East Series, 5. Cambridge: University Press, 1996, pp. 23-27.

[31] Barbara Daly Metcalf. *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982, pp. 47-48.

[32] Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān. *A Series of Essays on the Life of Muhammad and Subjects Subsidiary thereto.* Lahore: Premier Book House, 1968, rpt. of the 1870 edition, hereafter referred to as *Essays.*

[33] Muir. *Life.*

[34] Muir. *The Rise and Decline of Islam.* Present Day Tracts. London: The Religious Tract Society, [1883], later published as part of: J. Murray Mitchell and Sir William Muir. *Two Old Faiths: Essays on the Religions of the Hindus and the Mohammedans.* New York: Chautaugua Press, 1891. Idem. *Mahomet and Islam: A Sketch of the Prophet's Life from Original Sources and a Brief Outline of his Religion.* 3rd rev. ed. London: Religious Society, 1895 [first edition c. 1885].

[35] The section comprising the analysis of the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth as historical materials first appeared as "The Coran; Sīrat Hishāmi; The Biography of Mahomet, by Ibn Hishām; Sīrat Wāckidi; Sīrat Tabari." *The Calcutta Review.* 19 (Jan.-Jun., 1853), pp. 1-80. Subsequent sections followed in the next two years.

[36] These were later published together in one volume as, Muir. *The Mohammedan Controversy; Biographies of Mohammad; Sprenger on Tradition; The Indian Liturgy; and the Psalter.* Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1897.

[37] Muir. *The Testimony borne by the Coran to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures.* Agra: Agra Religious Tract and Book Society, 1856, with a second edition published in 1860.

[38] Powell, *Missionaries and Muslims*, p. 261.

[39] Muir. *The Corān: Its Composition and Teaching; and the Testimony it Bears to the Holy Scriptures.* Non-Christian Religious Systems. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, [1878].

[40] Muir. "An Address Delivered by Sir William Muir, K.C.S.I. , on the Occasion of a Visit to the Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College at Allygurh, on 12th November 1875," *An Account of the Ceremony of Laying the Foundation Stone of the Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College, Allygurh, together with some Articles on Subjects Connected with the Movement, being Extracts from English and Anglo-Indian Newspapers.* Allahabad: Pioneer Press, 1877, pp. 30-32. Idem. "Speech of the Lieutenant-Governor at the Moradabad Durbar." *The Pioneer.* Nov. 16, 1871, p. 3.

[41] John Murdoch, in his, *Catalogue of the Christian Vernacular Literature of India.* Madras: Caleb Foster, 1870, lists a publication in Roman Urdu by Mirzapore Mission Press in 1854 entitled "Ancient and Modern Church History," which in part consisted of a translation of Muir's work on the first three centuries of the church. J. F. Blumhardt, in his, *Catalogue of Hindustani Printed Books in the Library of the British Museum.* London: Longmans & Co., 1889, p. 322, lists as number 14104.c.18 another book entitled *Tawārīkh-i-Kalīsā min ḥayṣ al-ibtidā.* Lucknow, 1870, translated by Raja Shiv Prasad, who had previously translated Muir's book on the Qur'ān. See also Christian W. Troll. *Sayyid Ahmad Khan: A Reinterpretation of Muslim Theology.* New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1978, p. 67.

[42] Muir. *Controversy.*

[43] For a comprehensive bibliography of Aḥmad Khān's works and secondary works about him, see: Troll. *Sayyid Ahmad Khan,* pp. 353-366.

[44] Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān. *The Causes of the Indian Revolt.* Appendix A in Hafeez Malik and Morris Dembo. *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan's History of the Bijnor Rebellion.* South Asia Series (East Lansing, MI) occasional paper no. 17. East Lansing, MI: Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1972. p. 124. The text was originally published in Urdu in 1858, the year after the Revolt as *Asbāb-i baghāwat-i-Hind,* and according to Graham, translated and published in English by Graham and Sir Auckland Colvin, see G. F. I. Graham. *The Life and Work of Syed Ahmad Khan C. S. I.* Rpt. IAD Oriental Series, 29. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1974. [First edition, 1885] p. 32.

[45] Sir William Wilson Hunter. *The Indian Musalmans: Are They Bound in Conscience to Rebel against the Queen?* London: Troubner and Company, 1871; Aḥmad Khān. *Review on Dr. Hunter's Indian Musalmans: Are They Bound in Conscience to Rebel against the Queen?* Lahore: Premier Book House, n.d. [rpt. of 1872 edition published in India]. An abridged version is found in Aḥmad Khān. *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan,* compiled and edited by Shan Mohammad. Bombay: Nachiketa Publications Ltd., 1972, pp. 65-82.

[46] Aḥmad Khān, Sir Sayyid. *The Mohommedan Commentary on the Holy Bible.* Part 1. Ghazeepore: Printed and published by the author, 1862; Idem., *The Mohommedan Commentary on the Holy Bible.* Part 2. Aligarh: Printed and published by the author, 1865; for publication details of Part 3, see Troll, *Sayyid Ahmad Khan,* p. 58.

[47] 'Imād ud-Dīn (1830?-1900), a convert to Christianity and an evangelist with the CMS wrote a criticism of Aḥmad Khān's ideas in *Tanqīd ul-Khiyālāt,* published by the Punjab Religious Book Society, Lahore in 1882-83. See summary in E. M. Wherry. *The Muslim Controversy, being a Review of Christian Literature written in the Urdu Language for the Propagation of the Christian Religion and the Refutation of Islam.* London: The Christian Literature Society, 1905, pp. 36-57.

[48] Thomas Patrick Hughes. "Some Account of the Late Fazl-i-Hakk, of Peshawur." *The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (*CMI*), new series, 5 (1869), pp.30-32.

[49] As a result of an ecumenical gathering of missionaries from many of the mission organizations at Allahabad at the end of 1872, there was decision to produce a quarterly periodical "which should seek to represent the common faith of all Evangelical Christians in India," and to be " a bond of union between all believers" in India. This decision led to the founding of the *Indian Evangelical Review,* which under various editors sought to fulfill this mission from 1873 until 1903, giving voice to not only missionaries, but also to their supporters in the Indian Civil Service and at home, and to national Christians: "Notes and Intelligence." *The Indian Evangelical Review: A Quarterly Journal of Missionary Thought and Effort* (*IER*), 1, 1(1873), p. 96.

[50] Hughes. "The Shiahposh Kafirs." *IER,* 1, 1 (1873), pp. 93-94. Idem. "The Afghans." *Report of the General Missionary Conference held at Allahabad, 1872-1873.* London: Scely, Jackson, and Halliday, 1873, p. 79. Idem. "The Afghans." *IER,* 1, 3 (1873), p. 332. Idem., ed. *The Kalīd-i-Afghāni, being Selections of Pushto Prose and Poetry for the use of Students.* 2nd ed. Lahore: Munshi Gulab Singh, 1893 [first edition was published in 1872].

[51] Idem. "An Indian Missionary on Muhammad and Muhammadanism." *The CMI*, new series, 10 (1874) pp. 330-340. R. Bosworth Smith. *Mohammed and Mohammedanism: Lectures delivered at the Royal Institute of Great Britain in February and March, 1874.* New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1875.

[52] Thomas P. Hughes, *Notes on Muhammadanism, being Outlines of the Religious System of Islam.* rev. ed. London: Wm. H. Allen & Co., 1877. p. ix. Though his original work was published in 1875, all references are from the 1877 edition.

[53] Idem. "A Week in Egypt." *CMI*, second new series, 1 (1876) pp. 216-218. Idem. *Notes on Muhammadanism, being Outlines of the Religious System of Islam.* Rev. ed. London: Wm. H. Allen & Co., 1877, hereafter referred to as *Notes.*

[54] Idem. *The Akhund of Swat: A Muhammadan Saint, and Dilawar Khan: The Converted Afghan Brigand.* Reprinted from the *Calcutta Christian Intelligencer*, 1876. Idem. "The Kingdom of Kashghar." *IER*, 4, 13 (1876), pp. 52-60. Idem. "The Wahhabis of Najd and India." *CMI*, second new series, 3 (1878), pp. 98-100, 160-165. Idem. "Our Mission to the Afghans." *CMI*, second new series, 4 (1879) pp. 7-15. Idem. "Opening Paper," *Report of the Second Decennial Missionary Conference held at Calcutta, 1882-1883.* Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1883, p. 240. Idem. "The Mulla of Mānki." *The CMI*, second new series, 8 (1883), pp. 529-531.

[55] Hughes edited a collection of poetry by the Afghan poet, 'Abdur Raḥmān in 1877, and published a translation of the first two books of the Bible into the Pusthto language the following year: from the CMS archival record. He also prepared the introductory notes for missionaries for a Roman-Urdu edition of the Qur'ān.

[56] Idem. *Dictionary of Islam, being a Cyclopaedia of the Doctrines, Rites, Ceremonies, and customs, together with the Technical and Theological Terms, of the Muhammadan Religion.* Calcutta: Rupa & Co., 1988 rpt. [originally published 1885], hereafter referred to as *Dictionary*.

[57] Evan Stanton. [Thomas P. Hughes]. *Ruhainah: A Story of Afghan Life.* New York: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1886. Thomas P. Hughes. "Missions to Muslims." *The Andover Review* (*AR*), 9, 49 (Jan., 1888), pp. 1-18. Idem. "The Muslim's Bible." *AR*, 9, 53 (May, 1888), pp. 466-474. Idem. "The Muslim's Faith." *AR*, 10, 55 (Jul., 1888), pp. 23-36.

[58] Thomas P. Hughes. "Has Islam a Future?" *The Arena*, 35 (Oct., 1892), pp. 532-539.

[59] The Christian Literature Society in London and Madras printed at least 17 such booklets authored by Sell from 1909 to 1915.

[60] Edward Sell. *The Faith of Islam.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1880. The same publishers printed a revised edition in 1896. The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, London, published another revised and enlarged edition in 1906.

[61] Edward Sell. "The Church of Islam." *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, 27, 104 (Apr., 1878) pp. 327-341. Idem. "The Sects of Islam." *BFER.*, 28, 109 (Jul., 1879), pp. 583-600. Idem. "Muhammadan Exegesis of the Qurān and the Traditions." *BFER.*, 28, 110 (Oct., 1879), pp. 735-763. Idem. "The Faith of Islam," *BFER.*, 29, 114 (Oct., 1880), pp. 763-787. Idem. "The Faith of Islam," *BFER.*, 30, 115 (Jan., 1881), pp. 165-190.

[62] Idem. "The New Islam." *The Contemporary Review*, 64 (Aug., 1893), pp. 282-293.

[63] Idem. *The Life of Muḥammad.* London: Christian Literature Society for India, 1913. *Essays on Islam.* London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., 1901. Idem. *The Religious Orders of Islam.* Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., 1908.

[64] Amīr 'Alī. *A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed.* London: Williams and Norgate, 1873. It was revised and published as *The Spirit of Islam* in 1891, with further revisions and printings in 1922 and 1953.

[65] The publication information on the *Tagore Law Lectures* of 1884 has been unavailable. Amīr 'Alī. *The Personal Law of the Mahommedans.* London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1880; this was published in Urdu in 1885. Idem. *Mohammedan Law.* 2 vols. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co., 1892, with revisions in 1904 and 1912.

[66] Amīr 'Alī. *A Short History of the Saracens, being a Concise Account of the Rise and Decline of the Saracenic Power and of the Economic, Social and Intellectual Development of the Arab Nation.* London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1951 ed. [1st ed. 1889; latest reprint with corrections, 1924].

[67] K. K. Aziz. *Ameer Ali: His Life and Works.* Lahore: Publishers United, 1968; Razi Wasti, ed. *Syed Ameer Ali on Islamic History and Culture.* People's Publishing House, 1968; idem., ed. *Memoirs and other Writings of Syed Ameer Ali.* Lahore: People's Publishing House, 1968. Amīr 'Alī. *The Right Hon'ble Syed Ameer Ali : Political Writings.* Ed. Shan Muhammad. New Delhi: Ashish Pub. House, 1989; idem. *The Right Honourable Syed Ameer Ali: Personality and Achievements.* New Delhi: Uppal Pub. House, 1991.

[68] Amīr 'Alī. *Islām.* London: Constable, 1914; idem. *The Ethics of Islam; with the Political Spirit of Islam, etc.* Islamic Series, 2. Calcutta: Noor Library, Academy of Islamic Research and Oriental Learning, 1951.

[69] For an annotated bibliography of Chirāgh 'Alī's works, see A. N. M. Wahidur-Rahman. "The Religious Thought of Moulvi Chirāgh 'Alī." M. A. thesis, McGill University, 1982, pp. 62-67.

[70] The treatise is variously titled as *Tārīkh-i-Muḥammadī* and *Tawarīkh-i-Muḥammadī*, perhaps reflecting different editions. The former is listed in J. F. Blumhardt. *Catalogue of Hindustani Printed Books in the Library of the British Museum* (London: Longmans & Co., 1889), p. 130, as published in Lahore in 1871. The latter is listed in the London School of Oriental and African Studies as published in Amritsar in 1878. For a review, see Wherry. *The Muslim Controversy*, pp. 23-36.

[71] This document is, apparently, no longer extant. Wahidur-Rahman. "The Religious Thought," pp. 59, 62, 67.

[72] Chirāgh 'Alī. *Majmū'ah-i Rasā'il-i Chirāgh 'Alī.* Ed. 'Abd Ullāh Khān. Hyderabad: Kutub Khāna Aṣifīyah, 1918.

[73] Chirāgh 'Alī. *The Proposed Political, Legal and Social Reforms under Moslem Rule.* Bombay: Education Society's Press, 1882.

[74] Chirāgh 'Alī. *A Critical Exposition of the Popular "Jihād," Showing that all the Wars of Mohammad were Defensive; and that Aggressive War, or Compulsory Conversion, is not Allowed in the Koran.* IAD Religio-Philosophy (Reprint) Series no. 42. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1984 [originally published, 1884].

[75] For a comment on the difficulties inherent in the term, "colonial discourse," see Andrew Porter. *European Imperialism, 1860-1914.* Studies in European History. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1994, pp. 67-68.

[76] Rosalind O'Hanlon and David Washbrook. "After Orientalism: Culture, Criticism, and Politics in the Third World." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34 (1992), p. 141.

[77] Edward Said. *Orientalism.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1978, p. 3.

[78] Ronald Inden. "Orientalist Constructions of India." *Modern Asian Studies*, 20, 3 (1986), p. 406.

[79] Ibid., p. 408.

[80] Ibid., p. 410.

[81] Ibid., p. 445.

[82] Ibid., pp. 411-417.

[83] Ibid., p. 417.

[84] Inden. "Orientalist Constructions," p. 415.

[85] Aijaz Ahmad. "Between Orientalism and Historicism: Anthropological Knowledge of India." *Studies in History*, new series 7, 1 (Jan.- June, 1991), p. 144.

[86] Dane Kennedy. "Imperial History and Post-Colonial Theory," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 24, 3 (Sept., 1996), p. 353.

[87] Kate Teltscher. *India Inscribed: European and British Writing on India 1600-1800.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 6-11.

[88] The analysis in this thesis of the role of missionaries and other Evangelicals in nineteenth century imperial expansion has been significantly influenced and inspired by the writings of scholars associated with the North Atlantic Missiology Project, based in Westminster College, Cambridge, and its structure closely reflect the emphases presented by John Casson in his article, "Mission Archives and New Directions in Mission History," a version of which was first published in the *Bulletin of the Association of British Theological and Philosophical Libraries*, 4, 1 (Mar., 1997),pp. 9-13; and also available on the Internet at the North Atlantic Missiology Project web site at: <http://office3.divinity.cam.ac.uk/carts/namp/ABTAPL.htm>.

[89] Ahmad. "Between Orientalism and Historicism," p. 150.

[90] C. A. Bayly. "Returning the British to South Asian History: The Limits of Colonial Hegemony." *South Asia*, 17, 2 (1994), p. 1.

[91] Ibid., p. 5.

[92] Peter Penner. *The Patronage Bureaucracy in North India: The Robert M. Bird and James Thomason School 1820-1870.* Delhi: Chanakya Publications, 1986.

[93] Barbara D. Metcalf. "Presidential Address: Too Little and too Much: Reflections on Muslims in the History of India." *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 54, 4 (Nov. 1995), p. 956.

[94] Bayly. "Returning the British," p. 10.

[95] Metcalf. "Presidential Address," p. 956.

[96] Bayly. "Returning the British," p. 10.

[97] Barbara Daly Metcalf. *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982, pp. 198-234.

[98] Ibid., pp. 264-296

[99] Saurabh Dube. "Paternalism and Freedom: The Evangelical Encounter in Colonial Chhattisgarh, Central India." *Modern Asian Studies*, 29, 1 (1995), p. 199.

[100] Geoffrey A. Oddie. " 'Orientalism' and British Protestant Missionary Constructions of India in the Nineteenth Century." *South Asia*, 17, 2 (1994), pp. 28, 37.

[101] Geoffrey A. Oddie. *Social Protest in India: British Protestant Missionaries and Social Reforms 1850-1900.* New Delhi: Manohar, 1979, p. 10.

[102] For an analysis of the university missionary brotherhoods from Cambridge, Oxford, and Trinity College, Dublin, that would fit in this category see Martin Maw. *Visions of India: Fulfillment Theology, the Aryan Race Theory, & the Work of British Protestant Missionaries in Victorian India.* Studies in the Intercultural History of Christianity, band 57. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1990.

[103] Ibid., p. 11.

[104] Ibid., pp. 41-42.

[105] Edward Said. *Orientalism.* 2nd ed. New York: Vintage Press, 1994, p. 336.

[106] Ibid., p.339.

[107] Jacob S. Dharmaraj. *Colonialism and Christian Mission: Postcolonial Reflections.* Delhi: Indian Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1993, pp. xvi-xx.

[108] Brian Stanley. *The Bible and the Flag: Protestant Missions and British Imperialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.* Leicester: Appolos, 1990, p. 12. In his first chapter, he presents an excellent deconstruction of the modern trend to link Christian missionary activity with the colonial enterprise, showing the ideological background to the development of the supposition. Ibid., pp. 11-31.

[109] Mangalwadi, *Missionary Conspiracy*, written in reply to Arun Shourie. *Missionaries in India: Continuities, Changes, Dilemmas.* New Delhi: ASA Publications, 1994.

[110] Raphael Israeli. "The Cross Battles the Crescent: One Century of Missionary Work among Chinese Muslims (1850-1950). *Modern Asian Studies*, 29, 1 (1995), p. 203.

[111] Gyan Prakash. "Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 32 (1990), p. 386. [383-408]

[112] Oddie. " 'Orientalism'," p 28.

[113] Said. *Orientalism*, p. 100.

[114] A. L. Tibawi. *British Interests in Palestine 1800-1901: A Study of Religious and Educational Enterprise.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961, pp. 4-5, 17.

[115] John C. B. Webster. "British Missions in India." *Missionary Ideologies in the Imperialist Era 1800-1920*, Torben Christensen and William R. Hutchison, eds. Denmark: Aros, 1982, p. 41.

[116] M. A. Sherring. "Our Late Lieutenant-Governors." *The Indian Evangelical Review: A Quarterly Journal of Missionary Thought and Effort*, 2, 5 (1874), pp. 140-149.

[117] Webster. "British Missions in India," p. 44.

[118] Ibid., p. 45.

[119] William Muir. *The Mohammedan Controversy; Biographies of Mohammad; Sprenger on Tradition; The Indian Liturgy; and the Psalter*. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1897, p. 6.

[120] Porter. "Religion and Empire," pp. 382, 386.

[121] Webster. *The Christian Community and Change in Nineteenth Century North India.* Delhi: The Macmillan Company of India Ltd., 1976.

[122] Idem. "Mission Sources of Nineteenth Century Punjab History." *Sources on Punjab History.* Eds. W. Eric Gustafson and Kenneth W. Jones. Delhi: Manohar Book Service, 1975, pp. 171-218.

[123] Alter. *In the Doab and Rohilkhand.*

[124] Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries.*

[125] For greater detail regarding Catholic efforts, see also: Avril Powell. "Artful Apostasy? A Mughal Mansabdar among the Jesuits." *Society and Ideology: Essays in South Asian History, Presented to Professor K. A. Ballhatchet*, ed. by Peter Robb. SOAS Studies on South Asia. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. 72-96.

[126] Other papers by Powell on this period of controversy are: Powell. "Muslim-Christian Confrontation: Dr. Wazir Khan in Nineteenth-Century Agra." *Religious Controversy in British India: Dialogues in South Asian Languages.* Ed. Kenneth W. Jones. SUNY Series in Religious Studies. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 77-92. Idem. "Maulana Rahmat Allah Kairnawi and Muslim-Christian Controversy in mid-Nineteenth Century India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1 (1976), pp. 42-63. Idem. "Muslim Reaction to Missionary Activity in Agra." *Indian Society and the Beginning of Modernization, c. 1830-1850.* Eds. C. H. Philips and M. D. Wain-

wright. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1976, pp. 146-157

[127] Lyle L. Vander Werff. *Christian Mission to Muslims, the Record: Anglican and Reformed Approaches in India and the Near East, 1800-1938.* The William Carey Series on Islamic Studies. South Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1977.

[128] Jamal Muhammad Buaben. *Image of the Prophet Muḥammad in the West: A Study of Muir, Margoliouth and Watt.* London: The Islamic Foundation, 1996; Clinton Bennett. *Victorian Images of Islam.* CSIC Studies on Islam and Christianity. London: Grey Seal Books, 1992.

[129] Norman Daniel. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image.* Oxford: Oneworld Publications Ltd., 1993.

[130] Avril Powell. "The Muir Family: Indian Administrators, Orientalists and Educationalists." *South Asia Library Group Newsletter*, 42, (1995), pp. 31-34; idem. "The Muir Brothers, Evangelical Discourse, and Indigenous Scholarship in 19th Century North India," to be published in connection with the North Atlantic Missiology Project (University of Cambridge, Westminster College, Cambridge).

[131] Baljon, J. M. S. Jr. *The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1949, pp. 45-68, 77-85.

[132] Bashir Ahmad Dar. *Religious Thought of Sayyid Ahmad Khan.* Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture, 1957, pp. 105-117.

[133]Christian W. Troll. *Sayyid Ahmad Khan: A Reinterpretation of Muslim Theology.* New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1978, pp. 100-143.

[134] Another paper which focused on the early period of Aḥmad Khān's scholarship is by Bruce Lawrence who traced the mystical element in his early writings and the changes that took place in his ideas both after the 1857 Revolt and after his return from England in 1870. Bruce B. Lawrence. "Mystical and Rational Elements in the early Religious Writings of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan." *The Rose and the Rock: Mystical an Rational Elements in the Intellectual History of South Asian Islam.* Ed. Bruce B. Lawrence. Comparative Studies on Southern Asia, 15. [Durham, N. C.]: Duke University Programs in Comparative Studies on Southern Asia [and] Islamic and Arabian Development Studies, 1979, pp. 61-103.

[135] Aziz Ahmad. *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan.* London: Oxford University Press, 1967, pp. 31-56.

[136] Ibid., pp. 57-65.

[137] Abdullahil Ahsan. "Late Nineteenth Century Muslim Response to the Western Criticism of Islam: An Analysis of Amir Ali's Life and Works." M. A. thesis, McGill University, 1981. Wahidir-Rahman. "The Religious Thought."

[138] A. N. M. Wahidur-Rahman. "Modernist Muslim's Approach to *Ḥadīth*. Aligarh School." *Hamdard Islamicus*, 16, 4 (Winter 1993), pp. 13-26.

[139] Brown. *Rethinking Tradition.*

[140] Muhammad Aslam Syed. *Muslim Response to the West: Muslim Historiography in India, 1857-1914.* Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research, 1988.

Chapter 1: Interaction of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān and Sir William Muir on Ḥadīth literature

In Western scholarly studies on Ḥadīth material as well as in attempts to reconstruct a historical biography of Muḥammad, the work of Sir William Muir in the middle of the nineteenth century is often over-looked. Not only did he produce one of the first biographies of Muḥammad in the English language based on primary sources, he also formulated a thorough critique of the Ḥadīth and a methodology with which to sift what he considered historically accurate traditions from spurious ones. Subsequent scholars tended to reach very similar conclusions in their evaluation of the authenticity of the historical accounts contained within this body of traditions that formed the basis of not only the Muslim perception of their Prophet, but the foundation of the early development of Islam and the Muslim legal system as well.

Muir's contribution was unique in the West not only in its pioneering use of early Muslim sources, but also in that the context in which he wrote made Muslim evaluation of his research both immediate and interactive. A contemporary of Muir who responded to his *Life* soon after its publication was Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān. He wrote his *Essays* in which he sought to answer a number of Muir's criticisms; the book was later published in a more complete form in Urdu as *Al-Khuṭubāt al-Aḥmadīyah 'alā al-'Arab wa al-Sīrah al Muḥammadīyah* in 1887. Unlike many of the European Orientalists, Muir lived, worked, and conducted his research in an Islamic context where he had the benefit of interaction with believing Muslims such as Aḥmad Khān who, while trained in the traditional approach to the Ḥadīth, were also active in seeking to reform this classical approach in order to meet the needs of the contemporary Muslim community. In this process, these Muslim scholars were becoming increasingly skilled in selecting and assimilating those aspects of Western historiography and textual criticism which they considered legitimate.

Muir and Aḥmad Khān were influenced by their individual ideological frameworks both in the methodologies they chose to use and in the conclusions they reached. Muir applied Western critical methods to the biographical material found in the Ḥadīth

in his attempt to reconstruct a historically accurate life of Muḥammad. As an Evangelical Christian, he could not accept Muḥammad as a prophet of God bringing a message that supplanted the Gospel and that denied the deity of Christ. Hence, he began with the premise that any accounts that ascribed miraculous powers to Muḥammad had to be spurious. The spread of Islam could only be explained in purely human terms, and thus he sought to rationalize any supernatural elements found within the traditions. Aḥmad Khān, on the other hand, accepted, at least initially, the authority of the Ḥadīth in matters of religious belief and practice. His education had been in the traditional Islamic studies, though heavily influenced by the Shāh Walī Ullāh school of thought which rejected *taqlīd* and tended to favor a revival of the practice of *ijtihād*. Though his own evaluation of the traditions was continuing to evolve, little of this was overtly evident in his controversy with Muir, where he was more concerned with defending the traditional methodologies of evaluating the Ḥadīth against Muir's criticisms. In his later writings which were directed more to his fellow Muslims, he rejected all supernaturalism, but on the basis of a comprehensive scientific outlook as opposed to Muir's selective rejection of miracles in non-Christian religions.

This chapter examines the writings of Muir and Aḥmad Khān in the context of Muslim-Christian interaction in north-western India after the Revolt of 1857. It begins with (i) a brief sketch of their biographical details, emphasizing the factors that shaped their philosophical and religious perspectives. Next, (ii) their writings during or shortly after the Revolt of 1857 provide an appropriate starting point for a discussion on the changing dynamics of the encounter of Muslims with Christian government officials and missionaries after this pivotal event, by contrasting the opinions of Muir and Aḥmad Khān on whether Christian missionary activity had been a causal factor in the Revolt and on the role of the government in religious matters. After this survey of their early writings the chapter focuses on (iii) their major works on the topic of the Ḥadīth, and compares their methodology in evaluating the authenticity of traditional material. This analysis comprises the major part of this chapter.

Biographical sketches of Muir and Aḥmad Khān in their socio-political and intellectual contexts

Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān is generally revered for his contribution to the modernizing of Islam and Muslim education in India.[1] The Mohammadan Anglo-Oriental (MAO) College which he founded exerted an enormous influence on the generation of scholars in the late nineteenth century that departed from the traditional Islamic schools and sought to incorporate Western methodologies and science in their learning. Aḥmad Khān was also a key spokesman for the Indian Muslim community in the aftermath of the 1857 Revolt, particularly in the north-western provinces, in interpreting the causes of the revolt to the British government and in countering the negative image presented by those who wished to blame the Muslims and their religion for the uprising. Besides educational and political achievements, Aḥmad Khān was also influential in the area of religion, both in interaction with Christians as well as in discussions within the Islamic scholarly community. His pioneering efforts to integrate a rationalist, scientific approach to knowledge with Islam were the primary source from which subsequent Islamic modernists in India drew their inspiration.

Aḥmad Khān had a traditional Islamic education which he felt compelled to review when he began to work as a sub-judge, or *munṣif* in Delhi, in 1847. He began to study the Ḥadīth, including the *Mishkāt*, *Jāmi'i Tirmizī*, and several parts of *Saḥīḥ Muslim*, with Maulāna Makhṣūṣullāh, nephew of 'Abdul 'Azīz and grandson of Shāh Wali Ullāh.[2] This helped to form the basis of his critical analysis of Muir's evaluation of the Ḥadīth in his *Life of Mahomet*. One of his first writings was on the life of the Prophet consisting of a small booklet on the birth, death, miracles and other events of the life of Muḥammad, written to give an accurate account of the traditional procedures to be followed in *mawlūd* or celebrations of the Prophet's birthday.[3] A major emphasis of this work was: "the essence of Islam is love for the Prophet and love for the Prophet will be reflected in following his Sunna."[4] In his subsequent writings, he continued to reveal this early Sufi influence of seeing the Sunna as an ethical pattern rather than a principle of legal authority.

The life of Sir William Muir closely parallels that of Aḥmad Khān: he was born two years later in 1819, entered the Indian service one year prior to Aḥmad Khān in 1837, and they both retired in 1876; Muir married when he was 21 and Aḥmad Khān when he was 18 years old. Both were appointed to be Knight Commanders of the Star of India (KCSI)--Muir in 1867 and Aḥmad Khān in 1888, and both received honorary degrees from the University of Edinburgh. Upon retirement, both also devoted themselves to educational work--Aḥmad Khān at the MAO College and Muir at the University of Edinburgh. Muir died at Edinburgh in 1905, while Aḥmad Khān pre-deceased him in Aligarh in 1893. During his service in India, Muir had been assigned to various posts in the north-western part of India, where Aḥmad Khān was also serving, though it is doubtful that they were ever stationed in any city at the same time. Nonetheless, Aḥmad Khān was well acquainted with Muir; in his biography of Aḥmad Khān, Lt. Colonel Graham termed Muir as Aḥmad Khān's "intimate friend" and "one of his best and most influential friends" despite his deep disagreement with Muir that he expressed in his writings.[5]

Muir had studied at the universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, but left before taking his degree, after accepting an appointment with the Bengal Civil Service. In his preparation for work in India, he trained at Haileybury College, the officers' school of the East India Company, excelling in Oriental languages. Instruction in Oriental languages was central to the training at Haileybury, which became the first institution in Britain to offer such instruction.[6] As part of the Indian Civil Service, Muir rose through the ranks from settlement officer, to district collector, to secretary to the provincial government, to become Lt.-Governor of the North West Provinces from 1868-1874.[7] In an article in *The Pioneer* published in Allahabad, speculating on a possible replacement for Muir in the position of Lt.-Governor, Muir's abilities in administration receive this positive evaluation:

> In all the great questions which at present call for statesmanlike treatment, Sir W. Muir is thoroughly versed. No one since the days of Mr. Thomason has studied with such earnestness and success the knotty problems of revenue and land tenure. With matters of social reform he is peculiary [sic] fitted to deal, for there are few who have

> mixed so freely with the people,--few whose acquaintance with native manners and customs is so minute and accurate. Regarding the education of the masses, an enthusiast's energy has in Sir W. Muir been tempered by breadth of view and by patient observation of the course of events. Beyond all this he is utterly fearless as to whom he pleases or displeases. More than once he is known to have restrained by his determined opposition that reckless haste which is sometimes mistaken for energy. More than once the Supreme Council has had to admit its inability to bend his will or to cajole him into acquiescence.[8]

As a civil servant, he was very much part of the British colonial empire, sharing as well as shaping that perspective. Even after his return to England, he continued to take part in the shaping of the British policy in India by functioning as a member of the Council of India from 1876 to 1885.[9]

Impact of professional career and religious beliefs on Muir's scholarship

Muir, working in various capacities for the Bengal Civil Service could not help but be influenced in his thought and writings by the position he held in the colonial government. As Said states, "No one has ever devised a method for detaching the scholar from the circumstances of life, from the fact of his involvement (conscious or unconscious) with a class, a set of beliefs, a social position, or from the mere activity of being a member of a society."[10] Bennett sees Muir as strongly influenced by his education at Haileybury College, leading him to attitudes of racial and cultural superiority.[11] He also suggests that Muir fit the pattern characteristic of other colonial administrators termed by Said as a "dialectic of information and control," by utilizing "their knowledge of people, language and culture for the purposes of control."[12] Yet in most of his writings, his Evangelical religious convictions had a much more overt influence on his choice of subjects and his treatment of them than his involvement in the colonial regime. He was significantly involved in the production of Christian literature--awarding prizes for publications of high quality,[13] assisting in the establishment and running of the North India Tract organization,[14] and writing a number of books or tracts himself, both for the purpose of controversy with Muslims and for the education of the indigenous Christian church. Muir's strong support for evangelical missions, Christian education, and indigenous congregations of Christians was a hallmark of his administration.

Muir was closely associated with the missionary community, and as an Evangelical was strongly supportive of their aims. In the words of Norman Daniel, "Sir William Muir brings together three different worlds: that of scholarship, that of government, and that of missions."[15] He had been a close friend of Pfander, a German Pietist recruited by CMS to work in northern India,[16] and it was upon the latter's encouragement that he proceeded to research and publish his biography of the Prophet Muḥammad.[17] This book along with his numerous other writings became a chief source of information on Islam for the missionaries who were serving in India or subsequently came with the purpose of working with Muslims. They were influenced in their perception of Islam by his writings as he was in turn influenced through his contact with Pfander.[18] As a government official, however, Muir supported the official policy of neutrality, arguing that it was improper for a "Christian" government to promote Hinduism or Islam and inadvisable to inculcate Christianity, but also that individual officers must be free to support educational or evangelistic efforts in a private capacity.[19]

Said, ignoring the strong impact of Muir's faith on his work as a government official and his research as an Orientalist constructs a different motivation to explain his pursuits. He sees the only explanation for Muir's enormous labors in scholarship on Islam coupled with his negative attitude and "impressive antipathy in that work to the Orient, Islam, and the Arabs," to be an attempt to deal with "the Orient's claim on him," followed by a sort of debunking project after his Orientalist training "opened his eyes to what the Orient really was."[20] Yet Said's definition and descriptions of the archetypal Orientalist often seem an ill fit for Muir. When he states his thesis, "that the essential aspects of modern Orientalist theory and praxis (from which present-day Orientalism derives) can be understood, not as a sudden access of objective knowledge about the Orient, but as a set of structures inherited from the past, secularized, redisposed, and reformed by such disciplines as philology, which in turn were naturalized, modernized, and laicized substitutes for (or versions of) Christian supernaturalism,"[21] Muir would appear to be a "pre-Orientalist" in that he did utilize a sudden access to primary materials made possible by his posting to India and in that because of his Evangelical convictions he was committed to Christian supernaturalism and not to secularism or naturalism. Nor-

man Daniel presents Muir as continuing the biases and negative propaganda of the Middle Ages.[22] This conclusion is somewhat questionable because of his consistent use of primary sources and his thorough description of his method in analyzing the authenticity of traditional accounts. However, Said's description of Oriental scholarship consisting of "circumventing the unruly (un-Occidental) nonhistory of the Orient with orderly chronicle, portraits, and plots," does give an accurate description of Muir's record of the history of Muḥammad and Islam in his numerous books and his attitude in general toward the Muslim record of Islamic history.[23]

The missionaries and the Revolt of 1857

The Revolt of 1857 had a considerable impact on the relationship between the Christian missionaries and the Muslim community in India. Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, in his analysis of the causes of the rebellion, saw the people's perception of the government's involvement in missionary activity as "chief among the secondary causes of the rebellion," the primary cause being the non-involvement of the indigenous people in the Legislative Council of India.[24] The people misapprehended the actions of the government and were convinced that it intended to force the Christian religion and foreign customs on Muslims and Hindus alike. They felt that this was not being done openly, but by indirect steps such as the removal of the study of Arabic and Sanskrit, and by reducing the people to poverty. The material assistance and Christian education given to the orphans after the drought of 1837 were also seen in this light.[25] With regard to the ongoing religious controversy, Aḥmad Khān had this to say:

> In the first days of British rule in Hindustan, there used to be less talk than at present on the subject of religion. Discussion on this point has been increasing day by day and has now reached its climax. I do not say that Government has interfered in these matters; but it has been the general opinion that all that was done was according to the instructions and hints of Government, and was by no means displeasing to it. It has been commonly believed that Government appointed missionaries and maintained them at its own cost. It has been supposed that Government, and the officers of Government throughout the country were in the habit of giving large sums of money to these missionaries with the intention of covering their expenses, enabling them to distribute books, and in every way aiding them.[26]

The common perception clearly implicated the government and its officials in activities which the people felt threatened their religion. In this, Aḥmad Khān stated that the creedal nature of the Muslim faith caused the Muslims to feel more threatened, and accounted for their greater numbers among the rebels.[27] He argued that it was "wrong and impolitic on the part of a government to interfere in any way with the faith of its subjects," especially in hindering the study of the tenets of their religion.[28] He did not insist that this was the intention of the government, but the people had misunderstood its actions as such, and it had done nothing to alleviate their suspicion and ill-will.

In addition to the government, Aḥmad Khān faulted also the missionaries and their methods. They had introduced a new system of preaching; rather than holding to the traditional method of limiting religious discussion to a mosque or private home, they had taken to preaching in public places and printing and circulating controversial tracts. They had not confined themselves to explaining their own doctrines and books, but "attacked the followers and the holy places of other creeds: annoying, and insulting beyond expression the feelings of those who listened to them."[29] In all this, the missionaries enjoyed the protection of the authorities. They also opened Christian schools which the people were encouraged to attend by officers in high governmental positions, one of which could likely have been Muir. The schools were tolerated because the people believed that such education would lead to a position in the civil service, but were nonetheless seen as instrumental in the erosion of their faith.

A final factor cited by Aḥmad Khān as contributing to the distrust was the letter circulated among government officials proposing that since India was now united under one rule and connected by telegraph and railways, it was time that it be united under one religion, namely Christianity.[30] In his account of the 1857 Revolt, John William Kaye also presented this incident as a factor in creating the general opinion that the government intended to convert the people to their religion. Though its precise source seemed unclear, he described it as originating from the missionary community and sent to "'Educated Natives,' especially to respectable Mahomedans in Government employment."[31] Lt.-Governor Halliday saw it as serious enough that he responded with another

circular disclaiming any government connection with the previous letter. That some felt this was only another example of the subtle and under-cover methods the government was using to convert the masses was seen in Mirza Firoz Shah Shahzada's declaration calling for people to join *jihādīs* on the basis of the efforts of the government and the missionaries to destroy the religion of the Hindus and Muslims.[32]

Muir disagreed with the view that the activities of the missionaries were the cause of the Revolt. As head of the Intelligence Department at Delhi, he was intimately involved in the circulation of information as the uprising grew and was eventually defeated. In some of his letters he deals with the same charge of government toleration of missionary activity circulating in Britain. He admitted that the threat of Christianization by the British was a "tale" circulated by the rebel leaders, but that it was at no point connected with any grievance against missionary institutions or government support for the same. He argued that Indian nationals "do most thoroughly distinguish between a public and a private act in favor of Christian unity" and that they would actually respect one who lived by his convictions in supporting religion.[33] In another letter he again dismissed the allegations that missionary associations were to blame. He stated, "So far as my observations go, Missionary efforts have, in these quarters at least, attracted no hostile feeling, nor would any amount of private support of Missionary Institutions be challenged as a grievance."[34] He had not seen any special ill-feeling against the missionaries or their buildings in the destruction that followed, and counseled that if the uprising was successfully weathered, "[the government's] religious policy should still be that of strict neutrality, but its officers should be left free to use their private influence as hitherto in the support of Christianity."[35]

Muir continued to maintain this position with regard to official involvement with Christian missionary endeavors, reflecting the attitude of other Evangelicals in the Civil Service. He was a strong advocate of the post-1857 British position on a separation of the interests of the state from those of the church. He maintained, however, that this did not preclude the involvement of individuals within the civil service in the missionary endeavors of the Christian church in a personal capacity. In this he was continuing the policy of his mentor, James Thomason, of whom Muir wrote: "Sternly as

Thomason held, in his position of Lieut.-Governor, to the axiom, that the introduction of religious teaching by the Government was not only expedient but unjustifiable, he could yet see, as the goal of his measures, both Collegiate and Indigenous, the eventful conversion of the people to Christianity."[36] At a speech at Moradabad in 1871, Muir stated his position with respect to freedom of religion from the standpoint of a committed Christian:

> We value the Christian faith as our richest treasure; but, doing so, we can the better appreciate the existence of the same attachment in the breasts of both Mahomedan and Hindu to their respective faiths. We believe the Old Testament and in the Holy Gospel, and we love and prize them as our Sacred Scripture; and so we know the Hindu loves his Shasters, and the Mahomedan his Koran. And, as we should not ourselves tolerate interference with our own belief, or with our own observances, neither will we permit interference in any shape, or in any degree, with the faith and observances of our subjects.[37]

His speech at the MAO College at Aligarh in 1875, the first year of its functioning,[38] also reflected this perspective. He first congratulated his friend Aḥmad Khān whose vision and hard work had led to the founding of the college. In his speech, Muir stated that while he believed that the education of the young should be on a religious basis, the British government in India did not practice this principle since as a Christian government it could not inculcate tenets of Hinduism or Islam; and Hindus and Muslims would naturally object to any attempt by it "to inculcate Christianity in its schools and colleges."[39] He also appealed to the pronouncement of Queen Victoria who, upon assuming the direct administration of India after the 1857 Revolt, "declared that while herself placing a firm reliance on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of the Christian religion, disclaimed alike the right and the desire to impose her own convictions upon her Indian subjects."[40] Yet Muir continued to advocate the involvement of government officials in supporting Christian educational institutions privately, motivated by their personal convictions. As a committed Christian, Muir felt he could fully recognize and sympathize with the corresponding convictions and principles, from a Muslim point of view, upon which that college had been established. Aside from the granting of land to the MAO College in his official capacity, Muir had himself donated personal funds to the college "for the furtherance of secular

studies, and of European science and literature," and was pleased with the arrangements made for this.[41] As for his other involvements in Christian work during his tenure at Allahabad, Muir had personally conducted services for Christians and taught Sunday School at Allahabad in the absence of a regular clergyman, and had founded a village for the Christian community near Allahabad that was named Muirabad in his honor.[42] His most lasting contributions however were his writings.

Publications and scholarly interaction: Muir

The publication of Muir's *Life* in 1861 and the 1857 Revolt were the two events which initiated a widespread response from the concerned Muslims of India. The latter event shaped the community's political history while the former "molded mainly its religious history and added a new dimension to the Western Orientalists' approach to Islam."[43] Prior to the publication of the Prophet's biography, Muir had written a series of articles in the *Calcutta Review* on the Controversy between the missionaries and Muslim scholars.[44] He was a founder of the North India Christian Tract and Book Society, functioning as its President for 14 years and as its Patron for many years after that, as well as writing and publishing a number of their first books and tracts.[45] His first major work, however, was this four-volume biography of the Prophet, based on early Muslim sources.

Muir's friend, Pfander, had encouraged him to write a biography of Muḥammad which would be suitable for perusal by Muslims in the local language, written from sources they themselves would acknowledge.[46] Aloys Sprenger (1813-1893), while in India to teach at the Delhi College, had gained access to a number of manuscripts containing copies of the works of early Muslim historians such as Ibn Hishām (d. 834), Ibn Sa'd (d. 845) the Kātib of al-Wāqidī, and al-Ṭabari (d. 923);[47] and had published a biography of the Prophet in English in 1851.[48] Muir utilized these same primary sources along with the works of Sprenger and Gustav Weil,[49] though he apologized in advance for any deficiency in content that might be due to his lack of access to Western research, to his preoccupation with official business at Agra where he was stationed at the time,

and later, to the inaccessibility of certain documents because of the Revolt which was at its height.

In assessing the colonialist approach to the history and culture of the Muslims of South Asia, Metcalf characterizes textually based, narrowly defined Islam as " 'too little' to describe the complex and varied practices and loyalties of actual Muslims," especially when Islam is made into the single most important causal variable for whatever Muslims do.[50] Muir's *Life of Mahomet* could certainly be characterized as textual in its approach to Islam. He examines Islam through an investigation of the Qur'ān and, more importantly for this study, the Ḥadīth collections. From this he deduced how Islam was to be defined and interpreted, why Muslims behaved the way they do, and why Islam as a religion would always be inferior to Christianity. However, he did not utilize a comparison with the West in which non-European societies are seen as "backward, irrational, and medieval" because religion is the central force, and European societies are seen as "beyond religion in public life" and thus more progressive, as Metcalf describes the colonialist approach generally.[51] For Muir, as an Evangelical, religion was still regarded the defining force in society it necessarily had to be, with the caveat that that religion must be Christianity to be truly beneficial.[52]

The fault with the majority of the previous attempts of Western scholars to write a biography was, in Muir's opinion, that they were full of inaccuracies because of a lack of access to original documents. The fault with similar attempts by Muslims was that they were full of inanities because Muslim authors believed unquestioningly the multitude of miracles of Muḥammad contained in the traditions.[53] He had in an earlier article called for a "sifting analysis of the traditions, according to the probable dates of their being recorded; an account of the individuals who registered them; of the means they possessed for arriving at a true knowledge of the facts; and of the number through whom they successively descended."[54] In a lengthy introduction to his work, he proceeded to give his critique of the traditional Muslim method of analyzing the genuineness of traditions and outlined his own approach. C. J. Lyall, in his obituary of Muir for the Royal Asiatic Society described this section thus:

> The introductory chapter on the sources of the biography states, with a skill and clearness which have never been surpassed, the criteria which must be applied in utilizing, for an account of the Prophet's career, the information furnished by the Ḳur'ān and the supplementary data of tradition. The author's intimate knowledge and experience of Oriental character enabled him to criticize and interpret these data with a unique authority; and the chapter will always be read with profit by those who approach the task of constructing a rational account of the origins of the Faith of Islam.[55]

He was also quick to add, however, that the work was "marked with a polemic character which must necessarily render in some degree antipathetic to those who profess the religion of Muḥammad."[56] This certainly was the reaction of Indian Muslim scholars such as Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, who while appreciating Muir's scholarship, took strong exception to his biased and negative portrayal of Muḥammad. Aḥmad Khān also challenged his method of handling the body of traditions and made a thorough case in support of the traditional method practiced by Muslims throughout their history.

William Muir was quite explicit as to the polemical basis of his motivation for analyzing the Ḥadīth and writing a fresh biography of Muḥammad. He was convinced that a fresh sifting of the Ḥadīth would help the missionary by loosening the hold of the traditions on those Muslims who recognized the weakness of evidence based on hearsay or bias.[57] This was not to be merely an academic exercise, limited to the pursuit of literary phantoms, antiquarian research, or the acquisition of remote historical truths. rather it was to enable Christians to confront Islam with their own weapons, such as the writings of Ibn Isḥāq (d. 767), al-Wāqidī (d. 822), and al-Ṭabarī, rather than inadequate Western scholarship.[58] He seems to have had no doubt as to the outcome of the re-examination of the traditional sources. At the same time, Muir seemed to be making a conscious effort to break with traditional patterns of Western interpretations of Islam, while maintaining Western epistemological presuppositions which he labeled "historical deductions of modern research."[59]Though he admired Pfander, Muir criticized his writings as those which "have little reference to the historical deductions of modern research, and deal more with the deep principles of reason and of faith."[60] He joined scholars such as Weil and Sprenger in breaking new ground in Western research on Islam in

their direct access to early Arabic sources, but saw it as no contradiction to retain his Evangelical bias rather than adopting the secular bias characteristic of later Orientalists.

Publications and scholarly interaction: Aḥmad Khān

As part of his larger effort in pursuing a policy of reconciliation between the Muslims and the English, Aḥmad Khān had sought to accommodate the Christian presence and thought within the Islamic community through a number of writings, including an essay on the term used for Christians, *Naṣārā* (c.1858), a commentary on the Bible (1862, 1865), and a treatise on the permissibility of eating with Christians (1866).[61] Earlier, in a period termed by Baljon the "first stage of his religious thought"[62] in which his religious views followed the orthodox interpretations, Aḥmad Khān had begun to make notes for a work in defense of Islam to counter the writings of missionaries active in Agra. These notes were destroyed in the Revolt and were never later published as such.[63] It would seem that Aḥmad Khān had had contact with the missionary Pfander early in his career while stationed in Agra in 1842, and had received copies of the Persian and Arabic Bibles he requested after reading some of Pfander's tracts.[64] Ram Chandra, a Christian convert, had given Aḥmad Khān a number of Christian writings, including Muir's Urdu history of the Christian church as well as a copy of *Baḥṣ mufīd al-'Āmm fī Taḥqīq al-Islām* consisting of a debate between Rām Chandra and the Qaẓi of Delhi, Maulāna Ulfat Ḥusayn, which had been edited and published by Muir.[65] In his comments in a letter to missionaries in Agra, Rām Chandra echoed the statement by Aḥmad Khān's contemporary and biographer, Khawāja Alṭāf Ḥusayn Ḥālī (1837-1914), that Aḥmad Khān was "already printing a small pamphlet showing the errors of the Bible Chronology. I am positively told that he is going to compose a work proving the corruption of our present Bible."[66] Interestingly, in the commentary on the Bible which he later produced, Aḥmad Khān sought, on the contrary, to prove that there had been no corruption of the text itself.

However, Muir's biography of the Prophet caused Aḥmad Khān great distress regarding the portrayal of Islam and the character of Muḥammad, and concern for the doubts the book might create in the minds of a new generation of young Muslims who

were then studying in English.[67] In a letter to Mehdi 'Alī Khān on August 20, 1869, he stated:

> These days I am in a bit of a turmoil. I have been reading the book William Muir wrote on the life of the Prophet. It has burned my heart and its injustices and prejudices have roasted my heart. I have resolved to write a biography of the Prophet just as I had earlier intended, even if I have to spend all my money and become like a beggar, begging for alms.[68]

Ḥālī describes how in a visit to Aligarh in 1868, he and a friend found Aḥmad Khān in an agitated state of mind over Muir's work and determined to make a reply, against the advice of friends who considered it imprudent in light of Muir's position in government.[69] Aḥmad Khān subsequently went to Britain, accompanying one of his sons who was on his way to study there on a government scholarship. One of his major aims in making the trip was "to gain access to Islamic and western source material in the libraries of London, in order to write a comprehensive reply to Muir's work."[70] He responded primarily to Muir's first volume which dealt at length with an evaluation of the collection of the Ḥadīth. He was able to publish his research as *A Series of Essays on the Life of Muḥammad*, but in Ḥālī's assessment, "he did no more than have a summary of his Urdu notes translated into English and printed in that form."[71] He later printed a revised version in Urdu as *Al-Khuṭubāt al-Aḥmadīyah 'alā al-'Arab wa al-Sīrah al Muḥammadīyah* in 1887. Interestingly, Aḥmad Khān felt compelled to make use of European sources to gain a proper hearing, while Muir was similarly motivated to use early Arabic sources.

Belief regarding the Ḥadīth

Muir's concern in his analysis of the Ḥadīth was to find authentic, reliable sources from which to re-construct a biography of the Prophet. He considered the traditions or the Ḥadīth to be the second major source, after the Qur'ān, of historical material for the life of the Prophet and the rise of Islam.[72] But unlike the Qur'ān, which Muir acclaimed as a reliable, contemporary account, the traditions were suspect in his opinion. He defined the traditions as, "the sayings of the friends and followers of the Prophet, handed down by a real or supposed chain of narrators to the period when they were col-

lected, recorded, and classified," the process of transmission being for the most part oral, a factor which weakened the reliability of the traditions because of the dependence on fallible memory and tendency to exaggeration.[73] The weaknesses in this system, as he saw them, were the doubtful history of the origin of the Ḥadīth, the inadequacy of the traditional tools to evaluate the accounts, and the intrusion of the prejudices and convictions of those passing on a tradition. Muir acknowledged that the traditions could, however, contain historical facts which could have had their source in written remembrances by the Companions of the Prophet, but with no way of separating the factual history from the spurious traditions that had arisen.[74] Nevertheless, he did not reject completely the historicity of traditional accounts. In an essay reviewing the prologue to Sprenger's biography of Muḥammad, Muir discounted the idea that most of the traditional material had no basis in historical fact. He found in even the tales of the miracles of Prophet and of his "heavenly journey" a kernel of reality, "some real incident on which they were engrafted, which prompted the idea, and gave to fancy a starting point for its fairy creations and illustrative colouring."[75]

Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān saw the importance of the Ḥadīth for the biography of the Prophet and sought to refute Muir's negative assessment of Muḥammad by appealing to a different set of criteria of evaluation. But beyond mere biographical data, the traditions were also a source of the Sunna or custom/practice of the Prophet and thus a standard of conduct for Muslims applicable in all eras. He shared with Muir the opinion that the traditions had not been written down at the time of Muḥammad and his associates, but for the simple reasons that they were not needed and that "the art of authorship was in its infancy."[76] He also agreed that many fictitious traditions had been fabricated, a number of which were mixed in with genuine ones in accepted collections of Ḥadīth, but disagreed with Muir's opinion that they could not be separated. He felt that Islam was not affected in the least by the charge that fabricated traditions existed because Muslim scholars had not only been aware of them from the beginning but had written works "with the sole intention of discriminating false hadeeses from genuine ones," fashioned rules and tests "for ascertaining their merits, genuineness, and authenticity," and condemned fabricators as sinners.[77] He presented an often phrase-by-phrase critique

of Muir's *Life* as a "Supplement" to his essay "On the Mohammedan Traditions."[78] His overall assessment of Muir's work was as follows:

> [T]he entire character of his composition clearly indicates that, before having arrived at any conclusion by an unprejudiced and candid investigation, as well as by fair, just, and legitimate reasoning, his mind was prepossessed by the idea that all these traditions were nothing else than mere fabrications or inventions of the narrators and other persons.[79]

He saw Muir as setting out to prove that fabrication and as motivated by *animus* in his writings. So though he respected Muir's learning[80] and approved of his inclusion of Ḥadīth material in his biography, he strongly disapproved of Muir's method of handling the material and his general dismissal of their authenticity.

Amīr 'Alī, the details of whose life and work will be summarized in the following chapter, exhibited some ambivalence towards Muir's work in that while he repeatedly and vociferously attacked Muir's negative portrayal of Muḥammad and of Islam,[81] he quoted him when his conclusions were favorable and tended to adopt his approach to history at times. He explicitly followed Muir's lead in explaining the development of pre-Islamic legends,[82] in explaining the night journey of the Prophet as a vision,[83] in evaluating the genuineness of the documents containing the generous treaties of Muḥammad with the Christians,[84] and where his assessment of Muḥammad in general was positive.[85] Like Muir, Amīr 'Alī was focusing in his study of the traditions on the task to produce an authentic account of the Prophet, but unlike Muir, his purpose was not to discredit Islam but to reaffirm its unique and valuable contributions to the history of world civilization. His difference with Muir in the methodology used was more in the particular authors he considered valid rather than in the tools used to evaluate the validity of particular traditions, whereas Aḥmad Khān disagreed with Muir in both aspects.

Factors leading to the origin of the Ḥadīth

Devotion to the Prophet

Muir considered cultural and historical factors to have had a major influence on the development of the body of traditions, the first of these being the Muslim community's devotion to Muḥammad as the Prophet of God. He described the scenario after the

death of Muḥammad as one where between military campaigns, this "simple and semi-barbarous race" would fill time with recounting acts and sayings of the one who had set them on the course of conquest and victory stretching from Spain to India.[86] These tales grew with the passing of time, and where facts failed, imagination aided memory. Muir stated that the expansion of the empire also necessitated the rise of a body of tradition to supplement the Qur'ān which, though the source of divine guidance, did not include instructions on dealing with the many new situations the community faced. The Sunna of the Prophet was then adopted to supplement the divine text, drawing on his every remembered action and word, though Muḥammad never claimed such infallibility.[87]After his death, the Prophet's image "was soon encircled with a divine effulgence which he never anticipated; and . . . his commonest sayings and minutest actions became eventually invested with a celestial sanctity which he would probably have been the last himself to countenance."[88]

Aḥmad Khān disagreed with the notion that Muslims held Muḥammad to be infallible. He demonstrated that Muḥammad himself had directed his followers to consider authoritative only such sayings of his which he declared to be revealed and those with reference to religious dogmas, to morals, and to the life hereafter.[89] Ḥadīth regarding the peculiar circumstances of his life, of the society in general, or of the art of government needed to be examined first before being accepted as inspired. Following the Prophet in matters of religion was a duty, following in these other matters was merely meritorious.[90] But this respect for the Prophet as well as hope of merit was enough to motivate the early Muslims to seek out and investigate traditions regarding his life. Aḥmad Khān also objected to Muir's practice of putting the worst possible construction on traditions glorifying Muḥammad, as he saw it. What would happen to every other pious and virtuous person, he asked, if that person was examined "through the obfuscated and perverted medium of fraud and hypocrisy.[91] For the sake of intellectual honesty, Aḥmad Khān sought the same respect for the Prophet of Islam that Moses and Jesus received as leaders in Judaism and Christianity.

Aḥmad Khān's description of the historical scenario in which the Ḥadīth originated countered that of Muir. Aḥmad Khān began with the initial impetus towards the

preservation of his sayings coming from Muḥammad himself, who had suggested that it would be good to pass on traditions faithfully, but had rebuked those who misrepresented his words.[92] Few traditions, however, were written down during the Prophet's lifetime or even shortly thereafter, but with the passing of the generation who knew him, collectors began to work. In contrast to Muir, Aḥmad Khān stated that these early collectors were not motivated by the needs of the expanding empire, since they were not involved in its administration, being wholly devoted to religion. He described them as "several truly virtuous and pious persons, who regarded this world with contempt, and devoted themselves entirely to religion," as they undertook the task of collecting traditions.[93] This divergence between Muir and Aḥmad Khān in their perceptions of the historical antecedents of the Ḥadīth, points to their differing outlooks as to the purpose of the collections of Ḥadīth. Muir saw political and cultural reasons for creating a body of traditions, while Aḥmad Khān saw its role as strictly religious.

This tendency to view the collection of Ḥadīth as being religiously motivated is also evident in Aḥmad Khān's explanation of the presence of fabricated Ḥadīth. Though he admits deliberate fabrication, he first suggested possible natural causes.[94] Misunderstandings, differences in opinions or even a loss in memory regarding the real sense of the Prophet's original pronouncement could have easily led to variations. Additions could also have arisen through explanations of a tradition being passed on as part of that tradition. Conflicting material could also have had its source in the contradicting traditions of the Jews which had been incorporated into the body of Muslim traditional material. Deliberate forgeries he attributed to various motives including the desire of some to promote praiseworthy customs such as reading the Qur'ān or praying, the desire of others to entertain or motivate a crowd of hearers or to defeat antagonists in controversy, or the work of malicious persons in circulating spurious Ḥadīth. It is significant that even the motives for deliberate forgeries were seen by Aḥmad Khān as having their basis in religion rather than in any political movement or personal ambition. His later writings demonstrated a shift towards a position on possible causes similar to that of Muir's, yet within a more religious flavor, listing as the causes for the fabrication of traditions as follows:

> . . . that people liked very much additions by which the Prophet gained a luster of sanctity and glory; that narrators of events, deeds and words of the Prophet discovered that they themselves participated in the honour and praise they allotted to him; that sometimes quarrels arose, and that then every group recorded traditions in support of its own tenets; that wicked people forged traditions to please kings and princes; that unbelievers issued traditions with fantastic contents in order to soil Islam.[95]

Aḥmad Khān's concern for determining authenticity stemmed from his concern that the Muslim community was uncritically and unquestioningly accepting any tradition from the authorized collections as authoritative. While his *Essays* showed primarily his efforts to refute Muir, his other writings on Ḥadīth, such as the one quoted above, evinced a concern for the reform of the practices of the Muslim community in the spirit of Shāh Wali Ullāh.[96]

Influence of political leaders

Muir saw strong links between the content of material within the traditions and the political or historical period in which it was produced. During the caliphates of Abū Bakr and 'Umar the main tendency was "to exalt the character of Mahomet, and to endow it with superhuman attributes,"[97] resulting in the type of traditions Muir decried. The disunity that arose during caliphate of 'Uthmān between his followers and those of 'Alī was actually beneficial to the accurate recording of history in that members of each side were conscious of hostile criticism against them and therefore careful in the claims they made. In support of this point, Muir quoted a tradition from Kātib al-Wāqidī in which 'Uthmān forbids repetition of traditions about Muḥammad which had not already been made known during the rule of the first two caliphs, as evidence that fabricated traditions were already surfacing then.[98] The careful scrutiny of the traditions of opposing groups was accompanied by the perpetuation of traditions that depreciated their adversaries. Muir notes, "[P]artisanship has fortunately thus secured for us a large amount of historical fact which would otherwise have sunk unnoticed."[99]

During the reign of the Umayyads, traditions in praise of the Prophet continued to abound. What was lacking in official sources was praise for the immediate family of Muḥammad with an accompanying attempt to seek a divine right to rule within that

praise, in contrast to traditions from the Shī'i opposition to Umayyad rule.[100] The Umayyad caliphate was also the period when the main fabric of the tradition was formed. Towards the end of this century, extant traditions were sought out and recorded; subsequent factions might try to recast what had been gathered, but the basic material had been established. According to Muir, although the chief characteristic was the glorification of the Prophet, the basic content was trustworthy:

> In the traditional impress of this period, though the feature of Mahomet himself were magnified into majestic and supernatural dimensions yet the character of his friends and followers, and the general events of early Islam, were undoubtedly preserved with tolerable accuracy, and thus a broad basis of historical truth has been maintained.[101]

In contrast, the coming of the 'Abbāsids, in Muir's view, brought much more official tampering with the recording of the traditions. In seeking to overthrow the Umayyad regime, the 'Abbāsids and Shī'is used "perverted tradition" as their chief instrument to accomplish their ends.[102] Their object was to blacken the name of the forefathers of the Umayyads and to exalt 'Ali, almost to the point of deifying him. It was under the patronage of the 'Abbāsid caliphs, that the biographers of Muḥammad and historians of Islam flourished. Muir saw this patronage as directly affecting the content of what they wrote. Of Ibn Isḥāq, writing under the patronage of the first two 'Abbāsid caliphs he writes, "While lauding their ancestors, he seeks to stigmatize the Ommeyads, and to denounce as miscreants those of their forefathers who acted a prominent part in the first scenes of Islamite history."[103] Al-Wāqidī, Ibn Hishām and others lived and wrote during al-Ma'mūn's reign (813-833). Muir quoted Weil's lament from his *Geschichte Der Chalifen* that these earliest biographies were written at a time "when every word in favor of Muāvia rendered the speaker liable to death, and when all were declared outlaws who would not acknowledge 'Alī to be the most distinguished of mankind."[104] Muir deemed impartiality in such a setting impossible. Aḥmad Khān did not respond to these charges directly, except to state that he had fully explained the rise of spurious traditions elsewhere (see previous subheading), and to point out Muir's inconsistency in considering nearly all extant traditions as fabrications while at the same time relying so heavily on the accounts of al-Wāqidī.[105]

Weaknesses in the traditional evaluation of the Ḥadīth

In addition to the writings of biographers and historians, the work of the collectors of general tradition, the *muḥaddithūn*, was also criticized by Muir. While stating that some of them also "came within the circle of Abbāsside influence, and some of them under the direct persuasion of Al-Māmūn,"[106] Muir concluded that in general, "there is no reason to doubt that the Collectors were sincere and honest in doing that which they professed to do" in seeking traditions from far and wide, inquiring carefully into their lists of transmitters, and recording them with scrupulous accuracy.[107] But what Muir objected to more than the character of the *muḥaddithūn* or the political influence under which they served, was the manner of selection itself.

Lack of critical analysis

Muir felt that the method of evaluating the authenticity of the Ḥadīth was not sufficiently stringent, but this conclusion was done on the basis of a European standard of criticism, and all the assumptions that involved. After acknowledging that the compilers did unsparingly reject ninety-nine out of a hundred extant traditions, Muir stated, "But the European reader will be grievously deceived if he at all regards such criticism, rigorous as it was, in the light of a sound and discriminating investigation into the credibility of the traditional elements."[108] He felt there was a need to teach Muslims the principles of historical criticism. Interestingly, it was this type of criticism which was used by the Muslim '*ulamā'* with devastating effectiveness against the reliability of the Christian scriptures in the Agra debate of the 1854 at which Muir had also been present.[109] Aḥmad Khān countered that the critical evaluation of the tradition had not been the responsibility of the Collectors. The only evaluation they carried out was on the basis of the *isnād*, not according to subject matter at all, the reason being that the nature of their work was only to collect, leaving the criticism of the content to subsequent generations of readers.[110] Amīr 'Alī stated in the conclusion of his *Critical Examination* that the science of historic evidence was an original contribution by the Muslims, or more specifically, the Arabs, to the science of history. "The mass of conflicting traditions with which they had to deal, regarding the life and history of their great Master, early

gave rise to the science of sifting the credibility of historical documents."[111] He thus sharply disagreed with Muir's position that the Muslims of India were in dire need of instruction from the West.

Muir attributed the unwillingness of the compilers of the tradition to critically evaluate the subject-matter of those traditions to the very nature of Islam. He stated, "The spirit of Islam would not brook the spirit of free inquiry and real criticism," and included both the beginnings of Islam and subsequent regimes in this denunciation.[112] He described Muḥammad and his followers as having blind faith that would not permit any doubt, questionings, or investigation in matters where "thus saith the Prophet of the Lord."[113] Later governments had no option but to silence anyone who would openly seek answers to doubts he might have, according to Muir, since "the dogmas of Islam were so closely welded with the principles upon which the Moslem government was reared."[114] This union of spiritual and political elements resulted in the "utter absence of candid and free investigation into the origin and truth of Islam, which so painfully characterizes the Moslem mind even in the present day."[115]

Such a condemnation of Islam did not remain unanswered; within the next few decades numerous Indian Muslim writers such as Chirāgh 'Alī, Sayyid Amīr 'Alī, and Shiblī Nu'mānī, led by Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, repeatedly challenged this Western notion that there was no toleration in Islam. Aḥmad Khān turned the focus on the limiting aspects of other religions and argued his new approach to the Ḥadīth. He pointed out that the Jews implicitly believed that every word of the Old Testament was a revelation and therefore infallible, and that Christians also believed the Scriptures. In addition the latter held to two doctrines that he found to crush any freedom of independent judgment, namely the doctrines of the trinity and the sacrifice of Christ for the sins of all, because of their incomprehensibility.[116] His description of the freedom in Islam regarding the Ḥadīth was more an argument for a reformist approach to tradition than a clear reflection of history:

> All the Mohammedan traditions are, according to Islam, open to the free judgment of every person, as well as for free inquiry and investigation, as regards the narrators and also the subject-matter, and he is at liberty to reject entirely all such traditions which, according to his

> free and unbiased judgment, and after patient investigation, prove themselves to be contrary to reason and nature, or which, by any other way, are found to be spurious.[117]

Reliance on isnād

In his analysis of the methodology of the *muḥaddithūn*, William Muir criticized their reliance on a chain of narrators, or *isnād*, although he recognized the semblance of authenticity that it gave the traditions. The authority of a particular tradition was dependent on whether it could be traced back to one of the Companions of the Prophet, and whether each individual in that chain of transmitters was of impeachable character. If these two requirements were in place, the tradition had to be received, even if the content was improbable.[118] These thorough lists of genuine personages, the juxtapositioning of improbable accounts, and the simplicity in presenting all traditions meeting the requirements for acceptability, demonstrated that these traditions had not been fabricated by the Collectors themselves.[119] But Muir doubted that this method could adequately furnish authentic historical material regarding the life of Muḥammad.

Aḥmad Khan was very critical of William Muir and other Western writers whose understanding of the rules for selecting authentic Ḥadīth he considered woefully inadequate, leading to the "grossest blunders when venturing to express an opinion upon the merits of [Islam]."[120] He devoted one of his essays on the life of Muḥammad to explaining these rules and evaluating the relative merits of various collections of traditional material.[121] He acknowledged that the current laws of criticism were not established at the time that the theological literature was written. The writers, however, had their own rules of composition, and unless they were thoroughly understood, it would be impossible to form a correct opinion of the defects of any specific writer. He outlined four key principles related to the transmitter that determined reliability. Firstly, it was required that the narrator trace the names of successive narrators through which the tradition had been transmitted, back to Muḥammad if possible. Secondly, each narrator in the chain had to be "truthful and trustworthy." Thirdly, when the tradition was reduced to writing, it was compulsory to accompany it with the list of transmitters, its *isnād*, along with any information regarding their general conduct. Finally, a personal evalua-

tion of the credibility of the tradition could be appended by the collector to its content and transmission record.[122] On this basis many works on Ḥadīth were compiled.

In another essay, Aḥmad Khān further detailed the various tests applied to determine the authenticity of transmitted traditions, according to its *isnād*.[123] Each narrator in the *isnād* was presented according to one of seven set formulae indicating the directness of transmission. Muslim scholars disagreed over the degree of certainty required. Some felt it was sufficient if connecting links were known to have lived at the same time and locality, others required proof of contact or actual proof of the occasion of transmission. Traditions could be categorized according to the character of the transmitters into one of the following: *ṣaḥīḥ* (sound), *ḥasan* (fair), *ḍa'īf* (weak), *and gharīb* (obscure).[124] Ḥadīth were also divided in terms of the source of each, whether it was traced back to Muḥammad himself, to one of his associates, or to one who had seen an associate. This final category, considered to be *riwāyāt* or tales, consisted of those beginning with "it has been related," and without any other details as to chain of narration--a kind "no more entitled to credit than is public gossip."[125] Yet it was traditions of this latter category which Aḥmad Khān said filled the books of the historians such as Ibn Hishām and the Kātib al-Wāqidī, which European writers used so freely.

Aḥmad Khān's major criticism of European writers was that they did not devote themselves to the necessary research and were motivated rather by prejudice and enmity in their selection of traditions from which they composed their histories of Muḥammad and Islām.

> Christian writers, ignorant of the rules and regulations that have been so established by learned Mohammedan Divines for ascertaining the intrinsic value and genuineness of any hadees, when they accidentally read any of our histories which, as before said, contain nothing but the worst of all hadeeses vainly flatter themselves that they have become acquainted with all the *minutiae* of Islam, and begin to criticize and ridicule our religion.[126]

He based his frequent dismissal of Muir's conclusions on the fact that Muir had drawn his material from unreliable groups of writings, primarily from al-Wāqidi.

The most reliable collections of Ḥadīth, according to Aḥmad Khān, were the ones by Bukhārī (d. 870), Muslim (d. 875), Tirmizī (d. 892), Abū Dā'ūd (d. 889), Nasā'ī (d. 915), Ibn Mājah (d. 887), and Imām Mālik (d. 795), because they contained only Ḥadīth related by trustworthy persons. His inclusion of Imām Mālik reflects the emphasis of Shāh Wāli Ullāh who elevated Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'* to the level of the collections of Bukhārī and Muslim in the highest category of reliability.[127] Aḥmad Khān qualified this division between reliable and less reliable collections by stating, "It should, however, be borne in mind that, as the above-named books may contain some of doubted truth, or apocryphal Hadeeses, so the rest may contain some genuine ones."[128] This uncertainty was so slight that traditions from the reliable collections were trusted by learned Muslims unless there was evidence of their unreliability. To assist in this task of evaluating the authenticity of Ḥadīth on the basis of trustworthiness of the transmitters, books had been written giving their biographies in great detail.

Aḥmad Khān considered biographers and writers of *siyar*, which he translated as "ecclesiastical history," less cautious that the *muḥaddithūn*, since the latter were more conscious that inaccuracies in their work could possibly result in innovations in religious matters. The former group of writers tended to use somewhat indiscriminately whatever material that came along, not expecting that their work would be regarded as a basis for doctrine. Aḥmad Khān considered the writings of the biographers to be less reliable as to historical accuracy also because of their lack of discrimination in the traditions they included.

> The most fruitful source of their subject-matter being that of oral tradition, every story related to them by individuals was eagerly welcomed by them, and inserted in their books without the least inquiry or investigation as to the nature of the tradition itself, or the character of the party furnishing it.[129]

The task of evaluating individual traditions within their writings was thus left up to the discerning reader using the requisite tools. Within this class of less reliable writings Aḥmad Khān included the following: the *Tārikh* of Bukhārī, the *Tārikh* of Ṭabarī, the *Sīrat* of Shāmī, the *Sīrat* of Ibn Hishām, and the *Ṭabaqāt* of Ibn Sa'd also known as

Kātib al-Wāqidī.[130] The traditions contained within these collections required the most careful scrutiny, even if the author was well-known.

However, it was precisely this freedom from careful testing that caused Muir to consider the contribution of the biographers and historians invaluable.

> Happily, the Biographers did not hold themselves bound by the strict canons of the *Sunna*; they have preserved traditions sometimes resting on a single authority, or otherwise technically weak, and therefore rejected by the Collectors of the *Sunna*; and they have thus rescued for us not a few facts and narratives of special interest, bearing internal marks of authenticity.[131]

This was a point Muir repeatedly emphasized, disagreeing with Sprenger who held the official collections of Ḥadīth to contain more truth than the biographies.[132] While agreeing that the biographers tended to include every kind of tradition pertinent to their discussion without abiding by the stringent tests of the *muḥaddithūn*, Muir found no reason however, to doubt that their record was relatively accurate. Apart from the effort to glorify the Prophet, "they sought honestly to give a true picture of the Prophet; . . . while they admit some legendary tales excluded from the *Sunna*, their works are to a very great extent composed of precisely the same material; and . . . are, moreover, less under the influence of theological bias than were the collectors of the *Sunna*."[133]

Aḥmad Khān was categorical in his rejection of the traditions related by al-Wāqidī and his "Secretary" as well as of those transmitted by other historians which did not follow the rules of the *muḥaddithūn*. He referred to traditions from al-Wāqidī as "the weakest and most inauthentic traditions," and "no more entitled to credit than is public gossip"[134] and stated that they contained "nothing but puerile absurdities, rejected even by Mohamedans themselves."[135] He saw Muir's extensive use of al-Wāqidī as going against his own preconception that most traditions were fabrications, and accused Muir of poor scholarship for not investigating and discriminating genuine traditions from fabrications.[136] By this method Aḥmad Khān could effectively eliminate much of the evidence presented by Muir to support his analysis of Muḥammad's life and character.[137] Beginning as he did from a different "canon of criticism" it was inevitable that his conclusions would be different than that of Muir. The latter recognized that the veracity and reliability of al-Wāqidī had been doubted, but accepted Sprenger's defense of his

account, considering it to be "the fruit of an honest endeavor to bring together the most credible authorities current at the end of the second century, and to depict the life of Mahomet with as much truth as from such sources was possible."[138] Aḥmad Khān's advice to writers on Islam was not to quote the Ḥadīth as an authority without being aware of the sources of the individual traditions. Aḥmad Khān did not object to critical evaluations, but rather to the neglect of the above principles, and to the substituting of invective, ridicule, and sarcasm for "the fair and legitimate arguments of a sound and liberal criticism."[139]

For Muir, doubts whether the compiled traditions contained authentic material were caused by several factors inherent in the nature of the traditions in addition to problems with the *isnād*. The brevity of the units transmitted and their total isolation from any context were characteristics that weakened their reliability and yet seemed to extend to the contemporary witness who was the first link in the chain. The style of narration was as if the event was first narrated "with all the informality of hearsay," a "looseness" that may have been present in each subsequent transmission.[140] The indivisibility of the unit transmitted resulted in its acceptance or rejection strictly on the basis of the *isnād* without regard for improbable or contradictory elements it might contain. Muir doubted the use of parallel accounts as confirmation of authenticity since he thought it quite possible that lines of transmission might have converged at one or more points. He speculated that the early recording of transmitted traditions had led to harmonization. Muir summarized his perspective on the methodology of the *muḥaddithūn* thus:

> The critical test applied by the collectors had, as we have just seen, no reference whatever to these pregnant sources of error; and, though it may have exposed and excluded multitudes of modern fabrications, it failed to place the earlier traditions upon a certain basis, or to supply any means of judging, between the actual and the fictitious, between the offspring of the imagination and the sober evidence of fact.[141]

For this reason, Muir felt it was necessary to construct another method by which to validate the historical authenticity of the content of the traditions.

Tests to determine fabricated Ḥadīth

William Muir proposed his own set of principles for determining the accuracy of historical material found within the Ḥadīth. By these he sought to answer two basic questions, whether the narrator would have had opportunity for personally knowing the facts he narrated and whether there was any trace of bias, special interest, or prejudice on the part of the narrator or by the Muslim community as a whole exhibited in the account. Muir had noted these two criteria while studying the collection of earlier controversial tracts by Henry Martyn, in which the author denied Muḥammad's miracles because of the lack of these two requisites: "their being recorded at or near the time of their occurrence, and the narrators being under no constraint."[142] To answer the first question, Muir set forth principles relating to the *period* to which the particular tradition referred; to answer the second, he gave principles relating to the *subject* it treated.[143]

Period

Muir's main emphasis in the tests relating to the *period* of a particular tradition was to establish whether the transmitter could have been a contemporary witness of the event, and hence meet that qualification for accurate historical reporting. Since almost no witnesses left after Muḥammad's death were older than he, any traditions relating to the time prior to the Prophet would be without a contemporary witness, and hence unreliable. Aḥmad Khān challenged the assumption that the testimony of an eye-witness was essential to establish the certainty of any historical fact. He argued that according to "the established laws of evidence which are acknowledged throughout the whole civilized world," other circumstances "apply in a manner equally forcible," though he did not state what those circumstances might be.[144] As for Muir's premise that traditions relating to events prior to the birth of Muḥammad were automatically suspect, Aḥmad Khān points out that the passing on of oral traditions had begun before the Prophet's death, and that since a number of Muḥammad's companions were older than he was and would have remembered these early events, those traditions could not be invalidated by period alone.

Muir also reasoned that events not significant at the time, even if occurring during the Prophet's lifetime would not likely have been remembered with any great accuracy and must therefore also be suspect. Speaking of Muḥammad, he said, "A poor orphan, a quiet inoffensive citizen, he was perhaps of all the inhabitants of Mecca the least likely to have the eyes of his neighbours turned upon him, and their memory and imagination busy in noting the events of his life, and conjuring up anticipations of coming greatness."[145] General history of that time such as public personages, national events, and genealogies, however, Muḥammad and his Companions would have remembered, and since these would have attracted more general attention, they would therefore be more reliable. Aḥmad Khān opposed the idea that traditions regarding insignificant details of Muḥammad's life before he became a public figure could not be accurate. He argued that when such a person became well-known in a role offensive to his family, an even more critical light would be focused on his origins by those who would be in the best position to know them. Furthermore, the application of that principle to other prophets such as Jesus and Moses would bring into question crucial events of their birth and childhood.[146]

Events relating to the time period during the lifetime of the Prophet were suspect for the reason that the accounts were very one-sided, in Muir's opinion. At the time of Muḥammad's death, no opponents would still have been living who could give an account justifying their opposition from the time of the beginning of his public ministry to the taking of Mecca. Converts who had formerly opposed him would not provide such a balancing view because of the zeal of their new belief. Muir insisted that accounts of the cruelty of those who opposed Muhammad, of the suffering of Muslims in the early years, and of groups such as the conquered Jewish and Arab tribes and the Hypocrites who were often portrayed negatively, must be seen in this light.[147] In response, Aḥmad Khān once again appealed not only to traditions regarding other prophets and their followers, but also to the honesty and truthfulness of the witnesses and the "millions and millions" of their number as proof of the "impossibility of the misrepresentation of those facts."[148]

> How is it possible to conceive that the early converts to any religion whatsoever, whose belief in their religion is sincere, who in the inner-

> most recesses of their hearts believe that to follow the example of their prophet is the surest and safest path to salvation, and that to disobey his commands and injunctions is to incur eternal damnation;--how is it possible, we would ask, that all such pious and virtuous persons should have, all at once, become deaf to the mandates of their prophet, as well as blind to the written injunctions and precepts of their Sacred Book, and should have indulged in lying, fraud, hypocrisy--in short, in vices and crimes of every description?[149]

For Muir, any tradition from the above time periods if reported in great detail would be suspect to the degree of that detail. Here Muir quoted Henry Alford (1810-1871) from the "Prolegomena" to his edition of the Greek Testament[150] to support his argument. In general, William Muir made very few references to the critical methods used by Christian theologians in the analysis of the Bible. His critics noted that he "applied form criticism to the Qur'ān and Muslim traditions, yet appeared to regard the 'whole book of Genesis or the book of Chronicles as the production of a single individual.'"[151] One reason for his hesitancy to use these critical methods would have been that it was the findings of these theologians that had provided *'ulamā'* such as Raḥmat Ullāh and Wazīr Khān with the tools to confound Pfander and French in the 1854 debate at Agra.[152] But Muir's use of Alford here was in connection with the *traditions* that had accumulated around the writers of Scripture, not the Scriptures themselves.

Aḥmad Khān in his analysis of the historical accuracy of the traditions repeatedly emphasized the importance of the character of the transmitter, while Muir emphasized the content. For Aḥmad Khān, it was the initial narrator that must be a contemporary of the events described, not the initial appearance of the tradition. For him it was not the great detail of a fabricated tradition that created suspicion of the subject matter as much as flaws in the character of the narrator. Therefore, the critical rules of the *muḥaddithūn* in evaluating the transmitters were more relevant in accurate discrimination between the false and the true than Muir's rules regarding the period and content of a tradition.[153]

Subject matter

Muir examined the *subject matter* of the Ḥadīth for any trace of bias, whether personal, sectarian, or communal. He felt that the matter of being associated with the

Prophet had been considered a special honor, leading to fabrications of such personal knowledge of him. In the same manner, individuals would tend to exaggerate their suffering and exploits in the name of Islam. The credibility of these traditions would then be questionable.[154] The sectarian bias of larger groups such as the Shī'is, Umayyads, and 'Abbāsids, as well as smaller groups motivated by a strong spirit of clanship also had "a deep and abiding impress upon Tradition."[155] For these types of interpolations, there could be possible checks; but for divergence as a result of biases common to the whole Muslim body, there remained no check whatever.

Miracles

In addressing the subject of communal bias, Muir returned to his theme of denouncing all traditions glorifying Muḥammad and investing him with supernatural attributes. The Prophet's close association with the celestial spheres led followers to see him with superstitious awe, a glorification Muir rejected on the basis of "reason."

> On a subject so impalpable to sense, so readily apprehended by imagination, it may be fairly assumed that reason had little share in controlling the fertile productions of fancy; that the conclusions of his susceptible and credulous followers far exceeded the premises granted by Mahomet; that even simple facts were construed by their excited faith as pregnant with marks of supernatural power and unearthly companionship; and that, after the object of their veneration had passed from their sight, fond devotion perpetuated and enhanced the fascinating legends.[156]

This bias against miraculous accounts was also predicated on another major component of Muir's proposed method of evaluating Ḥadīth, that of a comparison of the content of any tradition with what was stated in the Qur'ān, which he considered a "genuine and contemporary document."[157] He found that the Qur'ān affirmed the Ḥadīth, however, in its main historical points and in its portrayal of what interested Muḥammad. A major disagreement between the Qur'ān and the Ḥadīth was in the matter of miracles performed by the Prophet.

> There is no position more satisfactorily established by the Coran than that Mahomet did not in any part of his career perform miracles, or pretend to perform them. Yet tradition abounds with miraculous acts, which belie the plain declarations of the Coran; and which, moreover, if ever attempted, would undoubtedly have been mentioned in those pretended revelations which omitted nothing, however trivial, that

> could strengthen the prophetical claim. Here, then, in matters of simple narration and historical fact, we find Tradition discredited by the Coran.[158]

Also, the excesses to which Mawlāna Ghulām Imām Shahīd had gone in his *Mawlūd Sharīf*[159] in ascribing miracles to Muḥammad had caused Muir to react with extreme criticism in his review of the work for the *Calcutta Review* in 1852, and to conclude that "the Mohammedan mind of India" was "credulous beyond belief."[160] Hence he was quick to affirm the historical accuracy of the Qur'ān, and on the basis of its record, find the traditions containing a mixture of truth and falsehood with no rule for dividing between the two. In this matter, even the Kātib al-Wāqidī whom Muir generally approved as more reliable than some other sources, came in for criticism for indiscriminately including such stories in his account.[161] Legends and tales put in the mouth of the Prophet were dismissed on the premise that though some were found in the Qur'ān, in general Muḥammad was "taciturn, laconic, and reserved," and was therefore not likely to have given out this mass of fables.[162] All such stories were attributed by Muir to the heated imagination of his followers.

For Muir, this denial of miracles was not motivated by a rejection of the supernatural and of God's divine intervention in human history. Rather to admit Muḥammad's ability to perform the miraculous would be to acknowledge the possibility that he was a true messenger of God, a position Muir could not countenance in his evangelical theology. Muir's older brother, John Muir (1810-1882), who also served with the Civil Service in India, presented similar arguments against the historicity of miracles in stories of ancient Hinduism.[163] Both brothers reflect the influence of the Evidential Theology of William Paley (1743-1805), believing that God affirmed true religions by verifiable miracles. In their writings, both emphasized that for a miracle to be "verifiable," it had to be recorded by witnesses and withstand the scrutiny of opponents.[164]

Like Muir, Aḥmad Khān held strongly to this principle of rejecting any tradition whose content was contrary to what the Qur'ān declared, arguing that any Ḥadīth should confirm or support the Qur'ān, explain or comment on some portion of it, or bear

reference to matters not spoken of in the Qur'ān.[165] However, he objected to the characterization of Muḥammad and of his followers as indulging in imaginative stories. He argued that in the interests of intellectual standards, any historical figure renown for his piety should not be approached with a prejudice determined to see the worst. The companions and successors who would have been instrumental in passing on the traditions were also men devoted to God and thus also devoted to truth and honesty.[166] To thus impugn their motives as Muir had done was not justified in his opinion. Interestingly, Aḥmad Khān did not seek to defend the accounts of miracles or of prophecies, and in fact took pains to explain away many of the miraculous stories surrounding Muḥammad's birth which Muir held up to ridicule.[167] He did, however, charge Muir with behaving as "a prejudiced antagonist," who "looks down, with sovereign contempt and groundless suspicion, upon what regards every other religion than his own."[168]

Amīr 'Alī in his biography of the Prophet, agreed that Muḥammad had disclaimed any power to work miracles, resting the truth of his divine commission solely on his teaching. He compared Muir with the Quraysh tribe in Muḥammad's time in his suggestion that Muḥammad would have been more effective in his preaching if he had been able to support his claim with miraculous works.[169] He took issue with Muir for stating that Muḥammad was inferior to the Old Testament prophets because he produced no miracles. Amīr 'Alī was of the opinion that "the rationalist of every age will be satisfied with the unanswerable reply of Mohammed to the idolaters of those days, which would apply equally well to the Christians of the present: 'My Lord be Praised! Am I more than a man sent as an apostle? . . . Angels do not commonly walk the earth, or God would have dispatched an angel to preach His truth to you.' "[170] Although he personally approved of Aḥmad Khān's and Muir's preference for interpreting the Prophet's "ascension," as a vision rather than a bodily journey, he questioned the Christians' double standard in accepting the bodily ascensions of both Elijah and Jesus while considering Muslims who did believe Muḥammad's journey to have been in a physical body as less rational.[171] He recognized that the Evangelical rejection of the Prophet's miracles had more to do with their theological exclusiveness than with any tendencies toward a strict Naturalism.

Christian and Jewish Scriptures

Another class of traditions which Muir also rejected as infected with a general bias were those that found confirmations of Muḥammad in Jewish and Christian Scriptures. This included supposed prophecies of the coming of the Prophet and his early recognition by Jewish and Christian religious leaders, supposed foreshadowings of peculiar rites and doctrines of Islam, and endeavors to make Arab history fit with Old Testament accounts and additional Jewish legends, including the tracing of Arab lineage back to Ishmael, the son of Abraham.[172] At this point, Muir attacked the traditions "which affirm that the Jews and Christians mutilated or interpolated their Scriptures."[173] Muir had previously published his studies on what the Qur'ān said regarding the Bible in *The Testimony borne by the Coran to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures* in which he concluded Muḥammad had no doubt as to the genuineness of the Scriptures extant at his time, and that his teachings corresponded with them.[174] But as Islam spread, the discrepancies between the teachings of the Qur'ān and those of the Bible became more apparent in those areas where the Bible was more widely studied. The logical result was that the Jews and Christians were accused of having falsified their Scriptures, and stories of such occurrences gained circulation.[175] The reason Muir gave for upright and sensible Muslims not contradicting these fabrications at the time, was the oppressive regimes that limited freedom and inquiry. "Honest inquiry into the genuineness of holy Scripture would have sapped the foundations of Islam, and was therefore out of the question.... [I]t has already been shown that the faith and polity of Islam were one;--that free opinions and heresy were synonymous with conspiracy, treason, and rebellion."[176]

Aḥmad Khān responded to the arguments of Muir with an essay on "The Prophecies Respecting Mohammed as Contained in both the Old and New Testament."[177] Unlike his position in the matter of the miracles where he agreed with Muir that the accounts had been fabricated later, here he maintained that there was strong evidence for prophecies in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures that had been predicting the coming of Muḥammad. Since the Qur'ān contained assertions that the Prophet had been mentioned in the Law and the Gospel, Aḥmad Khān's stance was consistent with his confidence in the Qur'ān as the standard of authenticity by which to judge the Ḥadīth.[178]

"Satanic Verses"

If numerous traditions glorifying Muḥammad were fabricated, others that appeared to denigrate Muḥammad or that seemed heretical were likewise deleted, Muir postulated. However with the disappearance of such traditions, the evidence that they ever existed was also no longer available, rendering such an assertion without foundation. An exception, Muir thought, would be the incident of the "Satanic verses" where Muḥammad was said to have compromised with the idolatry in Mecca. In commenting on the sources for this incident, Muir wrote, "The story of the lapse is honestly told by Wāchidi and Tabari, and (as we find by a quotation in the latter) by Ibn Ishāc; but it is entirely and tacitly omitted by Ibn Hishām, although his book professes to embrace that of Ibn Ishāc."[179] In a later discussion on the comparative reliability of various historians, Muir again used Ibn Ḥishām's deletion of this incident from his account as evidence of reduced reliability. "His having thus studiously omitted all reference to so important a narrative, for no other reason apparently than because he fancied it to be discreditable to the Prophet, cannot but lessen our confidence generally in his book."[180] He also quoted the author of the *Mawāhib al-laduniyya* to support the authenticity of the story within the Islamic tradition.[181]

In his reply, Aḥmad Khān gave a much more comprehensive quotation from the relevant portion of the *Mawāhib*, giving both the Arabic with its translation, in order to provide the context for Muir's excerpts and remarks. He emphasized the broken *isnād* and the unreliability of certain transmitters within that chain. "Traditions possessing an incomplete list of their narrators, can be considered as authentic only when they have other proofs to appeal to for establishing their own genuineness; when they are not at variance with the import of other authentic hadeeses as well as with the injunctions and commandments enjoined in the Holy Koran."[182] This particular tradition, he argued, contradicted commands in the Qur'ān and was inconsistent with both the character of Muḥammad and the spirit of Islam. He proceeded to give an alternative account of what might have happened, using a different tradition which placed the disputed words not in the Prophet's mouth, but in that of his enemies.[183] In a sense, this type of selection confirms Muir's concept of communal bias determining the content of a tradition. But

Aḥmad Khān rightly pointed out that the principle of considering anything disparaging to the Prophet as having more legitimacy did open the way to many other abuses.[184]

Muir found a basis for fabrications or deletions such as the incident of the "Satanic Verses" in what he considered the sanction in Islam for the telling of untruths and of inventing pious frauds. If a divine religion needed the support of miracles, it would be "doing God a service" by fabricating some.[185] He gave the early caliphs, 'Umar and 'Uthmān, as examples as those who would *not* participate in such an activity, citing their caution in passing on traditions regarding the Prophet and their unwillingness to be guilty of adding to the facts. In contrast, 'Ā'isha' (d. 678), a wife of Muḥammad, was presented as an example of one given to "gossiping tales and trifling frivolities."[186] "But none of them, as far as we can judge, was free from the tendency to glorify Mahomet at the expense of truth, or could be withheld from the marvelous, by the most glaring violations of probability or of reason."[187] So once again, Muir attributed fabricated traditions to the motive of wanting to glorify the Prophet.

In addition to appealing to the essential honesty of the early converts as previously noted, Aḥmad Khān countered Muir's allegations of bias with a reference to Christian history. He acknowledged that within Islam, false and spurious traditions did arise in spite of precautions, just as they had in Judaism and Christianity. However, the difference, as he saw it, was that such "pious frauds" were not made into dogma as in Christian history. To illustrate, he cited Muir's own account of the rise of spurious books in Christianity's second century when Origen and other church leaders deemed it permissible to use their opponents tactics in disputing with heathen philosophers, as found in Muir's Urdu history of the Christian Church.[188]

Tests to determine authentic Ḥadīth

With the general perspective that tradition cannot be "received with too much caution, or exposed to too rigorous a criticism," Muir proceeded to give his own standards for regarding any tradition or any parts of a tradition as reliable.[189] With each consideration he proposed, he also gave exceptions which would qualify acceptance. (i) Unanimous consent or general agreement of traditions from various sources or chains

of transmission was seen as a strong indication of credibility. However, agreement that was too close fostered suspicion that subsequent harmonization may have occurred, or that the traditions derived from the same family of spurious origin. Not considering a tradition as an indivisible unit, Muir also sought to discriminate between authentic portions and those fabrications which were later interpolated. In some cases, the parts in which traditions might vary in minor details were seen as more trustworthy than the parts in which there was complete verbal agreement. To illustrate, Muir agreed with Sprenger's assessment of traditions about Muḥammad's birth which agreed almost literally as to the marvelous but differed in the facts. "The *marvelous* was derived from one common source of fabrication, but the *facts* from original authorities. Hence the uniformity of the one, and the variation of the other."[190] In other instances, verbal coincidence pointed to early written records originating too long after Muḥammad's death to be considered contemporary records, yet transcribed much earlier than most of the other traditions, therefore giving greater reliability.

(ii) Another guideline proposed by Muir to which earlier reference has been made, was consistency with the teachings of the Qur'ān. Any points of a tradition which agreed with the record of the Qur'ān would be considered as having greater validity. However, this was qualified by the recognition that obscure references in the revelation could also give rise to fabrications seeking to explain them by placing them in a particular historical context. Muir cited several examples and further illustrated his point with a parallel trend in early Christian history.[191]

(iii) The next standard for credibility related once again to his distrust of material glorifying the Prophet. Any disparagement of Muḥammad or tradition contrary to accepted Islam would tend to indicate authenticity. "When a tradition contains . . . anything at variance either in fact or doctrine with the principles and tendencies of Islam, there will be strong reason for admitting it as authentic: because, otherwise, it seems hardly credible that such a tradition could be fabricated, or having been fabricated that it could obtain currency among the followers of Mahomet."[192] The caution Muir added here was that this principle was not to be applied in accepting as authentic all that was considered "by *ourselves* discreditable or opposed to morality." Standards changed from era to era,

what was considered indecent at the present time might have been laudable in another age and culture. Though himself deeply influenced by his own theological beliefs and cultural origin, Muir recognized the danger of such an ethnocentric approach in evaluating history.

(iv) Another source which Muir considered "far more authentic than any yet alluded to" was the collection of transcripts of treaties Muḥammad made with surrounding tribes--Jewish, Christian, Muslim, and pagan--which were reduced to writing and were attested by one or more of his followers.[193] While these documents provided only a few facts, they did illustrate Muḥammad's relations with his neighbors and provided support to the traditional outline. The method of their preservation invested these traditions with greater authenticity. Since they were recorded on leather and preserved by the families who received them and considered them of great value or by non-Muslim tribes who relied on them as security for the concessions they contained, they had a historical authority "almost on par with the Coran."[194]

(v) A final source of authentic material was the poetry imbedded within the traditions. Muir appealed to what he perceived as the cultural character of the Arabs.

> When we consider the poetical habits of the nation, their faculty of preserving poetry by memory, the ancient style and language of the pieces themselves, the fair likelihood that carefully composed verses were at the first committed for greater security to writing, it cannot certainly be deemed improbable that such poems or fragments should in reality have been composed by the parties to whom they are ascribed.[195]

However, Muir considered any anticipation of Muḥammad's prophetic role, or of his military and political victories in poetical works to be anachronistic. In general, the value of poetry for use as a historical source for biography was limited to confirming other more factual sources and to giving the spirit of early Muslims towards non-believing neighbors and opponents.

Conclusion

The discussion regarding authentic sources for both Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān and Sir William Muir was not merely an historical abstraction. Muir was concerned to find

genuine material from which to construct a biography of Muḥammad and to show that by their own sources, Muslims would have to reject the prophethood of Muḥammad. Aḥmad Khān, disturbed by the portrayal of the Prophet and the conclusions put forward by Muir, attacked his work at the foundation by criticizing both his sources and his methodology in handling those sources.

In regards to sources, Muir preferred the writings of the biographers and historians since their collections were based on the criteria of content and would include all relevant material, even if its *isnād* was weak.

> To the three biographies by Ibn Hishām, by Wāckidi and his Secretary, and by Tabari, the judicious historian will, as his original authorities, confine himself. He will also receive, with a similar respect, such traditions in the general Collections of the earliest traditionists,--Bokhāri, Muslim, Tirmidzi, &c., as may bear upon his subject. But he will reject as *evidence* all later authors, to whose so-called traditions he will not allow any historical weight whatever.

Aḥmad Khān on the other hand, tended to reject the compilations of historians and biographers in favor of those of the *muḥaddithūn*. He held strongly to the requirement of a sound *isnād* if a tradition was to be considered genuine. The Muslim scholars had developed the science of *'ilm al-rijāl* to evaluate the reliability of individual transmitters in the chain, and thus collections of tradition lacking that chain were deemed as unreliable sources. It was by this standard along with the evaluation of the content that he later rejected most of the Ḥadīth as lacking any authority.

The two also disagreed as to methodology in handling the traditional material. In his conclusion to the guidelines for authenticity, Muir reiterated his rejection of the authority of the *isnād* for the historian or biographer of Muḥammad. Each tradition must stand or fall by its own merits as a whole and the validity of the component parts. The historical content of the Qur'ān remained the final standard for accuracy. For events where tradition provided the only evidence, careful discrimination was needed between "the fitful and scattered gleams of truth, which mingle with its fictitious illumination."[196] Aḥmad Khān, in contrast, appealed to the traditional standard of evaluating the authenticity of a tradition through an analysis of its *isnād*. The analysis of its content was for him, only a secondary consideration, at least at the time of this controversy.

Another major difference that can be discerned between the two writers in their approach to the Ḥadīth is the motive each ascribed to the *muḥaddithūn*. Aḥmad Khān tended to see the recording of traditions primarily as a function of religion in that the collectors were consciously aware of how those traditions could shape Islam, while biographers and historians were equally aware that theirs was not a religious role, providing much greater latitude in the selection of Ḥadīth for their writings. Muir, on the other hand, postulated no such self-awareness on the part of the collectors of a need to preserve the religion of Islam from innovations, seeing the selection of material based on political considerations. The differences between the collections of the *muḥaddithūn* and those of the biographers or historians were because of a more honest handling of the material by the latter, in his view, including material that others might consider derogatory to Islam of the Prophet.

One area in which there was a similarity in their conclusions, though not their presuppositions, was in their rejection of the records of Muḥammad's miracles. With regard to Aḥmad Khān, this is more an argument from silence than an explicit statement. His reluctance to defend the stories of the miracles is significant in light of his later outright rejection of the supernatural and acceptance of the rational and natural as the ground of truth. His reluctance to explicitly reject them in this earlier work could indicate a transitional phase in his own experience, or more likely, merely the apologetic nature of the work in which the rejection of miracles could not necessarily enhance his cause. Muir's rejection of Muḥammad's miracles was on a completely different basis. He regarded miracles as proof of a divine mission and began with the presumption that the origin of Muḥammad's mission was not from God. Therefore, any traditional accounts containing supernatural elements had to be rejected.

Both were, in a number of areas, influenced by the constraints of their own religious beliefs in interpreting the traditional material. Muir could not acknowledge the prophethood of Muḥammad without questioning the finality and ultimate revelation of God in Christ Jesus, as recorded in the Bible. For this reason, his principles in evaluating the Ḥadīth would have to preclude any attribution of divine inspiration or miraculous

powers to Muḥammad who so clearly denied Christ's divinity. Aḥmad Khān as a believing Muslim, could not countenance the ascription of impious motives to Muḥammad or to his early followers. Thus the Prophet could not have acted contrary to the clear teachings of the Qur'ān by compromising with the idolatry at Mecca, and his pious companions could not have deliberately perpetrated frauds glorifying Muḥammad more than he deserved. Aḥmad Khān also felt compelled to defend the traditional method of evaluating the traditions by their chains of transmission in order to arrive at the traditional assessment of the character and mission of the Prophet. The strong language both writers used to attack the other's larger community of faith seems to indicate that the "controversy" for them was not confined to the realm of intellectual abstraction, but touched them at the core of their spirituality. Yet this fundamental influence on their respective positions was not overtly acknowledged by either, as each tried to present his arguments on what he assumed to be a universal standard of reason.

However, where Muir was situated solidly in conservative theological trends, actively involved in the Evangelical missionary movement, Aḥmad Khān demonstrated a shift in his writings from a position similar to that of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth of his day to one where his orthodoxy was questioned by others. In his journal *Tahẕīb al-Akhlāq*, he criticized the blind following of any tradition, and presented a strict set of standards to determine the authority of a tradition, even if found in an accepted collection.[197] He held the position that even those traditions claiming to give the words of the Prophet could only be considered as having transmitted the sense of his teaching, not his actual words. Brown states, "He so severely restricted the application of Ḥadīth that he came to be viewed by conservative opponents as a *munkir-i-Ḥadīth*, a denier of tradition."[198] Muir, on the other hand, shows little evidence of having been influenced by this interaction, though subsequent generations of missionaries who relied on his work did demonstrate an acceptance of the scholarship of Aḥmad Khān in this field, as the next chapter demonstrates through an examination of the writings of Thomas Patrick Hughes and Edward Sell.

Notes

[1] Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān's life has been researched by many scholars, and a number of different biographies have been written, variously emphasizing his contributions to the British Empire, to the Muslim community, to political independence, to Hindu-Muslim unity, to Muslim separatism and nationalism, to education, and more. See chapter 1 of Christian W. Troll. *Sayyid Ahmad Khan: A Reinterpretation of Muslim Theology*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1978, pp. 3-27. Subsequent works include: Hafeez Malik. *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Muslim Modernization in India and Pakistan*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980; Sheila McDonough. *Muslim Ethics and Modernity: A Comparative Study of the Ethical Thought of Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Mawlana Maududi*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984; Saeeda Iqbal. *Islamic Rationalism in the Subcontinent with Special Reference to Shāh Waliullāh, Sayyid Ahmad Khān and Allāma Muhammad Iqbal*. Lahore: Islamic Book Service, 1984. In addition, a number of thesis have been written at McGill University in the past few years dealing with various aspects of Aḥmad Khān's works: Andreas Felix D'Souza. "The Concept of Revelation in the Writings of Three Modern Indian Muslims: A Study of Ahmad Khan, Abu al-Kalam Azad, and Abu al-A'la Mawdudi." Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, 1988; Shaista Azizalam. "Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and the 'Ulamā'." Unpublished M. A. Thesis, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, 1992; Agusni Yahyi. "The Impact of Colonial Experience on the Religious and Social Thought of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān and Ahmad Hassan: A Comparison." Unpublished M. A. Thesis, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, 1994; Ruswan. "Colonial Experience and Muslims Educational Reforms: A Compariston of the Aligarh and the Muhammadiyah Movements." Unpublished M. A. Thesis, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, 1997.

[2] Altāf Ḥusayn Ḥālī. *Hayat-i-Javed: A Biographical Account of Sir Sayyid*. Trans. by K. H. Qadiri and David J. Matthews. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1979 [originally published in Urdu, 1901], p. 33.

[3] Entitled *Jilā al-Qulūb bi ẓikr al-Maḥbūb* (1839), as in Ḥālī, *Hayat-i-Javed*, p. 31.

[4] Brown. *Rethinking Tradition*, p. 33.

[5] G. F. I. Graham. *The Life and Work of Syed Ahmad Khan C. S. I.* Rpt. IAD Oriental Series, 29. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1974, [first edition, 1885] pp. 107, 194.

[6] Bernard S. Cohn. "The Recruitment and Training of British Civil Servants in India," in *An Anthropologist among the Historians and Other Essays*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987, pp. 528-533, 541.

[7] "Death of Sir William Muir," *The Times*, July 12, 1905, p. 4.

[8] "The Lieutenant-Governorship of the North-West," *The Pioneer*. Jan. 10, 1872, p. 5.

[9] C. J. Lyall. "Obituary Notices: Sir William Muir," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 37 (1905), p. 873.

[10] Edward Said. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978, p. 10.

[11] Clinton Bennett. *Victorian Images of Islam*. CSIC Studies on Islam and Christianity. London: Grey Seal Books, 1992, p. 14.

[12] Ibid., p. 104.

[13] "Notes and Intelligence." *The Indian Evangelical Review: A Quarterly Journal of Missionary Thought and Effort*, 1, 1 (1873), pp. 96. Describes awards given by Muir to publications in the Urdu language.

[14] J. J. Lucas. *History of the North India Christian Tract and Book Society, Allahabad: 1848-1934*. Allahabad: The North India Christian Tract & Book Society, [1934], pp. 1-3, 39-41.

[15] Norman Daniel. *Islam, Europe and Empire*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966, p. 279.

[16] Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, pp. 132-157 for biographical information of C. G. Pfander. The remaining chapters give an account of his interaction with Muslims in northern India.

[17] Muir, *Life*. p. iii.

[18] Bennett. *Victorian Images*, p. 13.

[19] William Muir. "An Address Delivered by Sir William Muir, K.C.S.I. , on the occasion of a visit to the Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College at Allygurh, on 12th November 1875," *An Account of the Ceremony of Laying the Foundation Stone of the Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College, Allygurh, Together with some Articles on Subjects Connected with the Movement, being Extracts from English and Anglo-Indian Newspapers.* Allahabad: Pioneer Press, 1877, pp. 30-32.

[20] Said. *Orientalism*, pp. 150-151.

[21] Ibid., p. 122.

[22] Norman Daniel. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image.* Rev. ed. Oxford: Oneworld, 1993, pp. 326-327.

[23] Said. *Orientalism.* p. 151.

[24] Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān. *The Causes of the Indian Revolt.* Appendix A in Hafeez Malik and Morris Dembo. *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan's History of the Bijnor Rebellion.* South Asia Series (East Lansing, MI) occasional paper no. 17. East Lansing, MI: Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1972. p. 124. The text was originally published in Urdu in 1858, the year after the Revolt as *Asbāb-i baghāwat-i-Hind*, and according to G. F. I. Graham, translated and published in English by Graham and Sir Auckland Colvin, see Graham. *Life*, p. 32.

[25] For further details on the involvement of missionaries in the aftermath of the famine and the Muslim community's response, see Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, pp. 159-163.

[26] Aḥmad Khān. *The Causes of the Indian Revolt*, p. 125.

[27] Ibid., p. 129.

[28] Ibid., p. 129.

[29] Ibid., p. 126.

[30] Ibid., p. 128. A copy of the letter is included as "Appendix I" in the same volume. It argues the superiority of the Christian religion based on the fact of Christ's resurrection from the dead, and urges the reader to consider these facts, then embrace them publicly, pp. 149-151.

[31] John William Kaye. *A History of the Sepoy War in India. 1857-1858.* Vol. 1. London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1870, pp. 472-473.

[32] Moti Lal Bhargava. *History of Modern India.* Lucknow: The Upper India Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1970, p. 293.

[33] Sir William Muir. *Records of the Intelligence Department of the Government of the North-West Provinces of India during the Mutiny of 1857 including Correspondence with the Supreme Government, Delhi, Cawnpore, and Other Places*, vol. 2. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1902, p. 112.

[34] Ibid., pp. 130-131.

[35] Ibid.

[36] William Muir. *The Honourable James Thomason, Lieutenant-Governor N.-W. P., India, 1843-1853 A.D.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897, p. 89.

[37] William Muir. "Speech of the Lieutenant-Governor at the Moradabad Durbar," *The Pioneer.* Nov. 16, 1871, p. 3. He added that the only conditions qualifying this freedom was loyalty to the British Government, obedience to the law, and non-interference with the religious freedom of another; any such communal strife would be punished in the due course of law.

[38] The Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College officially opened on Jan. 8, 1877, but had been operational since 1875.

[39] Muir, "An Address, pp. 30-31.

[40] Ibid., p. 31. See also Muir. "Speech of the Lieutenant-Governor," p. 3.

[41] Muir. "An Address," pp. 30-32.

[42] Eugene Stock. *The History of the Church Missionary Society*, v. 2. London, Church Missionary Society, 1899, pp. 264-265, 524.

[43] Wahidur-Raḥman. "The Religious Thought of Moulvi Chirāgh 'Ali," p. 18.

[44] The articles were later published in, Sir William Muir. *The Mohammedan Controversy.*

[45] Lucas. *History*, pp. 2-3, 39-41.

[46] Muir. *Life*, Preface, p. iii.

[47] Ibid., pp. xcv-ci. C. J. Lyall in his obituary notes that the manuscripts used by Muir were "an abridgment of Ibn Hishām's *Sīrat ar-Rasūl*, the autograph of the compiler, dating from 707 of the Hijrah; the volume of Tabarī's *Annals* dealing with the whole of the Prophet's life except the last five years; and, most important of all, the portion of the *Ṭabaḳāt* of Ibn Sa'd, called the Secretary of Wāḳidī," all of which were subsequently deposited in the India Office Library. Lyall, "Obituary," p. 876.

[48] Aloys Sprenger. *The Life of Mohammad, from Original Sources.* Allahabad: Presbyterian Mission Press, 1851. This was subsequently incorporated into his *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammad; nach bisher grösstentheils unbenutzten Quellen.* 3 vols. Berlin: Nicolaische verlagsbuchhandlung--A. Effert & L. Lindtner, 1861, 1862, 1865. Reviewed by Muir in *Calcutta Review* in 1868, see Muir, "Value of Early Mahometan Historical Sources," in *The Mohammedan Controversy*, pp. 103-152.

[49] See especially, Gustav Weil. *Mohammad der Prophet: Sein Leben und seine Lehre.* Stuttgart: Verlag der J. B. Metzlerschen Buchhandlung, 1843, and his *Geschichte der Chalifen; nach handschriftlichen, grösstentheils noch unbenhtzten Quellen*, 3 vols. Mannheim: F. Bassermann, 1846-1851.

[50] Barbara D. Metcalf. "Presidential Address: Too Little and Too Much: Reflections on Muslims in the History of India." *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 54, 4 (Nov. 1995), p. 956.

[51] Ibid.

[52] See William Muir. *The Rise and Decline of Islam.* Present Day Tracts. London: The Religious Tract Society, [1883], also contained in J. Murray Mitchell, and William Muir. *Two old faiths: essays on the religions of the Hindus and the Mohammedans.* New York: Chautauqua Press, 1891.

[53] Muir. *Controversy*, p. 78.

[54] Ibid., p. 18.

[55] C. J. Lyall. "Obituary," p. 877.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Muir. *Controversy*, pp. 18-19.

[58] Ibid., p. 66.

[59] Ibid., p. 67.

[60] Ibid.

[61] J. M. S. Baljon Jr. *The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, ₁949. p. 17.

[62] Baljon. *The Reforms.*

[63] Ḥālī. *Hayāt.* p. 74.

[64] Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, p. 167.

[65] Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, p. 217. Ram Chandra and Aḥmad Khān had previously sparred over the modernist challenge to traditional astronomy, where the latter had defended the traditional cosmology, a position he later repudiated.

[66] Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, pp. 217-218.

[67] Ḥālī. *Hayāt*. p. 119.

[68] Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān. *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Sayyid jo...Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān marḥūm ke'ilmī o adabī, siyāsī o mazhabī fārsī o urdū khaṭūṭ ka majmū'ah jis men 1849 'i. 1898 'i. tak ke khaṭūṭ jam'a kie gae hen*. Shaykh Muḥammad Ismā'īl Pānīpatī, ed. Lahore: Majlis Taraqqī Adab, 1959. p. 62 [Translation mine].

[69] Troll. *Sayyid Ahmad Khan*, p. 113.

[70] Ibid., p. 127.

[71] Ḥālī. *Hayat*. p. 119.

[72] Muir. *Life*, p. ii.

[73] Ibid., pp. xxvi-xxviii.

[74] Ibid., pp. xxxiv-xxxv.

[75] Sir William Muir. "Value of Early Mahometan Historical Sources," *The Mohammedan Controversy; Biographies of Mohammad; Sprenger on Tradition; The Indian Liturgy; and the Psalter*. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1897, p. 123, first published in the *Calcutta Review*, 46 (1868), pp. 319-390. A review of Aloys Sprenger's *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammad*. Berlin, 1865.

[76] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p.178.

[77] Ibid., p. 210.

[78] Ibid., pp. 204-241.

[79] Ibid., p. 205.

[80] He wrote of his "high respect for the character and attainments of Sir Wm. Muir," and his "knowledge of his profound acquaintance with oriental literature" (Ibid., p.221) as well as of "the high attainments of Sir Wm. Muir as an Arabic scholar" (Ibid., p. 238), but in both references lamented the fact that Muir did not use these abilities to report more accurately on matters relating to Muḥammad.

[81] Sayyid Amīr 'Alī. *A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammad*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1873, pp. vii-ix.

[82] Ibid., p. 26.

[83] Ibid., p. 59n. This also followed Aḥmad Khān's position as stated in his *Essays*, pp.342-372.

[84] Ibid., p. 208.

[85] Ibid., pp. 42, 107.

[86] Muir. *Life*, p. xxviii.

[87] Ibid., p. xxxi.

[88] Muir. *Controversy*, p. 107.

[89] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 191.

[90] Ibid., p. 191.

[91] Ibid., p. 206.

[92] Ibid., pp. 192-193.

[93] Ibid., pp. 207-208.

[94] Ibid., p. 200.

[95] Baljon, *Reforms*, pp. 61-62, quoting from the collection of Aḥmad Khān's later writings entitled, *Ākhirī Mazāmīn* (1898), pp. 128-129. See also Aziz Ahmad. *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan*. London: Oxford University Press, 1967, p. 49.

[96] Troll, Sayyid Ahmad Khan, pp. 137-143, particularly p. 137, note 161 for a list of other writings on Ḥadīth.

[97] Muir. *Life*, p. xxxvi.

[98] Ibid., p. xxxvii, footnote.

[99] Muir. *Controversy*, p. 150.

[100] Muir. *Life*, p. xxxvii.

[101] Ibid., p. xxxviii.

[102] Ibid., p. xxxix.

[103] Ibid., p. xl.

[104] Ibid., p. xli.

[105] Aḥmad Khān. Essays, pp. 209-210.

[106] Ibid., p. xli.

[107] Ibid., p. xlv.

[108] Ibid., p. xliv.

[109] Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, pp. 246, 244.

[110] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, pp. 212-213.

[111] Amīr 'Alī. *A Critical Examination*, p. 337.

[112] Muir. *Life*, p. xlv.

[113] Ibid., p. xlv.

[114] Ibid., p. xlv.

[115] Ibid., p. xlv. In another essay, Muir states that Islam "placed shackles on the independence of human thought, stifled free inquiry, and imprisoned the intellect in the close dark cell of dogma and superstition." Muir. *Controversy*, p. 149.

[116] Aḥmad Khān, *Essays*, pp. 162-163, 171.

[117] Ibid., p. 164.

[118] Muir. *Life*, p. xliv.

[119] Ibid., p. xlv-xlvi.

[120] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 177.

[121] Aḥmad Khān. "On the Mohammedan Theological Literature," *Essays*, pp. 176-189.

[122] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, pp. 178-179.

[123] Aḥmad Khān. "On the Mohammedan Traditions," *Essays*, pp. 190-240. For the section on transmitting traditions, see pp. 195-200.

[124] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 198.

[125] Ibid., p. 197.

[126] Ibid., pp. 203-204.

[127] Brown. *Rethinking Tradition*, p. 23.

[128] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 180.

[129] Ibid., p. 182.

[130] Ibid., p. 183.

[131] Muir. *Controversy*, p. 113.

[132] Ibid., pp. 119, 127-128; Sprenger. *Life of Moḥammad*, pp. 68-74.

[133] Muir. *Controversy*, p. 122.

[134] Ibid., p. 209.

[135] Ibid., p. 212.

[136] Ibid., p. 210.

[137] For a similar trend of rejecting the writings of al-Wāqidī by Shiblī Nu'mānī, a historian who worked with Aḥmad Khān at MAO College, see Muhammad Qasim Zaman. "A Venture in Critical Islamic Historiography and the Significance of its Failure," *Numen*, 41 (1994), pp. 32-34.

[138] Muir. *Life*, pp. xcvi, c.

[139] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 181.

[140] Muir. *Life*, p. xlviii.

[141] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. l.

[142] Muir. *Controversy*, p. 11, see S. Lee. *Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism by the late Rev. Henry Martyn, B. D.* . . . Cambridge: J. Deighton & Sons, and Stevenson, 1824, pp. 455-457.

[143] Muir. *Life*, p. liii.

[144] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 214.

[145] Muir. *Life*, p. liv.

[146] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 215.

[147] Muir. *Life*, p. lviii.

[148] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 218.

[149] Ibid., pp. 218-219.

[150] Muir. *Life*, p. liv, see Henry Alford. *The Greek Testament: With a Critically Revised Text; a Digest of Various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena; and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 1. London: Rivingtons, 1848, p. 56.

[151] Bennett. *Victorian Images of Islam*, p. 125, quoting George Cox. "Review of the *Life of Mahomet*," *National Review*, 1850, pp. 137-160.

[152] Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, pp. 268-271. William Muir's brother John Muir (1810-1882) had used Western methods of textual criticism in his controversies with Hindus. John had preceded William to India and had written several books examining the textual history of Hinduism and providing a Christian response. Upon his retirement, he returned to Scotland and continued his academic study of Indian literature and Christian theology. Unlike his brother William, John's Christian theology underwent a significant change as he ceased to exempt the Bible from the rigorous philological and historical analysis to which he had subjected the Hindu Scriptures. See Richard Fox Young. *Resistant Hinduism: Sanskrit Sources on Anti-Christian Apologetics in Early Nineteenth-Century India.* Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, ed. by Gerhard Oberhammer, v. 8. Vienna: Institut fur Indologie der Universitat Wien, 1981, pp. 64, 69-71, 166-168. I have not been able to acquire a copy of Avril Powell's paper, "The Muir Brothers, Evangelical Discourse, and Indigenous Scholarship in 19th Century North India," to be published in connection with the North Atlantic Missiology Project (University of Cambridge, Westminster College, Cambridge), though I presume that the contrast between the two brothers is dealt with in greater detail.

[153] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 218.

[154] Muir. *Life*, pp. lix-lx.

[155] Ibid., p. lxi.

[156] Ibid., p. lxiii.

[157] Ibid., p. l.

[158] Muir. *Life*, pp. l-li.

[159] Shahīd, Mawlāna Ghulām Imām. *Mawlūd Sharīf.* Cawnpore: Maṭba'-i Muḥammadī, 1850; also published in Lucknow, 1843; Cawnpore, 1845, Agra, 1852, according to Muir, see next footnote.

[160] Muir. "Biographies of Mohammad for India; and the Mohammedan Controversy," *Controversy*, p. 86.

[161] Ibid., p. lxvi.

[162] Ibid., pp. lxvi-lxvii.

[163] Young. *Resistant Hinduism*, pp. 71-75.

[164] Ibid., p. 72.

[165] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 180, 190.

[166] Ibid., p. 207.

[167] Ibid., p. 377-394.

[168] Ibid., p. 220.

[169] Amīr 'Alī. *A Critical Examination*, p. 49.

[170] Ibid., p. 58.

[171] Ibid., p. 59.

[172] Muir. *Life*. pp. lxvii-lxx.

[173] Ibid., p. lxx.

[174] Muir. *Life*, p. lxx.

[175] Ibid., pp. lxx-lxxi.

[176] Ibid., p. lxxii.

[177] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, pp. 318-341.

[178] Ibid., pp. 318-319.

[179] Ibid., p. lxxiii, footnote.

[180] Ibid., p. xciv.

[181] Ibid., p. lxxiii, footnote. Qasṭalānī (d. 1517), was the author of *al-Mawāhib al-laduniyya fī-'l-Minaḥ al-Muḥammadiyya*., a collection of Ḥadīth on the life of Muḥammad.

[182] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 230.

[183] Ibid., pp. 231-232.

[184] In his *A Critical Examination*, Amīr 'Alī shows that this tool can be used against the Christian history as well, pp. 286-287.

[185] Muir. *Life*, p. lxxiv.

[186] Ibid., p. lxxv.

[187] Ibid.

[188] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 194. See "Introduction," note 41 for bibliographic information on Muir's book.

[189] Muir. *Life*, pp. lxxvii-lxxxvii.

[190] Ibid., p. lxxix.

[191] Ibid., p. lxxxi.

[192] Ibid.

[193] Ibid., p. lxxxi-lxxxiii.

[194] Ibid., p. lxxxii. See also idem. "Ancient Arabic Poetry:Its Genuiness and Authenticity." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, n.s., 11 (1879), pp. 72-92.

[195] Ibid., p. lxxxiv.

[196] Ibid., p. lxxxvii.

[197] Aḥmad Khān. "Iqsām-i Ḥadīṣ." *Tahzīb al-Akhlāq*, v. 2. *Sar Sayyid Aḥmad Khān ke Maẓāmīn maṭbu'ah Tahzīb al-Akhlāq 1287 ta 1293 hijrī [1870-1876]*. Lahore: Malik Faẓl al-Dīn, 1895, pp. 172-180.

[198] Brown. *Rethinking Tradition*, p. 36.

Chapter 2: Contributions of Thomas P. Hughes and Edward Sell to the discussion of Ḥadīth Literature

While Sir William Muir made his contribution to the discussion of the Ḥadīth as an administrative official of the Indian government albeit of Evangelical convictions, several missionaries arriving after the Revolt of 1857 also participated in the Christian-Muslim discourse on this subject. Thomas Patrick Hughes and Edward Sell, both from England, were missionaries in India with the Church Missionary Society and made major contributions to the Western understanding of Islam. Hughes' *Dictionary of Islam*, first published in 1885, continues to be reprinted to the current time.[1] Edward Sell's *Faith of Islam*, went through numerous revisions and printings as well.[2] Both included significant sections on the topic of the Ḥadīth in their writings, approaching the subject with an Orientalist and Evangelical bias similar to that of Muir, but focusing on the role of Ḥadīth in contemporary expressions of Islam rather than the history of its development as Muir had done. Two Muslim scholars who interacted with their writings as well as with those of Sir William Muir were Sayyid Amīr 'Alī and Mawlavī Chirāgh 'Alī, though they did not limit their scholarship to responding to what they considered attacks on Islam and the character of Muḥammad.

This chapter focuses particularly on the writings of the missionaries, Hughes and Sell. After a brief summary of their careers, the development of their ideas about Islam and Indian Muslims within the context of British missionary efforts in India is discussed.[3] Their response to other Orientalists, to the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth, and to Islamic modernists, with a special reference to Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī, is then examined, especially as to the perception of the Ḥadīth by each group. Finally, a thorough description of their analysis of the definition, origin, development, authenticity, and importance of the Ḥadīth in contemporary Islam is presented. The ideas of Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Ali on these topics and their interaction with Hughes and Sell are interspersed throughout this chapter.

Biographical Sketches

Missionaries

Few biographical details are available for Hughes and Sell--no published memoirs, no biographies, and no scholarly studies on these two men are available.[4] What is known is that both Hughes and Sell attended the Church Missionary College, and were ordained together along with a number of other prospective missionaries, in 1864.[5] The Church Missionary College was opened at Islington in 1825 for the purpose of providing training for prospective missionary candidates with the Church Missionary Society. Its main work was to provide training to prepare non-graduate men for service as missionaries through a three-year course followed by ordination by the Bishop of London before they went abroad. [6] The Church Missionary Society to which Hughes and Sell belonged, had its origins with the prominent Evangelicals of the Clapham Sect[7] of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It had been the main expression of the missionary concern of Evangelicals within the Church of England, and had grown rapidly in terms of missionary activity in England.[8]

Hughes' missionary career began with his departure for India in 1864 to work in the city of Peshawar. He worked as an evangelist among the Pathan people of that area until 1884. He was ordained as a priest by the Bishop of Calcutta in 1867. In addition to his two major books and numerous articles on Islam and missionary efforts among Muslims, Hughes also compiled a selection of Pushto prose and poetry entitled *The Kalīd-i-Afghānī* and functioned as the examiner in the Pushto language for the British government in the Punjab.[9] Upon retiring from CMS, he and his family moved to the United States where he was involved as a clergyman in several churches in the New York area, as well as an editor of a multi-volume work on the genealogy of early Americans, before his death in 1911. The recognition of his scholarship came in the forms of a membership in the Royal Asiatic Society of England and Ireland, being made one of the original Fellows of the University of the Punjab at Lahore, and the awarding of a B. D. by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1878, and of an honorary LL. D. from St. John's College in Annapolis, Maryland, in 1897.

Edward Sell left England in 1865, a year after Hughes' departure, to work in Madras as Headmaster of the Harris High School, with a specific assignment to direct his ministry towards the Muslim population. He continued an active ministry in southern India for sixty-seven years in a variety of missionary tasks, including an abundance of research and literary work. Two days after his retirement in 1932, he died in Bangalore at the age of 93. He left a legacy of writings about Islam as well as studies about the Christian scriptures and doctrines.[10] Like Hughes, Sell was ordained as a priest in 1867. He was also a member of the Royal Asiatic Society, was made a Fellow of the Madras University, received a B. D. from the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1881, and a D. D. from the University of Edinburgh, and was awarded the Kaiser-i-Hind Gold medal in 1906. His designation as "Chairman of the Arabic, Persian, and Hindustani Board of Studies" in Buckland's *Dictionary of Indian Biography* is unclear as to whether this was a government or church appointment, but testifies to Sell's linguistic abilities.[11] Yet both Sell and Hughes were typical of the CMS missionaries in that they had little formal education before they left for their field of service. Nevertheless, their contribution to the new missionary scholarship was considerable.[12]

In addition to several monographs, both missionaries wrote numerous articles published in missionary and other periodicals. Their writings up to 1888 will serve as the basis for an analysis of their perspectives on the Ḥadīth and on the missionary enterprise as a whole. In general, their articles formed the foundation of their later books, as they continued to revise and add to their original data and conclusions. Hence, Hughes' review of R. Bosworth Smith's *Muhammad and Muhammadanism*[13] contained themes that were expanded into his *Notes on Muhammadanism*, in which he stated that those "notes" would later become the basis of the *Dictionary of Islam* he was compiling.[14] Edward Sell's *Faith of Islam* was drawn from a series of articles he published in *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review*[15] and went through two subsequent revisions in 1896 and 1907. The writings of this period were generally intended for a European audience and not as contributions to the genre of controversial writings that had arisen, though Sell's *Faith of Islam* was translated into Urdu as *'Aqā'id-i-Islamiyyat* by Mawlavī Ḥamīdī Shafqat Allāh and published by the American Mission Press in 1883.[16]

Though Hughes intended to assist those engaged in such controversy through his *Notes* and his *Dictionary*, he did not direct his writings to the Muslim audience as "a controversial attack on the religious system of Muhammad."[17]

Muslim Modernists

Sayyid Amīr 'Alī had a wide range of influences on his intellectual make-up. He was educated by tutors in Persian and Urdu studies at home in Bengal, followed by studies at Mohsinia College at Hooghly where he came under the influence of Sayyid Karāmat 'Alī of Jawnpur (1796-1876).[18] He was the *mutawalli*, or superintendent, of the Shī'i Imāmbāra at Hooghly when Amīr 'Alī encountered him, and was able to impart a wide range of instruction because of the extensive knowledge he gained through his travels and research in a variety of disciplines.[19] In his *Memoirs*, Amīr 'Alī further included many English intellectuals, authors, ruling elite, and politicians among those who influenced his thinking. He went to study law in England on a government scholarship from 1868 to 1873. During his stay in England, he wrote his biography of the Prophet Muḥammad, *A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed*, published in 1873, three years after the publication of Aḥmad Khān's *Essays*. In his *Memoirs*, Amīr 'Alī indicated that he was motivated to write the biography through his discussions with friends in England and his desire to correct the abundant misperceptions found in Western portrayals of Islam.[20] He subsequently returned to England for health reasons two years later, during which visit he began his extensive work explaining Islamic Law to an English readership.[21]

Upon his return to India in 1873, Amīr 'Alī practiced law in Calcutta, gaining promotions to positions of increasing responsibility.[22] His concern for the Muslim community led him to establish the National Muhammadan Association in 1877.[23] He continued his involvement as not only a practitioner, but also as a scholar of Islamic law, when he was appointed to the Tagore Professorship of Law at the University of Calcutta.[24] He was appointed a judge of the Calcutta High Court in 1890 where he served until his retirement fourteen years later. During this time he together with his association continued to give an effective voice to the Muslims in India, especially during the viceroyalty of Lord Ripon in the early 1880's.[25] His scholarly research took the form of a

history of Islamic civilization[26] as well as a major revision of his *Critical Examination* in the form of what was to be his most celebrated and reprinted book, *The Spirit of Islam*, in 1891. When he retired to England with his British wife in 1904, he continued to be a consistent advocate for the cause of Muslims, both in India and elsewhere. He wrote numerous articles on Islam for English journals, assisted in the establishment of the Muslim League particularly the active London branch, and supported the cause of Turkey before the expulsion of the Caliph. Even in his retirement, his involvement in legal matters did not cease; he was appointed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London in 1909, the first Indian member on that committee.[27]

Amīr 'Alī's response to the ideas of the West was not merely that of a critical reactionary. The synthesis of his traditional, though reform-oriented education with modernist ideas from the West, led him to develop a modernist reconstruction of Islam. He reached into the early centuries of Muslim civilization to find his identity in the Mu'tazili movement.[28] He found that "the advancement of culture, and the development and growth of new ideas" had affected the Muslims of India as it had other races and peoples, and the younger generation was tending unconsciously towards the Mu'tazili doctrines, while those of the older generation of the Shī'ahs were becoming Akhbāris and those of the Sunnis were becoming "Puritans of the Wahābī type."[29] He did not consider this a weakening of the Islamic faith, but the expression of a desire to revert to the pristine purity of Islam and to cast off growths which had marred its glory. An essay by Martin Forward discusses Amīr 'Alī's position as an interpreter of Islam to the West and a Muslim interpreter of Christianity, concluding that he failed to effectively communicate his vision to the Indian Muslims, but was more successful as an apologist for Islam, exhibiting the very strong influence of Western modes of thinking.[30]

While in England, he had met with one of the leaders of Islamic modernism in India, Aḥmad Khān, who was accompanying his sons, one of whom was also studying there on a government scholarship. Aḥmad Khān was using the opportunity to research and write his *Essays*, also in response to Muir and other Orientalist writings. Amīr 'Alī records, "Both in England and in India I had frequent opportunities of discussing with Sir Syed Ahmad the position of the Muslims in the political economy of British India

and of their prospects in the future."[31] It could be assumed that since their interests in responding to Muir were so similar, they would also have discussed their respective research. Amīr 'Alī's *Critical Examination* shows the influence of Aḥmad Khān's thought, quoting from his *Essays*, interacting with his ideas, and adopting the same anti-Wāqidī approach to the early sources.[32] In one sense, Aḥmad Khān responded to Muir's introductory essay on evaluating the authenticity of the traditional stories of the Prophet, while Amīr 'Alī completed the project by building on that foundation and responding to the negative portrayal of specific incidents of the Prophet's life as presented in Muir's *Life*.

Chirāgh 'Alī, another Muslim modernist in India, also responded to the writings of Muir, Hughes, and Sell. His life and ideas have received less attention than other Indian modernists, both among Western and Indian Muslim scholars.[33] Yet in the latter half of the nineteenth century, he along with Aḥmad Khān and Amīr 'Alī were the major figures replying to the Orientalist criticism of Islam. Chirāgh 'Alī's family had already adapted itself to the British rule in north-western India. His father worked in the British civil service in various cities in the region, had achieved some knowledge of English, and had even adopted their customs to the point of wearing English dress at times.[34] When his father died in 1856, Chirāgh 'Alī was educated by his mother and grandmother at home in Meerut where they had settled. He followed his father in working as an employee of the government. He first met Sayyid Aḥmad Khān in Lucknow in 1874, after the latter's return from London, and followed him to Aligarh a few years later to assist him in translation.[35] In 1877, he was selected by Aḥmad Khān to go to Hyderabad to assist the Nawāb and Prime Minister there in the revenue department. He continued there in posts of increasing responsibility, serving as Financial Secretary just before his death in 1895.[36]

Chirāgh 'Alī began to contribute to the Christian-Muslim discourse early in his career, perhaps his first work being a response to a book by the convert from Islam, 'Imād ud-Dīn.[37] While his early works were published in Urdu, two major works from the latter part of his career were first published in English and translated into Urdu only after his death, namely *The Proposed Political, Legal and Social Reforms under Moslem*

Rule and *A Critical Exposition of the Popular "Jihād."* In these, he answered the charges of Muir, Hughes, and Sell regarding the character of Muḥammad and the nature of Islam. He was concerned with constructing Islam according to what he perceived to be its original beauty by ridding it of all the ugly accretions introduced through the activities of jurists, theologians, and traditionists.[38] By this he believed he would be able to remove the misunderstandings of the Western Orientalists, whose writings were the catalyst that caused him to write the books. Another result of targeting this audience was his use of numerous Western authors including Hughes and Sell, but especially the works of Muir.[39] In this he followed the pattern set by Aḥmad Khān and Amīr 'Alī who also made frequent references to Western authors in their writings in English. He also utilized the writings of modernist Muslims from other parts of the world, developing his modernist approach to the Qur'ān, Ḥadīth, and other sources of Muslim law that was more radical than even that of Aḥmad Khān in rejecting classical positions.[40]

Opposition to previous Orientalists

A point made by both the new school of the Muslim modernists and the missionaries writing about Islam from within the Indian context was that previous representations of Islam and its Prophet were tinged with a particular prejudice. With rationalism and scientific methodology being the dominant intellectual paradigm in Europe and fast becoming so among the Western-educated scholars in India, all were claiming their research to be unbiased and objective, and accusing their opponents of failing to meet that ideal. Yet both the Evangelicals and the Muslims were themselves fundamentally guided by their own deeply held beliefs in the views they held and elucidated in their writings, making themselves vulnerable to the same charge with which they condemned others.

In the preface to *A Critical Examination*, Amīr 'Alī listed the various Western writers who, he suggested, wrote with a particular bias, each having a special theory of their own to prove.[41] Two of those that he singled out were Sprenger and Muir, who have been discussed in the previous chapter. While he found Muir's *Life* not "over-philosophical" and possessing "the merit of real earnestness," he did find fault with his motives and bias against Islam, evidenced in Muir's candid admission that the work was

motivated by a desire to assist a Christian missionary, namely C. G. Pfander, in "his controversial war with the Moslems in India."[42] Thus Amīr 'Alī felt it necessary to respond to the false theories and apocryphal stories Muir presented in it. The review of his book in the *Indian Evangelical Review* commended its elegance and purity of language, its evident care and study, but faulted it for the same reason that Amīr 'Alī had criticized the Orientalist writings. "The author evidently writes rather as an earnest partisan than as an unbiased critic," it stated.[43] The review rightly pointed out that while he censured others in their attempts to prove their special theories, Amīr 'Alī himself announced that his object was "to try and prove that Islam has been a real blessing to mankind."[44] The difficulty of writing on the topic of another person's religion was addressed, albeit somewhat one-sidedly, when the review stated the near impossibility for a believing Muslim to be able to "correctly apprehend the teachings of Christianity, or be able to draw an unprejudiced comparison between the systems of Jesus and Mahammad," the primary weakness being a failure to distinguish between essential and incidental elements in the history of the other one's religion.[45] What the review did not acknowledge was that the same could be said of Christian missionaries or Orientalists writing about Islam.

Missionary objections to "misrepresentations" of Islam

Missionary scholars, in a similar manner, were heavily influenced by their religious convictions in their perspective of people of other faith. Stanley E. Brush's characterization of missionary scholarship with reference to the Presbyterian missionaries working among Muslims in India in the nineteenth century is particularly apt.

> Nothing quite so distinctly highlights the contours of an ideological landscape as its scholarship. When that scholarship is pursued as an adjunct of some great cause, such as the missionary enterprise of the church was in the nineteenth century, its values are clearly defined. They shape its scholarship by identifying the issues, the avenues of investigation, the methods to be used and, most important of all, the goals to be reached. Questions of objectivity are irrelevant because truth and error are already known. This was not an investigation of the existence of truth nor the product of the scholar's search for spiritual certainties. Rather, it was the product of a faith already firmly held

> and a strengthening of the scholar missionary's arsenal for combat with spiritual opponents.[46]

T. P. Hughes' writings on Islam would fit this pattern to some extent. He was at first primarily motivated by a concern regarding misrepresentations of Islam, as he saw them, produced by writers in England, such as R. Bosworth Smith, who sought to portray Muḥammad and his teachings in a more positive light than had previously been done. Books such as Smith's *Mohammad and Mohammedanism* represented a more "conciliatory" approach taken by those who adopted a sympathetic attitude towards Islam, in contrast to others such as Muir who are termed "confrontational," according to Bennett's typology.[47] Bennett notes that the three authors he analyzes in the former category were Britain-based and "dependent on secondary sources on which to build their appraisal of Islam," while those in the latter group had academic recognition as Orientalists and linguists and had spent years in India as missionaries or, as in Muir's case, as civil administrators with strong ties to evangelical missions.[48] Hughes and Sell would both fit in this latter school; and both were highly critical of the scholarship of those of the first.

Hughes' evangelical orthodoxy and commitment to mission constrained him from any acknowledgment of Muḥammad's divine mission. He felt that favourable portrayals of Muḥammad by other authors endangered the missionary enterprise by providing Muslims of India who read English with tools to oppose or undermine it. He cited the circulation of an Urdu translation of Davenport's *Apology for Islam* in North India as an example.[49] Indian Muslims writing in response to Western criticisms often did quote approvingly from these "conciliatory" writers while opposing those of the "confrontational" school.[50] The strength of Hughes' own religious motivation, as well as his advocacy of strong convictions on the part of scholars who wrote on Islam, is seen in his expression of dismay at Smith's prediction that soon the "highest philosophy and truest Christianity" will yield to Muhammad "the title which he claimed--that of a *Prophet, a very Prophet of God!*"[51] (Italics his). He even suggested that just as the Indian Church had received European missionaries such as C. G. Pfander and T. V. French, "to guide the Muhammadans of that ccuntry to the true Saviour, so she may have to re-

ciprocate by sending either an Imadudeen, a Safdar Ali, or a Ram Chander, to preach Christianity to the alumni of Harrow, Rugby, or even Oxford itself."[52]

Hughes firmly opposed theological and philosophical positions that asked the missionary to treat all religions as equally true, to treat Islam as a "near relation," or to "penetrate to the common elements which . . . underlie all religions alike."[53] In this he identified fully with the Evangelical camp. He saw the role of the missionary as that of calling upon "the millions of Islam to loose from their moorings amidst the reefs and shoals of a false system, and to steer forth into the wide ocean of religious inquiry" providing some fair haven of refuge where they would find peace and rest.[54] He was critical of those missionaries who instead of giving a clear message of this safe haven were merely proliferating doubts. His concluding assessment of Islam in his review of Smith's book was highly negative, because from his perspective he saw only the barriers it placed in the way of Muslim nations to responding favourably to the Christian gospel. He quotes Muir's assessment that "No system could have been devised with more consummate skill for shutting out the nations, over which it has sway, from the light of the truth."[55]

Emphasis on personal knowledge and experience

Hughes placed great importance on personal knowledge and experience as the primary qualifications for writing on the Orient. He began his review of Smith's book with a general lament that Christian writers up until the beginning of the 18th century held "the most absurd opinions" about the founder of Islam and had not made any attempt "to give either Muhammad or his religion a fair and impartial consideration."[56] Hughes recognized that he as a missionary would be viewed as being just as biased and lacking impartiality. He acknowledged that the assumption would be made by critics that "when a Christian Missionary approaches the consideration of Muhammadanism, he must necessarily bring with him all the bias and party spirit of one whose life is devoted to the work of proselytism."[57] But he felt that the intimate contact one in such a profession could have with practitioners of the religion under examination more than compensated for such possible bias. He insisted that a missionary who daily interacted with Muslims in discussions with their religious leaders and in regular social contacts, gained

his credentials through his constant study of their system of religion—both in terms of religious texts and field research. In his view, such a one was, "to say the least, as likely to form as true and as just an estimate of the character of Muhammad and his religious system as those who have but studied the question with the information derived from the works of English and Continental writers."[58] He contrasted a writer such as Smith who "can lay no claim to original Oriental research, and has not had any practical experience of the working of that great religious system which he has undertaken to defend," to one like Muir or fellow missionaries in India, Africa, Turkey, Persia, or Afghanistan who had an "intimate acquaintance with the system."[59] Hughes clearly considered the work done by Muir on manuscripts of al-Wāqidī, previously unavailable in the West, and his own regular interviews with Muslim religious leaders to have greater scholarly merit than reconstructions of Islam made by non-specialists such as Smith solely on the basis of Orientalist writings in European languages.

Like Hughes, Edward Sell also took issue with the Orientalist scholars of his day by whom, in his view, much was "written either in ignorant prejudice, or from an ideal standpoint."[60] He stressed, as did Hughes, that a greater qualification than being well-versed in the writings of the Europeans, was to live among the people and to know their literature. Not only the Orientalist scholar, but also the traveler came under criticism. With reference to practices such as divorce and polygamy, Hughes stated, "It is but seldom that the European traveler obtains an insight of the interior economy of the Muhammadan domestic life, but the Christian Missionary, living as he does for a lengthened period in the midst of the people, has frequent opportunities of judging the baneful and pernicious influence of Muhammadanism on domestic life."[61] He rested the authority of his own research on Muslim sources, confirming from living witnesses that those principles still formed the basis of their faith and practice. In the introduction to his *Dictionary* he stated that while he made use of some Orientalist works, he had also, during a long residence among Muslims, "been able to consult very numerous Arabic and Persian works in their originals, and to obtain the assistance of very able Muhammadan native scholars of all schools of thought in Islam."[62] In an earlier article, he had given as a footnote to his description of Wahhābī beliefs that his information could be considered

reliable because of his intimate acquaintance with the chief disciple of Sayyid Aḥmad of Rae Bareli, and because he had "studied Islamism under the tutorship of the second son of that Wahabi divine," who was living near Peshawar at that time.[63] In addition to religious scholars he consulted in India, Hughes spent a brief time in Egypt visiting mosques and questioning scholars in places like al-Azhar.[64] However, Hughes did acknowledge a greater debt to certain European writers such as Muir, Weil, and Sprenger than Sell did.[65]

In emphasizing the advantage of direct knowledge, Hughes directly confronted several issues which are key components of current discussions on Orientalism. In his use of primary sources and his checking of facts with local religious leaders, he separated himself from that class of Orientalists Said described as circumscribing the Orient "by a series of attitudes and judgments that send the Western mind, not first to Oriental sources for correction and verification but rather to Orientalist works."[66] Hughes' statement regarding earlier negative assessments of the Prophet Muḥammad are significant in the light of writings by Norman Daniel and Jabal Muhammad Buaben.[67] After his very thorough survey of mediaeval Christian writings on Muḥammad, Daniel proceeds to find the same themes in more recent Western writings, especially in those of conservative, British Christians of the nineteenth century such as Muir and other missionaries.[68] Buaben follows a similar analysis, making a detailed application to Muir's biography of Muḥammad. Both conclude that the negative assessments made of Muḥammad and Islam indicate a continuation of the medieval attitudes and therefore also of medieval methodologies of study, considered inferior to more modern, scientific and objective approaches. However, Hughes was aware of the ignorance regarding Islam expressed in earlier writings and deliberately sought to distance himself from them by researching original sources and involving himself in a continuous dialogue with Muslims from a variety of sectarian backgrounds.

The desirability of direct knowledge

Hughes argued that dogmatic Christian religious convictions would not be a hindrance to scholarly research, but rather would in fact be desirable in the study of Islam, because Muslims themselves held to firm convictions. The idea that this shared com-

monality of strong personal religious convictions, albeit to different religions, would engender a degree of mutual understanding and respect, was also central to the concept of government neutrality in religious matters as practiced by a number of Evangelical administrators. Hughes opposed the bias of European writers who regarded "all dogmatic teaching as antiquated" and who recommended that missionaries not give such teaching a prominent place in dealing with Islam.[69] He claimed that his studies showed how central dogma was in Islam, and that Muslim religious leaders would spurn teaching that ignored dogma "as unworthy of theologians whether of Islam or Christianity."[70] He did not, for example, believe that Muir's biography of the Prophet "loses value because it was written by a religious mind."[71] He suggested that those who boasted of religious neutrality and came up with a favourable view of Muḥammad and Islam were in reality influenced by another form of bias, the bias of "doubt" or skepticism.[72]

He was proposing that the Christian studying the character of Muḥammad and Islam should not "give up the truth which he has received in the Book of God." Hughes gave as examples the converts from Islam to Christianity who found it "impossible to treat their former creed as having any claim to consideration as a God-sent revelation."[73] He supported his position with the fact that Muḥammad made religious claims with respect to Jesus and other biblical prophets. Because Islam claimed to be "a continuation and confirmation of the religion of Jesus," it was only right that the claims to prophethood by its founder should be evaluated by "those who have a pious and godly conviction that Christianity is *true*."[74] This argument that Muḥammad's claim to a status comparable to that of Jesus opened him up to such an examination of his claims and character was repeated in his *Notes*,[75] as well as in his *Dictionary*,[76] and even his later articles in the *Andover Review* which demonstrate a considerable moderation in tone, still insisted that Islam's claim to supersede Christianity made controversy necessary.[77] However, in these later writings, published after the completion of his missionary career, he censured the views of missionaries who while manifesting religious commitment lack scholarly research. In itemizing reasons for a lack of success in missions to Muslims, he stated that missionaries who devoted themselves to convert Muslims had "despised their adversary," not going beyond a knowledge of Arabic, a cursory perusal of

the Koran, and a slight acquaintance with merely the outline of Muslim faith."[78] So while insisting that religious commitment was not to be considered a disqualification, he recognized that that alone would be inadequate in making valid conclusions regarding Muḥammad and the religion of Islam.

Hughes' conciliatory perspectives

The articles Hughes wrote for the *Andover Review* in 1888 demonstrate a change in his thinking and can be seen as somewhat of a critique and an indictment of Christian missionary efforts directed at Muslims, based on his extended involvement in missionary work in India. Whereas previously he may have felt the need to justify his profession and defend himself against criticisms, in these articles Hughes moved closer to the opinions of writers such as Smith whom he formerly opposed. He rebuked missionaries who despised Muḥammad and Islam: "They never suppose that Muhammadanism has anything to teach, and therefore seldom pause to consider what are the inherent qualities of this great religious system. . . . There is scarcely a Christian polemic addressed to Muslims which does not contain evidence of this culpable carelessness regarding the belief of the Muslim."[79] He cited an example from the writings of C. G. Pfander regarding the Muslim belief of the abrogation of previous Scriptures.[80]

The change could be seen most notably in his new assessment of the Prophet. Previously, in his *Notes*, he had stated that attacking the character of Muḥammad was generally avoided as it was an offensive line of argument and tended to rouse opposition, yet he defended the inclusion of his character in the bill of indictment.[81] In these later writings, he took a different position, deploring those methodologies that "attack (often unjustly) the character of Muhammad in order to prove that so 'earthen a vessel' could not possibly have been the means of conveying any form of truth to mankind."[82] Whereas previously he had seen the Prophet's relations with his Coptic slave, Mary, as an unlawful deed sanctioned by a supposed revelation from God,[83] he now reversed his position, stating, "It has always been considered one of the most effectual means to disproving the divine origin of Islam to attack with the utmost bigotry the moral character of its prophet, and first and foremost in the bill of indictment is the charge of

Muḥammad's adultery with Mary the Copt."[84] He went on to argue that a Muslim would be aghast at a charge of adultery since polygamy was not prohibited to the Prophet and his female slaves were as legal to him as were those of the Old Testament saints such as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to their masters.[85]

With regard to Muslim practice, Hughes also reversed his position on a number of points. He had formerly disagreed with Smith's attempt to highlight prayer as an indication of Muslim spirituality, terming it a mechanical act, the prayer of form only, and the vain repetition condemned by Jesus.[86] Now he stated, "The Muhammadan prayers are not as mechanical as the praying wheel of the Buddhist, nor, in fact, as much so as the saint worship of a very large portion of the Christian world," and considered those who criticized their mechanical nature as those "whose habits of thought and mental training have not fitted them to appreciate true 'devotional life' of men who have a firm and ever-abiding belief in the existence of a supreme being."[87] Whereas previously he rejected Smith's appeal to follow the example of the Apostle Paul in penetrating to commonly shared elements between the religion he confronted and his own, he now echoed that call, saying that the Christian brought face to face with a religious Muslim teacher was dealing with "an honest believer in a God and a revealed religion."[88] His explanation for the often harsh and prejudicial treatment of Muḥammad and Islam compared to the treatment of other non-Christian religions was that "the blood of the crusader still flows in our veins."[89]

The novel Hughes published under the pseudonym "Evan Stanton" in 1886 also reflected this change in thinking. He seemed to retreat from a strictly exclusivist position when he presented a character of that persuasion in a negative light. Mrs. Lawson, who "kept a mental record of the religious condition of her neighbours and divided them all into 'the saved' and 'the unsaved': the 'worldly' and the 'Christian,' " was seen by the other characters as an example of what Christianity should not be.[90] The protagonist preferred a simple faith to dogmatism and complicated theology, and declared himself unqualified to answer his bride's question, "Will no Mohamedans go to Heaven?"[91] In spite of this radical evolution of his thought, Hughes was not converting to Islam; he

maintained that while Islam had succeeded in transforming the world better than other religions, it still fell short of what was possible through Christianity.[92]

A later article published in another American journal indicates possible reasons for these changed perspectives. He attributed Muslim misunderstandings of Christianity to the manner of missionary work in Muslim countries, specifically the language and culture of the colonialist powers and the history peculiar to Protestant Evangelicalism.[93] He stated that the writings of Amīr 'Ali and Aḥmad Khān had answered many of the objections raised by Muir in his biography of the Prophet—objections which missionaries still resorted to in their polemics.[94] His own reconsideration of the modern methods of missionary preaching came as a result of an encounter in a mosque on the Afghan frontier where he had been preaching with "an old grey-bearded Muslim priest" who solemnly rebuked him for his attack on the character of Muḥammad.[95] This indicates that the interaction with Muslims in India, both direct conversation and indirect encounters through print, challenged him to reconsider some of his Orientalist and Evangelical prejudices.

Political views

Missionaries like Hughes demonstrated their distinct approach to Orientalism in the area of political attitudes as well. They did not equate their mission with that of the British empire, and were quite critical of government officials or policies which they saw as hindering their work of spreading the Christian gospel. In Hughes' interpretation of the state of the "Great Game" in Central Asia, he suggested that God might be just as willing to use the Russian power to open that area to the influence of the Gospel as He might use Britain. To close his discussion on the struggle for political supremacy in Central Asia, he said,

> Who is to win? Russia or Britain? It is a political question, and one which I will not venture to answer, but of one thing we may be quite sure, all, all is being overruled by the God of nations with a view to Christ's kingdom and glory, and if Christian England should in any way grow cold or lukewarm in her Christian Mission, God has another nation to hand which he can use for his purpose of mercy.[96]

In light of this possibility, he found it "impossible to view the approach of Russia with feelings of anxiety, much less jealousy."[97] He complained of government interference in attempts to expand missionary work in Central Asia beyond the British north-western frontier. The government had insisted on political stability in the region first in light of the struggle of the British, Russian, Persian, and Afghan forces to control the region. Hughes stated that Christian missionaries had always shown a willingness to work in harmony with the wishes of the 'powers that be,' but they could not agree with delaying their missionary endeavors when there was no sign of increasing peace."[98] Therefore, while willing to work in co-operation with the British colonial power, he clearly stated that the missionary's guiding purposes were different from that of the government, and that he should not hesitate to disobey the temporal power in order to be obedient to a higher calling.[99]

While drawing distinctions between the aims of the British colonial power and those of the missionaries, Hughes also saw some parallels and convergence. In his opposition to the British unwillingness to improve relations with Kabul, he argued,

> There is something un-English and un-Christian in the political expediency,--neutral zone,--or "buffer" policy which appears to satisfy Government. Cabul and its adjacent countries are the only places in the whole habitable globe where the Englishman cannot place his foot. This is un-English. Cabul and its adjacent countries are the only places in the universe where the missionary cannot go on his errand of mercy. This is un-Christian.[100]

In his description of the Shiaposh Kafir tribes inhabiting Central Asian areas, he sought to convince government officials that in addition to bringing religion to this region, missionaries would also introduce "civilization" as they had, in his opinion, done in many regions of the world throughout history.[101] This, he argued, would be a source of strength rather than instability for the Indian government. However, the fact that the missionary interest was not primarily for the expansion and stability of the British power is seen in his subsequent warning that if the government would not withdraw its complete ban on travel to the region, the missionary would need to consider the will of God as having precedence over government.[102]

Descriptions of contemporary Islam

Unlike Muir who focused on the early history of Islam and made a study of early texts to construct what he imagined Islam to be, Sell and Hughes focused more attention on expressions of Islam current at their time, once again appealing to their experience and relationships with the practitioners as their authority. Sell stated in his essay on "The Church of Islam" that he had not discussed whether Muḥammad had been deceived or self-deceived, an apostle or an impostor, or other theoretical questions of the origins of Islam, "but what Islam as a religious system has become, and is; how it now works; what orthodox Muslims believe, and how they act in that belief."[103] The factors which prompted him to do this research rather than to write a biography of the Prophet or the history of the political spread of Islam as Muir was doing, were the practical realities faced by both the missionaries and the colonialist government who had to deal with "Islam as it is, and as it now influences those who rule and those who are ruled under it."[104] Hughes also, in a brief review of the first edition of his *Notes*, was described as having represented Islam "as it really is, not as it is supposed that it might be," in contrast to "the speculations current in literary society" in England.[105]

Hughes, in the introduction to his *Notes*, stated his aim to provide information to missionaries and others who might be interested.[106] In his *Dictionary*, he broadened his target audience, writing that he hoped that it would be useful not only for Christian missionaries engaged in controversy with Muslim scholars, but also for government officials, travelers, and students of comparative religions.[107] Both Sell and Hughes were consciously writing from a context in which the Ottoman empire was a world power to which England had to relate, in which England was also the ruler of the largest Muslim nation--India, and in which Islam was a vast system with which the Church had to come to terms. Thus while in their close interaction with the practitioners of the religious system they were describing they differed considerably from other European Orientalists, their major writings were not intended for Muslims or other "Orientals," but for Westerners, to construct an image of Islam which they felt more accurately reflected the reality they had experienced.

Hughes, Sell and the Muslim modernists

However, in reflecting on Islam "as it is," Hughes and Sell had to account for recent developments in the Muslim world that seemed to deviate from traditional practice as described in standard European accounts. Two such developments were the new construction of Islam in the writings by Muslims such as Aḥmad Khān, Amīr 'Alī, and Chirāgh 'Alī who interacted with Western education, and the on-going influence of the "Wahhābī" movement.

Sayyid Aḥmad Khān

Both authors demonstrated a familiarity with a number of Aḥmad Khān's writings, especially his *Essays*. Within five years of its publication, Hughes had incorporated key ideas from it in both his review of R. Bosworth Smith's book and in his first edition of his *Notes*.[108] He also mentioned the treatise written by Aḥmad Khān to prove that Muslims could eat with the *Ahl al-Kitāb*, the "People of the Book," namely the Jews and Christians, acknowledging that their hesitancy to do so could be due to unfriendly feelings towards the ruling power or to a jealousy of race.[109] Aḥmad Khān's commentary received more attention from the Christian community. Hughes referred to the idea expressed in it and in the writings of Sayyid Amīr 'Alī that the Christians had lost the original *Injīl* sent down to Jesus and that the surviving New Testament contained the equivalent of the Ḥadīth or the Sunna--traditions handed down by Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul and others.[110]

Sell referred to Aḥmad Khān's commentary with reference to his treatment of the question of the abrogation of the Christian Scriptures.[111] He pointed out what he saw as a significant discrepancy between the Urdu and English parallel versions. Whereas the English rendering appeared to completely denounce the belief that one law repealed another, in the Urdu text Aḥmad Khān seemed to denounce only the belief that it was because of any inherent defect that abrogation occurred. Sell stated, "To his co-religionists the Syed says in effect: 'The books *are abrogated* but not because they were imperfect'. . . . The leader of an apparently liberal section of Indian Musalmans is, in this instance, at least, as conservative as the most bigoted."[112] Interestingly, subsequent

editions of Sell's book, published when Aḥmad Khān's modernist views were better developed and more widely known, omitted this complaint.[113] Sell did, however, go on to quote Aḥmad Khān extensively as an authority on the Muslim view of the Bible, seeing the Acts of the Apostles and the various Epistles as not inspired but worthy of the same respect as the Ḥadīth. He stated that Aḥmad Khān, after a full discussion of the matter in his commentary, endorsed the opinion of earlier commentators who held that any corruption of the Scriptures was in meaning only, not in text.[114]

Amīr 'Alī

Hughes also interacted with Amīr 'Alī's biography of the Prophet published in 1873,[115] stating his disagreement with the Indian lawyer's assertion that slavery in Islam was a temporary custom which Muḥammad believed would disappear with the progress of ideas and changing circumstances.[116] Hughes was of the opinion that slavery was interwoven in the law of Islam, which was fixed and unchangeable. He was unwilling to permit the modernist Muslims such as Aḥmad Khān and Amīr 'Alī to reform Islam and conform it to the principles of Western scientific thought. Rather than maintaining his stated objective to describe contemporary expressions of Islam, Hughes was now limiting Islam to only the traditional interpretations or reform movements that called for a return to the authority of the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth. He attacked Amīr 'Alī's claim to be a Muslim rationalist on the basis that Islam, as "a system of the most positive *dogma*" did not admit either rationalism or free thought.[117] He concluded of the modernists, "Sayyid Ahmad and Ameer 'Ali no more represent the Muhammadanism of the Qur'ān and the Traditions, than the opinions of Mr. Voysey[118] represent the teaching of orthodox Christianity."[119]

Rationalism in Islamic modernism

Hughes may also have been reacting more to the rationalism of the modernists rather than to their attempts to reform Islam. His opposition to European rationalist writers has already been noted. In his later writings, he showed a preference for the spirituality of Islam in place of the rationalism that diminished the divine element. He wrote, "Missionaries have been slow to recognize the elements of divine truth contained in Is-

lam. In these days of rampant rationalism . . . the higher teachings of Islam are precious gems of truth whereon to build the spiritual structure of a still higher faith."[120] Previously he had agreed heartily with a remark made by Muir regarding Orientalists who wrote favourably of Islam, "They labour under a miserable delusion who suppose that Muhammadanism paves the way for a purer faith."[121] Now he saw in the Muslim teachings about God, the Bible, prayer, Jesus, and future judgment, not necessarily a true spirituality but at least a preparation for Christianity that was lacking in other Asian religions.[122] Hughes had seen converts go through a period of skepticism and unbelief, sometimes never ridding themselves of these hindrances, as result of rejecting Islam on the basis of rationalism.[123] In a conference in 1882, he had already noticed this trend and counseled his fellow missionaries to present the devotional rather than the skeptical side of the faith.[124] His resistance towards rationalist elements within Islam should be seen in this context.

Sell displayed a similar exclusionary attitude towards modernist trends in Islamic thought. After reviewing briefly Islam's treatment of heterodox leaders within its own history, he concludes

> "that the true nature of Islam is not to be learnt from the rationalistic statements of some Muslim student in the Inner Temple,[125] or British University, not from some Stamboulee who, with his French mannerism and dress, loses faith in everything human and divine but the grand Turk. Rather we should learn it from the Moullas of Cairo, the Ulemas of Constantinople, the Hakeems and the Moulvies of the far East. Give them full power and sway, and never would Islam see again the glory which for a while adorned it at Baghdad.[126]

Sell saw the influence of the Qur'ān from the beginning as despotic, limiting free thought and opposing innovation in all spheres of life, whether political, social, intellectual, or moral.[127] It would seem that what motivated the missionaries to oppose modernist reformulations of the Muslim faith was their desire to see Islam as a system completely opposed to progress and civilization, incapable of reform, and void of genuine spiritual life, leaving no options for the dissatisfied Muslim but to cast off the supposedly repressive system and accept Christianity if he wanted authentic spirituality along with Western civilization. Such a stance was consistent with their Evangelical beliefs of

salvation being found exclusively in Christ Jesus, and provided a justification for their work in proclaiming the Gospel in India and other foreign lands.

Sell consistently supported his rejection of modernist trends by appealing to the traditional orthodoxy of the Sunni *'ulamā'* with whom he had contact and with the orthodoxy he believed to be dominant in a Muslim state. He argued that enlightened Muslims in India seeking to reform society albeit from within the guidelines of orthodoxy, did not, in many cases, represent orthodox Islam, and their counterpart would not be found among the *'ulamā'* in a Muslim state. To judge the system of Islam "from the very liberal utterances of a few men who expound their views before English audiences is to yield oneself up to delusion on the subject."[128] Sell's rejection of the fresh attempts to revive the practice of *ijtihād* on the basis of a similar rejection by the orthodox *'ulamā'* will be discussed later.

Sell saw the movement as the outgrowth of European skepticism that was affecting both Hindus and Muslims in India. At the missionary conference for South India and Ceylon in 1879, he entered into a discussion with another missionary from Madras who had encountered a prominent Muslim skeptic in Hyderabad and had been told that "the great mass of the Musalmāns in the Northern Districts are quite rationalistic."[129] Sell responded that in his opinion, "this class of people are very few in number, have no great influence, and are not likely to influence the great body of Muhammadans, by whom they are spoken of with great contempt in Madras."[130] He stated that there had been many such movements in Islam, but that they had always lost out to orthodoxy. He felt that this new expression was particularly unhelpful in that it was not simply a "revolt against the despotism of their own creed," but tended to deny the supernatural altogether, and thus placed another barrier in the way of accepting the Christian message.[131]

However, his position underwent a major shift as he continued to observe the developments within India. A decade later, at the Centenary Conference on the Protestant Missions held in London in 1888, he took a more positive view of the "modern school of Mohammedans in India."[132] He mentioned Amīr 'Alī and his book, *The Personal Law of*

the Mohammedans as well as Chirāgh 'Alī and his books, *The Proposed Political, Legal and Social Reforms*, and *A Critical Exposition of the Popular "Jihād,"* and recommended a study of their views on women in Islam, religious wars, and the doctrines of inspiration and of the authority of the canon law in Islam. With regard to this last topic, Sell found the modernists' position "more reasonable" since they, as he saw it, denied the eternal nature of the Qur'ān and ridiculed the orthodox view of verbal inspiration.[133] He also now considered their numbers sufficient to make a considerable impact on Islam in India. He addressed the assembly of missionaries and those who supported them saying, "There is a very considerable number, a growing number, of educated, cultured Mohammedans in India who feel that whilst they retain their allegiance to Mohammed and the Koran they can only do so by entirely throwing aside what has been considered to be, and what has been put before you as being, the only thought in Islam about these subjects."[134] Previously he had himself insisted on such a narrow definition of Islam. Sell had come under the severe criticism of writers such as Chirāgh 'Alī and had had opportunity for controversy with such modernists. Though he might not agree with their positions or even feel that they had supported them sufficiently, he now concluded regarding this trend towards a modernist outlook, "I look upon this state of affairs with very much hope indeed."[135]

In a subsequent article in 1893, after Amīr 'Alī's thoroughly revised version of his biography of the Prophet had been published as *The Spirit of Islam, or the Life and Teachings of Mohammed*, Sell analyzed the movement in greater detail and acknowledged that this new perspective, if it gained greater currency, would force a modification or rejection of the "commonly received opinion of the immobility of Muhammadan Governments."[136] While not accepting or rejecting the new views, Sell thought it necessary to inform his readers that a growing number of educated Muslims in India held these views and saw them as a way to retain their spirituality and admiration for Muḥammad while rejecting those expressions of traditional Islam which conflicted with what they accepted of Western modernity and morality. Sell's 1896 revision of *The Faith of Islam* also contained an extensive addition on the "modern Mu'tazilas."[137] In this his review of the movement was more negative and, while repeating the same

quotes from those modernist writers, emphasized that they were not generally accepted by the *'ulamā'* or by general opinion. He also mentioned in the Preface to this edition that the conclusions he made in the first edition "have not been controverted by any competent Muslim authority, except on the questions of the finality of the Muhammadan Law and of the present use of Ijtihad, on which subjects the late Maulvi Cherāgh 'Alī differs from me"[138] He dealt extensively with the latter's *Critical Exposition of the Law of Jihād* in an appendix.[139] In this, Sell demonstrated a greater willingness than Muir and other Orientalists to listen to the responses of educated Muslims to their writings, and to incorporate their scholarship in his own and interact with the conclusions they reached.

Ahl-i-Ḥadīth

Both Hughes and Sell made the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth movement, which they commonly referred to as the "Wahhābī" movement, a special focus of their study. In his 1878 article in the *Christian Missionary Intelligencer*, Hughes traced the history of the reform movement in Arabia and also in India as led by Sayyid Aḥmad (1786-1831) of Rae Bareli in Oudh.[140] He disagreed with W. W. Hunter's (1840-1900) assessment of their political threat to the British in India, seeing their continuing influence in the subcontinent as more in the area of Muslim religious thought than in that of politics.[141] This reform movement tended to deny "the validity of medieval law schools in favor of the direct use of the textual sources of the faith, the Qur'an and the *hadis*, which were to be interpreted literally and narrowly."[142] One reason why they attracted the attention of the missionaries was that they, with the Deobandis, were in the forefront of those who debated with both reformist Hindus and Christian missionaries.[143] The political activities of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth found their most prominent expression in military campaigns against the Sikhs in north-western India under Sayyid Aḥmad in the first half of the nineteenth century. The British administration in India had launched a major effort to clean up left-over fighters on the frontier in 1863, followed by trials of suspected leaders in Ambala and Patna from 1864 until 1871.[144] In this context, it was no wonder that British administrative officials such as Hunter would see the presence of this group primarily in terms of a political threat. Aḥmad Khān in his review of Hunter's work

pointed out the fallacy of extrapolating the localized conditions of the Bengal region to include all of India, and further to include all Muslims.[145] He saw the accusations particularly inapplicable to the Pathans in the north-western frontier region. Since this was the context in which Hughes wrote his works, it is understandable that he would share Aḥmad Khān's convictions as to the non-political thrust of the movement. During his brief stay in Egypt, Hughes made a careful search for any influence of "Wahhābīism," but found no evidence for such a religious revival there.[146]

Like Aḥmad Khān, Hughes saw the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth movement in Islam as analogous to that of the Protestants in Christianity.[147] This would have been another major factor in drawing the attention of Protestant missionaries to this movement. Hughes was convinced that the movement represented "the earliest teachings of the Muslim Faith as they came from Muhammad and his immediate successors."[148] As an Evangelical, he would have been attracted by the emphasis on rejecting medieval accretions to faith in favour of recourse to textual sources interpreted quite literally. He would also have appreciated their radical approach to religious practice that emphasized the individual responsibility over a blind following of past religious authorities, and may even have felt some empathy for their general religious and psychological orientation consisting of an "urgent quest for a single standard of religious interpretation and an exclusiveness and sense of embattlement against all others,"[149] and the fact that they were Muslims by conviction, not merely by birth. The major difference that Hughes saw between the Protestant and Ahl-i-Ḥadīth movements was that the former asserted the paramount authority of Scripture over tradition, while the latter asserted the authority of Scripture *with* tradition. [150] This, then, led him to examine the role that tradition, or the Ḥadīth, played in their construction of Islam.

Hughes saw the rise of the study of Ḥadīth in general as a consequence of "Wahhābism,"[151] and strongly disagreed with European writers who saw in the movement an attempt to strip the religion of its traditions and restore it to the simple teaching of the Qur'ān.

> Wahabism is simply a revival of the teaching of the Traditions, to the partial rejection of the third and fourth foundations of faith, namely,

> the Ijma' and Qiyās. The Wahabīs of India never speak of themselves as Wahabīs, but as "*Ahl i Hadīs*," or the People of the Traditions; and it is entirely owing to this revival that so great an impetus has been given to the study of the Hadīs, printed copies of which are published by thousands at Bombay, Lucknow, and Delhi.[152]

He saw tradition occupying a totally different place in Islam from that occupied in Christianity.[153] Duties and dogma within Islam that were held to be divinely instituted most often found their source not in the Qur'ān but in the Ḥadīth.

Sell also attributed the rise of the Arab reformer, Muḥammad Ibn 'Abdul Wahhab (1703-1792) to the latter's conviction that the Qur'ān and the traditions had been neglected in favour of "the sayings of men of lesser note and the jurisprudence of the four great Imāms."[154] While in one sense, the movement sought to cleanse Islam from the traditionalism of later ages, in no sense could it be said that the Wahhābīs rejected Tradition.[155] They accepted as binding not only the Qur'ān, but also the Ḥadīth as recorded on the authority of the Companions. Sell did not see the resulting movement as a progressive return to first principles, but rather as one that bound "the fetters of Islam more tightly."[156] In thus denying the legitimacy of the modernists to transform Islam, Sell and other missionaries like him found in the reformist Ahl-i-Ḥadīth movement a confirmation that Islam could not change to meet the demands of a changing world and was antagonistic to the Western ideals of liberty and free thought.

Discussion of Ḥadīth

Their criticism of European writers led both Hughes and Sell to a discussion on Ḥadīth. Both were critical of writers who presumed the Qur'ān to be the all-embracing code of Islam. Such a position, they felt, ignored the fact that much of what made up Islam was based on the body of traditions that rose subsequent to the writing of the Qur'ān and were viewed as authoritative. Hughes argued that all groups—Shī'i, Sunnī, or Ahl-i-Ḥadīth--received the traditions of the sayings and practices of Muḥammad as obligatory along with the pronouncements that he declared as revealed from Allāh.[157] Sell echoed the view that there was not one sect whose faith and practice was based on the Qur'ān alone. "Its voice is supreme in all that it concerns, but its exegesis, the whole

system of legal jurisprudence and of theological science, is largely founded on the Traditions."[158] In another essay he declared, "Without going so far as saying that every Tradition by itself is to be accepted as an authority in Islam, we distinctly assert that there can be no true conception formed of that system if the Traditions are not studied and taken into account."[159] He was of the opinion that it would be very difficult for someone who had not "lived in long and friendly intercourse" with Muslims to realize how the Ḥadīth were the foundation for so much of their religious life and opinions, thoughts and actions.[160]This conviction regarding the centrality of the Ḥadīth was born out of Sell's experience in discussions with Muslim religious leaders.

> Every missionary to the Muhammadans knows that for one text from the Koran quoted against him in controversy he will get a dozen from the Sunnat. In vain does he say it is tradition, and not the "book." The answer is ever ready, it is to us what your four Gospels are to you--neither more or less.[161]

Here, again, Sell was confronting those who wrote on Islam from a distance, imagining an ideal which did not match with what he had experienced as reality. The comparison of Ḥadīth literature to the Gospels was made repeatedly, as another tool to stress its authority to the European reader. The Muslim would view the Gospels as a record of what Jesus said and did, handed down by his companions, just as the Ḥadīth was a record of what Muḥammad said and did, similarly handed down by his companions. Sell quotes Ibn Khaldūn (1332-1406) as his authority for this comparison.[162] Hughes further compared the authority of the Ḥadīth for the Muslim to that of the Pauline epistles for the orthodox Christian.[163]

Amīr 'Alī was of the similar opinion that although Muslim law was founded essentially on the Qur'ān, its silence on many matters resulted in it being supplemented "by oral precepts delivered from time to time by the Prophet and by a reference to the daily mode of his life as handed down to posterity by his immediate followers."[164] His perspective was that of one involved in legal matters, seeking to determine the relevance of the principles of Muslim law for the Muslim community of his time. However, he tended to reject the authority of the body of accepted traditions as binding, taking a position quite opposed to that of Hughes and Sell. He even saw the Ḥadīth as being a ma-

jor factor in creating the schism between the Sunnis and the Shī'ahs, each group attaching different values to individual traditions depending on the source from which they were received.[165] Belonging to the Shī'ahs himself, Amīr 'Alī saw that sect as approaching the traditions with a more rational and critical perspective, using the precepts of the Qur'ān as the final authority, while he characterized the Sunnis as basing their doctrines on the entirety of the traditions.[166]

Chirāgh 'Alī also upheld the idea that the Qur'ān did not teach a precise system of precepts to regulate the minute details of life or ceremonial worship, but went further than Amīr 'Alī in rejecting the authority of the Ḥadīth to fill in that gap. The purpose of the Qur'ān was merely to reveal certain religious doctrines and general rules of morality.[167] Neither it nor the teachings of Muḥammad were ever intended to restrict spiritual development or free thinking, or to create obstacles in any sphere of life, whether political, social, intellectual, or moral.[168] Chirāgh 'Alī endeavored to show that Islam as taught by the Prophet had an elasticity that enabled it to adapt to changing circumstances, an idea stoutly resisted by Hughes and Sell.[169]

In their objection to the European characterization of Islam as "a simple system of Deism unfettered by numerous dogmas and creeds," Hughes and Sell were reacting to criticism of the missionary movement which was supposedly thus "fettered."[170] In contrast, in their own construction of Islam, it was the multiple layers of tradition that were added to the simple pronouncements of the Qur'ān that became a vast burden now hanging as a "dead weight" upon the religion.[171] Sell blamed this body of tradition along with the authority it had acquired as an infallible and unvarying rule of faith for the "immobility of the Muhammadan world" and its inability to progress according to the European notion of progress.[172] He described how horrified the pious Muslim would be to learn of the "progress" his English friends envisioned him making, since innovation was a crime, a sin, in his eyes.[173] Hughes, in his focus on the Ḥadīth, was also replying to those who questioned the Evangelical rejection of Muḥammad's message partly on the basis of his "private vices." He felt that these critics had a wrong estimation of the place the example of Muḥammad occupied in Islam.[174] Sell also disagreed with those who diminished the importance of the example of the Prophet in an attempt to excuse

what was seen as his jealousy, cruelty to the Jewish tribes, licentiousness, and other weaknesses.[175] As was demonstrated earlier, Hughes eventually came to a more positive assessment of Muḥammad, without a diminished view of the Prophet's authority as an example to the faithful.

The approach of Sell and Hughes to the study of the Ḥadīth differed from that of Muir in its basic intention. Whereas Muir's exploration of the sources of the traditions was to arrive at a historically reliable assessment of the life and character of Muḥammad, Hughes and Sell were closer to Aḥmad Khān in their purpose for looking at the Ḥadīth. They described Islam in its contemporary form and argued that that description was ultimately an expression of Muslims' attempts to follow the example of their Prophet in all details of life.[176] It was in the Ḥadīth that the roots of much of the contemporary expressions of Islam were to be found. It was also a study of these traditions that would assist the missionary or other European wishing to understand how normative Islam should manifest itself.

Chirāgh 'Alī censured the Orientalists for placing such importance on the authority of the Ḥadīth and insisting on refusing Islam any prospect of change. "The European writers like Muir, Osborn,[177] Hughes, and Sell, while describing the Mohammadan traditions, take no notice of the fact that almost all of them are not theoretically and conscientiously binding on the Moslems."[178] He considered the sifting of the traditions done in the third century to have been done too late, and the method of analyzing their authenticity by *isnād* as merely "pseudo-critical," without any sifting on critical, historical, or rational principles nor any examination of subject matter or internal and historical evidence.[179] Such traditions could not be authoritative and thus not binding on Muslims, though jurists continued to insist on using them as the basis for common law. He wrote, "This is tantamount to our acting in accordance with traditions even when our reason and conscience have no obligations to do so."[180] This interaction with authors such as Muir, Hughes, and Sell demonstrates that the Muslims were not only aware of their writings, but actively confronting their ideas with creative arguments that had the effect of transforming Islam in all of India.

Definition

In their preliminary definitions of Ḥadīth, Hughes and Sell both emphasized how foundational the body of tradition was to both dogma and ritual in Islam. A related concern was the degree of inspiration attributed to these writings, since it had a direct bearing on their authority. Hughes summarized the traditions as consisting of 3 types of Sunna--what Muḥammad did, what he said should be practiced, and what was done in his presence.[181] The collections of the traditions were called Ḥadīth and constituted the body of oral law of Muḥammad with an authority that was next only to the Qur'ān.[182] "Tradition in Islam is nothing less than the supposed inspired sayings of the Prophet, recorded and handed down by uninspired writers, and is absolutely necessary to complete the structure of faith."[183]

Sell's definition was very similar: "It is the collection of the sayings of the prophet in answer to inquiries as to the correct ritual to be observed in worship, as to the course of action to be followed in the varied relationships of social and political life. It is too something more, *viz.*, the record of the actions of the prophet."[184] With respect to inspiration, Sell stated that Muslims believed in the divine inspiration of all Muḥammad's words and actions, with the resulting high authority of the Ḥadīth in the religion. In the Qur'ān the very words were God's, while in the Sunna, "the ideas are divine, the outward form human."[185] He supported this idea with a quote from al-Ghazālī (1058-1111) on the necessity of the second part of the *kalima* or creed, emphasizing the authority of the Prophet.[186] He designated the revelation contained in the Qur'ān as "objective," while the Muḥammad's sayings as collected in the Ḥadīth were by "subjective" inspiration, but still true inspiration.[187] In *The Faith of Islam*, Sell gave a more detailed description of the degrees of inspiration.[188] *Waḥy* was considered to be inspiration given directly to the major prophets in the form of words to be written in a book, while *ilhām* was inspiration given to a saint or prophet who delivered a message about God from his own mind. The degree of inspiration applied to the Ḥadīth was a lower form of *waḥy* called *ishārat al-malak*, denoting a sign given by the angel Gabriel, but not words from his mouth. Sell noted that this was denied by some who said that the

Qur'ān alone was inspired by *waḥy*, but stated, "The practical belief is, however, that the Traditions were Wahī inspiration, and thus they come to be as authoritative as the Qurān."[189]

In his definition of the Ḥadīth, Amīr 'Alī focused on the matter of relative authority. For him the Ḥadīth included the words, counsels, and oral laws of Muḥammad along with the record of his actions, works, daily practices and his silence (hence approval) of acts committed by his disciples.[190] But he immediately followed this with the qualification that rules deducted from these sources varied considerably with respect to the degree of authority attached to them, grading them according to how widely they were known and reported in the early centuries.[191]

Origin and Development

According to Hughes and Sell, the prominence of the Ḥadīth and its authority derived fundamentally from the Prophet himself. Traditions stating that Muḥammad himself commanded his followers to follow his example, and those giving the subsequent practice of his Companions to that effect, abounded.[192] Hughes quoted Aḥmad Khān on the belief of every Muslim that the Prophet always acted in conformity with the injunctions of the Qur'ān, and thus became the exemplar that every Muslim must follow.[193] Hughes argued that the example of Muḥammad was for the Muslim what the example of Christ was for the Christian, an idea repeated by Sell.[194] Sell further added that, on the basis of the sinlessness of the Prophet, obedience to him was considered obedience to God.[195] He stated, "It is the belief common to all Musalmāns that the Prophet in all that he did, in all that he said, was supernaturally guided, and that his words and acts are to all time and to all his followers a divine rule of faith and practice."[196] However, both Hughes and Sell failed to include Aḥmad Khān's qualifier that Muslims saw all of the Prophet's words and actions concerning secular matters the same as those of any other virtuous and pious individual, unless they were clearly indicated to be of divine origin.[197] The position adopted by Hughes in his review of Smith's book on the comprehensive authority of the Prophet's example seems similar to that of Muir's, to which Aḥmad Khān was reacting with his insistence on the limitation of that author-

ity. However, in his *Notes* published only a few years later, as well as in his *Dictionary*, Hughes moved closer to Aḥmad Khān's interpretation as he included the concept of secondary revelation, as Aḥmad Khān did, in reference to the authority of the Ḥadīth.[198] Hughes described this type of revelation as similar to that which Christians believed the writers of the Christian Scriptures received, a concept Aḥmad Khān had discussed in his commentary on the Bible.[199]

In tracing the development of the Ḥadīth after the death of the Prophet, both Hughes and Sell tended to follow the analysis of Muir as given in his *Life*. Hughes merely quoted Muir extensively in his *Dictionary*, with a focus on the natural tendency to fabricate stories about a past hero and on the need for broader source material generated by an expanding empire.[200] The major weaknesses of the body of traditions as explained by Hughes were the lack of written testimony by contemporary witnesses and the unreliability of oral transmission. Sell also closely followed Muir in describing the rise of the Sunna based on an authoritative body of traditions.[201] During the Prophet's lifetime, believers could ask him directly on aspects of worship, and his replies would be taken as divine instructions. As the empire grew after his death, new questions arose, leading to the development of Qiyās, or analogical reasoning based on previous revelation to determine correct practice. While the first four "rightly guided Caliphs" lived, people could question them, since they could recall Muḥammad's words and actions. But as time went on, the community came to rely more and more on devout men who had memorized the Qur'ān, the Sunna, and the judgments of the rightly guided Caliphs. Sell saw in this progression a temptation to create spurious sayings of the Prophet to settle disputed matters.[202] He summed up the weaknesses of such as system in the following words: "It is not difficult to see that a system which sought to regulate all departments of life, all developments of men's ideas and energies by, to use Muslim terms, Sunnat and Quias, was one which not only gave every temptation a system could give to the manufacture of tradition, but which would soon become too cumbersome to be of practical use."[203]

Chirāgh 'Alī echoed the position of Muir and the missionaries concerning the origin and development of Ḥadīth. He described the Ḥadīth as a "vast ocean of tradi-

tions," an ocean which soon became chaotic because of the flood that poured in.[204] Although Muḥammad had never commanded his followers to collect his sayings or record his actions, and though the Companions were also adverse to such records, a prolific oral tradition developed nevertheless.[205] He saw the traditions as a mixture of truth and error, with anyone making an appeal to the practice of the prophet to justify his or her behaviour. Unlike Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, he did not hesitate to attribute political motives to those creating spurious accounts. "Every religious, social, and political system was defended, when necessary, to please a Khalif or an Ameer to serve his purpose, by an appeal to some oral tradition."[206] The sifting that did occur was too late and inadequate. On this basis, Chirāgh 'Alī was adamant in his refusal to accept their authority in determining matters of Law for the nineteenth century Muslim community.

Amīr 'Alī added an interesting twist to the rise of Ḥadīth and the influence of sectarian differences in their preservation. All traditional sayings of Muḥammad which appeared to support the claims of 'Alī to the Caliphate were suppressed by his opponents in positions of power.[207] He also questioned those accounts originating from sources such as Abū Hurayra and 'Ā'isha, seeing them tainted with evident traces of jealousy towards the members of the Prophet's family. As a result, all traditions not handed down by 'Alī or his immediate descendants were rejected by the Shī'ahs.[208]

Determining authenticity

In summarizing the history of the growth of the body of traditions, Hughes stated that in spite of severe warnings from Muḥammad, many spurious traditions abounded, as evidenced by the numerous traditions Abū Dā'ūd and Bukhārī rejected from those they had collected. Since the rule of faith in Islam was based on that body of Ḥadīth, it was necessary that a science of evaluating the traditions or *'Ilm-i-Ḥadīth* be developed. In the first edition of his *Notes*, completed during a short trip to England in 1875 after eleven years in India, Hughes had taken the rules and categories for the reception and rejection of traditions directly from Aḥmad Khān's *Essays*. In the 1877 edition, completed after returning to Peshawar with a visit to Egypt[209] on the way, he arranged the material on Ḥadīth according to the description of the various categories of Ḥadīth

and the strength of the chain of transmitters as given in the Arabic treatise, *Nukhba al-Fikr*, by the 15th century Egyptian Ḥadīth scholar and jurist, Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalāni.[210] Hughes recorded that copies of the six authoritative collections along with that of Imām Mālik were printed and available in India, but the most widely read, especially by the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth,[211] was the *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ* a collection of the most reliable traditions translated into Persian by Shaykh 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Muḥaddith Dihlawī (1551-1642) during the reign of Mughal emperor, Akbar (1542-1605), and translated into English by Captain Matthews in 1809.[212] Hughes used this collection extensively in his publications.[213]

Hughes combined the approaches of Muir and Aḥmad Khān in assessing the authenticity of the Ḥadīth. He expressed his confidence that "the compilers of the books of tradition were sincere and honest in their endeavours to produce correct and well authenticated traditions of their Prophet's precepts and practice."[214] But sincerity would not be enough to guarantee accuracy. He quoted Muir with regard to the weakness of oral transmission in not providing the proper check against "the license of error and fabrication."[215] But along with Muir's objections to the system of Ḥadīth criticism, Hughes also took note of Aḥmad Khān's response to Muir in his *Essays*. In his *Dictionary*, Hughes quoted Aḥmad Khān's essays extensively with regard to the various styles of transmission, degree of authenticity, causes of diverse accounts, and apocryphal Ḥadīth.[216] However, he left out Aḥmad Khān's criticism of Christian writers ignorant of these rules regulating the study of Ḥadīth, which directly followed that section.[217] Perhaps he felt he was meeting this objection through his own thorough study. In his earlier *Notes*, he had detected a tension within Aḥmad Khān's writings between his earlier education in the traditional approach to Ḥadīth and his new modernist ideas. When he noted that Aḥmad Khān confirmed Muir's critical assessment of the reliability of the Ḥadīth, and that he considered only the Qur'ān and a few--not more than five--traditions were accepted as fully reliable and authoritative in faith and practice, Hughes wrote of him, "The learned Sayyid is in this, as in almost everything he writes on the subject of religion, his own refutation."[218] The factor leading Hughes to study the traditions was not the necessity of gaining an accurate account of the life of Muḥammad as it was for Muir. Rather, he felt that it was significant that though "shrouded with a degree of un-

certainty," this body of traditions still occupied a central place in the theological structure of Islam.[219] In this perspective of the value or importance of Ḥadīth, his approach reflected that of Aḥmad Khān more than that of Muir.

The standards used for determining authentic Ḥadīth according to Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī are similar to those of Aḥmad Khān, but not as detailed. They, too, insisted that any tradition which conflicted with positive directions in the Qur'ān were to be considered apocryphal.[220] Chirāgh 'Alī generally did not appeal to the Ḥadīth as a reliable historical record, preferring to follow the record of the Qur'ān. He wrote, "I am seldom inclined to quote traditions, having little or no belief in their genuineness, as generally they are unauthentic, unsupported, and one-sided."[221] However, they acknowledged there were tests to be applied to traditions to determine the degree of their authenticity. Amīr 'Alī noted that the Mu'tazilis, of which he claimed to be a modern member, had eliminated "such alleged sayings of the Prophet as appeared incompatible and out of harmony with his developed teachings as explained and illustrated by the philosophers and jurists of his race."[222] He recognized that the Sunnis tended to follow the rules of *isnād*.[223] Chirāgh 'Alī similarly tended to combine traditional tests based on the technicalities of the list of transmitters with scientific and rational criticism of the content.[224]

Authorized collections and schools of fiqh

In discussing the authoritative collections of Ḥadīth for the Sunnis, Hughes followed Aḥmad Khān in giving special attention to Imām Mālik. Aḥmad Khān had included the early jurist as a seventh major collector after the standard six, Bukhārī, Muslim, Tirmizī, Abū Da'ūd, Nasā'ī, and Ibn Mājah.[225] This reflects the tendency initiated by Shāh Walī Allāh to elevate Imām Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'* above all other collections of traditions and to place it along side the canonical collections in the highest category of reliability.[226] Hughes, while not including him with the six, stated that Imām Mālik's work was still held in great esteem and believed by many to be the source from which the others derived most of their material.[227] In his *Dictionary*, he focused on the beliefs and practices of the Sunnis primarily, with indications where the Shī'ah or Ahl-i-Ḥadīth might differ.[228] This focus was in contrast with the writings of earlier evangelical mis-

sionaries such as C. G. Pfander who drew more from Shī'i sources.[229] The matter of authoritative collections of Ḥadīth was certainly one such disagreement, and Hughes mentioned the five differing collections accepted by the Shī'ah, seeking to refute the idea of some European authors that this sect rejected tradition altogether.[230]

Hughes again quoted Aḥmad Khān who saw that literature as most in need of emendation when he evaluated *siyār* or biographical literature.[231] Hughes, however, proceeded to provide a list of both traditional and popular biographies of the Prophet. Earlier in his *Notes* he had indicated that the only "Life of Muḥammad" in the English language which he considered of any pretension to original research was that of Muir, once again demonstrating his synthesizing of selected aspects of Muir's works with those of Aḥmad Khān .[232] Amīr 'Alī also addressed the matter of the use of early biographies as historical sources, in *A Critical Examination.* Like Aḥmad Khān, he considered the writings of al-Wāqidī and his Kātib, on which Muir's *Life* was in large measure based, as "regarded in the Mohammedan world as the least trustworthy and most careless biographers of Mohammad."[233] To support his contention, he quoted Ibn Khallikān (1211-1282) concerning the feeble authority of al-Wāqidī's traditions and the doubts as to his veracity. Amīr 'Alī also disagreed with Muir's negative evaluations of Ibn Hishām (d. 834), and stated in his preface that his own research would be based on the writings of Ibn Hishām and Ibn al-Athīr (1160-1233), the former whom he considered to occupy "the position of the most careful and trustworthy biographer of the Prophet."[234]

Sell's account of the Ḥadīth was a summary of the orthodox Sunni position, with a Ḥanafī bias, based as it was on the *Sharḥ-i-Wiqāya,*[235] and did not differ greatly from that given by Aḥmad Khān in his *Essays.*[236] He stated that the unwillingness to commit the sayings of Muḥammad to writing from the beginning was a consequence of the Prophet's own command. Another of his commands regarding careful transmission of his words resulted in the formation of rules insisting on the recitation of the chain of transmitters or *isnād* of the traditions to prevent the rise of spurious ones. Here Sell quoted the tradition word for word from the English rendering in Aḥmad Khān's work.[237] However, false traditions continued to circulate, necessitating the rise of Ḥadīth scholars to collect and sift the false from the true. Sell proceeded to list the six

major collections, giving brief biographical accounts of their compilers' lives emphasizing the enormous number of traditions they dealt with as well as their piety qualifying them to make decisions on authenticity. His list did not differ from that given by Hughes, and like Hughes, only briefly mentioned the alternate authorities accepted by the Shī'ah, indicating that they flourished much later.[238] His emphasis was that no group of Muslims accepted the Qur'ān alone as their authority, even if there were differing opinions on which traditions were authoritative. "There is by no means an absolute consensus of opinion among the Sunnīs as to the exact value of each Tradition, yet all admit that a 'genuine Tradition' must be obeyed."[239] Sell followed a standard classification of the traditions based on the strength of the *isnād*, glossing over the finer details and subdivisions of class. He ended his account with a statement we have seen forming such a foundational principle for both Muir and Aḥmad Khān, "It is the universally accepted rule, that no authentic Tradition can be contrary to the Qurān."[240]

Sell wrote less than did Muir and Hughes on the categories of authentic Ḥadīth, focusing rather on schools of jurisprudence that developed, again in keeping with his emphasis on Islam "as it is." He discussed the four major Sunni schools in light of their approach to the Ḥadīth. The Ḥanafī school, which he described as most widely spread and which was dominant in most of India at the time, was founded by Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 767) who admitted very few traditions as authoritative in his system.[241] Mālik Ibn Anās, who delighted in collecting traditions, developed the Māliki school, a system which was much more historical and more directly based on traditions. Imām al-Shāfi'ī (d. 820) and Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 855), in reaction to the Ḥanifites, gave greater weight to tradition as well. Sell attributed the vast collection of tradition that became such an integral part of the religion to these later systems.[242] In characterizing the difference between the schools of *fiqh* with respect to tradition, a maulavi friend of Sell's stated that a Ḥanafī jurist would be satisfied to make a judgment on just one passage in the Qur'ān or Ḥadīth while a Shafi'ī jurist would require many traditions.[243]

In order to maintain his conception of Islam as bound for all time by unchanging traditions without any ability to adapt to changing circumstances, Sell rejected the idea proposed by "apologists for Islam," presumably lawyers such as Amīr 'Alī, that this

process of law formation could be extrapolated so that fresh imāms could arise and deduce new judgments in keeping with the times. He pointed to the *fatwas* or legal decrees issued by the *'ulamā'* in the Ottoman empire as proof of "how firmly a Muslim State is bound in the fetters of an unchangeable law."[244] He felt a rejection of the continued use of *ijtihād* was justified on the basis of his discussions with religious leaders who insisted that no *Mujtahid*, one with authority to exercise *ijtihād*, had arisen since the four Imāms, and that discussions even in new situations must be according to one of the four schools.[245] He disagreed with Amīr 'Alī's reinterpretation of *ijtihād* and considered it historically inaccurate, stating that even if one were to accept some of Amīr 'Alī's revised definitions, that in no way proved that Islam had any capacity for progress.[246] He emphasized that according to the author of the *Sharh-i-Waqāyah*, following one of the four schools of jurisprudence was a necessary extension of the authority of the Qur'ān and the Sunna.[247] Because of the abundance of spurious traditions, the four Imāms were needed, even though there had been no such institutions at the time of the Prophet. He concluded, "In short, the orthodox belief is that the only safe way is to follow the Imāms, and to believe and act according to the dogmas and rule of the Mazhab, to which the particular person belongs."[248]

In his first book, *The Proposed Political, Legal & Social Reforms under Moslem Rule*, Chirāgh 'Alī directly addressed Sell's writings on the rigidity Islam due to the inflexibility within the schools of law. He opposed Sell's statement that no *mujtahid* had arisen after the four Sunni Imāms and that all legal decisions had to be made within the confines of their four schools of *fiqh*. [249] He argued that no such authority had been claimed by or conferred on the Imāms. The authors Sell claimed to have consulted he characterized as those who practiced *taqlīd*, those blindly following "any one of the four doctors or schools of jurisprudence, without having any opinion, insight discretion, or knowledge of their own."[250] Chirāgh 'Alī's rating of the four Imāms was slightly different from that of Sell. He agreed that Abū Ḥanīfa had used few traditions, and that Mālik Ibn Anās and Imām al-Shāfi'ī used more. But Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal came under severe disapproval for discarding the principle of analogical deductions and incorporating 30,000 traditions in his system, most of which were inauthentic fabrications, though some justi-

fication was found in his system as a corrective to other excesses.[251] He concluded that in its historical context, "every system was progressive, incomplete, changeable and undergoing alteration and improvement."[252] Amīr 'Alī's description of the schools was similar, with an interesting comment that Abū Ḥanīfa often quoted the sixth Shī'i Imām as his authority for the traditions he used. He attributed Abū Ḥanīfa's willingness to use analogical reasoning to this influence of the house of the Prophet, namely 'Alī's lineage.[253]

Conclusion

The prominent place of the subject of Ḥadīth in the writings of both Thomas P. Hughes and Edward Sell indicates that they had achieved a greater understanding of its importance in Islamic religious discourse in India. A strong undercurrent in their writings was a reaction to what they perceived to be a superficial conception of Islam expressed in the writings of English Orientalists. They strongly opposed any attempt to present Islam as an idealized form of Deism, with a minimum of dogma and a theology free of tradition. They saw the body of traditions known as the Ḥadīth as composing the essential structure of Islam, and saw in the rise of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth a movement to restore the purity of that traditional structure.

Hughes and Sell approached Islam and the subject of Ḥadīth from a world-view fundamentally shaped by their Evangelical ideology and their missionary profession. They saw the ultimate religious truth residing only in Christianity and believed in the primary importance in spreading that truth to all people. Consequently, they criticized alike the British government for trying to restrict missionary movement and the modernist movements in India that introduced rationalism and skepticism which questioned the supernatural element in religion. Their view of Islam, at least initially, was that of a lifeless religious tradition bound by fetters of tradition, unable to change because that tradition composed the essence of the religion.

Their discussion of the Ḥadīth differed from that by Sir William Muir in that the questions they were asking were quite different. While Muir sought to determine the authenticity of traditional stories in order to construct what he saw as an historically

accurate biography of the Prophet, Hughes and Sell sought to describe Islam "as it is." They were more concerned with current expressions of Muslim religiosity and with understanding the foundations of Islamic institutions such as its forms of worship and its legal code. These concerns led them to seek to understand the historical development of the Ḥadīth and its relevance to diverse religious groups and movements in India and the broader Muslim world.

Hughes and Sell seem to have been more open to the influence of their interaction with Indian Muslims. Due to their own limited training in Orientalist studies, they had much to learn and applied themselves to learning both from local religious leaders and from classical and contemporary writings. Thus they continually compared and contrasted the teachings of newer movements with those of the "orthodox." They felt free to adopt the ideas concerning Ḥadīth they found in Aḥmad Khān's *Essays*, while at the same time rejecting some of his modernist trends as a complete departure from traditional Islam. The compounded effect of his writings with those of Amīr 'Alī and of Chirāgh 'Alī, however, was that both Hughes and Sell seemed to modify their views, and began to acknowledge some of the positive aspects of Islam.

Notes

[1] Thomas P. Hughes. *A Dictionary of Islam : Being a Cyclopaedia of the Doctrines, Rites, Ceremonies, and Customs, Together With the Technical and Theological Terms, of the Muhammadan Religion.* Columbia, MO: South Asia Books, 1996. Kazi Publications, Chicago, brought out an edition in 1995.

[2] Edward Sell. *The Faith of Islam.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1880. The same publishers printed a revised edition in 1896. The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, London, published another revised and enlarged edition in 1906.

[3] Because of the almost complete lack of any other secondary sources on these two men and their writings, this discussion is given in some detail.

[4] The following record has been taken from the records of the C. M. C. archives in London, England, as well as from the article on "Hughes, Thomas Patrick" in *Who Was Who in America: A Companion Volume to Who's Who in America*, vol. 1, 1897-1942. Chicago: The A. N. Marquis Company, 1943, p. 603; from *Crockford's Clerical Directory.* 26th issue. London: Oxford University Press, 1894, and the 42nd issue, 1910; and from the note to Hughes's article, "Missions to Muslims." *The Andover Review: A Religious and Theological Monthly*, 9, 49 (Jan. 1888), p. 1. Two brief obituaries for Edward Sell are: Murray T. Titus. "Current Topics: Canon Edward Sell." *The Moslem World*, 22 (1932), pp. 297-298; Samuel M. Zwemer. "Obituary Notices: The Reverend Canon Sell, D. D." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, (1932), pp. 730-731.

[5] "Ordination of Missionaries." *CMI*, 15 (Sept., 1864), n. p.

[6] Alison Hodge. "The Training of Missionaries for Africa: The Church Missionary Society's Training College at Islington, 1900-1915." *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 4, 2 (1971), pp. 82, 84.

[7] See Introduction, note 6.

[8] For the official history of C. M. S. in the nineteenth century, see Eugene Stock. *The History of the Church Missionary Society*, 3 vols. London, Church Missionary Society, 1899. Stock added a fourth volume in 1916 to update the information.

[9] Robert Needham Cust in his review of Hughes' *Dictionary*, however, questioned the breadth of his linguistic ability. He doubted whether Hughes had any knowledge of Arabic "beyond spelling out the Koran," and of any of the European languages because he didn't quote any of the French, German, or other Continental Orientalists. Cust fails to recognize that Hughes was deliberately attempting to avoid reliance on Western authors in his work. Robert Needham Cust. "Islam." *Notes on Missionary Subjects. Part II, Essays on the Great Problems outside the Orbit of Pure Evangelistic Work, but which the Missionary has to Face.* London: Elliot Stock, 1888, p. 54.

[10] An informal survey of the collections of several libraries shows at least 28 titles on Islam covering historical, sectarian, and general theological issues, plus books on Urdu and Persian grammar. One of his latest books lists 30 titles on Christian themes, dealing primarily with studies of the Old Testament, all published after 1922. All but one of his books on Islam were published prior to this time. A number of these studies were less than 100 pages in length. See Edward Sell. *The Exile.* Madras: Christian Literature Society for India, 1931.

[11] C. E. Buckland. *Dictionary of Indian Biography.* London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. Lim., 1906, p. 382.

[12] Andrew Walls. *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996, pp. 193-195. Regarding the state of Evangelical missionary education in Britain in the 1860's to the 1880's see: Andrew Porter. "Cambridge, Keswick, and

late Nineteenth-Century Attitudes to Africa." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 5, 1 (Oct., 1976), pp. 9-13.

[13] T. P. Hughes. "An Indian Missionary on Muhammad and Muhammadanism." *CMI*, new series, 10 (1874), pp. 330-340. The book he was reviewing was, R. Bosworth Smith. *Mohammad and Mohammedanism: Lectures delivered at the Royal Institutions of Great Britain in February and March, 1874.* New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1875.

[14] Thomas P. Hughes, *Notes on Muhammadanism, being Outlines of the Religious System of Islam.* rev. ed. London: Wm. H. Allen & Co., 1877. p. ix.

[15] Edward Sell. "The Church of Islam." *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, (*BFER*) 27, 104 (Apr. 1878) pp. 327-341. Idem. "The Sects of Islam." *BFER*, 28, 109 (Jul. 1879), pp. 583-600. Idem. "Muhammadan Exegesis of the Qurān and the Traditions." *BFER*, 28, 110 (Oct. 1879), pp. 735-763. Idem. "The Faith of Islam," *BFER*, 29, 114 (Oct. 1880), pp. 763-787. Idem. "The Faith of Islam," *BFER*, 30, 115 (Jan. 1881), pp. 165-190.

[16] Anjuman Taraqqī-yi Urdu Pakistan. *Qāmūs al-kutub Urdu*, vol. 1. Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqī-i-Urdu Pakistan, 1961, item 1555.

[17] Hughes. *Dictionary*, p. v.

[18] Amīr 'Alī. *Memoirs*, p. 16. He is not to be confused with his contemporary, Karāmat 'Alī (d. 1873), also of Jawnpur, who studied under 'Abdul 'Azīz and was a disciple of Sayyid Aḥmad of Brēlwī of the Mujāhidīn movement. See Daniel Brown. "Islamic Modernism in South Asia: A Reassessment." *The Muslim World*. 87, 3-4 (Jul.-Oct., 1997), p. 259; A. Yusuf Ali. "Karāmat 'Alī" EI^2, p. 626.

[19] Shan Muhammad. *The Right Hounourable Syed Ameer Ali: Personality and Achievements.* New Delhi: Uppal Publishing House, 1991, pp. 10-11.

[20] Amīr 'Alī. *Memoirs and Other Writings of Syed Ameer Ali.* Ed. Syed Razi Wasti. Lahore: People's Publishing House, 1968, p. 32-33.

[21] K. K. Azīz. *Ameer Ali: His Life and Work.* Lahore: Publishers United Ltd., 1968, p. 10. See Amīr 'Alī. *The Personal Law of the Mahommedans.* London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1880.

[22] Shan Muhammad. *The Right Honourable Syed Ameer Ahmad*, pp. 15, 60-61.

[23] Ibid., pp. 16-27.

[24] Azīz. *Ameer Ali*, pp. 10-11. His 1884 lectures were published, and in subsequent revisions became the first volume of his *Mahommedan Law*, while the previous book on the *Personal Law of the Mahommedans* became the second volume.

[25] Shan Muhammad. *The Right Honourable Syed Ameer Ali*, pp. 29-47.

[26] Sayyid Amīr 'Alī. *A Short History of the Saracens: Being a Concise Account of the Rise and Decline of the Saracenic Power and of the Economic, Social and Intellectual Development of the Arab Nation from the Earliest Times to the Destruction of Bagdad and the Expulsion of the Moors from Spain.* London : Macmillan, 1899, [originally published in 1889].

[27] Muhammad Aslam Syed. *Muslim Response to the West: Muslim Hitoriography in India, 1857-1914.* Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research, 1988, p. 65.

[28] Sayyid Amīr 'Ali. *The Personal Law of the Mahommedans.* London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1880, p. xi. The Mu'tazilis initiated a philosophical/theological movement in the 8th/9th century A. D. in response to what they saw as rigid, unquestioning adherence to a literal reading of the Qur'ān and of the Sunna. One of their distinctive emphases was the justice of God and the free will of humans.

[29] Ibid., p. xi. For a brief history and description of the Akhbārīs, see Moojan Momen. *An Introduction to Shi'i Islam: The History and Doctrines of Twelver Shi'ism.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, pp. 117-118, 222. "In essence, the Akhbārī movement was a rejection of the rationalist priniciple on which *ijtihād* and the whole of Shi'i jurisprudence had come to be based. Some Ak-

hbārīs went further and also rejected the Mu'tazilī (i.e. rationalistic) basis of Shi'i doctrine also. In practice this meant a move towards the Sunni principles of jurisprudence (with the Imams taking over the position of the founders of the Sunni schools of law) and an almost-Ash'arī (i.e. Sunni) position in theology." Momen, p. 222.

[30] Martin Forward. "Syed Ameer Ali: A Bridge Builder." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations.* 6, 1 (1995), pp. 45-62.

[31] Amīr 'Alī. *Memoirs*, p. 33.

[32] Amīr 'Alī. *A Critical Examination*, p. 59, 214, 226, 239-240; for views on al-Wāqidī, see p. vii.

[33] Wahidur-Rahman. "The Religious Thought," p. 4.

[34] Ibid., p. 57.

[35] Ibid., p. 59.

[36] Ibid., p. 60.

[37] See pp. 19-20 of this thesis.

[38] Wahidur-Rahman. "The Religious Thought," pp. 147-148.

[39] Ibid., pp. 153-155.

[40] Aziz Ahmad. *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan 1857-1964.* London: Oxford University Press, 1967, pp. 57-61.

[41] Amīr 'Alī. *A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed.* London: Williams and Norgate, 1873, p. vi.

[42] Ibid., p. vii.

[43] "Book Notices: *A Critical Examination of Life and Teachings of Mohammad*, by Syed Ameer Ali, Moulvi, M. A., LLB." *The Indian Evangelical Review: A Quarterly Journal of Missionary Thought and Effort* (*IER*), 1, 2 (1873) p. 249.

[44] Ibid. See Amīr 'Alī. *A Critical Examination*, p. viii.

[45] Ibid., pp. 249-250.

[46] Stanley E. Brush. "Presbyterians and Islam in India." *Journal of Presbyterian History*, 62, 3 (Fall, 1984), p. 215.

[47] Bennett. *Victorian Images.* p. 13.

[48] Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[49] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 331. John Davenport. *An Apology for Mohammad and the Koran.* London: J. Davy, 1869.

[50] Bennett. *Victorian Images*, p. 14.

[51] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 331.

[52] Ibid., p. 331. 'Imād ud-Dīn and Ṣafdar 'Alī were both converts from Islam, and had originally participated in the 1857 debates; see Avril Powell. "Artful Apostasy? A Mughal Mansabdar among the Jesuits." *Society and Ideology: Essays in South Asian History, presented to Professor K. A. Balihatchet*, ed. by Peter Robb. SOAS Studies on South Asia. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. 92-94. [72-96] Ram Chandar was a convert from Hinduism and had had contact with Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān in the 1850's, as described in chapter one, and had continued to be and effective apologist and leader in the Christian church in the Punjab. The fact that Hughes identified himself more strongly with these Indian Evangelicals than with his own countrymen illustrates that the Orientalism of the missionaries tended to have a strong religious rather than racial, ethnic, or cultural basis for its constituting the "Other." This was clearly spelled out in his insistence that it was Islam, not racial characteristics of the Oriental or other "accidental circum-

stances" that caused the resistance of Muslim society to both Christianity and "the progress of civilization." Hughes. *Notes*, p. xii.

[53] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, pp. 332, 335, 339.

[54] Hughes. *Notes*. p. x. Also in Hughes. "An Indian Missionary," pp. 339-340.

[55] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 340.

[56] Ibid.,p. 330.

[57] Ibid., p. 331.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid., p. 340. Hughes's criticism does reveal a major weakness in Smith's work. In listing his sources, Smith did mention Aḥmad Khān's *Essays* and Amīr 'Alī's *A Critical Examination*, but stated that he had not heard of these two books when he wrote the substance of his lectures in 1872, and in enlarging his work, he "purposely abstained from consulting them" since he had heard that they advocated from the Muslim point of view what he was seeking to advocate from the Christian stand-point. He felt his work would have greater impact if similar conclusions were reached independently, thus opening himself up to the charge of a lack of "original Oriental research." Smith. *Mohammad*, pp. xvi-xvii.

[60] Sell. *Faith of Islam*, 1880 ed., p. x. See also Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, pp. 33, 34.

[61] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 338.

[62] Hughes. *Dictionary*, p. vi.

[63] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 337.

[64] Thomas P. Hughes. "A Week in Egypt." *CMI*, 1, second new series (1876) pp. 216-218.

[65] Hughes. *Dictionary*, pp. vi, 387, 643-646.

[66] Said. *Orientalism*, p. 67.

[67] Norman Daniel. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Oneworld Publications Ltd., 1993. Jamal Muhammad Buaben. *Image of the Prophet Muḥammad in the West: A Study of Muir, Margoliouth and Watt*. London: The Islamic Foundation, 1996.

[68] Daniel. *Islam and the West*, pp. 326-327.

[69] Hughes. *Notes*. p. ix.

[70] Ibid., p. ix.

[71] Hughes, "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 331.

[72] In Hughes opinion, such a perspective, the product of the European enlightenment, was not appropriate for the Muslim context, since neutrality or even moderation was unknown to Islam, and doubt or even discussion as to what is truth was not allowed. This harsh assessment echoed Muir's repeated characterization of Islam as intolerant, but that was not the focus of Hughes' argument. Ibid., pp. 331-332.

[73] Ibid., p. 332.

[74] Ibid., p. 331.

[75] Hughes. *Notes*, p. 4-9.

[76] Hughes. *Dictionary*, pp. 398-399.

[77] Thomas P. Hughes. "The Muslim's Faith." *The Andover Review* (*AR*), 10, 55 (July, 1888), p. 28.

[78] Thomas P. Hughes. "Missions to Muslims." *AR*, 9, 49 (Jan. 1888), p. 10.

[79] Hughes. "Missions to Muslims." *AR*, pp. 10-11.

[80] Ibid., p. 11. Hughes had also mentioned this example earlier in his *Notes*, p. 84, footnote. His argument follows that of Aḥmad Khān in his commentary on the Bible, *The Mohommedan Commentary on the Holy Bible*. Ghazeepore: by the author, 1862, p. 268.

[81] Hughes. *Notes*, p. 3.

[82] Hughes. "The Muslim's Faith." *AR*, p. 34.

[83] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 333.

[84] Hughes. " Missions to Muslims." *AR*, p. 11.

[85] Ibid., p. 12. His perception of Islam with reference to the matters of polygamy, divorce and slavery is also much more favourable. Hughes. "The Muslim's Faith." *AR*, p. 35, cf. "An Indian Muslim." *CMI*, pp. 337-338.

[86] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, pp. 338-339.

[87] Hughes. "The Muslim's Faith." *AR*, p. 32.

[88] Ibid., p. 35. Previously he spoke only of "false systems" and a "false creed." Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 339.

[89] Hughes. "Missions to Muslims." *AR*, p. 12. Also, Thomas P. Hughes. "The Muslim's Bible." *AR*, 9, 53 (May, 1888), p. 474.

[90] [Thomas P. Hughes]. *Ruhainah: A Story of Afghan Life*. New York: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1886, pp. 91-92.

[91] Ibid., pp. 112-114, 266.

[92] Hughes. "The Muslim's Faith." *AR*, p. 36.

[93] Thomas Patrick Hughes. "Has Islam a Future?" *The Arena*, 35 (Oct., 1892), p. 533.

[94] Ibid., pp. 534-535.

[95] Ibid., pp. 535-536.

[96] Thomas Patrick Hughes. "The Afghans." *Report of the General Missionary Conference held at Allahabad, 1872-1873.* London: Seely, Jackson, and Halliday, 1873, pp. 79.

[97] Thomas Patrick Hughes. "The Afghans." *IER*, v. 1, n. 3(1873) p. 332.

[98] Thomas Patrick Hughes. "The Shiahposh Kafirs." *IER*, v. 1, n. 1(1873) pp. 93-94.

[99] This did not mean that he did not have a strong personal opinions on the political situation in the Afghan region. These are expressed, along with the details of his involvement in an attempt at some resolution in his "Lord Salisbury's Afghan Policy." *The Arena*, 36, (Nov., 1892), pp. 645-652.

[100] Hughes. "The Afghans." *IER*, p. 331.

[101] Hughes. "The Shiaposh Kafirs." *IER*, p. 94.

[102] Ibid., pp. 94-95.

[103] Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, p. 335.

[104] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, 1880 ed., p. ix.

[105] Hughes. "A Week in Egypt," with following editorial note. *CMI*, p. 224.

[106] Hughes. *Notes*, p. ix.

[107] Hughes. *Dictionary*, p. viii. Cust, in his review of the book, considered it of but limited value because of Hughes' limited knowledge and experience of Islam beyond his contact with the Afghans of Peshawar. See Cust. "Islam," p. 53.

[108] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 333. Hughes. *Notes*, p. 52 footnote.

[109] Hughes. *Notes*, p. 145.

[110] Ibid., p. 272.

[111] Sell. *Faith of Islam*, 1880 ed., p.147; also Edward Sell. "The Faith of Islam," *BFER*, 30, 115 (Jan. 1881), p. 166. See Aḥmad Khān. *The Mohommedan Commentary on the Holy Bible*, p. 268.

[112] Sell. *Faith of Islam*, 1880 ed., p. 147, footnote.

[113] Sell. *Faith of Islam*, 1896 ed., p. 207.

[114] Sell. *Faith of Islam*, 1880 ed., pp. 148-149.

[115] Amīr 'Ali, Sayyid. *A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed.* London: Williams and Norgate, 1873.

[116] Hughes. *Notes*, pp. 194-195.

[117] Ibid., pp. 272-273.

[118] Charles Vosey (1828-1912), an Anglican parish priest in England was found guilty by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of having denied specific doctrines—inspiration of the Scriptures, salvation, Christ's atonement and His divinity, and the doctrine of the Trinity. See M. A. Crowther. *Church Embattled: Religious Controversy in Mid-Victorian England.* Newton Abbot, Devon: David & Charles (Publishers) Ltd., 1970, pp. 127-137.

[119] Ibid., p. 173.

[120] Hughes. "Missions to Muslims." *A. R*, pp. 12-13. Also in his "The Muslim's Faith." *A. R*, p. 34.

[121] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 340, quoting from Muir. *Life*, v. iv, p. 321.

[122] Hughes. "Missions to Muslims." *AR*, p. 13. These points are then expanded in his article, "The Muslim's Faith." *AR*, pp. 23-36.

[123] Hughes. "Missions to Muslims." *AR*, p. 13. He gives the example of the convert Dilāwar Khān in his *The Akhund of Swat: A Muhammadan Saint, and Dilawar Khan: The Converted Afghan Brigand.* Reprinted from the Calcutta Christian Intelligencer, 1876, pp. 23-24.

[124] Thomas P. Hughes. "Opening Paper," *Report of the Second Decennial Missionary Conference held at Calcutta, 1882-1883.* Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1883, p. 240.

[125] Presumably referring to Amīr 'Alī who had published his *A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed* while studying law at the Inner Temple five years previously. See Preface to Amīr 'Alī. *A Critical Examination*, p. x.

[126] Sell. "The Church of Islam," p. 340.

[127] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. 9.

[128] Ibid., p. xi.

[129] Edward Sell. "Muhammadans" and subsequent discussion. *The Missionary Conference: South India and Ceylon, 1879.* Madras: Addison & Co., 1880, pp. 343-344.

[130] Ibid., p. 344.

[131] Ibid., p. 344. In the missionary conference of 1882 in Calcutta, a Rev. M. Goldsmith also commented on the rise of rationalism in Hyderabad, and attributed it in part to the influence of Aḥmad Khān. He characterized them as adopting European dress and neglecting tradition of the orthodox, who termed them "Naturis" (from the English "nature"), a term also applied to Aḥmad Khān by his opponents. See M. Goldsmith. "Work amongst Mahomedans." *Report of the Second Decennial Missionary Conference held at Calcutta, 1882-1883.* Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1883, p. 234.

[132] Edward Sell. "Discussion," following W. W. Hunter. "The Increase and Influence of Islam." *Report of the Centenary Conference on the Protestant Missions of the World held in Exeter Hall (June 9th-19th), London, 1888*, ed. James Johnston. Vol. 1. New York: Fleming H. Revell, [1888], pp. 28-29.

[133] Sell. "Discussion." *Report of the Centenary Conference*, pp. 28-29.

[134] Ibid., p. 29.

[135] Ibid.

[136] Edward Sell. "The New Islam." *The Contemporary Review*, 64 (Aug. 1893), p. 288.

[137] Edward Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, rev. ed. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co., Ltd., 1896, pp. 193-199. Sell's *Studies in Islam* (London: Church Missionary Society, 1928), provides little additional information about the movement, but once again takes a more positive view, especially regarding the application of the principles of Higher Criticism to the study of the Qur'ān. See pp. 258-259.

[138] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, 1896 ed., pp. v-vi.

[139] Ibid., pp. 359-366.

[140] Hughes. "The Wahhabis of Najd and India." *CMI*, 3 second new series (1878) pp. 98-100, 160-165.

[141] Ibid., p. 163. For Hunter's views, see, Sir William Wilson Hunter. *The Indian Musalmans : Are They Bound in Conscience to Rebel against the Queen?* London: Troubner and Company, 1871. Sayyid Aḥmad Khān had written a review of the book which appeared as a series of articles in *The Pioneer* from November 1871to February 1872; see abridged version in Aḥmad Khān. *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, compiled and edited by Shan Mohammad. Bombay: Nachiketa Publications Ltd., 1972, pp. 65-82.

[142] Metcalf. *Islamic Revival in British India*, p. 265.

[143] Ibid., p. 279.

[144] Ibid., pp. 280-281.

[145] Aḥmad Khān. *Writings and Speeches*, pp. 67-70.

[146] Hughes. "A Week in Egypt." *CMI*, p. 221.

[147] Hughes. "The Wahhabis." *CMI*, p. 164. Aḥmad Khān. *Writings and Speeches*, p. 68. See also *The Pioneer*, Apr. 4, 1871, p. 4 and Apr. 5, 1871, p. 5, where Aḥmad Khān again makes the comparison, as well as proclaiming himself "a friend of Wahabeeism" while at the same time a "liberal Mahomedan."

[148] Hughes. *Dictionary*. p. v.

[149] Metcalf. *Islamic Revival*, pp. 269, 295.

[150] Hughes. "The Wahhabis." *CMI*, p. 164.

[151] Hughes. *Dictionary*, p. 643.

[152] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary," p. 337.

[153] Hughes. "The Wahhabis," p. 164; Hughes. *Dictionary*, p. 661.

[154] Edward Sell. "The Sects of Islam." *BFER*, 28, 109 (Jul. 1879), p. 594.

[155] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. 105. See also p. 11.

[156] Ibid., p. 106.

[157] Hughes. *Notes*, pp. vii-viii, 50.

[158] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. 1. See also his paper on "Muhammadans," *The Missionary Conference: South India and Ceylon, 1879*. Madras: Addison & Co., 1880, pp. 336-339.

[159] Edward Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis of the Qurān and the Traditions." *BFER*, 28, 110 (Oct. 1879), p. 757.

[160] Ibid., p.760.

[161] Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, p. 329.

[162] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*. p. 10.

[163] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 337.

[164] Amīr 'Alī. *The Personal Law*, pp. 3-4.

[165] Ibid., p. 4.

[166] Ibid., pp. 9-11.

[167] Chirāgh 'Alī. *The Proposed Political, Legal, and Social Reforms*, p. xiv; Idem. *A Critical Exposition*, pp. xcii-cii.

[168] Chirāgh 'Alī. *The Proposed*, p. xxxv.

[169] Ibid., p. ii.

[170] Hughes. *Notes*. p. vii.

[171] Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, p. 332.

[172] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. 13.

[173] Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, p. 335.

[174] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, pp. 332-333.

[175] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. 13.

[176] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 333.

[177] Robert Durie Osborn (1835-1889) was part of the British military force in India, participating in the suppression of the Revolt of 1857 and in the Afghan war in 1878 before retiring as Lt.-Colonel in 1879. He wrote *Islam under the Arabs* (1876) and *Islam under the Khalifs of Bagdad* (1877) as well as a number of journal articles. See C. E. Buckland. *Dictionary of Indian Biography*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Lim., 1906, pp. 323-324.

[178] Chirāgh 'Alī. *The Proposed*, p. xx.

[179] Ibid., p. xix.

[180] Ibid., p. xx.

[181] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 333.

[182] Hughes. *Notes*, p. 50.

[183] Hughes. "The Wahhabis." *CMI*, p. 164. See also Hughes. *Dictionary*, p. 661.

[184] Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, p. 329. See also Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, p. 757.

[185] Ibid., p. 329.

[186] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. 10.

[187] Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, p. 757.

[188] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. 37-38.

[189] Ibid., p. 38.

[190] Amīr 'Alī. *The Personal Law*, pp. 9-10.

[191] Ibid., p. 10.

[192] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. 13ff. Here Sell cites as his source for some of the traditions: Lane, Edward William. *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, Written in Egypt during the Years 1833, 34, and 35, partly from Notes Made during a Former Visit to that Country in the Years 1825, 26, 27, and 28.* London : M. A. Nattali, 1846, vol. 1, p. 354.

[193] Hughes. "An Indian Missionary." *CMI*, p. 333; quoting Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*. p. 190.

[194] Sell. *Faith of Islam*, p. 16.

[195] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

[196] Ibid., p. 10. Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, p. 329.

[197] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 208.

[198] Hughes. *Notes*, p. 60. Hughes. *Dictionary*, p. 639.

[199] Aḥmad Khān. *Commentary*, pp. 13-14.

[200] Hughes. *Dictionary*, pp. 643-646, from Muir. *Life*, pp. xxviii-xxxvi, xlii.

[201] Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, pp. 330-331.

[202] Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, p. 757.

[203] Ibid., p. 331.

[204] Chirāgh 'Alī. *The Proposed*, p. xviii.

[205] Ibid., pp. xviii, xxi.

[206] Ibid., p. xix.

[207] Amīr 'Alī. *The Personal Law*, pp. 4-5.

[208] Ibid., pp. 10-11. This sentence was omitted from the 1908 edition of this book, where the blame is placed more generally on the Umayyads and the 'Abbāsids.

[209] Hughes. "A Week in Egypt." *CMI*, pp. 215-224.

[210] Shihāb al Dīn Abu al Faḍl Aḥmad Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, (1372-1449), according to EI^2. Hughes gives the author as Shaykh Shahāb-ud-Dīn Ahmad, and indicates that he used a copy edited by Capt. W. Nassau Lees, LL.D. (Calcutta, 1862) in his *Notes*, p. 52, footnote. See also Aftāb Aḥmad Raḥmānī. "The Life and Works of Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī," *Islamic Culture* 47 (Jul. 1973), pp. 266-268. Raḥmānī states, "Though considerably small, the *Nukhba* of Ibn Ḥajar has been through the centuries an extremely popular book on *uṣūl al-ḥadīth*." p. 266.

[211] Hughes. "Wahhabis." *CMI*, p. 163, footnote.

[212] Hughes. *Notes*, p. 57.

[213] Hughes. *Dictionary*, p. 353.

[214] Ibid., pp. 58-59.

[215] Ibid., p. 59.

[216] Hughes. *Dictionary*, pp. 640-642. See Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, pp. 195-203.

[217] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 203.

[218] Hughes. *Notes*, p. 59.

[219] Ibid., p. 60.

[220] Amīr 'Alī. *The Personal Law*, p. 9.

[221] Chirāgh 'Alī. *The Proposed*, p. 147.

[222] Amīr 'Alī. *The Personal Law*, pp. 9-10.

[223] Ibid., p. 10.

[224] Chirāgh 'Alī. *A Critical Exposition*, p. 205.

[225] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*. p. 180.

[226] Daniel W. Brown. *Rethinking Tradition*, p. 128.

[227] Hughes. *Dictionary*, pp. 642-643.

[228] Ibid., p. v.

[229] Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, p. 148.

[230] Ibid., p. 643.

[231] Hughes. *Notes*, p. 162.

[232] Ibid., p. 5.

[233] Amīr 'Alī. *A Critical Examination*, p. vii.

[234] Ibid., p. ix.

[235] Written by 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd al-Maḥbūbī, known as Ṣadr al-Sharī'a al-Thānī (d. 1346) , a Ḥanafī jurist of Bukhāra. See EI^2, v. 3, p. 163b; v. 6, p 848a; v. 8, p. 749a.

[236] Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, p. 762. The subsequent summary is taken from Ibid., pp. 757-763.

[237] Ibid., p. 757, cf. Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 193.

[238] Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, pp. 758-759. These are listed by name in his *Faith of Islam*, p. 16n.

[239] Sell. *Faith of Islam*, p. 16.

[240] Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, p.762.

[241] Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, p. 331. In the 1896 edition of *The Faith of Islam* (London: Paul, 1896), he added that Abū Ḥanīfa selected so few because of the rigorous conditions the traditions and its transmitters had to meet, quoting Ibn Khaldūn as his authority; p. 27.

[242] Ibid., p. 332.

[243] Ibid., pp. 332-333.

[244] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. ix.

[245] Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, p. 334.

[246] Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. 34. The 1896 edition contained no significant revision of this position, except to include that Amīr 'Alī had admitted in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* (1895) that the description as given by Sell of the orthodox position was historically accurate.

[247] Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, pp. 762-763.

[248] Ibid., p. 763.

[249] Chirāgh 'Alī. *The Proposed*, p. vi. He also joined the controversy between Sell and Amīr 'Alī on the matter of *ijtihād*, arguing that though the word was now a technical term, it had not been so in Muḥammad's time. He preferred to emphasize the principle of personal opinion by qualified jurists; see pp. xxxvii-xl. Sell continued the discussion in an appendix to his 1896 edition of *The Faith of Islam*.

[250] Ibid., p. vii.

[251] Ibid., pp. viii-xi.

[252] Ibid., p. xii.

[253] Amīr 'Alī. *The Personal Law*, p. 19.

Conclusion

Summary of the discussion of the Ḥadīth

The perception of the nature and importance of the Ḥadīth by Muslims in India was already undergoing change before the impact of Western ideologies was felt. The reformist movement, led in the eighteenth century by Shāh Wali Ullāh and in the early nineteenth century by his sons and grandsons, had rejected *taqlīd* and found a new dynamic in a fresh evaluation of the Ḥadīth. A call to follow the Sunna of the Prophet as found in the Ḥadīth provided an alternative source of authority to that of the established legal doctrines which were seen as restricting fresh applications. Modernists such as Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān received their early training in this reformist tradition and were strongly influenced by it.

European scholars began a fresh study of the Ḥadīth at this time as a result of a new access to primary source material through the colonialist acquisition of a number of Muslim territories. Motivated by a desire to fit this new information into their theoretical frameworks and to understand the Orient from their scientific and rationalistic world view, they analyzed the historical sources seeking to find in them definitive answers for their questions regarding the origins and present expressions of Islam. Manuscripts were collected from conquered territories or studied in library collections in those territories, and analyzed with the critical methodologies that had recently been applied to the Scriptures of the Jews and Christians. The Ḥadīth figured prominently in Orientalist studies not only as a source for constructing the early history of Islam, but also as an interpretative principle used to explain the rigidity of Islamic institutions of the day. They saw Muslims as bound to their traditions, unable to adapt to change, specifically to modern, Western civilization. The missionaries, who shared the perspectives of the Orientalists to some extent, included a religious element, seeing Islam as a form of spiritual bondage preventing people from seeing the true light of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Again they saw the accumulated weight of centuries of tradition forging a chain of bondage in Islam. The three English authors examined in this thesis, Muir, Hughes, and Sell, were active in writing such critical analyses.

These new analyses of Islam and the Prophet Muḥammad provoked a response from Muslim scholars, particularly from those who were seeking to integrate some aspects of Western philosophy with their Islamic faith in an attempt to revitalize the Muslim community. The three Muslim authors examined in this thesis, Aḥmad Khān, Amīr 'Alī, and Chirāgh 'Alī, answered the critiques from a modernist perspective. They, too, dealt with the subject of Ḥadīth, combining some of the literary criticism of the West with their own reformist tradition. While they were convinced that the historical record confirmed their belief in the superiority of Islam in matters of culture, they increasingly doubted the authority of the majority of Ḥadīth in the practice of Islam, relying more on the Qur'ān as their authoritative standard.

Muir's book, *The Life of Mahomet*, sparked numerous rejoinders. With the new access to Arabic manuscripts of early Muslim biographies of Muḥammad, particularly the one by al-Wāqidī, Muir concluded that the other traditional literature was highly unreliable when examined in their light. His motivation was to establish a solid basis for writing a new, critical biography of Muḥammad, freeing it from the legends that had encrusted the historical account. He attributed the origin of these legends to religious and political biases that sought to glorify that Prophet after his death, or to promote a particular faction to gain political advantage over another. He found the evaluation of traditions by their *isnād* to be woefully inadequate in light of the rigorous methods of historical scholarship practiced in Europe, and suggested a set of alternate criteria which focused more on content than on transmission of the Ḥadīth, being one of the first Europeans to prepare such detailed guidelines. His other major sources were two Orientalists, Gustav Weil and Aloys Sprenger, who were also utilizing these newly available biographical accounts and applying the European methods of historical criticism to Ḥadīth. Muir's analysis of the collection of the Ḥadīth and of the traditional methods of determining its authenticity was contained in the first chapter of his *Life*.

Aḥmad Khān found Muir's portrayal of Islam and of Muḥammad to be offensive, and feared the effect it might have on the new generation of Muslims that was being trained in the Western system of education. He opposed Muir's characterization of the collectors of Ḥadīth as being motivated by a desire to please their political masters.

Although he did not defend the record of the miracles of the Prophet, he argued for an equitable standard that would not ridicule the same aspects in the life of Muḥammad that were revered in the lives of other prophets such as Moses and Jesus. Aḥmad Khān also accused European writers of ignorance regarding the traditional method of evaluating the Ḥadīth by *isnād*, maintaining that if the tests were properly understood and applied, many errors in their assessment of the life of Muḥammad would have been avoided. By this standard, he rejected the biography written by al-Wāqidī and endorsed the canons of traditions as collected by the six accepted *muḥaddithūn* as more reliable. He opposed Muir's position that Muslims believed every action and teaching of Muḥammad to be sacred and binding in terms of religious practice. In later writings he went even further to argue that very few of the traditions had the necessary authenticity to be considered as authoritative for doctrine and jurisprudence.

Amīr 'Alī's contribution to the debate during this period consisted of his biography of the Prophet and his introduction to Islamic law. Like Aḥmad Khān, he took strong exception to the portrayal of Muḥammad in Muir's *Life of Mahomet*. He moved beyond a defense of Islam to attack the history of Christianity in which he found evidence for the same faults and weaknesses Muir had found in the history of Islam. He did not deal extensively with the matter of the Ḥadīth as a valid historical source or with the methodology of determining the authenticity of individual accounts. Where he did refer to these subjects, he tended to follow the pattern set by Aḥmad Khān in rejecting the accounts of al-Wāqidī as invalid and pointing out the inconsistency of Muir's practice of denying the miracles of Muḥammad while accepting those of Jesus Christ. He considered the traditional method of evaluating the Ḥadīth as developed by past Muslim scholars to have been their unique contribution to historiography. With his background in law, Amīr 'Alī was deeply concerned with the legal implications of the traditions, and argued against the limiting of *ijtihād* to the first few centuries of Islam. He considered the re-evaluation of the Muslim law to be an continuing process, making Islam adaptable to any age or cultural context. He considered himself to be an intellectual heir of the Mu'tazili position, arguing for a theology based on rationalism that included evaluating the content of the Ḥadīth from a rational basis.

A major motivation for Hughes and Sell to enter the discussion regarding the Ḥadīth was their objection to the writings on Islam by other Europeans who tended to ignore the vast body of traditions underlying Muslim faith and practice, and to portray Islam as limited to the teachings of the Qur'ān. Both Hughes and Sell insisted that Islam as it appeared in India in their day was based more on the Ḥadīth than on merely the Qur'ān. In this they disagreed with the positions of Aḥmad Khān and Amīr 'Alī who expressed decreasing confidence in the Ḥadīth in their writings. Unlike Muir, the purpose of these two missionaries was not to determine the accuracy of the accounts of the life of Muḥammad, but to determine the normative beliefs and practices of Islam and to show how the Muslim community was forever bound within this culturally inferior and spiritually false system. In their view, the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth reflected more accurately "true" Islam than did the rationalists such as Aḥmad Khān and Amīr 'Alī. Sell in particular took a strong stand against the continuance of *ijtihād*, arguing that all legal developments, at least for the Sunnis, were circumscribed within the principles as put forth by the four standard schools of *fiqh*.

Chirāgh 'Alī continued Aḥmad Khān's point-by-point critique of Muir on the matter of *jihād*, as well writing an extended response to Muir, Sell, Hughes and others who considered Islam bound by tradition and unable to change. He did not consider the Ḥadīth as a reliable historical record, nor binding upon the Muslim community for faith and religious practice. He based his refutation of Muir's negative portrayal of Muḥammad on the fact that the traditions used by Muir were unreliable because of their weak *isnāds*, and on an appeal to the Qur'ān as a final arbitrator in all questionable matters. But like Amīr 'Alī, Chirāgh 'Ali also quoted Muir's account on those occasions when it supported his argument.

Conclusions regarding the Christian-Muslim discourse

An analysis of European perceptions of India and Indian religions reveals a multiplicity of "Orientalisms." Because of the overlapping of categories, some of the distinctions are somewhat arbitrary. Colonial administrators such as Muir who professed an Evangelical faith tended to have more in common with their missionary friends than

with their fellow administrators, though in general they displayed a greater concern for the administration of the empire than the missionaries did. Indigenous Christians and converts also viewed other religious systems with the same antipathy as their Evangelical counterparts, but also manifested a concern for the indigenous control of the national church. A growing western-educated elite among the Muslims, meanwhile, tended to echo some of the same criticisms of traditional forms of religions as Evangelical administrators and missionaries, but from a different premise altogether, expressing at the same time a severe criticism of Evangelical assessments of their religious beliefs and practices. Moreover, the interaction of these various groups produced a continuous dialectic that transformed the views of all the participants. With this qualification in mind, several important conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the Christian-Muslim discourse on the Ḥadīth.

Presuppositions evident in the interaction

In examining the writings of Orientalists, Evangelicals, and missionaries or of the Muslim scholars who responded to them, it is seen that each approached the interaction with his own particular biases that shaped his conclusions. While for the most part not acknowledging such bias, all the authors examined in this thesis appealed rather to an ideal of objective research, and judged the opinions of those who disagreed with them by that standard. Muir, Hughes, and Sell found previous Christian scholarship and secular Orientalist scholarship equally lacking in objectivity. They rested their own claim to objectivity on their access to original sources in the Arabic and other Muslim languages unavailable to previous scholars, coupled with their use of the tools of Western critical methodologies, or on their presence in a Muslim context where contact and interaction with believing Muslims was frequent and extensive. Yet they openly professed their belief that Christianity provided the only valid religious experience and that all systems that opposed it were false and doomed to fail. The Evangelicals refused to accept Muḥammad as the Prophet of God with a message superseding that of Christ, and thus rejected the accounts of the miracles of Muḥammad because they considered miracles to be the divine authentication of a messenger from God. As a result, they viewed the body

of Ḥadīth literature as highly suspect because of its numerous stories glorifying the Prophet. Hughes did acknowledge that the accusation could be made that missionaries would be necessarily biased in whatever they wrote on Islam because their work involved the persuasion of people to leave their former religion and adhere to a new one, but he felt that in his case this danger was negated by his direct access to Muslims and regular interaction with them.

Aḥmad Khān, Amīr 'Alī, and Chirāgh 'Ali considered their own work, however, to be free of bias and based on rationality, while at the same time stating explicitly their goal to present a positive picture of Islam. If the Evangelicals were unwilling to accept the finality of Muḥammad's message and its ability to adapt to the contemporary context, the Muslim modernists were likewise unwilling to accept the exclusive nature of the Evangelical message of salvation only in Christ Jesus. Aḥmad Khān, after emerging from a somewhat conservative theological position, promoted positive relationships between Muslims and Christians including the British government in his writings and example. Amīr 'Alī likewise was very positive towards English society, receiving a significant portion of his education there, marrying an English woman, writing his books in that language, and eventually spending his retirement years there. He was attracted by the Unitarian approach to Christianity, and counted many of its exponents as his friends. Yet both men were solidly committed to the religion of Islam, despite accusations of apostasy by their co-religionists in India. While they found the Ḥadīth containing many accounts that were contrary to the standard of reason they had adopted, they were committed to the message of Muḥammad as contained in the Qur'ān and rejected analyses of Islam by Orientalists portraying its history as bound by its law in "primitive" social customs such as slavery, polygamy, and holy war.

Their defense of Islam was passionate and based partly on the traditional system of evaluating the Ḥadīth by its *isnād* and partly on the European critical methodologies that evaluated the content rather than the transmission record. They uniformly rejected the accounts of al-Wāqidī, so loved by the Orientalists, as inferior and unreliable in historical information, and insisted that each traditional account must first of all not violate any clear teaching of the Qur'ān nor accepted standards of reason. In this evalua-

tion, they were similarly influenced by religious bias as were the Evangelicals; they were unable to accept any possibility that Islam could not become as "progressive" as European civilizations, or even that the message of Muḥammad if correctly interpreted could possibly have tolerated the social evils detailed by the Orientalists. Taking the offensive, they argued that basic Christian doctrines such as the Trinity were illogical. Attacks on the historical character of Islam were countered with equally negative examples from Christian history. They quickly pointed out that the scholarship of the Evangelicals was warped by a prejudiced view of Islam and of Muḥammad, and that the Christians inconsistently applied critical tools to the study of Islam which they did not apply to their own religion. In this manner, each side seemed quick to recognize bias in the writings of the other, but not in its own work. A willingness to admit his own bias and an effort to adapt his critical methodology accordingly would have strengthened the argument of each scholar. Their appeals to objectivity coexisting with clear statements about their commitments either to Islam or against it caused other scholars to question their research.

Evangelical Distinctives

In examining the writings of Evangelicals on Islam in this thesis, the aspects in which they departed from the standard Orientalist perspective, have been emphasized. In contrast to Inden's depiction of the Orientalist's self-understanding, Evangelicals did not see Western Man as the perfect embodiment of what mankind should be.[1] Their division of humanity was not between the European and the Oriental, but on a completely different basis--that between the "lost" and the "saved." "The most important polarity was not to be found in race or culture, but in the individual's morality and relationship with God."[2] On this basis then, they would equally criticize the excesses of both British colonial administrators who did not share their Evangelical commitment as well as those of the non-Christian peoples around them, calling both groups to repentance and faith in Christ. That this approach was an extension of evangelistic efforts at home was seen in that descriptions of the plight of the lost in Britain were almost as harrowing as the descriptions of the condition of the Oriental 'heathen.'[3] Thus Muir's efforts in assisting

Christian endeavors were not so much to bring the light of civilization as to bring the light of the Gospel. Hughes approached his research with a conviction that Islam was a system providing a false hope of salvation, and that his calling was to guide Muslims to the sure hope of the Gospel. Their writings demonstrate a definition of the Other that was evidence of their closer affiliation with Indian Christians than with European secularists. Unlike other Orientalists, they could accept Indian converts as their "brothers" and "sisters," equal to themselves before God. Several modern scholars, however, see contradictions between this theoretical ideal and the actual practice of missionaries. Whereas they would describe converts as equal in the Kingdom of God, they still constructed powerful images of the non-western Other and tended to dominate, though more from spiritual rather than material or political considerations.[4]

In addition to a fundamental difference between the underlying philosophies of the colonialists and the Evangelical missionaries, their aims and objectives also differed. Whereas British officials were primarily concerned with the maintenance or development of empire, missionaries, for the most part, aimed at the conversion of individual souls (and administrators who were also Evangelical, such as Muir, combined both objectives).[5] Often the objections of missionaries to certain social and cultural practices were expressed in terms of denunciations of the religions with which they were connected. The opposition of men like Hughes and Sell to reform movements that sought to eradicate those same practices was not as contradictory as it might appear, since the reformers were seen as another barrier to the acceptance of the Christian gospel. In addition to seeking the conversion of individuals and the removal of barriers to such conversion, missionaries, as well as the Evangelical administrators, were also concerned with the material and spiritual progress of the converts, the establishment of communities and churches to facilitate such progress, and general humanitarian concerns such as education and other social and economic reforms.[6] At times these objectives would overlap with those of the colonialists, and at such points there would be co-operation, but such confluence of objectives should not be seen as automatic, as was demonstrated by Hughes' writings on the Afghan situation. Maw describes the missionary as existing "At

the periphery of the colonial and native communities, in touch with both but a part of neither."[7]

In their portrayal of the Orient and the Oriental, the missionaries were at times influenced by some of the same cultural prejudices which affected many other Europeans.[8] They at times displayed the same sense of cultural superiority and painted a very negative picture of the "Heathen." However, in this latter practice, the missionaries were once again operating from a different set of objectives than those of the colonialists seeking political or economic control. "Because the Evangelicals and missionaries wanted to demonstrate the need for missionaries in India, gain access to the East India Company's territory, recruit more volunteers, secure increased funding and also suppress 'certain dreadful practices,' there was considerable pressure on them to select and highlight the more negative aspects of India's religious and social system."[9] But in these descriptions, too, one must be wary of generalizations that include all missionary organizations and missionaries as a homogenous group. While most did not question the role the West was destined to play in bringing the benefits of modernity to the world, there were those throughout this period who criticized the imperialist system from their Christian standpoint. "Missionaries were to be found on all points of the spectrum, from uncritical advocates of collaboration between imperialism and mission to those who argued for careful separation."[10]

Muslim contribution to shaping the views of the Europeans

The thesis demonstrates that it must not be assumed that the colonized peoples had no voice or influence in shaping the knowledge of the Orientalists. Several writers have criticized Said for portraying the production of knowledge about the Orient as an exclusively western affair. Such a vision "neglects the important ways in which the so-called Orientals have shaped not only their own world but also the Orientalist views criticized by Said. It would be a serious mistake to deny agency to the colonized in our effort to show the force of colonial discourse."[11] The interplay of indigenous and Orientalist discourses was a vital aspect in the formation of authoritative knowledge about the Orient, and was certainly true in the case of the interaction in northern India on the

matter of the Ḥadīth. There was no "monolithic imperial project" nor a "monolithic subaltern response," rather a set of complicated interactions and encounters in which both sides were changed.[12] The cultures of the colonized should not be seen as "being at once both all-embracing systems, strong enough to shape social and economic life, but also predominantly static and strangely fragile to any external touch" ready to shatter at the arrival of any colonial power.[13] The indigenous culture was constantly evolving, responding to a variety of external and internal stimuli, which it continued to do with the arrival of the colonizers.

As discussed earlier, the Muslims in northern India were already vitally involved in a re-evaluation of their use of the Ḥadīth before the arrival of the British. Aḥmad Khān had been schooled in these reformist trends and his response to Western writers was merely a further step in an already on-going process. By availing himself of the opportunity to respond to Muir, Aḥmad Khān regained the capacity to have true knowledge, in Inden's terminology. By first publishing his book in English and quoting numerous European sources, he gained a greater hearing among European writers. Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī in their writings also had a considerable influence on subsequent European writings on India and Islam, both by missionaries and more secular Orientalists. Although the arrival of the printing press introduced a new methodology, this was eagerly adopted and adapted by various groups within the Muslim communities in India for their own purposes. But it would be inaccurate to consider the various forms and expressions of discourse as all being imposed from without. Bayly states, "For while the Baptists, the CMS and the crypto-Christian administrators unwittingly helped to engender an Indian critical public, its rapid development owed much to patterns in debate, publicity and the diffusion of knowledge which were already in place in India."[14] Factors such as these underline the need to resist sweeping generalizations in analyzing the works of British writers in colonial India.

Interactive aspect of the discourse

In their writings on Ḥadīth, both British and Indian participants did not remain unaffected by the encounter, but reflected in their work an awareness of each others'

writings and on-going attempts to define each other. This mutual influence reflects Inden's argument that Euro-American Selves and Indian Others have not simply interacted as entities that remain fundamentally the same. "Far from embodying simple, unchanging essences, all agents are relatively complex and shifting. They make and remake one another through a dialectic process in changing situations."[15] Kennedy confirms this when he states that post-colonial theory has demonstrated that "imperialism was a process of mutual interaction, of point and counterpoint that inscribed itself on the dominant partner as well as the dominated one."[16] This thesis demonstrates that mutual interaction and the changing representations of each other that resulted.[17]

The writings of Muir, Sell, and Hughes differed from those of the stereotypical Orientalist in that as they lived, worked, and conducted their research in a Muslim context, Muslim evaluation of their research was both immediate and interactive. Hughes and Sell incorporated the ideas of both Muir and Aḥmad Khān, as well as interacting with Sayyid Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī, who, in turn, critiqued the writings of the Europeans. Thus they broke with the pattern of the Orientalist analyzed by Said who, upon later reflection on his book, *Orientalism*, wrote, "None of the Orientalists I write about seems ever to have intended an Oriental as a reader."[18] Muir's works were not purely for Western consumption, though he may have intended that missionaries be the primary ones to benefit. His biography of Muḥammad was written while in India, available to scholars there, and responded to by a number of Indian scholars. Some of his other works were written or translated into Urdu or Arabic and addressed to Indian Muslim readers.

Where the missionaries differed from Muir, was in their greater willingness to interact with the ideas of the Muslim modernists. Prior to the Revolt of 1857, Muir had been closely acquainted with the current writings of Muslims regarding the Prophet Muḥammad, critiquing those works in a number of reviews in the *Calcutta Review.* However, subsequent to the publication of his own biography of the Prophet, he gave no indication of an awareness of the response of Muslims to his findings. His abridged edition of the book in 1877[1915] contained no acknowledgment of the criticisms of Aḥmad Khān and Amīr 'Alī, both of which had appeared earlier in that decade. This silence is

difficult to explain, when he had interacted with much less scholarly works earlier, and since his government position brought him in contact with Aḥmad Khān and his educational endeavors at Aligarh. In contrast, both Hughes and Sell freely quote Aḥmad Khān as an authority in their books on Islam. Their relatively recent arrival in India and their lack of extensive formal education in England may have made them more receptive to learning from contemporary Muslim scholars. Unlike Muir who was researching the early history of Islam, both Hughes and Sell were also concerned with portraying Islam as it was being practiced at that time. Thus they were more diligent in analyzing the recent trends of thinking in the Muslim community, including the rise of the modernists and the growth of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth. However, in spite of this openness to interact with the new ideas of the modernists, Hughes and Sell initially rejected their conclusions regarding the flexibility of Islam, preferring to see it as a rigid system, bound by its traditions, in need of replacement. In their later writings, this harsh assessment was somewhat modified. Hughes still opposed the resort to rationalism, but saw in Islam a true quest for spirituality, in some ways a purer expression than certain expressions of Christianity. Sell's perception of the modernists also evolved to the extent that he saw their "New Islam" as a positive development.

The question of whether the Muslims altered either their assessment of the Ḥadīth or their methodology in evaluating the traditions, as a result of interaction with the Evangelicals such as Muir, Hughes, and Sell is unclear. Certainly they reflected the thinking of Muir in their own conclusions regarding the historical accuracy of the traditional accounts, but that could have been the consequence of their wider interaction with Western scholarly methodology. However, an examination of their writings demonstrates that Muir, Sell, and Hughes figured predominantly in the sources they quoted or reacted against. Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī went further in their rejection of the authority of the Ḥadīth than did Aḥmad Khān, possibly reflecting a greater influence of Muir's writing on their thought. However, their opposition to Muir's conclusions regarding the nature of Muḥammad and Islam was more detailed and sharp. In summary, although the interaction of Christian missionaries with this educated elite of the Muslim community was characterized by confrontation, they caused each to reassess their own

deeply-held religious presuppositions and their perceptions of the other, resulting in a fuller understanding of, though not agreement with, the other.

Notes

[1] Inden, "Orientalist Constructions," p. 416.

[2] Oddie, " 'Orientalism,' " p. 29.

[3] Ibid., p. 30.

[4] Dube. "Paternalism and Freedom," p. 199; Oddie. " 'Orientalism'," pp. 38-40. See also Webster's discussion on the struggle for ecclesiastical independence in the Punjab in his "British Missions in India," pp. 42-44.

[5] Ibid., p. 31.

[6] Ibid., pp. 31-32.

[7] Maw. *Visions of India*, pp. 4-5.

[8] Oddie. "Orientalism," p. 37.

[9] Ibid., p. 37. See also Sharma. *Christian Missions*, p. 42.

[10] Wilbert R. Shenk. "Reflections on the Modern Missionary Movement: 1792-1992." *Mission Studies: Journal of the International Association for Mission Studies*, 9, 1 (1992), p. 70.

[11] Peter van der Veer. "The Foreign Hand: Orientalist Discourse in Sociology and Communalism." *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*, p. 23.

[12] Though in denying the absoluteness and uni-directionality of colonial hegemony and ascribing agency to both colonizers and colonized, scholars would still insist in a resulting colonial domination going far beyond the intention of any of its principal actors. See Carol A. Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer. "Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament." *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*, p. 10.

[13] Andrew Porter. " 'Cultural Imperialism' and Missionary Enterprise." North Atlantic Missiology Project, Position Paper Number 7. Cambridge: NAMP, [1996], p. 9.

[14] Bayly. "Returning the British," p. 9.

[15] Ronald Inden. *Imagining India*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1990, pp. 2-3.

[16] Kennedy. "Imperial History," p. 359.

[17] Wilfred Cantwell Smith discusses this type of interaction between religious traditions, specifically the deliberate attempt of a foreign missionary to initiate change and possible consequences, in his article, "Participation: The Changing Christian Role in Other Cultures." *Occasional Bulletin from the Missionary Research Library*, 20, 4 (Apr., 1969), pp. 1-13. His student, Arvind Sharma, applies this approach in his "Hinduism and Christian Missionary Activity: A Case Study for the 19th Century, the Ramakrishna Mission." *Indian Church History Review*, 7, 2 (1973), pp. 151-158.

[18] Said. *Orientalism*. 1994 ed., p. 336.

[19] William Muir. *The Life of Mahomet from Original Sources*. New and abridged ed. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1877. In this edition, the extensive introduction on the authority of the Qur'ān and the Ḥadīth has been reproduced in an appendix, almost identical in content, but without the detailed footnotes containing quotes from the Ḥadīth collections and commentary by Weil and Sprenger.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Alford, Henry. *The Greek Testament: With a Critically Revised Text; a Digest of Various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena: and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary,* vol. 1. London: Rivingtons, 1848.

Aḥmad Khān, Sir Sayyid. *The Causes of the Indian Revolt.* Appendix A in Hafeez Malik and Morris Dembo. *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan's History of the Bijnor Rebellion.* South Asia Series (East Lansing, MI) occasional paper no. 17. East Lansing, MI: Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1972. pp. 113-148.

_____. *Maktūbāt-i-Sir Sayyid jo...Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān marḥūm ke'ilmī o adabī, siyāsī o mazhabī fārsī o urdū khaṭūṭ ka majmū'ah jis men 1849 'i. 1898 'i. tak ke khaṭūṭ jam'a kie gae hen.* Shaykh Muḥammad Ismā'īl Pānīpatī, ed. Lahore: Majlis Taraqqī Adab, 1959. pp. 61-64.

_____. *The Mohommedan Commentary on the Holy Bible.* Vol. 1 & 2. Ghazeepore: by the author, 1862.

_____. *A Series of Essays on the Life of Muhammad and Subjects Subsidiary thereto.* Lahore: Premier Book House, 1968 [rpt. of the 1870 edition].

_____. *Tahzīb al-Akhlāq,* v. 2. *Sar Sayyid Aḥmad Khān ke Maẓāmīn maṭbu'ah Tahzīb al-Akhlāq 1287 ta 1293 hijrī [1870-1876].* Lahore: Malik Faẓl al-Dīn.

_____. *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan.* Ed. Shan Mohammad. Bombay: Nachiketa Publications Ltd., 1972.

Amīr 'Alī, Sayyid. *A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed.* London: Williams and Norgate, 1873.

_____. *Mohammedan Law.* 2 vols. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co., 1892.

_____. *The Personal Law of the Mahommedans.* London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1880.

_____. *The Right Honourable Syed Ameer Ali: Personality and Achievements.* Ed. Shan Muhammad New Delhi: Uppal Pub. House, 1991.

_____. *The Right Honourable Syed Ameer Ali : Political Writings.* Ed. Shan Muhammad. New Delhi: Ashish Pub. House, 1989.

_____. *A Short History of the Saracens, being a Concise Account of the Rise and Decline of the Saracenic Power and of the Economic, Social and Intellectual Development of the Arab Nation.* London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1951 [first edition, 1889].

Blumhardt, J. F. *Catalogue of Hindustani Printed Books in the Library of the British Museum.* London: Longmans & Co., 1889.

"Book Notices: *A Critical Examination of Life and Teachings of Mohammad,* by Syed Ameer Ali, Moulvi, M. A., LLB." *IER,* 1, 2 (1873) pp. 249-250.

Chirāgh 'Alī, Maulawi. *A Critical Exposition of the Popular "Jihād," Showing that all the Wars of Mohammad were Defensive; and that Aggressive War, or Compulsory Conversion, is not Allowed in the Koran.* IAD Religio-Philosophy (Reprint) Series no. 42. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1984 [first edition, 1884].

_____. *The Proposed Political, Legal and Social Reforms under Moslem Rule.* Bombay: Education Society's Press, 1882.

Goldsmith, M. "Work amongst Mahomedans." *Report of the Second Decennial Missionary Conference held at Calcutta, 1882-1883.* Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1883, pp. 231-238.

Ḥālī, Altāf Ḥusayn. *Hayat-i-Javed: A Biographical Account of Sir Sayyid.* Trans. K. H. Qadiri and David J. Matthews. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1979 [originally published in Urdu, 1901].

Hughes, Thomas Patrick. "The Afghans." *IER: A Quarterly Journal of Missionary Thought and Effort*, 1, 3 (1873), pp. 318-333.

_____. "The Afghans." *Report of the General Missionary Conference held at Allahabad, 1872-1873.* London: Seely, Jackson, and Halliday, 1873, pp. 72-80.

_____. *The Akhund of Swat: A Muhammadan Saint, and Dilawar Khan: The Converted Afghan Brigand.* Reprinted from the *Calcutta Christian Intelligencer*, 1876.

_____. *Dictionary of Islam, being a Cyclopaedia of the Doctrines, Rites, Ceremonies, and Customs, together with the Technical and Theological Terms, of the Muhammadan Religion.* Calcutta: Rupa & Co., 1988 [rpt. of the original 1885 edition].

_____. "Has Islam a Future?" *The Arena*, 35 (Oct., 1892), pp. 532-539.

_____. "An Indian Missionary on Muhammad and Muhammadanism." *CMI*, new series, 10 (1874), pp. 330-340.

_____. "The Kingdom of Kashghar." *IER*, 4, 13 (1876), pp. 52-60.

_____. "Lord Salisbury's Afghan Policy." *The Arena*, 36 (Nov. 1892), pp. 645-652.

_____. *Notes on Muhammadanism, being Outlines of the Religious System of Islam.* Rev. ed. London: Wm. H. Allen & Co., 1877.

_____. "Missions to Muslims." *AR*, 9, 49 (Jan., 1888), pp. 1-18.

_____. "Opening Paper," *Report of the Second Decennial Missionary Conference held at Calcutta, 1882-1883.* Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1883, pp. 239-240.

_____. "Our Mission to the Afghans." *CMI*, second new series, 4 (1879) pp. 7-15

_____. "The Mulla of Mānki." *CMI*, second new series, 8 (1883), pp. 529-531.

_____. "The Muslim's Bible." *AR*, 9, 53 (May, 1888), pp. 466-474.

_____. "The Muslim's Faith." *AR*, 10, 55 (Jul., 1888), pp. 23-36.

[_____] Evan Stanton. *Ruhainah: A Story of Afghan Life.* New York: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1886.

_____. "The Shiahposh Kafirs." *IER*, 1, 1 (1873), pp. 93-94.

_____. "Some Account of the Late Fazl-i-Hakk, of Peshawur." *CMI*, new series, 5 (1869), pp. 30-32.

_____. "The Wahhabis of Najd and India." *CMI*, second new series, 3 (1878), pp. 98-100, 160-165.

_____. "A Week in Egypt." *CMI*, second new series, 1 (1876), pp. 216-218.

Hunter, Sir William Wilson. *The Indian Musalmans: Are They Bound in Conscience to Rebel against the Queen?* London: Troubner and Company, 1871.

Kaye, John William. *A History of the Sepoy War in India. 1857-1858*, vol. 1. London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1870.

Lee, S. *Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism by the late Rev. Henry Martyn, B. D...* Cambridge: J. Deighton & Sons, and Stevenson, 1824.

"The Lieutenant-Governorship of the North-West." *The Pioneer.* Jan. 10, 1872, pp. 5-6.

Mitchell, J. Murray and Sir William Muir. *Two Old Faiths: Essays on the Religions of the Hindus and the Mohammedans.* New York: Chautaugua Press, 1891.

Muir, Sir William. "An Address Delivered by Sir William Muir, K.C.S.I. , on the Occasion of a Visit to the Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College at Allygurh, on 12th November 1875," *An Account of the Ceremony of Laying the Foundation Stone of the Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College, Allygurh, together with some Articles on Subjects Connected with the Movement, being Extracts from English and Anglo-Indian Newspapers.* Allahabad: Pioneer Press, 1877, pp. 30-32.

_____. *The Corān: Its Composition and Teaching; and the Testimony it Bears to the Holy Scriptures.* Non-Christian Religious Systems. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, [1878].

_____. *The Honourable James Thomason, Lieutenant-Governor N.-W. P., India, 1843-1853 A.D.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.

_____. *The Life of Mahomet: With Introductory Chapters on the Original Sources for the Biography of Mahomet and on the Pre-Islamite History of Arabia.* Osnabruck: Biblio Verlag, 1988 [rpt. of the 1861 London edition].

_____. *Mahomet and Islam: A Sketch of the Prophet's Life from Original Sources and a brief outline of his Religion.* 3rd rev. ed. London: Religious Society, 1895 [first edition, c. 1885].

_____. *The Mohammedan Controversy; Biographies of Mohammad; Sprenger on Tradition; The Indian Liturgy; and the Psalter.* Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1897.

_____. *Records of the Intelligence Department of the Government of the North-West Provinces of India during the Mutiny of 1857 including Correspondence with the supreme Government, Delhi, Cawnpore, and other places*, vol. 2. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1902.

_____. *The Rise and Decline of Islam.* Present Day Tracts. London: The Religious Tract Society, [1883].

_____. "Speech of the Lieutenant-Governor at the Moradabad Durbar." *The Pioneer.* Nov. 16, 1871, p. 3.

_____. *The Testimony borne by the Coran to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures.* Agra: Agra Religious Tract and Book Society, 1856 [second edition, 1860].

Murdoch, John. *Catalogue of the Christian Vernacular Literature of India.* Madras: Caleb Foster, 1870.

"Notes and Intelligence." *IER*, 1, 1 (1873), p. 96.

"Ordination of Missionaries." *CMI*, 15 (Sept., 1864), n. p.

Sell, Edward. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, 27, 104 (Apr., 1878) pp. 327-341.

_____. "Discussion," following W. W. Hunter. "The Increase and Influence of Islam." *Report of the Centenary Conference on the Protestant Missions of the World held in Exeter Hall (June 9th-19th), London, 1888*, ed. James Johnston. Vol. 1. New York: Fleming H. Revell, [1888], pp. 28-29.

_____. *The Exile.* Madras: Christian Literature Society for India, 1931.

_____. "The Faith of Islam," *BFER*, 29, 114 (Oct., 1880), pp. 763-787.

_____. "The Faith of Islam," *BFER*, 30, 115 (Jan., 1881), pp. 165-190.

_____. *The Faith of Islam.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd., 1880.

_____. *The Faith of Islam.* Rev. ed. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd., 1896.

_____. "Muhammadan Exegesis of the Qurān and the Traditions." *BFER*, 28, 110 (Oct., 1879), pp. 735-763.

_____. "Muhammadans," *The Missionary Conference: South India and Ceylon, 1879.* Madras: Addison & Co., 1880, pp. 336-339.

_____. "The New Islam." *The Contemporary Review*, 64 (Aug., 1893), pp. 282-293.

_____. "The Sects of Islam." *BFER*, 28, 109 (Jul., 1879), pp. 583-600.

Sherring, M. A. "Our Late Lieutenant-Governors." *IER*, 2, 5 (1874), pp. 140-149.

Smith, R. Bosworth. *Mohammed and Mohammedanism: Lectures delivered at the Royal Institute of Great Britain in February and March, 1874.* New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1875.

Sprenger, Aloys. *The Life of Mohammad, from Original Sources.* Allahabad: Presbyterian Mission Press, 1851.

Secondary sources

Ahmad, Aijaz. "Between Orientalism and Historicism: Anthropological Knowledge of India." *Studies in History*, new series 7, 1 (Jan.- June, 1991), pp. 135-163.

Ahsan, Abdullahil. "Late Nineteenth Century Muslim Response to the Western Criticism of Islam: An Analysis of Amir Ali's Life and Works." M. A. thesis, McGill University, 1981.

Alter, James P. "American Presbyterians in North India: Missionary Motives and Social Attitudes under British Colonialism." *Journal of Presbyterian History*, 53 (1975), pp. 291-312.

_____. *In the Doab and Rohilkhand: North Indian Christianity, 1815-1915.* Rev. and completed by John Alter. Delhi: I.S.P.C.K., 1986.

Anjuman Taraqqī-yi Urdu Pakistan. *Qāmūs al-kutub Urdu*, vol. 1. Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqī-i-Urdu Pakistan, 1961.

Azīz, K. K. *Ameer Ali: His Life and Work.* Lahore: Publishers United Ltd., 1968.

Bayly, C. A.. "Returning the British to South Asian History: The Limits of Colonial Hegemony." *South Asia*, 17, 2 (1994), pp. 1-25.

Bebbington, D. W. *Evangelicalism in modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s.* London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Bennett, Clinton. *Victorian Images of Islam.* CSIC Studies on Islam and Christianity. London: Grey Seal Books, 1992.

Bhargava, Moti Lal. *History of Modern India.* Lucknow: The Upper India Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1970.

Breckenridge, Carol A and Peter van der Veer. "Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament." *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*, pp. 1-19.

Brown, Daniel W. "Islamic Modernism in South Asia: A Reassessment." *The Muslim World*, 87, 3-4 (Jul.-Oct., 1997), pp. 258-271.

_____. *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought.* Cambridge Middle East Series, 5. Cambridge: University Press, 1996.

Brush, Stanley E. "Presbyterians and Islam in India." *Journal of Presbyterian History*, 62, 3 (Fall, 1984), pp. 215-222.

Buaben, Jamal Muhammad. *Image of the Prophet Muḥammad in the West: A Study of Muir, Margoliouth and Watt.* London: The Islamic Foundation, 1996.

Buckland, C. E. *Dictionary of Indian Biography.* London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. Lim., 1906.

Casson, John. "Mission Archives and New Directions in Mission History," *Bulletin of the Association of British Theological and Philosophical Libraries*, 4, 1 (Mar., 1997), pp. ??????????

Cohn, Bernard S. "The Recruitment and Training of British Civil Servants in India." *Anthropologist among the Historians and Other Essays.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987, pp. 500-553.

Crockford's Clerical Directory. 26th issue. London: Oxford University Press, 1894.

_____. 42nd issue. London: Oxford University Press, 1910.

Crowther, M. A. *Church Embattled: Religious Controversy in Mid-Victorian England.* Newton Abbot, Devon: David & Charles (Publishers) Ltd., 1970.

Cust, Robert Needham. "Islam." *Notes on Missionary Subjects. Part II, Essays on the Great Problems outside the Orbit of Pure Evangelistic Work, but which the Missionary has to Face.* London: Elliot Stock, 1888, pp. 49-65.

Daniel, Norman. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image.* Oxford: Oneworld Publications Ltd., 1993.

"Death of Sir William Muir," *The Times*, July 12, 1905, p. 4.

Dewey, Clive. *Anglo-Indian Attitudes: The Mind of the Indian Civil Servant.* London: The Hambledon Press, 1993.

Dharmaraj, Jacob S. *Colonialism and Christian Mission: Postcolonial Reflections.* Delhi: Indian Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1993.

Dube, Saurabh. "Paternalism and Freedom: The Evangelical Encounter in Colonial Chhattisgarh, Central India." *Modern Asian Studies*, 29, 1 (1995), pp. 171-201.

Embree, Ainslie Thomas. *Charles Grant and British Rule in India.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

Graham, G. F. I. *The Life and Work of Syed Ahmad Khan C. S. I.* Rpt. IAD Oriental Series, 29. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1974 [first edition, 1885].

Hodge, Alison. "The Training of Missionaries for Africa: The Church Missionary Society's Training College at Islington, 1900-1915." *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 4, 2 (1971), pp. 81-96.

Howse, Ernest Marshall. *Saints in Politics: The "Clapham Sect" and the Growth of Freedom.* [Toronto]: University of Toronto Press, 1952.

"Hughes, Thomas Patrick." *Who Was Who in America: A Companion Volume to Who's Who in America*, vol. 1, 1897-1942. Chicago: The A. N. Marquis Company, 1943, p. 603.

Inden, Ronald. *Imagining India.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1990.

_____. "Orientalist Constructions of India." *Modern Asian Studies*, 20, 3 (1986), pp. 401-446.

Israeli, Raphael. "The Cross Battles the Crescent: One Century of Missionary Work among Chinese Muslims (1850-1950). *Modern Asian Studies*, 29, 1 (1995), pp. 203-221.

Kennedy, Dane. "Imperial History and Post-Colonial Theory," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 24, 3 (Sept., 1996), pp. 345-363.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *A History of the Expansion of Christianity. Vol. 4. The Great Century in Europe and the United States of America A. D. 1800-A. D. 1914.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1941.

Lucas, J. J. *History of the North India Christian Tract and Book Society, Allahabad: 1848-1934.* Allahabad: The North India Christian Tract & Book Society, [1934].

Lyall, C. J. "Obituary Notices: Sir William Muir," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 37 (1905), pp. 875-879.

Maw, Martin. *Visions of India: Fulfillment Theology, the Aryan Race Theory, & the Work of British Protestant Missionaries in Victorian India.* Studies in the Intercultural History of Christianity, 57. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1990.

McGrath, Alister. *A Passion for the Truth: The Intellectual Coherence of Evangelicalism.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995.

Metcalf, Barbara Daly. *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982.

_____. "Presidential Address: Too Little and too Much: Reflections on Muslims in the History of India." *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 54, 4 (Nov. 1995), pp. 951-967.

Moffett, Samuel Hugh. *A History of Christianity in Asia*, v. 1. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992.

Muhammad, Shan. *The Right Honourable Syed Ameer Ali: Personality and Achievements.* New Delhi: Uppal Publishing House, 1991.

Neill, Stephen. *A History of Christianity in India : The Beginnings to AD 1707*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

_____. *A History of Christianity in India, 1707-1858.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

O'Hanlon, Rosalind and David Washbrook. "After Orientalism: Culture, Criticism, and Politics in the Third World." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34 (1992), pp. 141-167.

Oddie, Geoffrey A. " 'Orientalism' and British Protestant Missionary Constructions of India in the Nineteenth Century." *South Asia*, 17, 2 (1994), pp. 27-42.

_____. *Social Protest in India: British Protestant Missionaries and Social Reforms 1850-1900.* New Delhi: Manohar, 1979.

Penner, Peter. *The Patronage Bureaucracy in North India: The Robert M. Bird and James Thomason School 1820-1870.* Delhi: Chanakya Publications, 1986.

Piggin, Stuart. *Making Evangelical Missionaries 1789-1858: The Social Background, Motives and Training of British Protestant Missionaries to India.* Evangelicals & Society from 1750, no. 2. [Abingdon]: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1984.

Porter, Andrew. "Cambridge, Keswick, and late Nineteenth-Century Attitudes to Africa." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 5, 1 (Oct., 1976), pp. 5-34.

_____. " 'Cultural Imperialism' and Missionary Enterprise." North Atlantic Missiology Project, Position Paper Number 7. Cambridge: NAMP, [1996].

_____. *European Imperialism, 1860-1914.* Studies in European History. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1994.

_____. "Religion and Empire: British Expansionism in the Long Nineteenth Century, 1780-1914." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 20, 3 (Sept., 1992), pp. 370-390.

Powell, Avril. "Artful Apostasy? A Mughal Mansabdar among the Jesuits." *Society and Ideology: Essays in South Asian History, presented to Professor K. A. Ballhatchet*, ed. by Peter Robb. SOAS Studies on South Asia. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. 72-96.

_____. "Maulana Rahmat Allah Kairnawi and Muslim-Christian Controversy in mid-Nineteenth Century India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1 (1976), pp. 42-63.

_____. "Muslim-Christian Confrontaion: Dr. Wazir Khan in Nineteenth-Century Agra." *Religious Controversy in British India: Dialogues inSouth Asian Languages.* Ed. Kenneth W. Jones. SUNY Series in Religious Studies. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 77-92.

_____. "Muslim Reaction to Missionary Activity in Agra." *Indian Society and the Beginning of Modernization, c. 1830-1850.* Eds. C. H. Philips and M. D. Wainwright. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1976, 146-157.

_____. *Muslims and Missionaries in Pre-Mutiny India.* London Studies on South Asia No. 7. Richmond, Surrey, UK: Curzon Press Ltd., 1993.

Prakash, Gyan. "Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 32 (1990), pp. 383-408.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

_____. *Orientalism.* 2nd ed. New York: Vintage Press, 1994.

Sharma, Arvind. "Hinduism and Christian Missionary Activity: A Case Study for the 19th Century, the Ramakrishna Mission." *Indian Church History Review*, 7, 2 (1973), pp. 151-158.

Sharma, Raj Bahadur. *Christian Missions in North India, 1813-1913 : A Case Study of Meerut Division and Dehra Dun District.* Delhi, India: Mittal Publications, 1988.

Shenk, Wilbert R. "Reflections on the Modern Missionary Movement: 1792-1992." *Mission Studies: Journal of the International Association for Mission Studies*, 9, 1 (1992), pp. 62-78.

Sherring, M. A. *The History of Protestant Missions in India from their Commencement in 1706 to 1881.* Rev. ed. by Edward Storrow. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1884.

Singh, Ganda. "Christianity in the Panjab: A Bibliographic Survey." *The Panjab Past and Present*, 1, 2 (Oct., 1967), pp. 368-388.

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell. "Participation: The Changing Christian Role in Other Cultures." *Occasional Bulletin from the Missionary Research Library*, 20, 4 (Apr., 1969), pp. 1-13.

Stanley, Brian. *The Bible and the Flag: Protestant Missions and British Imperialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.* Leicester: Appolos, 1990.

Stock, Eugene. *The History of the Church Missionary Society* . 3 vols.. London, Church Missionary Society, 1899.

Stokes, Eric. *The English Utilitarians and India.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Syed, Muhammad Aslam. *Muslim Response to the West: Muslim Historiography in India, 1857-1914.* Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research, 1988.

Teltscher, Kate. *India Inscribed: European and British Writing on India 1600-1800.* Delhi: Oxford Univeristy Press, 1995.

Tibawi, A. L. *British Interests in Palestine 1800-1901: A Study of Religious and Educational Enterprise.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Titus, Murray T. "Current Topics: Canon Edward Sell." *The Moslem World*, 22 (1932), pp. 297-298.

Troll, Christian W. *Sayyid Ahmad Khan: A Reinterpretation of Muslim Theology.* New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1978.

Vander Werff, Lyle L. *Christian Mission to Muslims, The Record: Anglican and Reformed Approaches in India and the Near East, 1800-1938.* The William Carey Library Series on Islamic Studies. South Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1977.

Veer, Peter van der. "The Foreign Hand: Orientalist Discourse in Sociology and Communalism." *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*, pp. 23-44.

Wahidur-Rahman A. N. M. "Modernist Muslim's Approach to *Hadith*: Aligarh School." *Hamdard Islamicus*, 16, 4 (Winter 1993), pp. 13-26.

_____. "The Religious Thought of Moulvi Chirāgh 'Alī." M. A. thesis, McGill University, 1982.

Walls, Andrew. *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996.

Wasti, Razi, ed. *Memoirs and other Writings of Syed Ameer Ali.* Lahore: People's Publishing House, 1968.

_____, ed. *Syed Ameer Ali on Islamic History and Culture.* People's Publishing House, 1968.

Webster, John C. B. "British Missions in India." *Missionary Ideologies in the Imperialist Era 1800-1920: Papers from the Durham Consultation, 1981.* Eds. Torben Christensen and William R. Hutchison, eds. Denmark: Aros, 1982, pp. 38-47.

_____. *The Christian Community and Change in Nineteenth Century North India.* Delhi: The Macmillan Company of India Ltd., 1976.

_____. "Mission Sources of Nineteenth Century Punjab History." *Sources on Punjab History.* Eds. W. Eric Gustafson and Kenneth W. Jones. Delhi: Manohar Book Service, 1975, pp. 171-218.

Wherry, E. M. *The Muslim Controversy, being a Review of Christian Literature written in the Urdu Language for the Propagation of the Christian Religion and the Refutation of Islam.* London: The Christian Literature Society, 1905.

Young, Richard Fox. *Resistant Hinduism: Sanskrit Sources on Anti-Christian Apologetics in Early Nineteenth-Century India.* Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, ed. by Gerhard Oberhammer, v. 8. Vienna: Institut fur Indologie der Universitat Wien, 1981.

Zaman, Muhammad Qasim. "A Venture in Critical Islamic Historiography and the Significance of its Failure," *Numen*, 41 (1994), pp. 26-49.