

Short title.

Mushiru-l-Haqq

"Indin Muslims attitue to the British."

INDIAN MUSLIMS ATTITUDE TO THE BRITISH IN  
THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY: A CASE STUDY  
OF SHÂH 'ABDUL 'AZÎZ

by

Mushiru-l-Haqq

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of  
Graduate Studies and Research in partial  
fulfilment of the requirements for the  
degree of Master of Arts in Islamic Studies.

Institute of Islamic Studies,  
McGill University,  
Montreal.

April 1964.

## CONTENTS

Foreword	i
1. Muslims meet Christians	1
2. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz: His Life and Personality	18
3. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz: Questions and Answers	34
4. Toleration and Friendliness	65
5. Verbal Jihâd	84
6. Epilogue	105
Notes and References	110
Bibliography	133

## Foreword

This is an attempt to study the attitude of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz (1746-1824), the son of Shâh Walîullâh, the leading 'âlims of their time in India, and of other Indian Muslims towards the British in India in the early 19th century. The 19th century has great significance in Indian history. The Battle of Plassey in 1757, marks the beginning of a process which led, in 1857, to the establishment of the suzerainty of the British Crown over India. The process which was set in motion in 1757, had reached a definite stage by 1803, when the British hegemony was established over Delhi, and the Mughal Emperor virtually became a pawn in their hands. The establishment of British control over Delhi must have disturbed the Muslims for it entailed the end of their own domination.

This particular period has not been yet fully studied for the Muslims of India. It seems as if the great event of the Mutiny of 1857, has overshadowed the whole century. In the present century, around the 1930s, the Indian Muslims looked back to their past and aspired to the pre-Mutiny period. They found

Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz giving a fatwâ that India was Dârul Harb. As it is understood according to Fiqh, Dârul Harb involves a Muslim in either jihâd or hijrah. Perhaps for this reason the present Indian writers concluded that the fatwâ of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz summoned the Muslims to wage jihâd against the British, or to migrate from the country. So vehemently has this view been presented that every writer of to-day repeats it without any hesitation, namely that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz did ask the Muslims to undertake jihâd.

The British did not enter India as invaders. They slowly became masters of the country. So slowly and tactfully did they come into power that for years the Indian people could not realize the changing situation. There is also the fact that when their rule was first established in different parts of India, many people felt relieved to be under the British administration.

One may ask the reason for the resentment of the 'Ulamâ' if it is claimed that the 'Ulamâ' stood against the British at a particular juncture. Were they in favour of the dying Mughal rule and did they want to revive it? Were they attempting to establish a national government based on the Hindu-Muslim unity?

The first proposition is obviously out of the question, because owing to their irreligious life and indulgence the later Mughals were severely criticized by the 'Ulamâ' and particularly by those who followed Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, nor did they seem to entertain much hope for their restoration. The second proposition seems to be the current theory. It is generally put forward by certain nationalist Muslims like 'Ubaydullâh Sindhî and others, but we should remember that these represent the ideas of much later times. And it would seem sanguine to say that even as early as in the time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz the Hindus and Muslims were aware of and embraced the idea of nationalism.

However, it is a fact that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz called non-Muslim India Dârul Harb. The reason has not been yet explored. But if the reason was to expel the British out of India, then we must know how far the Muslims responded to the fatwâ, and how far Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was successful in his call for jihâd. Moreover we are entitled to know whether or not he presented any programme to implement the jihâd movement, and how the British reacted to his fatwâ. And if the history is silent on these questions then we have to know why Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz issued the fatwâ of jihâd.

In the following pages we shall try to answer these questions. In this respect we shall limit ourselves to the time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz and of his contemporaries. This is because we should be misled if we were to consider the pre-Mutiny 19th century as a unit. In fact the first half of the 19th century may be divided into two parts: pre and post 1830. In the following pages we shall see a clear difference between these two periods. And since we have to study Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz in particular we shall consequently confine ourselves to the pre-1830 period.

## II

Since the present work is a kind of pen portrait of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz and of some of his contemporaries and is mostly based upon their own writings, it will be useful if we speak about the material used in this study. The present writer has tried to depend only upon original sources wherever possible. Secondary sources too have been used, but mostly to supplement original ones.

This work has been divided into five chapters. Chapter one gives a picture of the life of the Christians in India at that time, the relations

between the officials of the East India Company and the Christian missionaries, the relations between the Christians and the Muslims in general. This chapter is based upon information provided mainly by those English books which were written during or around that time; or by such books as have been written afterwards but by authors who have depended upon contemporary source materials. In the first category we can count the "Letters from India" by Victor Jacquemont (2 vols. London, 2nd ed. 1835), "Rambles and Recollections of an Indian official" by W. H. Sleeman (2 vols. London 1844). In the second category we can include the books like "Reformers in India, 1793-1833" by Kenneth Ingham (Cambridge, 1956).

The second chapter portrays the life and personality of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz on the basis of information found in his own writings, and of information provided by his contemporaries. For his own writings one may see the bibliography at the end of this thesis. For the second category it is worthwhile mentioning titles like "Tarjumânul Fuzalâ" (Persian) by Fazl-i Imâm Khayrâbâdî, "Tazkirah Ghawsiyah" by Shâh Ghaws 'Alî Qalandar, and "Waqâ'i 'Abdul Qâdir Khânî" by 'Abdul Qâdir Râmpûrî (Persian, unpublished, Urdu traslation, Karachi, 1960).



The third chapter deals with the fatwá of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz about the question of Dârul Harb. Apart from the fatwá, we shall consider some other relevant and important questions which were answered by Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. This part is mainly based on the study of "Fatâwá 'Azîzî" (Persian, 2 vols.), "Malfûzât-i 'Azîzî" (Persian), and "Tafsîr-i 'Azîzî" (Persian, 3 vols.) all by Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz.

The fourth chapter describes those 'peoplé' of that time who were friendly to the British, and who had accepted positions under the East India Company. This chapter is also based mostly upon the contemporary writings, such as "al-Thawrah al-Hindiyah" (Arabic) by Fazl-i Haqq Khayrâbâdî (the present writer could not have access to the original Arabic book, but has benefitted from its Urdu and English translations), "The Observations on the Mussulmauns of India" by Mrs. Meer Hasan Ali, and the "Autobiography of Lutfullah" (London, 3rd ed. 1858).

The fifth and last chapter deals with the life of two famous disciples of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, Sayyid Ahmad Shahîd and Shâh Ismâ'îl Shahîd, and with their activities during the life-time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. The structure of this chapter is based upon the exploration of the writings of

Shâh Ismâ'îl Shahîd (list given in the bibliography at the end), and of those who were their contemporaries, like Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khân and Muḥammad Ja'far Thânesarî.

In concluding this Forword<sup>e</sup>, I should like to express my gratitude to my Professors and fellow students who have made the appearance of this work possible. I am particularly indebted to Professor Wilfred Cantwell Smith, the Ex-Director of the Institute of Islamic Studies, for his constant help and generous encouragement. My thanks are due also to Professor Niyazi Berkes who was so kind as to read the entire thesis with me word by word, and who gave valuable suggestions. My friend, John B. Taylor, has kindly gone through the final draft; I am thankful to him also. Outside of the Institute, I wish to thank my friend and teacher Mr. Muhammad Idris of Jamia Millia, Delhi, for his help during the preparation of this work.

Finally, I want to express my deep gratitude to my esteemed teacher, Prof. M. Mujeeb of Jamia Millia, Delhi, without whose constant help and encouragement I could never have done justice to this work. To him this work is affectionately and gratefully dedicated.

Montreal, March 1964

Mushir ul Haque

## Chapter I

### Muslims meet Christians.

Before studying the question of relations between the Indian Muslims and the British in India in the early 19th century, it would be helpful if we knew what the Muslims of that period were thinking about the political situation of the country. Here we will not go into detail about the political situation, because any book of political history can serve this purpose. Since we have to see the relations between these two groups during the time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, we will limit ourselves to him and his opinion about the political situation. Till the end of the 18th century, as we know, the Marhattas were one of the strongest powers. They raided north India almost every year and upset the life of the people. Likewise, in the north-west of India, the Sikhs were in power. Delhi, being the capital of the Mughal King, was naturally the target of every adventurer, and the people of Delhi lived in an unsettled position. They did not know what could happen to them the next moment. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had written a few letters in Arabic-verse to one of his uncles, Shâh Ahlullâh,<sup>1</sup> describing the situation of his time.

He wrote:

"I see the infidels who are in power,  
They have brought ruin from Delhi to Kabul.<sup>2</sup>  
May God requite the Sikhs and Marhattas on our  
The worst requital, immediately without any delay.  
They have killed many people,  
And they have reduced every one to misery.  
None of the people is saved from their hands,  
Whenever their army, equipped with bows, attack.  
Every year they come to our city,  
And disturb our peaceful life.  
The city has been ruined, and there is no peace,  
So much so that I say, nay, every one says,  
Is there any protector for those who seek  
And is there any God fearing and just helper?"<sup>3</sup>

In another letter to the same person he wrote.

"The winter has come, and the heart is full of fear  
From the Sikhs; indeed the fear is not baseless.  
May God oust them from this city;  
They are the worst of enemies, and barbarians.  
I surrender my own and others' affairs to God,  
And indeed we pray for His protection".<sup>4</sup>

In a third letter to him he wrote.

"The city has become upset  
By the hands of invaders and barbarians.

You know well, whatever has been done  
To us by the Sikhs who have minced us.  
They have ruined every town,  
And have captured all the forts and ridges.  
They have destroyed the civilians  
And have killed them.  
They have looted many goods  
And have enslaved the women.  
If some one came forward to check them  
He was given the cup of death.  
The situation was so dreadful that mothers  
Ran away leaving their babies behind.  
Indeed the situation is horrifying, and  
Wise people should take a lesson from it.  
Look! how the low people  
Like weavers and sweepers  
Have become masters of the earth!  
Only to God I complain against them.  
Certainly the glory and honour is only to Him.  
This is how they have advanced  
Further and further day by day.  
They have completely cut off the Muslims.  
Though among Muslims there are great and wise  
Nonetheless they do not have the courage,  
Which stirs the man of determination.

Whenever an oppressed man approaches them,  
 They first order [military] operation;  
 Then sit together to counsel.  
 They are all fickle-minded, who  
 Finally surrender themselves to their faith.  
 They do not try to push the enemy back  
 Nor do they like to be censured.  
 This is their condition such as was never before,  
 Nor had any one dreamed of that.  
 If some one complains to them about enemies,  
 They try to silence him with their sharp tongues.  
 And the European Christians have come here,  
 Who are called honest in their words and  
 responsibilities.  
 They collect khirâj [revenue] with justice  
 In the name of him who is called imâm.<sup>5</sup>  
 They desire to take the country  
 From him who is incharge of lands and the people.  
 They want to take property  
 From their owners.  
 Their power is beyond imagination,  
 And their method is above conjecture".<sup>6</sup>

Such was the condition of the country in  
 which the Muslims found themselves. We see from these  
 lines how horrible the situation looked to Shâh 'Abdul  
 'Azîz. The Muslims' political power had been shaken,

and its end was approaching. The local non-Muslim powers were a destructive force for it. The British who had established their power in the East long before were encroaching towards the North. To them every Indian was alike. Their method of approach also was somewhat new. It was because <sup>of</sup> the difference between the British policy of penetration and the policy of attack and destruction of Marhattas and Sikhs that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz has not mentioned the British in the same way in which he has referred to Marhattas and Sikhs.

## II

Nowadays when most of the Indian Muslims study the British history of India they very often overlook one important point. They tend to think that from the first day of their arrival in India the British had a plan to spread Christianity all over the subcontinent. Therefore, they think that the 'Ulamâ' stood against the Christians. We will see that in the period under our study the British of the East India Company were not as much interested in Christianity as they were in their trade and economy. They did not consider themselves responsible for Christianity. The responsibility lay with the missionaries who were at first forbidden by the East India Company to set foot on Indian soil.

However, the missionaries entered India without the permission of the Company's Directors. When they did so the two were for a long time hostile to each other.

The Company maintained a typically commercial attitude till as late as 1758. The Charter of 1698 demanded that every ship of 500 tons load should carry a chaplain. For sixty years the Directors carefully sent out ships of 499 tons in order to escape providing the statutory chaplain.<sup>7</sup> The Company's attitude towards missionaries was so disparaging that protest was made to Archbishop Wake, which led to a change of attitude.<sup>8</sup> At home, in London, the missionaries were gaining many supporters. These helped them against the monopolist Company. "A great body of religious people throughout the island was already prepared to lead the attack on the renewal of the Charter if they believed the Company to be hostile to the principle of introducing Christianity into India".<sup>9</sup>

However, even this support from home did not enable the missionaries to enter India without an entry permit obtained from the Company. Some of them obtained it with great difficulty and many of them entered without permission. It was in 1833, (that is, after the period covered in this study) that the Company's Charter was renewed and it was declared that the missionaries were



no longer required to possess a licence in order to set foot in India.<sup>10</sup>

However, the fear of the Company was not baseless. Very often the missionaries turned their back upon the religious sentiments of the Indians. "A mutiny amongst some of the Company's sepoys at Vellore was widely attributed to attacks upon the Hindu religion. Fortunately the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the court of Directors of the East India Company, Edward Perry and Charles Grant, both evangelicals, were able to write a convincing refutation of the missionaries' culpability in a letter to the President of the Board of Control.<sup>[11]</sup> Largely as a result of these two men's effort to influence the debates in the Court the Directors eventually accepted the view that the unconscious behaviour of the military commander and the failure of the Governor to check him were the fundamental causes of the disaster".<sup>12</sup> When Lord Minto became Governor General of India (1807-1813), he "imposed severe restrictions upon the Baptist Mission Press at Serampore [Bengal] from which, unknown to the missionaries, there had recently been issued a number of violent attacks upon Islam and Hinduism".<sup>13</sup> But Lord Minto was criticized at home as hostile to missionaries. However, he soon assumed a liberal attitude to

missionaries, and "finally took upon himself the responsibility of permitting two Baptist missionaries to proceed to Agra and Delhi".<sup>14</sup>

On Indian soil we see the same difference of attitude between the missionaries and the Company's servants continuing. This was perhaps partially because of the interest of the Company and partially due to lack of religious conviction in their men stationed in India. The British employees of the Company, at that time, were known for their negligence towards their religion. "The Indians considered all Europeans in general and the English in particular to be winebibbers".<sup>15</sup> The English civilians in India also were disappointed with the officials' attitude towards their religious duties. In 1781, Mrs Fay wrote from Calcutta, in one of her 'Letters from India (1779-1815)! "I have never mentioned yet how indifferently we are provided with respect to place of worship; divine service being performed in a room (not a very large one) at the Old Fort; which is a great disgrace to the settlement: They talk of building a church and have fixed on a very eligible spot whereon to erect it but no further progress has been made in the business".<sup>16</sup>

This tussle between the East India Company and the missionaries continued till about 1831. In the

course of time, however, the attitude of the Company began to change. Though very often hostile to the Indians in their religious belief (however honest they might be in their own eyes), missionaries started public work to win the sympathy of the Indians. They aimed at dissemination of education, sanitation and eradication of social evils. They established some schools, hospitals and social service centres. Their schools basically were to provide the scriptural guidance, but the door was open to all.

In the beginning Muslims were afraid of Mission Schools. But soon they were also attracted by them.

"The register of the boys in the free school at Benares, where no distinctions were permitted, contains the names of 142 pupils admitted between June 1824 and May 1833, and includes representatives of innumerable castes ranging from Brahmans to Sudras, Christians and Muhammadans".<sup>17</sup> Inclination towards new learning in Muslim quarters was seen even before that time.

Warren Hastings, "roused by a petition from a considerable number of respectable Muhammadans, had founded a Madrassa, or College, in Calcutta, in 1781".<sup>18</sup> A few years later, in 1792, the Oriental College of Delhi (afterwards known as Delhi College) was founded; it was revived in 1825, when a new English class was started

in the College.<sup>19</sup> In the beginning the Muslims of Delhi suspected the policy of introducing an English class into Delhi College, but very soon they realised that their suspicion was not entirely based upon reason. And within three years, in 1831, the number of boys who took admission in the English class is said to have reached 300.<sup>20</sup> Muslims participated in the College not only as students but they also took an interest in its establishment. A wealthy Muslim endowed a handsome amount to run the College, and the 'Ulamâ' accepted chairs in the College under the Principalship of an English-man. Mawlânâ Mamlûk 'Alî was the Head of the Arabic Department.<sup>21</sup> Mawlânâ Muḥammad Qâsim Nânôtawî ( the founder of Deoband school) also was on the staff, though for a very short time.<sup>22</sup> Muftî Ṣadrud Dîn Âzurdah was one of the examiners.

### III

Beside participation in the educational field, a current of social toleration between Muslims and Christians was coming into society during the time of Shâh 'Abdul 'azîz. A tendency what may now be called 'Indianization' was evident in the English circle. English gentlemen in their daily life were

adopting Indian customs, habits and social practices.<sup>23</sup> We will see later some cases of happy relations between the 'Ulamâ' and English gentlemen. Here we will examine particularly some of the cases of inter-marriage between Christians and Muslims. According to Islamic law, a Muslim is allowed to marry a Christian woman, but, as was felt particularly strongly at that time, not vice versa.<sup>24</sup> In spite of this there are examples of Christians marrying Muslim women. "Some of them married into the best Mussulman families, like Major Hyder Hearsay (1782/3-1840),<sup>[25]</sup> who married Zahur-ul Nisa Begam, daughter of the deposed prince of Cambay and adopted as a daughter by the Emperor Akbar Shah II,<sup>26</sup> ... Col. Hearsay's son married the Nawab Mulka Humani Begam, daughter of Mirza Suliman Sheko and niece of Akbar II".<sup>27</sup> Bêgam Samrû of Sardhana is also an example of this; by birth she was a Muslim girl and her father was a noble (amîr) at the Mughal court.<sup>28</sup>

Bêgam Samrû was born about 1750 and in 1765 she was married to General Samrû. His name was Reinhardt. "Reinhardt was by temperament a grave, sullen and morose man; and the gloom of his countenance gained for him the nickname of Sombre from his friends while he was in the French service. This rather

harsh appellation was softened on the Indian tongue into Samru".<sup>29</sup> He started his life as a military adventurer, and very soon he acquired wealth, fame and power as did most of the European soldiers. He had good relations both with English officers of the East India Company and the Mughal king. Until his death in 1778, his Muslim wife, Bêgam Samrû, remained Muslim. Three years after his death, Bêgam Samrû was baptized under the name of Joanna by a Roman Catholic priest.<sup>30</sup> She lived another fifty years and managed her deceased husband's estate. There are no records available to tell why Bêgam Samrû was baptized after the death of her husband.<sup>31</sup> However, she kept her Muslim name on her seal even after baptism. It was "NOBILIS JOANNA SOMER: ZAYBUN NISÂ BÊGAM, 1200"/[1785].<sup>32</sup> Her Muslim name is written in Urdu characters and her Christian name in Roman. She died in 1836.

These examples are not negligible, particularly when we find the Muslims of that time asking Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz about the validity of intermarriage between the Sunnîs and Shî'îs. Strangely enough there is not a single question available in which some one has asked about intermarriage between Muslims and Christians. Perhaps Muslims of that time considered

the women who married Christians as outcaste, and, therefore, they did not bother themselves about this problem. We cannot say anything definitely, because nothing is available except one reference to Bêgam Samrû in the memoir of Mawlawî 'Abdul Qâdir Râmpûrî. But the attitude of Mawlawî 'Abdul Qâdir at this point does not appear to be very critical; his tone is rather complimentary. In 1815, when Lord Moira went on a state visit to the British territory around Delhi, Bêgam Samrû paid a visit to him. Mawlawî 'Abdul Qâdir was present on that occasion. He says, "It is said that she [Bêgam Samrû] has accepted Christianity. But I think that she does not have any relations to Christianity in particular. She wants to live<sup>a</sup> successful life. She is a Qur'ân-reader among the Muslims and Injîl [Bible]-knowing among the Christians. In the presence of Jews she rejects both, and in the company of Hindu she disregards everything. Among the Pârsîs she is a fire-worshipper, and before the Sikhs she carries the Granth".<sup>33</sup> Apart from this comment nothing seems to have been said from the Muslim side. In 1817 when Sayyid Aḥmad (known as Sayyid Aḥmad Shahîd) toured North India to reform Muslim society he went to Sardhana, the capital of the estate of

Bêgam Samrû. Two officers of the Bêgam's army became his disciples. Sayyid Ahmad asked them to be as prompt in the service of God as they were in the Bêgam's service.<sup>34</sup> Sayyid did not criticise Bêgam Samrû's conversion and admonished her servants to remain equally active in the service of God as he admonished the servants of the East India Company. But the East India Company was the representative of the Christians who were people of a scripture when the Bêgam could not be considered as such. She was an apostate and the silence of Sayyid Ahmad on this issue virtually encouraged the Muslims to serve not only the British, but even an apostate.<sup>35</sup>

#### IV

One may ask why Muslim society was not provoked at this social toleration. This is a question which needs an answer. And that answer, perhaps, will lead us to another question as to why this social toleration did not succeed. Evidently these cases of intermarriage or even the case of baptism were the result of personal liking or disliking of the person concerned. The East India Company was not yet regarded as the religious representative of Christianity. It was considered as a political



power, and its administration, compared to the Indians', was more acceptable to the general public. But when missionaries came onto the field and, for many reasons, some of which we have already seen, the policy of the East India Company changed to a large extent, the Muslims felt provoked. The missionaries started a mass programme of conversion on the ground that Islam was no more a valid religion and salvation lay only in Christianity. There were Roman Catholic Missions which had been opened in North India as early as the 16th century, but, in fact, by the 18th century these were no longer effective. For the first time after the Roman Catholic Missions, a Baptist Mission Society was started at Agra in 1811. In Delhi there was no Mission office before 1817.<sup>36</sup> Up to 1830 there was no clash between Muslims and Christians on religious grounds, not even on the question of conversion, for at that time the attitude of the missionaries towards Islam was not hostile. The Rev. 'Abdul Masîḥ (Muslim name Shaykh Şâliḥ, d. 1827) from Agra was baptized in Calcutta in 1811. He was the first (Indian) representative of the Church Mission Society. He worked hard and in less than 16 months he converted about 50 Hindus and Muslims to Christianity.<sup>37</sup> But no outcry was

heard on the baptism of 'Abdul Masîḥ or others. Had the missionaries concentrated only upon the positive teachings of the Bible, perhaps, there would have not been any clash between Muslims and Christians. During the entire Muslim period in India, the Muslims remained very passive on the question of conversion, except when it was given a political colour, or when the personality of the Prophet Muḥammad was misrepresented. In 1833, the Rev. Pfander wrote his book, *Mizânul Haqq*, in Persian, attacking the Qur'ân and the Prophet Muḥammad.<sup>38</sup> After the publication of this book in a very short time a few more books were written with the same motive. These provoked the Muslims and a series of unhealthy religious debates was started. Before that we do not find Muslims and Christians debating with each other. In fact the year 1830 can be considered in the Anglo-Muslim history in India as a landmark. The period after 1830 is beyond the scope of the present paper. This writer is concerned in seeing the Muslims' attitude towards the British in the early 19th century, that is till the death of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz.

So far we have seen what was the political situation in the country, and how Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz

regarded it; what was the relation between two major groups of the Christians, that is the East India Company and the missionaries, and how the Company's attitude was changing; how slowly, a social toleration was creeping into society. In the succeeding pages we shall try to see, in detail, the relation between the 'Ulamâ' and the British; and some important questions which the Muslims asked Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz as how to deal with the British.

## Chapter II

### Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz: His Life and Personality.

After the death of Shâh Walîullâh, his son, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz gradually became an outstanding figure among the Indian Muslims. He was born on 25th of Ramaḍân, the 9th month of the Islamic year, in 1159/1746. His chronogramatic name was Ghulâm Ḥalîm, but his father named him 'Abdul 'Azîz, and he was known by this name thereafter. As was the custom in those days, he started his education at the age of five with the study of the Qur'ân. Every biographer of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz seems to have agreed that he finished his education in Tafsîr, Ḥadîth, Ṣarf (Accidence), Nahw (Syntax), Fiqh, Uṣûl-i Fiqh (Principles of Jurisprudence), Manṭiq (Logic), Kalâm and 'Aqâ'id (Theology), Astronomy and Mathematics, about the early of age fifteen.<sup>1</sup> He was taught especially by his father and by two of his father's disciples, Shâh Muḥammad 'Âshiq and Khwâjah Amînullâh. Along with the current standard education he was also given lessons in mysticism by his father. His father held authority (ijâzah) in all four existing mystic orders, the Naqshbandî, the Qâdirî, the Suhrawardî and the Chishtî.<sup>2</sup> Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz too obtained such ijâzah

in all these orders from his father.

Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had profound knowlege of the Urdu language, and of Persian and Arabic literature.

Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was the eldest son of Shâh Walîfullâh. The other three were Shâh Rafî'ud Dîn, Shâh 'Abdul Qâdir and Shâh 'Abdul Ghanî. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had no male issue; his three daughters were all married to their cousins. The second daughter gave birth to two sons, Shâh Muḥammad Ishâq and Shâh Muḥammad Ya'qûb, both of whome migrated to the Hijaz after 1857.

Shâh Walîfullâh died when Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was about 17 years old. At that time Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, being the eldest son, and having completed his necessary education assumed the responsibility of the principalship of the "Madrasah Rahîmiyah" (Delhi), the school founded by his grandfather, Shâh 'Abdur Raḥîm. Thereafter Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz devoted his life to teaching, to spiritual guidance, to delivering sermons and to writing books.

Every Tuesday and Friday he used to give public sermons on the premises of the Madrasah; this was attended not only by Muslims but by non-Muslims also.

The Madrasah was a centre of traditional Islamic learning. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz's reputation did not remain confined to Delhi but it even spread to remote parts of India to Muslims who considered their education incomplete until they had sat at his feet. Many Muslims flocked around him in Delhi to benefit themselves. The Madrasah was expanded to accomodate them, and later the entire locality around the Madrasah came to be known as the "School of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz".<sup>3</sup> His fame even seems to have gone abroad, and by some his opinion in religious controversies was considered decisive.<sup>4</sup>

The Muslims of India at that time had been divided into two groups. The followers of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, such as Shâh Ismâ'îl, criticized the Muslims (in the same way as they had been criticized by orthodox 'Ulamâ' in the past) for acting against Islamic teachings, in so far as they had indulged in many Indianized social customs and habits which were branded as un-Islamic and innovations (bid'ah), but which were considered Islamic by those who were practising them. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, however, does not seem to be an outspoken representative of this criticism. He appears calm and peaceful by his temperament,

discreet and tactful and broad-minded. It seems as if to him sheer criticism was of no importance. We may quote an incident which shows his ability to judge situations coolly and methodically. It happened<sup>5</sup> that a mawlawî who was a munşif (a judicial officer) in the East India Company, somewhere in the Panjab, had his meal with his English officers at a common table. The 'Ulamâ' of that locality declared him to have gone outside the fold of Islam. The mawlawî tried to convince them on the ground of the Qur'ân and the Hadîth and the Fiqh, but all in vain. At last they came to Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. At the entrance of the house they met Shâh Raff'ud Dîn, his younger brother, and asked his opinion. He unequivocally said that the mawlawî was right. The opponents of the mawlawî did not accept his opinion and went to Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. He after hearing the case, delivered a long speech, to the effect that the mawlawî had committed a great mistake, and that he had reached the verge of kufr. The opponents of the mawlawî were delighted. The poor mawlawî and his relatives asked Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz what to do and how to re-enter the fold of Islam. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz then replied that the mawlawî

had not gone out of Islam, because just by reaching the verge of kufr no one could become kâfir. But, to be on the safe side, he asked him to recite the Words of Witness to the Faith (Kalimah'-i Shahâdah) and made him drink the holy water of the Qadam Sharîf (the holy foot).<sup>6</sup>

This attitude of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz may be understood as if he was of the opinion that the Muslims should not mix with the non-Muslims; otherwise, like his brother, he would have said very frankly that the mawlawî was right. But, if we remember the situation in which he was living, we should at least have to give some credit to him for his intelligent way of handling the situation. The people of the Panjab would have probably rejected his words if he had given his opinion in too clear-cut a way.

However, it was not very easy for Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz to satisfy one and all. There were people who could not endure even mild criticism. In his Malfûzât, he has complained that very often people behaved disagreeably towards him when they were not pleased with his ideas.<sup>7</sup> Indeed the differences were not only due to religious convictions. There were political reasons too.



In the political field the Muslim nobles (umara') at the Mughal court were divided into two major factions, Sunnî and Shî'î. Outside the court these two groups had their influence over the general public. The political intrigues of the courtiers were reflected in the religious differences prevalent in Muslim society. Both the Sunnî and the Shî'î factions were trying to overthrow the other. At that time Najaf Khân (1737-1781), Shî'î by faith, was a powerful figure in the Mughal court. On the other hand, the Rohillas were a strong Sunnî power,<sup>8</sup> although weak in the court. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had a high place in the estimation of the Rohillas. The influence of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz over the Rohillas naturally caused him to suffer hardships from the Shî'î group. There are several exaggerated stories mentioned by later historians of malicious treatment meted out to him by Shî'î group, particularly by Najaf Khân. But there is no contemporary evidence to confirm these stories.<sup>9</sup>

Apart from spiritual guidance and teaching, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz wrote and dictated several books. Some of them related to contemporary religious issues, and some contained the biography of the Muḥaddithîn, the grand sons of the Prophet and other

Companions. He wrote a few books on the subjects of logic and rhetoric. Tuhfah'-i Ithnâ 'Ashariyah, Tafsîr Fathul 'Azîz or Tafsîr-i 'Azîzî are among his well-known books. Fatâwâ 'Azîzî, another famous book, is the collection of fatâwâ asked on different occasions and collected afterwards without any chronological order or classification of topics. It appears impossible to trace out the duration of time for these fatâwâ. Malfûzât-i 'Azîzî is also a collection of his sayings collected by one of his disciples, whose name is not known.

The Tafsîr-i 'Azîzî was dictated to one of his pupils, Shaykh 'Abdullâh, a new Muslim.<sup>10</sup> Its exact date is not known except that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz dictated the book some time in his old age when he had lost his eye-sight.<sup>11</sup> The Tafsîr is in Persian, and is incomplete. It contains only the Sûrah-i Baqr, the 2nd chapter of the Qur'ân, and parts (ajzâ') 29th and 30th, the last two parts of the Qur'ân. In the Tafsîr, at the outset he gives an explanatory note at the beginning of each Sûrah about the title of the Sûrah, the place, the time and context of its revelation (shân-i nuzûl), the number of verses, words and letters. Then he traces its relation with the previous Sûrah.

Afterwards he comments upon and explains the verses. In his commentary he gives not only view point of the classical commentators, but also his own opinion wherever necessary.<sup>12</sup>

The other well-known and highly controversial book written by him is the Tuhfah, which was compiled in 1204/1789.<sup>13</sup> In this book he has described the history, belief and teachings of the Shi'is. The book deals with the fundamental teachings of the Shi'is, and discusses their belief about God, prophecy and the imâmat etc. The author informs us that the book was written when Shiism was permeating every (Sunnî) family.<sup>14</sup> There was hardly any Sunnî house, he says, in which some of its members had not become Shi'î.<sup>15</sup> They did not know anything about their new faith, but were always ready to discuss with their opponents without having solid knowledge concerning their new faith, or even concerning Sunnism. Likewise the Sunnîs lacked the necessary knowledge of Shiism. Therefore the author, as he says, compiled the book to provide information to people who were really interested in such debates. He based his book, he claims, only on genuine Shi'î sources. To him the best way of religious debate was to depend on those first-hand genuine sources

which were acceptable to the opponents. He was of the opinion that relying on books questioned by the other party would bear no fruit. About the Tuhfah he suggested that only those persons who had studied thoroughly both Sunnism and Shiism should read it. If a man knew <sup>only</sup> one view point and was ignorant of the other, it was not worth his while to read the book.

At that time the differences between Sunnīs and Shī'īs were so deep that sometime they considered the other beyond the pale of Islam. In the Fatāwā and in the Malfūzāt we find questions about the status of the Shī'ī according to the Shar', in regard to marriage and social intercourse. Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz, however, did not consider them outside Islam but he preferred to avoid social intercourse with them.<sup>16</sup> Likewise the Shī'īs also were bitter towards the Sunnīs. Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz has pointed out a Shī'ī gentleman, Sayyid Ruknud Dīn, who was bitterly opposed to him and wanted to kill him, but gradually became his disciple.<sup>17</sup>

In such circumstances Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz wrote the Tuhfah. The Sunnīs took it as an effective weapon against the Shī'īs. It was soon translated into Arabic by one Mawlawī Aslamī on the order of

at

the Nawwâb of Arcot.<sup>18</sup> For the Shî'îs the book proved explosive. The Shî'î 'Ulamâ' tried to refute the book and wrote voluminous works and treatises to answer the points raised in the Tuhfah.<sup>19</sup> They also blamed the author for having translated a little-known book, Şawâ'iq-i Mûbiqah, by Naşrullâh Kâbulî, and for having it published as his own original work, which Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz denied.<sup>20</sup>

Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, before publishing the book, presumably had anticipated serious opposition. He, therefore, had not given his commonly known name as the author. Instead he published the book with his chronogrammatic name, "Ḥâfiẓ Ghulâm Ḥalîm/ ['Abdul 'Azîz] b. Shaykh Quṭbud Dîn/[Walîullâh] b. Shaykh Abû'l Fayẓ/['Abdur Raḥîm] Dihlawî". When asked, he gave as the reason for using this name, that he did not feel very proud of this work and did not reckon it among his good works.<sup>21</sup> This might be one of the reasons, but, however, the book was, in a way, an open invitation to opposition and adversities.<sup>22</sup>

After Najaf Khân, the Shî'î power declined. The Mughal Emperor, who had been a source of strength to the Shî'î faction, himself became merely a pensioner of the East India Company,

which further weakened the Shif'î power. After 1803, the real political power was in the hands of neither Shif'îs nor of Sunnîs. Both were dependent upon a third power, which had no relation with either of them. In that situation Muslims began to ask new questions. The major question was how to deal with the British. Should they ignore them and rely upon the dying Mughal power, or should welcome them as friends, even though under compulsion of unwanted circumstances? In answer to this question we may glance at the relations between Muslims and British and particularly between Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz and the British at that time.

The British officers at Delhi were on good terms with Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. Very often they visited him and, if necessary, helped him.<sup>23</sup>

In Kamâlât-i 'Azîzî we find several interesting stories about the good relations between the English and Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz.<sup>24</sup> In the Malfûzât, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz mentioned three British officers, [Col. James] Skinner, [William] Fraser, and [Alexander] Seton. The way their names have been mentioned shows that they were quite close to him. He described Skinner as "a friend but rude",<sup>25</sup> Seton as "a learned friend but rude and flatterer", and

Fraser as "well-versed and a very good friend, who has studied something under me".<sup>26</sup> If we read the biographies of these three English gentlemen we can realize how Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had studied them. Skinner, by birth, was a Eurasian. His mother was a Râjpût woman, and he too had married into a good Râjpût family. He started his career as a military adventurer. Since he was a victim of "gradual supersession" on racial grounds<sup>27</sup> he was naturally bitter towards the English administration at Delhi. "At Delhi" as 'Abdul Qâdir Râmpûrî says, "Seton and Ochterlony always had complaints against Skinner".<sup>28</sup>

About Seton, the British Resident at Delhi, we read that he was "too gentle with the Mughal Emperor" and his administration at Delhi was "mildly inefficient".<sup>29</sup> At the time when the Mughal Emperor had been rendered almost helpless by the East India Company probably the careful expression of "too gentle" would have the same flavour which Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz wanted to express with the word "flatterer".

Fraser had very cordial and close contact with Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz and other prominent Indian nobles and men of letters. He had become so Indianized that "his brother officers did not like

his friendliness to the Delhi families".<sup>30</sup> One of his friends, a French traveller, Victor de Jacquemmont, writes about him, "He is half Asiatic in his habits. [He] is the only officer of Government, who, to my knowledge, keeps up any social relations with the natives. Last Sunday I paid a few visits with him to some of these long-beards (Mussulmauns). This politeness and condescension is, I fancy, blamed by the other British officers".<sup>31</sup> 'Abdul Qâdir Râmpûrî who served for a long time under several British officers, attributed to him the quality of "quick conception and deep knowledge".<sup>32</sup>

It is, however, clear that both Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz and some of the British officers knew each other very well. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz also realised that the British power had new blood in its veins. He was aware of their well organised military power.<sup>33</sup> We may be justified in assuming that he had probably realized that the British were not a passing force in India. We may also assume that it must have seemed useless to him to show hostility and bitterness towards them. Several times British people asked him religious questions to which he gave sharp, witty but unprovocative answers. He never provided an occasion to the British to



brand him as a rabble-rouser. They were so sure of his conscientious, modest and law-abiding nature that on one occasion, when Charles Metcalf, the British Resident at Delhi, was informed that Shâh Ismâ'îl, the nephew of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, was provoking sectarian hatred among the Muslims by his sermons, he was astonished that a nephew of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz could have become so turbulent.<sup>34</sup>

During the life time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz the religious debates between Muslims and Christians had not started.<sup>35</sup> We do not have any evidence to support such statements as "during the time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz' the religious debates had become common, and Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, considering it an Islamic duty, took part in them with full enthusiasm".<sup>36</sup> In fact the first religious debate, in its real sense, was held in 1844, between Mawlânâ Âl-i Ḥasan and the Rev. Pfander.<sup>37</sup> There are a few stories in Kamâlât-i 'Azîzî about discussions between Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz and Christians, but they are in their nature more similar to table-talk than to debate.<sup>38</sup> However, there are references here and there in the Malfûzât and in the Fatâwâ to religious questions put by the British; but, no doubt, they can only be termed religious curiosities, not as a debate.<sup>39</sup>

Here it may be asked why Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz and the British were so friendly to each other. Was it really "a symptom of fondness for Islam", as in the case of Skinner.<sup>40</sup> The answer is, however, not very difficult. We have seen that the attitude of the East India Company differed from that of the Christian missionaries. The East India Company was not prepared to create any difficulty in its way by arousing hostile religious sentiments. Their main purpose was to establish their political power on a solid basis, and to expand their trade, but not necessarily their religion. Although by that time they had become defacto rulers they were careful enough not to take any risk. That is partly the reason **why** during the life time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz we do not find any great opposition to the British administration from the Muslim side.

The 'Ulamâ' were in the service of the East India Company. Even Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had allowed his son-in-law, Mawlawî 'Abdul Hayy, to accept the office of the Muftî under the East India Company.<sup>41</sup> He must have realised that the policy of military resistance was no longer feasible. Opposition in those circumstances meant courting death. He, therefore, must have adopted a policy

after which he could not be accused of hostility to the British, and could thus proceed with his mission. His mission was to prepare the Muslims to face the changed political circumstances. Having realised the hopeless condition of Muslim political power he asked the Muslims not to live in the world of dreams. It is safe to assume that he was probably sure that the country was no longer an abode of Islam, where Muslims could live according to their own laws, as we will be seeing later when we will analyze his fatawá. The country had become Dârul Harb. To Muslim, as we shall see, there were two alternatives, jihâd or hijrah, if they were to take the classical Fiqh-opinions on their face value. Otherwise they had to find out their own way in that new situation.

It was the responsibility of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz to find out a safe way. This he did. He came forward and, without allowing his character and personality to be harmed and without compromising his religious identity, he tacitly told the Muslims how to cooperate with the new power.

### Chapter III

#### Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz: Questions and Answers.

Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was asked three kinds of question in the realm that concerns us. There were questions concerning the legal status of the country according to the ground of the Shar', under the British; questions about learning the English language and having social contact with the British; and questions about accepting jobs under the British government.<sup>1</sup>

Unfortunately we do not know the exact time and even the order of these questions. The compiler of the Fatâwâ 'Azîzî, which contains all these questions and their answers, has not mentioned the dates of the fatâwâ. All the fatâwâ have been collected in two volumes<sup>2</sup> without following any principle of classification. We also do not know whether this collection included all the fatâwâ issued by Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz or whether it was merely a part of them; and if the latter was the case, how much of it has not reached us. We can only assume that the existing fatâwâ are a part of the whole, which was collected by some one

haphazardly. However, atleast at four places dates have been given.<sup>3</sup> Besides these four occasions there are three more to which some date can be ascribed on the basis of conjectures.

There are some questions from "Mr. Fraser" [sawâlât az Mistar Farêjah] in the Fatâwâ 'Azîzî.<sup>4</sup> Fraser was posted at Delhi at two different times. The first time, as the secretary to General Ochterlony, was in 1805, and the second time he was appointed as Resident at Delhi from 1830 to 1835.<sup>5</sup> Since Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz died in 1824, it is apparent that the question had been asked about 1805.

There is another fatwâ which deals with the question of permissibility of eating with the English and polytheists;<sup>6</sup> it is also without date, but Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khân has quoted this fatwâ mentioning that it was issued in 1237/1821.<sup>7</sup>

At another place Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz has described the political condition of the country in the following allegorical way.<sup>8</sup> (From its contents it seems to be a letter written to some one, which the compiler has included in the fatâwâ.)

"The condition of the world is this that one of the chiefs from the South, a descendent of Malha [Marhatta?] decided

to take revenge for the Southern people on the people of the East. He first defeated the Easterners in Kotah, Rampur, and Agra. At last the people of the East were besieged in the Agra Fort, and the Southern people spread between Agra and Delhi and started to loot and massacre. ... Afterwards they reached Delhi and besieged the city and opened fire on the civil population. This continued for seven nights and eight days, but they could not capture the city. Then their fortune was changed into misfortune. The chief of the Eastern people, whose [English] name if translated into Hindi gives the meaning of jūn [nit or louse], came to Agra with his army. ... The Southern people flew away and the Eastern people kept chasing them. ... In short, the Southern chief did not have the courage to fight with the people of the East, because the Easterners were well experienced in military science, and their soldiers were well equipped with fire arms. ... The people of this area

were facing bad days. Both of the groups had pillaged the people, so much so that this time the Easterners also, much against their disposition, had started plundering and had set aside their peaceful nature".

Though Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz has not mentioned any particular name in this statement, he has provided a clue to the understanding of the whole story. This was the story of the Anglo-Marhatta war in 1803, when the British won the battle against the Marhattas. The people of the South were Marhattas, and the people of the East represented the British, whose Head Quarters were at Calcutta, the Eastern part of India. The Eastern chief was Lord Lake. Of course Lake is not the synonym of nit if it is correctly pronounced as Lêk [like ail]. But it does mean "nit" if pronounced as Lîk [like cheek]. In Urdu script both Lêk and Lîk are written in one and the same manner as (لک). Thus we can say that this letter probably was written sometime about 1803.

## II

Now we shall examine, in some detail, those fatâwâ which come within the scope of our

present study. We cannot, however, say when these fatâwâ were issued, because, as we have already seen, there is no way to date them. Moreover, we do not know to what region the inquirers belonged. If they were from Delhi or from north India the questions presumably were asked some time around or after 1803 when the East India Company extended its territory up to Delhi. And if they belonged to some Eastern districts of India the questions might have been asked before the 19th century when the people of that region had faced the changed situation.

However, replying to a purely theoretical question whether a Dârul Islâm could become a Dârul Harb or not, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz says:<sup>9</sup>

"Generally the authentic [fiqh] books say that Dârul Islâm becomes a Dârul Harb on the following three conditions:

1. The orders [ahkâm] of polytheists prevail.
2. No other Dârul Islâm is found in between the conqueror's Dârul Harb and the conquered Dârul Islâm.
3. No Muslim or Zimmî enjoys the amân-i awwal.<sup>10</sup>



On the other hand a Dârul Harb becomes Dârul Islâm if the orders [aḥkâm] of the Muslims prevail, that is the cities [shihir] where the rule [ḥukm] of the Imâmul Muslimîn prevails become Dârul Islâm; and the cities ruled by the leader [sardâr] of [non-Muslims] come under the definition of Dârul Harb.

In this city [presumably Deḥli] the rule of Imâmul Muslimîn is not in force, and the rule of the Christian officers [ḥukkâm-i Naṣârâ] is in force with impunity. What is meant by the enforcement of the orders [aḥkâm] of kufr is that the infidels are acting as rulers in administration and management of the affairs of the subjects, in the collection of revenue and dues, and taxes on commerce, in checking highway robbery and theft, in deciding disputes and enforcing penalties for crimes. It is of no significance if they do not interfere in the observance of some Islamic rites e.g. the Friday and the two 'Īd prayers, the azân [calling for

prayer] and sacrifice of cow, because these things do not hold any value in their eyes. They demolish mosques without any hesitation. Without their permission no Muslim or Zimmi can enter this city and its environs. And if they do not object to the entry of visitors [wâridîn], travellers [musâfirîn] and traders in their domain, it is because of their own interest. Distinguished persons like Shujâ'ul Mulk and Wilâyatî Bêgam could not enter their [Christians'] cities without obtaining their permission.<sup>11</sup> The Christians' control extends from this city to Calcutta. Of course here and there, for instance in Hyderabad, Rampur and Lucknow, they do not issue their own orders because the rulers of these states [wâliyân-i riyâsat] have entered into agreements with them and have submitted to them".

It is generally believed nowadays that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz declared "India" to be Dârul Harb through this fatwâ in 1803, when the East India Company became the de facto ruler of the Mughal

India, and through this fatwá he asked the Muslims to wage jihâd against the British or to migrate from the country.<sup>12</sup> How far this interpretation is correct, we shall see it later. But, at this stage, one may ask what Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz meant by declaring the country a Dârul Harb. Was it really a declaration of war against the British, or was it only a statement about the existing situation? These questions may be answered if we can clarify these two important points:

1. What legal right did Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz have to declare jihâd?
2. What motive did the Muslims have in asking the question about the status of India according to the Shar'?

It is now generally believed that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, being an 'âlim gave the fatwá that India was Dârul Harb, and thus it was obligatory for every Muslim to stand for jihâd or to leave the country for ever. (Here it is interesting to note that if the fatwá had implied these two conditions, the Muslim community did not respond to it at least during the life time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz.) However, in order to know what right Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had to give such fatwá, we must

know first of all the meaning of "fatwá". Fatwá is a technical term in Islamic jurisprudence. It contains a question (istiftâ') on some definite problem and its explicit answer (fatwá). The mufti (one who gives the fatwá) is not supposed to give his own opinion; rather he should base his answer on the previous authorities. This is the way a fatwá is given. But who is supposed to give a fatwá? Can every one who has the knowledge of the Sharf'ah give a fatwá? In fact this depends on the nature of the fatwá. To illustrate this point let us suppose two hypothetical cases. In the first case there is a man who has, let us say, made some mistake in his prayers, and he wants to know whether or not he is required to repeat these prayers. He can put this question before any 'âlim who would give the answer in accordance with the Sharf'ah, and his answer would be considered as a fatwá, too. On the other hand there is, say, a married couple, who are not on good terms. The wife wants to be rid of her husband. An 'âlim knows that on certain grounds their marriage can be declared as null and void, but practically every 'âlim does not have the power to declare so. Only that 'âlim can give an effective fatwá in this

situation who has been appointed by the government or by the community to deal with such a problem. Because of this the husband may refuse to accept the fatwá, and the 'âlim does not have power to execute it. So, as we see, a fatwá which may affect more than one person cannot be given by one who does not have the power to enforce it.

Let us come now to the case of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz and his fatwá of Dârul Harb. If we consider this fatwá as a declaration of jihâd then we have to see upon what authority Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz declared jihâd by his fatwá? It has been shown that a fatwá affecting more than one person must be issued by an authorised muftî. We know that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was not a state-appointed muftî, nor was he empowered by the whole community to issue such a fatwá.

To justify the claim, one may still say that when Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz issued this fatwá (around 1803) the Muslim rule in India was politically at an end. The Mughal ruler, who had the religious authority to declare jihâd, was under the influence of the British, and therefore, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, being an 'âlim, considered it his duty to declare jihâd to restore the Muslim power. This thesis might be acceptable if Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had proved

this hypothesis by his own action. We all know that neither did Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz himself launch any jihâd movement against the British nor did he ever call the people to fight against them. Neither he nor any of his followers in his life time migrated from India. In this circumstances it is not so easy to accept this modern interpretation of his fatwâ.

But if by his fatwâ Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz declare did/that India was Dârul Harb, but apparently did not at the same time open any war against the British, then we ought to know the purpose of the fatwâ. In some of his other fatâwâ, which we shall see later, he clearly said that the parts of India occupied by the non-Muslims were no more Dârul Islâm. It is very important to see why the Muslims were so anxious to know whether India was Dârul Harb or Dârul Islâm. This mystery will be solved when we examine the rest of the fatâwâ issued by Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz.

On another occasion Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was asked about the legal position of the domain of the Christians in the following way:<sup>13</sup>

"Is the <sup>sholw</sup> domain (mulk) of the Christians (naşârá) Dârul Harb or not?

And if it is, what is the decision about taking usury (sûd) from Christians and about performing the congregational Friday prayer".

His reply was:

"All the necessary conditions for a Dârul Harb have been laid down in the fiqh books. A few of them are given below. If these conditions exist in the domain of the Christians then it is Dârul Harb. And if the domain of Christians [according to these conditions] is Dârul Harb then [for a Muslim] it is permitted (jâ'iz) to take usury from kuffâr.

"As to the performing of the Friday prayers in a Dârul Harb, [it is written that] if there is a Muslim officer (hâkim) in Dârul Harb appointed by [the ruler of] the infidels, then the Friday prayers will be performed by the permission of the [Muslim] officer. And if there is no Muslim hâkim in Dârul Harb, the Muslims should select an honest man from among themselves and consider him as their leader (ra'is). They should perform their Friday and 'îd prayers with his permission. The duty of the ra'is is to look after the rights of minors if they are left without guardian,

and to protect the rights of orphans and to manage unclaimed properties etc. But it must be remembered that this <sup>a</sup>re'is will not have any authority in the country's political affairs (umûr-i mulkî mên taşarruf awr dakhlah hôgâ).

"So far as the question of a Dârul Harb's becoming a Dârul Islâm is concerned, the Fatâwâ 'Âlamgîrî says<sup>14</sup> that if the Sharî'ah (hukmul Islâm) is promulgated in a Dârul Harb the country becomes Dârul Islâm.

"And on the question of a Dârul Islâm's becoming a Dârul Harb, Imâm Muḥammad quoted Abû Ḥanîfah saying that on the following three conditions a Dârul Islâm becomes a Dârul Harb.

- "1. The rule of infidels (aḥkâmul kuffâr) are promulgated publicly and the Sharî'ah (hukmul Islâm) is not in force.
2. The Dârul Islâm is surrounded by Dârul Harb in such a way that no other city of Islam stands between the said Dârul Islâm and the conquering Dârul Harb.
3. No Muslim or infidel zimmî enjoys the amân-i awwal<sup>15</sup> granted to him before'.



"If the ḥarbī kuffār [infidels who are in the state of fighting with Muslims] conquer a Dārul Islām, or the citizens of Dārul Islām apostatize and overcome the Muslim ruler, or the ḡimmīs rebel against the government of Dārul Islām and come into power, a Dārul Islām remains a Dārul Islām unless the above mentioned three conditions are found.

"But according to Muḥammad and Abū Yūsuf, as it is recorded in Fatāwā 'Ālamgīrī,<sup>16</sup> merely by manifestation of the orders of kufr a Dārul Islām becomes Dārul Ḥarb. The remaining two conditions are not essential.

"It is also mentioned in the Fatāwā 'Ālamgīrī that in the cities where kuffār are rulers, it is lawful for Muslims to perform Friday prayer. And if the Muslim of that city agree upon a man as their qāzī, according to Shar', he would become their qāzī. And it is obligatory for Muslims to find out a Muslim ruler".

On another occasion Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz was asked explicitly about the region ('amaldārī) under the British administration. The question was whether or not the region under the English (Angrêz)

administration and that of other similar non-Muslims were Dârul Harb. And if they were Dârul Harb, whether or not it was allowed to take usury from the non-Muslims. To this question he replied.<sup>17</sup>

"According to Fiqh the usury between a Muslim and an infidel of a Dârul Harb is allowed. ... It should be known that the opinion about Dârul Islâm as being not changed into Dârul Harb at all is somehow weak. It is true that a Dârul Islâm becomes Dârul Harb. Of course on this point there is disagreement among the 'Ulamâ', as to when a Dârul Islâm becomes Dârul Harb. One group says that if even one Islamic rite like azân or circumcision is forbidden by force the Dârul Islâm becomes Dârul Harb.

"Another group of 'Ulamâ' says that just by abolishing the Islamic rites a Dârul Islâm does not become Dârul Harb unless the infidel rites are openly practised in Dârul Islâm. In the later circumstances a Dârul Islâm becomes Dârul Harb, though all the Islamic rites are still existing.

"Some other 'Ulamâ' have gone to this extent to say that Dârul Harb is a country

where no Muslim or zimmi remains in peace under the amân-i awwal, no matter whether Islamic rites exist or not, and whether infidel rites are openly practised or not. The scholars (muḥaqqiqîn) have preferred this third opinion, and according to this opinion the region under the English and other similar non-Muslim people is, no doubt, Dârul Harb".

There was another question: after how long would conquering kuffâr be considered according to the Shar' as the legal owners of the land and of the movable property of the Dârul Islâm, and whether or not it was lawful (ḥalâl) for a man to accept anything from that property if the kuffâr granted it to him. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz replied.<sup>18</sup>

"If the kuffâr capture some movable property and transfer it to their own country, they would be considered as owners of those things. About the question, 'after how long does a Dârul Islâm become Dârul Harb', it should be understood, that on this question the 'Ulamâ' hold different opinions. Some of them say that a Dârul Islâm never becomes Dârul Harb, till there is any other Dârul Islâm in between the two aforesaid Dârul Islâm and

Dârul Harb. The other hold the opinion that so long as even any one Islamic rite is publicly practised the country remains Dârul Islâm. If all Islamic rites are abolished it will become Dârul Harb. Some other 'Ulamâ' say that if the kuffâr abolish even one Islamic rite (sha'âyar) the Dârul Islâm would remain no longer.

"But the most reasonable opinion is this that the country (mulk) remains Dârul Islâm as long as the Muslims and infidels are fighting, and the Muslims have not lost hope of retaining their country, and they have not been completely subjugated, and the kuffâr have not become strong enough to forbid Islâmic rites, and the Muslims can live and carry on their business without the permission of kuffâr. The temporary capture of infidels is of no value. This capture will be nullified by the victory of Islam. But if the Muslims have lost the battle and have submitted to them and are living in the country and carrying on their business ~~with~~ the permission of infidels, and the Islamic rites are practised ~~only~~ because the infidels are not prejudiced against them,

and not because the Muslims are strong enough to practise them, the country is no longer Dârul Islâm, even if the Muslims are thinking of waging war again after prepration.

"In these circumstances it is lawful for the kuffâr to grant anything or everything from the conquered country".

This is what we find in the Fatawâ 'Azîzî in regard to Dârul Islâm and Dârul Harb. After examining the first (famous) fatwâ (of jihâd), we concluded that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, by declaring the country as Dârul Harb, could not and did not declare a war against the British, and that the Muslim (or Muslims) who asked the question were not necessarily prepared to fight. But still we have not seen why those questions were asked. To answer this question let us keep before us all these four questions:

1. Can a Dârul Islâm become Dârul Harb or not?
2. Is the British India [India under Company's rule] Dârul Harb? And if it is, then, what is the decision about taking usury from non-Muslims?
3. Are the regions under the English

administration and those under the non-Muslims Dârul Harb? And if so, is it allowed to take usury from the non-Muslims?

4. After how long a ~~time~~ are the conquering kuffâr considered the legal owners of the land and of the moveable property of the Dârul Islâm? And if they grant something from that land or property to someone, then, is he allowed to accept that grant?

As we see the first question is colourless and does not lead us to any conclusion, but all the other questions clearly show the motives of the questioners. Instead of asking of their duties to restore the Dârul Islâm they are anxious to know whether the new situation has opened the door of usury in field of economy. As long as India was Dârul Islâm they could not take usury, though they must have been paying it to others. But if the political situation was changed and India had become Dârul Harb where usury was allowed why should they not themselves benefit from the new situation? Perhaps it would seem going too far saying that the question of Dârul Islâm and Dârul Harb was

the product of an economic problem, but evidently this does not seem entirely baseless.<sup>19</sup>

However, we have seen this question in some detail, and it is time to go farther and see if there were some other questions about the new situation during the time of SHâh 'Abdul 'Azîz.

### III

The next most important question was whether Muslims should cooperate with the British or not. About this problem we read his opinion when he explains the Qur'ânic verse: "And do not collabarate in sin and transgressions" (5:2). He says:<sup>20</sup>

"The collaboration (<sup>a</sup>mu'âw<sup>a</sup>nat) is of two kinds, paid and unpaid. Nowadays the paid collaboration is called "service", and the other one is called "assistance". In either case there are some kinds of work which are admissible and some of them are forbidden. If the infidels are preparing themselves to fight with Muslims or to conquer a Dârul Uslâm, it is forbidden then to ~~serve~~ them or to assist them, and it is a grave sin to do so. If the infidels fight each other and employ the Muslims [to fight the infidels] then it

is permitted, according to the Shar'. Likewise it is permitted to serve the infidels if they employ the Muslims to keep watch over their property or to manage the civil administration of their country, as it is permitted to assist them in tailoring or in trading etc.

"But now after a lot of deliberation, it appears to me that the above mentioned services also are not altogether free from unlawfulness (hurmat). At least man feels hesitant in refusing their illegitimate [in the eyes of the Shar'] orders, and gradually he becomes their obedient servant. Thus the number of unbelievers goes up and their strength, power and prestige increase. But if this [service or assistance] is of the kind in which man has not to be very close with the infidels, then, undoubtedly this is lawful".

On another occasion when he was asked about accepting jobs under the Christians, he said:<sup>21</sup>

"Service under the Christians or under any infidel are of different kinds. Some of them are permissible (mubâh), some of them are desirable (mustahabb), and some of them are forbidden (harâm), and some of them are



gross sin (kabīrah) and near to kufr.

"If some one accepts a job under infidels for good purposes, e.g. protecting people from thieves and robbers, or providing Shar'f witness in the court, or constructing a bridge, or building or repairing a building like a caravanserai for the use of the general public, then, no doubt, these kinds of service are permissible, even desirable.

"If some one accepts a position under the infidels just to promote social contact with them, and if because of the nature of his work he happens to see the things which are against the Shar', or if he has to assist them in injustice, for example, if he works as a clerk, or as a domestic servant or as a soldier, or such types of work in which he is supposed to respect them beyond a limit, or he has to humiliate himself before them while standing or sitting, then these kinds of service are forbidden.

"If some one accepts a post under them to kill a Muslim or to destroy a [Muslim] state or to promote infidel practices or to find faults with Islam just for the sake

of criticism, then all these services are grave sin and near to kufr".

We see this is not a categorical statement.<sup>22</sup> Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz has not clearly said that service under the British was forbidden. He has classified the services and then mentioned what types of service were forbidden. No doubt all these services which Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz has classified under the forbidden services are forbidden according to the Shar', whether the employer is Christian, infidel or even Muslim. It is, therefore, hard to say that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was totally against serving the British.

In the Fatâwâ 'Azîzî we read a letter from Shâh Ghulâm 'Alî<sup>23</sup> to Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. It goes on:

"Some one has told me that there is a proposal in our school<sup>24</sup> for Mawlâwî 'Abdul Hayy [the nephew of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz], to accept a position as a muftî under the European infidels. By God I was shocked to have heard this news. I prefer to sit like a beggar instead of being a wealthy man by holding an office under them. For God's sake Mawlâwî 'Abdul Hayy must not entertain the idea of accepting such inauspicious service. He had

better remain content with a loaf of bread. He should teach the students and be busy in meditation. In no case this offer be accepted".<sup>25</sup>

Shâh Ghulâm 'Alî was a famous sûfi of his time. By nature he was against accepting any kind of help from those people who were engaged in state affairs.<sup>26</sup> He, therefore, may have been startled not because 'Abdul Hayy was going to serve the British government, but rather such a religious man as 'Abdul Hayy was intending to serve any government. In any case, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz replied to him:

"This is a fact that Mawlawî Ri'âyat 'Alî Khân, the Agent of the British (Mukhtâr), had written to me several times to send to him an austere 'âlim who knows Islamic law, and could advise him in judiciary affairs in the light of fiqh. We replied to him saying that it was possible that they [the British] might ask the 'âlim to do something against the Shar'. Moreover, there was a likelihood that the 'âlim would have to mix with them. Thus he would become indifferent to Islamic rites. He [Ri'âyat 'Alî] wrote to me again saying that the 'âlim should never mix with them, nor would he be asked to do anything against the Shar'. The 'âlim

would reside somewhere in the city, and would advise according to the Shar'-i Muhammadî without any fear".<sup>27</sup>

Then Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz discusses this problem in detail in the light of the Sharîah and the Tarîqah. From the Sharî'ah point of view he quotes the example of the Prophet Joseph who served the infidel king to benefit the common people. And from the Tarîqah point of view he thinks that if a man is without any family liability it is preferable for him not to indulge in any means of livelihood, although otherwise he may do so. He further quotes the examples of muftîs and qâdîs who had high places in the field of the Sharî'ah and the Tarîqah but were engaged in state affairs. After quoting these examples and discussing the matter in detail he concludes:

"In this particular case we should see carefully whether or not there is any thing which makes this service against the Shar'. We know that Mawlawî 'Abdul Hayy will not mix with infidels, nor will he be indifferent to religious affairs; he will neither participate in infidel practices nor flatter them nor tell lies. Since none of these forbidden habits is found in Mawlawî 'Abdul Hayy it is suggested

that he should go and stay there. If he finds things there otherwise, he should come back".<sup>28</sup>

The compiler of the Fatâwâ does not inform us whether or not Mawlawî 'Abdul Hayy accepted the job, but most probably he did.<sup>29</sup>

#### IV

The other problem was whether the Muslims should promote social contact with British people; whether they should learn the English language and eat with them. The importance of such questions in the time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz can easily be imagined from the incident of the Mawlawî of Panjab who had his meal with the English men and was declared by some Muslims to have gone out of Islam.<sup>30</sup> This attitude existed till the second half of the century. Mawlânâ Mamlûk 'Alî (who was the Professor of Arabic in Delhi College, the British administered institution) is reported to have washed his hands when he happened to have shaken hands with an Englishman.<sup>31</sup> In this situation we can imagine the importance of these questions.

We have already seen in the previous chapter that the British officers used to visit Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. This was the clear answer to the

question of social intercourse. For other questions, e.g. reading of English language or wearing English dress, of course, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was above putting up a personal example. But he declared them lawful. On the question of dress he said:

"A resemblance between Muslims and kuffâr is forbidden. But only that resemblance is forbidden which is born with the intention of exhibiting oneself like infidels or winning their sympathy. Otherwise there is no harm in using the things which are especially related to infidels with the intention of providing more comfort to the body".<sup>32</sup>

On the question of eating with non-Muslims, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz said that it was lawful, provided that the forbidden things were not served.<sup>33</sup> Giving his opinion about the English language he said that it was permissible to learn the English language. But if some one wanted to learn the language just to flatter the English people and to raise his position in their eyes, then it was forbidden and undesirable to learn the English language.<sup>34</sup>

## V

So far we have seen the attitude of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz towards the British in India. He considered

the country as Dârul Harb, but at the same time he allowed the Muslims to cooperate with the British as far as Islamic values were not violated. He went so far as to declare it lawful to eat with the British, to learn their language and even to dress like them.

This is what we may call a positive attitude, and in these pages we have not seen him bearing a negative attitude towards the British. But, strangely enough, we very often hear people today saying that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was bitterly opposed to the British and that he declared India Dârul Harb so as to tell the Muslims that for them there were only two alternatives: fighting (jihâd) or migration (hijrah).<sup>35</sup> On the contrary we do not find in the works of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz anything which can confirm this view. In order to be sure, let us see what he says about these two problems. It must be remembered, that he himself took the initiative to express his opinion regarding jihâd or hijrah; other Muslims did not ask him these questions. First we would see what jihâd meant to him. He said:

"Jihâd is of three kinds. The first is verbal jihâd (jihâd-i zubânî). It means that people should be invited towards Islam, and that the Shar' should be explained, and sermons

and preaching should be undertaken, and the objections and doubts of the opponents (mukhâlifîn) should be removed, and thus Islam should be manifested.

"The second kind of jihâd is the preparation for fighting. It means to frighten the opponents by recruiting volunteers, and by increasing the number of the people of Islam and by creating confusion among the opponents and by spending money to provide horses, camels and necessary arms and ammunition.

"The third kind of jihâd is to kill the opponents with spears and swords and to wrestle and combat with them.

"There is no doubt that the Prophet was busy only with the first two kinds of jihâd. He did not take part in the third kind of jihâd. And surely this third one is the lowest kind of jihâd."<sup>36</sup>

This is what he thought about jihâd. It must be remembered that this statement was not an answer to any inquirer; it was an expression of his own view point without being an answer to a question. The absence of a question on this particular problem also suggests that the Muslims in the early 19th century



were not thinking about jihâd.

Likewise we do not find question regarding the hijrah. Once, however, he spoke on this question. It was argued by <sup>of</sup>some his opponent 'Ulamâ' that after declaring the country Dârul Harb he should have migrated from the country, because in a Dârul Harb, the opponents said, a Muslim was supposed only to do jihâd or else to migrate from the country.<sup>37</sup> Replying to them he said:

"The migration from every Dârul Harb is not necessary. Muslims should only migrate from those countries where the infidels are prohibiting the Muslims from practising the Islamic rites e.g. fast, prayer, adhân and circumcission. If the Muslims are practising all these rites in public, migration is not obligatory".<sup>38</sup>

It is important to note that here in the case of hijrah Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz speaks about practising the Islamic rites in public without any other conditions, whereas in the question about religious status of the country he did not consider the public practice a sufficient condition to keep a country Dârul Islâm. With public practice, there, he added another condition, namely that public practice

should be the result of the Muslim power, and not due to the unprejudiced attitude of the infidels.<sup>39</sup> But here in the case of hijrah he disregarded that condition. This was because of the well-known fact that the Muslims of his time were enjoying religious freedom due to the unprejudiced attitude of the British who could change the situation any time.

We have now seen all the questions and their answers in regard to the religious status of the country, and in regard to dealings with the British. In the next chapters we shall examine in some detail the response from the Muslims' side.

## Chapter IV

### Toleration and Friendliness.

In the two preceding chapters we have studied Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz's attitude towards the British, and we have examined his views about the religious status of the country and about cooperation with the British. In this chapter we shall examine some of the people in the Muslim community who adopted a cooperative attitude and who mixed with the British. For this purpose we shall take some typical cases representing different aspects of the cooperative attitude. First we shall see the 'Ulamâ' who did not see any harm in serving the British government. Then we shall see those people who saw the changing situation of the country and decided to learn the English language. As a third category we shall study those who married English women, and whose English wives were welcomed into their houses. We have already seen some cases of those Muslim women who married the Europeans,<sup>1</sup> therefore, such cases will not be repeated in this chapter.

#### I

There were several 'Ulamâ' who served the

East India Company. Mawlânâ Fazl-i Imâm Khayrâbâdî (d. 1828)<sup>2</sup>, Muftî Şadrûddîn Âzurdah (1789-1863),<sup>3</sup> Mawlânâ Mamlûk 'Alî (d. 1851),<sup>4</sup> Mawlawî 'Abdul Qâdir Râmpûrî (1780-1849),<sup>5</sup> and Mawlânâ Fazl-i Haqq Khayrâbâdî (1797-1861)<sup>6</sup> were among the well-known names.

Here we study the case of Mawlânâ Fazl-i Haqq, because it is typical. For his whole life he served the British, but his attitude seems to have changed during the movement of 1857. At that point he is said to have stood against the British government; he took part in the movement, and was consequently sentenced by the British government for life transportation to the Andaman Islands.

Fazl-i Haqq was the son of Mawlânâ Fazl-i Imâm who was a famous 'âlim and had also profound knowledge in the 'rational sciences' ('ulûm-i 'aqlî); he was the Şadrus-Sudûr (chief judge) under the East India Company. It is not known when he joined the East India Company, but when he died in 1828, he was in the Company's service. Fazl-i Haqq completed his education mostly under his father, and studied the Hadith under Shâh 'Abdul Qâdir, the younger brother of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. For some time he was in the teaching profession, but after

the death of his father he joined the Company's service and was appointed the Sarishtahdâr [a post like our present day Under Secretary to the Government] to the British Resident at Delhi.<sup>7</sup> Fazl-i Haqq, by his nature, was very sensitive.<sup>8</sup> This is perhaps the reason that he could not stick to any one particular office for a long time. Because of some or other personal grievances with his officers, he resigned from the Company's service. For some time afterwards he served different princely states, such as Rampur, Alwar, Jhajhar etc., but no record seems to be available about the nature of his work in these states. In 1848 the East India Company established a new court of justice, called Huzf tahsil, at Lucknow, and asked Mawlânâ Fazl-i Haqq to preside over the court as Şadruş şudûr, a position which he accepted. He remained there till 1856. Then he again went to Alwar. Afterwards, in 1857, he was accused of taking part in the movement against the British.

As we have seen, he started his life in the East India Company's service, and, virtually, he finished his life also in Company service too. But this sudden change in his life which lead him to involvement in the 1857 movement and to life

imprisonment thereafter made his name more prominent. The reason of this change, however, is not clear. Later writers generally take this change as an expression of regret, as if he was expiating for his early collaboration.<sup>9</sup> But most probably this is overestimation. There is no historical evidence available to prove that till 1856 he had any basic policy difference with the government of the East India Company.

When he was in Lucknow in 1855, and was working as Şadrus Şudûr, a mosque was demolished by some Hindus in Hanûmân Garhî, a place near Lucknow. Mawlânâ Amîr 'Alî, an 'âlim of Lucknow declared jihâd against the Hindus of the Hanuman Garhi.<sup>10</sup> A fatwâ was issued in favour of jihâd. But many of the 'Ulamâ' opposed the move, and Fazl-i Haqq is reported to be one of them. A counter fatwâ was issued against the jihâd.<sup>11</sup>

"If the followers of Islam are in a minority and infidels are in a majority, then jihâd is forbidden against the command of 'ûlul amr', that is the ruler of the time, under whom the Muslims are living, be he English or Muslim. One who commits this mistake, e.g. takes part in jihâd, is a rebel and disobedient".<sup>12</sup>

In this fatwâ the 'Ulamâ' have gone as

far as to regard the British also as their 'ûlul amr', i.e. equate them to Muslim rulers. At this time Fazl-i Haqq is seen with those 'Ulamâ' who were friendly to the Government of East India Company.

After this incident the Mawlânâ is found in the movement of 1857, about which a number of far-fetched stories have been fabricated in connection with him by later writers. One story goes that when he was arrested on the charge of rebellion against the government he was taken in Lucknow before an English judge who happened to be one of his acquaintances. The main charge against the Mawlânâ was that he had signed a fatwâ of jihâd against the British. In the court the Mawlânâ himself was defending his case. No witness could stand before his cross-questioning and the case was about to be decided in his favour. When Mawlânâ saw that he had shaken all the witnesses he himself declared that in fact he had signed the fatwâ and he was against the government. The judge was thrown into a dilemma, because, he wanted to release him. He tried to stop the Mawlânâ, but the Mawlânâ went on saying that he was against the government. This statement turned the tables and finally the judge announced the sentence.<sup>13</sup>

Unfortunately this story does not cohere with other historical evidence. This story emphasises two important points; one that the judge was friendly to the Mawlânâ, and the other that the Mawlânâ had signed a fatwâ in favour of jihâd in 1857 against the British. These two points do not agree with other historical evidence. The fatwâ of jihâd was first published in the Şâdiqul Akhbâr, Delhi, in its issue of 26th July, 1857, a photo-copy of which has recently been published with the signatures of the 'Ulamâ' who had signed it, but we do not find the name of the Mawlânâ among the signatories.<sup>14</sup>

For the other point, that the judge was friendly to the Mawlânâ, we should better see the account of the mutiny written by the Mawlânâ himself. In his book, al-Thawrat al-Hindîyah [the Indian Revolution], which he completed during his exile in the Andaman Islands, he says that in Lucknow he had to face in the court a cruel Christian officer who had not learnt to show mercy to oppressed people.<sup>15</sup>

The question needs a thorough study as to what were the basic reasons which compelled the Mawlânâ to participate in the movement. This problem, however, is beyond the scope of the present study.



However, one point is clear that the Mawlânâ was not an active participant in the movement, as is generally understood. Moreover, he had not seen the question of the mutiny from political view point. The cause of the mutiny to him, as he has given in his book, was the religious policy of the Christians supported by the East India Company.<sup>16</sup> He did not go to Delhi particularly to join the rebel forces, but, as he says, went to see his family which was there, and he thought that probably he could do "something good for the people".<sup>17</sup> About his activities at Delhi, we have other evidence, in the Diary of Munshî Jîvan Lâl, the Secretary of Bahâdur Shâh Zafar, the last Mughal king. The diary, however, clears this point as to what the Mawlânâ had in his mind when he thought of doing something good for the people. Jîvan Lâl says that Mawlânâ Fazl-i Haqq asked the king to stop fighting, because the Mawlânâ thought that the Indian soldiers were unable to overcome the soldiers of the East India Company.<sup>18</sup>

After the British captured Delhi, and there was a state of lawlessness, Fazl-i Haqq left Delhi with his family, and his whereabouts were not known for some time. He was spending his days in misery when he heard the general proclamation of forgiveness

from Queen Victoria. It was announced that every one was forgiven except those who had killed English women or children or English refugees, or those who had formed a government or had instigated the people against the British government.<sup>19</sup> Seeing himself free from all these charges he came out of his refuge. But "after a few days", says the Mawlânâ, "a Christian officer sent for me from my house, put me in prison and subjected me to torture, causing me great pain. Then, putting me in chains, he sent me to the capital of the kingdom [<sup>20</sup>Lucknow] which had become by then the house of ruin and destruction. He entrusted my case to a cruel officer of dominating personality, who had no sympathy with those who sought justice. Two apostates, who were by nature quarrelsome and had had religious disputations with me in regard to a Quranic verse, meaning that one who befriends the Christians is a Christian himself, had supplied information about me. They used to insist on friendship with the Christians and had ultimately turned apostate, exchanging the Îmân with kufir".<sup>21</sup>

We have seen that the Mawlânâ's own account of the mutiny did not portray him as an active figure in the movement. His participation in the movement

lasted only for a few days, when he appeared as a passive figure. The only thing that made him a "hero" of the movement was his life transportation. But we should not forget that in those days many of the innocent and friendly civilians were either shot dead by court martial or subjected to severe ordial, as for instance Şahbâ'î and Mawlawî Muḥammad Bâqir. Şahbâ'î was a teacher in Delhi College, and Muḥammad Bâqir had very good relations with Mr. Taylor, the English Head Master of Delhi College. They did not take part in the movement, but both of them were shot dead by court martial only because they had failed to save the life of English refugees who were hidden in their houses. Mawlânâ Fazl-i Ḥaqq was the victim of a similar judgement, but, so far as his own attitude is concerned, he remained unchanged.

## II

In this section we shall see those who thought that the English language was necessary for the Muslims of their time. Not only did they think about it, but they learnt it without attending any school. 'Allâmah Tafazzul Ḥusayn was a famous Shî'î 'âlim. He was contemporary of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. He had not only profound knowledge of Arabic, Persian

and Urdu, but had also learnt Greek, Latin and English.<sup>22</sup> He is said to have translated some works of Newton into Persian.<sup>23</sup> About Nawwâb Rawshanud Dawlah, 'Abdul Qâdir Râmpûrî says that he could read and write the English language,<sup>24</sup> and he compiled an English Dictionary.<sup>25</sup> Mawlawî Muḥammad Ismâ'îl Murâdâbâdî knew English language very well. He had been in England and had married an English woman. His nephew, Mawlânâ Wahhâjud Dîn alias Mawlawî Munnû had learnt the English language from his aunt, Mrs. Ismâ'îl, and had "full command over the language".<sup>26</sup> Among such persons there is one Luṭfullâh whom we shall study in some detail.

As we see there are several Indian Muslims at that time who learnt the English language, but, perhaps, Luṭfullâh is the first Indian Muslim who studied the language and wrote his biography in English and had it published in London.<sup>27</sup>

Luṭfullâh was born in 1802, in Dharanagar, Malwa, in Central India. His father, Shaykh Muḥammad Akram, who was an 'âlim and had studied in Delhi, died when Luṭfullâh was only four years old. The early life of Luṭfullâh was very miserable. He, however, studied Persian and Arabic, and was compelled by circumstances to leave home. He travelled with

a physician up to Delhi and in 1817, he returned home. One day an English troops arrived there, and halted for a few days outside the village where Luṭfullâh was living. He visited the soldiers one morning and was very much impressed "by their excellent uniforms, their cannons in beautiful order, and all their warlike materials".<sup>28</sup> Every morning he went to the camp "to see their extraordinary manoeuvres, exercise, and processions, on parade". Due to his regular visits he became friend of one of the English soldiers. One day he visited the soldiers' camp, where his English friend was talking with other English soldiers. This was the first time that Luṭfullâh heard the English language spoken, and he felt an irresistible desire to learn it. In three or four days he learnt thirty seven words, which he wrote down in the Persian characters.<sup>29</sup> He was left disappointed one morning when he found that the English troops had marched off.

In 1819, he got a job as a clerk in the "Honourable Company's service".<sup>30</sup> But he was not happy with the clerical job. He wanted a job in which he could increase his knowledge of English. He left the job, and was soon hired by one Lieut. C. F. Hart to instruct him in Hindustani. That was the work

which he wanted. And, as he says, since then till 1835 he regularly held the profession of a teacher of the Persian, Hindustani, Arabic and Marathi languages to new comers from England.<sup>31</sup>

While living among the British people his cherished desire to learn the English language increased. But he was, however, too proud to learn the language from those whom he happened to teach himself. He, therefore, decided to learn the language on his own. At last, in 1821, he found an Indian munshî (clerk), Abbâ Miyân, who taught him the English alphabet, and enabled him to distinguish the words from dictionaries, and to read Hindustani and Persian fluently in the Roman characters. Abbâ Miyân was his first and last teacher of English.<sup>32</sup> Since then till the end of 1829, as he says, he never went to bed without learning ten words of English by heart, and reading by himself a few pages of Dr. Gilchrist's grammatical works with full attention. Thus after the hard labour of eight full years, he learnt English, "the most difficult language in the world".<sup>33</sup>

Now we can imagine Luṭfullâh's eminence. In those days the knowledge of the Persian Arabic and Hindustani languages was enough for a man to secure a good job. To Luṭfullâh every door was open,

because, over and above, he knew English too. Very often, then, he was hired by Indian nobles to teach their sons the English language. English people also wanted to keep him in their service. He kept good relations with both sides. He served under the British Political Agent in Kathiawar, and later he was attached to the Assistant Resident in Sindh where he took an important part in political talks between the East India Company and The Amir of Sindh. He translated Goldsmith's Natural History into Persian for the Nawwâb of Surat who was very friendly towards Luṭfullâh.

In 1844, his friend, the Nawwâb of Surat, died, and the East India Company deprived his son of the throne. The young Nawwâb after failing in his effort to restore his position decided to go to London to repair his fortunes. He took Luṭfullâh and an Englishman as his secretaries and sailed for London on 12th March, 1844. They stayed there till the end of the year, and came back unsuccessful. In those few months Luṭfullâh studied the life of the British people in their own country. He was impressed with the courteous attitude of the British people, but at the same time he was unhappy with the extravagances in their religious and social life. He criticized this aspect of their life. "The Christians

of this time", he says, "in reforming themselves, have reformed their religion too. They eat and drink and do what they like under the acts of their Parliament, without any regard to the Old and New Testaments, vide Leviticus, Chap. XI. ver. 7; Matthew, chapter v, ver. 17, 19".<sup>34</sup> He sums up the character of the English people, by saying that "they are entirely submissive to the law and obedient to the commands of their superiors. Their sense of patriotism is greater than that of any nation in the world. Their obedience, trust, and submission to the female sex are far beyond the limit of moderation. In fact, the freedom granted to womenkind in this country is great, and the mischief arising from the unreasonable toleration is most deplorable".<sup>35</sup>

When Luṭfullāh visited the India Office, he could not refrain from saying that "it is the place where the destiny of my sweet native land lies in the hands of twenty-four men, called the Honourable Directors of the Honourable East India Company".<sup>36</sup> At another place he described England as a country "where the sun appears far to the south, as weak as the moon, and the Polar star nearly vertical; where the country all over is fertile, and the people ingenious, civil, and active; where



the language, customs, and manners are entirely different from our own; where in fine, the destiny of our sweet native land lies in the hand of some twenty five great men".<sup>37</sup>

Luṭfullâh wrote his autobiography in 1854, giving the account of his life till 1844, and promised to write about the rest of his life in a second volume, after becoming the "master of his own time", something which he could hardly achieve. However, the present work is one of the important documents for studying the Muslims' attitude towards the British. Luṭfullâh was very often considered by his Muslim brothers "weak in the religious feelings due to too much reading in English books",<sup>38</sup> and "one of the Feringees due to his attachment with the East India Company".<sup>39</sup>

### III

Now we shall see some cases of those Christian women who married Indian Muslims and were received warmly in Muslim-houses. There are not many examples available. Among the 'Ulamâ', however, there was one Mawlawî Ismâ'îl Murâdâbâdî who married an English woman, and was called Mawlawî Landanî [the Mawlawî of London].<sup>40</sup> There is another Shî'î

gentleman, Mîr Ḥasan 'Alî of Lucknow who married an English woman. His life is also still in darkness. We know him through his English wife, who wrote to her friends in London of her experiences in a Shî'î house. Her writings were published later in 1832.<sup>41</sup>

Mîr Ḥasan 'Alî was the son of a learned Shî'î 'âlim, Mîr Ḥâjî Shâh, who was pêshnamâz (leader of prayer) in the household of an Awadh noble.

Mîr Ḥasan 'Alî went to Calcutta where he taught Arabic to some British officers. In 1810 he reached London, where he was appointed an Assistant to John Shakespear, who was the Professor of Hindustani at the Military College, Addiscombe. The Mîr remained there for about six years. During his stay there he translated the Gospel of St. Matthew.<sup>42</sup> In London he married an English girl whose maiden or family name is unknown. She was, however, attached in some capacity to the household of the Princess Augusta (d. 1840).<sup>43</sup> After acquiring the reputation of being "an efficient teacher", Mîr Ḥasan 'Alî returned to India in 1816 with his wife. In India, as Crook, the editor of the writings of Mrs. Mîr Ḥasan 'Alî, informs us, Ḥasan 'Alî served the government of the Nawwab of Awadh and the English government of the East India Company. No more information about him

seems to be available.<sup>44</sup> The authoress does not speak about him. She mostly describes the general social life of the Muslims of that time. However, there are references here and there in the book which help us to understand the Muslims' attitude towards the British. Her father-in-law, Mîr Hâjî Shâh was a Shî'î 'âlim. Originally he belonged to the Panjab, where his father was qâdî. Mîr Hâjî was born about 1746. He was given the standard education to assume the office of the qâdî, like his father; but because of the unsettled political situation during the Marhatta invasion of Panjab he left his homeland. After wandering for some time he reached Lucknow and settled there. The time when the authoress met him he was about seventy years old. About his religious life she says, "during our eleven years' constant intercourse I can answer for his early diligence; before the day had dawned his head was bowed in adoration to his Maker and Preserver. At all seasons of the years, and under all circumstances, this duty was never omitted. Prayer was his comfort; meditation and praise his chief delight".<sup>45</sup>

The Shî'î people, as we know, are generally known to be reserved in regard to social contact with non-Muslims. But this Shî'î 'âlim received his

non-Muslim daughter-in-law so warmly that she could not forget it for her whole life. "He embraced us both", she remembers, "with a warmth of pressure to his throbbing heart, that pronounced more than his words, the sincerity of our welcome. Never have I forgotten the moment of our meeting".<sup>46</sup> Moreover, the old gentleman used to take part in religious conversation with her. "It was his happiest time", says she, "when, in the quiet of night, the Meer, his son, translated, as I read, the Holy Bible to him. We have often been thus engaged until one or two, and even to a later hour in the morning; he remembered all he heard, and drew comparisons, in his own mind, between the two authorities of sacred writing--the Khoran and Bible; the one he had studied through his long life, the other, he was now equally satisfied, contained the words of God; he received both as the two witnesses of God".<sup>47</sup>

One more sentence, probably, would give a clearer picture of those Muslims who were ready to welcome the new situation. Mrs. Hasan 'Alî remained all through her life a Christian, in an orthodox Shî'î family, and in a non-Christian society, but she felt no embarrassment. In her

concluding pages she remarks:

"Of my long sojourn in the society of the Mussulmauns of Hindoostaun, I need here but remark, that I was received amongst them without prejudice, and allowed the free usage of my European habits and religious principles without a single attempt to bias or control me; that by respecting their trifling prejudices as regards eating and drinking, their esteem and confidence were secured to me".<sup>48</sup>

## Chapter V

### Verbal Jihâd.

The Muslim community at the time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was practising many of non-Islamic social customs. Many of them, as Mirzâ Hayrat, the biographer of Shâh Ismâ'îl, says, were given religious colour in the Muslim society. The 'Ulamâ' had been complaining against this tendency from time to time. But very seldom had an 'âlim stood against those customs which he considered as "innovation" (bid'ah), and started any organised reform movement.

Sayyid Ahmad and Shâh Ismâ'îl can be considered the pioneers in declaring a jihâd against those practices. Both of them were disciples of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz himself did not take active part in the reform movement started by his disciples, because by that time he had grown very old, and by nature he was calm. By his temperament he disliked any clash with opponents. Probably, for this reason, he sometimes allowed the practice of some of those social customs which were common in Muslim houses, but, if scrutinized, were against the spirit of

Islamic teachings.<sup>1</sup> He used to say that one should be moderate in reproaching and reprimanding.<sup>2</sup> How far the Muslim society had gone astray, we can realize from the following passage from the Taqwīyatul Īmān by Shāh Ismā'īl. He says:

"It is customary for many people, in the time of difficulty, to invoke the spirits of the Pīr (religious guides), apostles, Imāms, martyrs and angels, and fairies, and to beg them to fulfil their wishes. To propitiate them vows and offerings are made in their names. Moreover, children are named after them, for instance, 'Abdun Nabī (slave of apostle), 'Alī Bakhsh (gift of 'Alī) as well as Ḥasan Bakhsh, Ḥusayn Bakhsh, Madār Bakhsh, Sālār Bakhsh<sup>3</sup> and also Ghulām Muḥīud Dīn (slave of the Reviver of Faith). And for the life protection of their children some keep a lock of hair on their heads, and other make them wear a woven thread around their necks and clothe them in the name of some saints. Some people put chains on the leg of their children, and some offer sacrifices. Many of them invoke the saints in the time of difficulty and take oaths in their names. In short what the Hindus do

towards their idols, these pseudo-Muslims do all these things with prophets, saints, imâms martyrs, angels and fairies, and yet they claim that they themselves are Musalmans".<sup>4</sup>

If literature is a mirror of a society, the Taqwîyatul Îmân portrays a picture of the Muslim society at that time. Hundreds of "innovations" had found their way into Muslim houses. Shâh Ismâ'îl (1779-1830, afterwards known as Shâh Ismâ'îl Shahîd) stood to reform Muslim society. He was the nephew of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, and was brought up under him.<sup>5</sup> Shâh Ismâ'îl after his education took to criticizing and condemning un-Islamic customs. He had to face some of the 'Ulamâ' and mashâyakh who were encouraging the Muslim populace to their un-Islamic social practices. Mirzâ Hayrat, though very often he exaggerates, has given a full account of reform activities of Shâh Ismâ'îl, and the opposition he faced.<sup>6</sup>

## II

To popularize his teachings, Shâh Ismâ'îl wrote several books, mostly on the unity of God, the revival of sunn<sup>a</sup> and the eradication of "innovations". Only a few of his books are at the present available.



The following is a survey of his books.<sup>7</sup>

1. 'Aqabât: Some issues of Taṣawwuf and Kalâm have been raised and discussed in this book.

2. Îzâhul Haqq al-Ṣarîḥ fî ahkâm al-mayyit wa'l zarîḥ: [A detailed and clear guidance in regard to a dead body] (Persian); as the title suggests, this book deals with rites and rituals for the dead.

3. Mathnawî silk-i nûr: A eulogy on the Prophet Muḥammad.

4. Radd al-Ishrâk (Arabic): This book was in fact the commentary on the Kalamah'-i Tawḥîd [There is no god, but God; Muḥammad is the Prophet of God]. The book was divided into two chapters. In the first one the author dealt with the unity (tawḥîd) and polythism (shirk). In the second chapter he described the meaning of the sunnah (tradition) and bid'ah (innovation).

5. Risâlah fî mabḥath imkân al-naẓîr (Persian): This book is on a theological issue. Shâh Ismâ'îl held that God could create a man again similar to the Prophet Muḥammad, but He would not do so, because He Himself has declared the Prophet Muḥammad as the last Prophet. Those 'Ulamâ' who were his opponents and were headed by Mawlânâ Fazl-i Ḥaqq, were of the opinion that after the Prophet Muḥammad God could not

create a man like him. In the above book Shâh Ismâ'îl has presented his views on this issue.

6. Risâlah Êk Rôzî. In this treatise Shâh Ismâ'îl has replied to questions put by Mawlânâ Fazl-i Haqq on the subject of creating a new man like the Prophet Muḥammad. It is said that this tract was written in one day (êk rôz), hence, its title.

7. Risâlah Uṣûl-i Fiqh: It is a booklet which deals with the principles of Islamic jurisprudence.

8. Tanqîd al-jawâz fî jawâz-i raf'-i yadayn fî al-ṣalâh, (Persian): This book was written to prove that in prayer it is better to lift hands to the ears several times. This was contrary to the practice of the Ḥanafî Indian Muslims who were in majority.

9. Tanwîr al-'aynayn fî ithbât-i raf'-i yadayn, (Arabic): This book is also on the same theme of raising the hands up in the prayers.

10. Manṣab-i Imâmat, (Persian): In this book Shâh Ismâ'îl has described the meaning of imâmat, and the responsibilities and qualities of an imâm, the head of a Muslim state. To him the imâm is a vicegerent of prophets.<sup>8</sup> And the imâmat means that imâm must possess the prophetic virtues.<sup>9</sup> The book is incomplete. The author was killed before he could

complete the book.

11. Şirât-i mustaqîm: This a collection of the sayings of Sayyid Aḥmad (known as Sayyid Aḥmad Shahîd) compiled jointly by Shâh Ismâ'îl and Mawlawî 'Abdul Ḥayy. Shâh Ismâ'îl noted down all that Sayyid Aḥmad said in his preachings in Râ'ê Barêlî, when he was touring North India to reform the Muslim society around 1820. The book contain the four chapters, but all the chapters do not contain the sayings of Sayyid Aḥmad. Chapter one which describes the difference between prophethood and sainthood, and chapter four which explains the system of Tarîqah'-i Muḥammaîyah<sup>10</sup> were compiled by Shâh Ismâ'îl. Chapters two and three were originally written by Mawlawî 'Abdul Ḥayy, which Shâh Ismâ'îl included in the book.<sup>11</sup> Chapter two deals with those "innovations" which had crept into Muslim society, and chapter three gives an account of different Sufi orders practised in India. The book was originally written in Persian, but now it is available only in Urdu, with the name of Shâh Ismâ'îl as the translator.<sup>12</sup>

12. Tarwîyatul Îmân, (Urdu): This is the first chapter of the Radd al-Ishrâk, rendered into Urdu by the author himself. Several editions have been published afterwards. The book was translated into English sometime about 1852 by one Mîr Ḥashmat 'Alî.

13. Tadhkîrul Ikhwân, (Urdu): This is the second chapter of the Radd al-Ishrâk. It was rendered into Urdu after the death of the author by one of his friends, Muḥammad Sulṭân. Several editions of this book are available.

In none of these books, however, has the political condition of the country been discussed. The author has confined himself to the questions of unity, prophethood, innovations and some other religious and theological issues like raf'-i yadayn<sup>13</sup> and imtinâ'-i nazîr<sup>14</sup> etc. Only in the Şirâṭ-i mustaqîm, do we find four and a half pages out of 376 pages on the explanation of jihâd.<sup>15</sup> In these few pages the author has said that jihâd was one of the Divine gifts to human beings. One who took part in jihâd, he said, would be rewarded by God, and those against whom the jihâd was declared were benefitted by the mercy of God. Had they not been killed their sinful life would have been prolonged. About India there is only one reference in the book. There, the author compared the India of 1233/[1817] "when most part of Hindustan had become Dârul Harb"<sup>16</sup> with the India of centuries ago, when the Muslims were following the Shar', and, there was, therefore, prosperity everywhere in India.

## III

Sayyid Ahmad (1786-1830) was born at Rai Bareilly in Awadh.<sup>17</sup> According to custom he was given his first lesson at the age of four, but very soon his relations came to know that Sayyid Ahmad was not interested at all in reading and writing. Seeing his distaste towards schooling he was not forced to go to school, and most of his time he spent in physical exercises.<sup>18</sup> At the age of about seventeen he went to Lucknow with some other relations in search of a job. Not being happy with the social life of Lucknow, Sayyid Ahmad decided to go to Delhi. About 1218/1803 he reached Delhi and presented himself before Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz.<sup>19</sup> Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz sent him to his younger brother Shâh 'Abdul Qâdir. Sayyid Ahmad made his bay'ah (sufi allegiance) to Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. Along with the spiritual discipline he started to study under Shâh 'Abdul Qâdir and Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. During his stay there Sayyid Ahmad acquired the necessary knowledge of religious sciences, but he could not complete the standard education.<sup>20</sup> He returned to his home about 1808. After two years he went again to Delhi, and from there he proceeded on to Malwa. He found a job there in the army of Amîr Khân of Malwa.

The journey of Sayyid Ahmad to Malwa has become very important to later writers. They interpret it in different ways. 'Ubaydullâh Sindhî, for example, says that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz wanted to open a war against the East India Company to free the country. He, therefore, sent Sayyid Ahmad in the army of Amîr Khân to acquire military training.<sup>21</sup> Ghulâm Rasûl Mihr, on the other hand, thinks that Sayyid Ahmad was not deputed by Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. He went there, Mihr says, by "divine inspiration".<sup>22</sup> Abûl Hasan 'Alî Nadwî and Mirzâ Hayrat Dihlawî say that Sayyid Ahmad did not want publicity as a spiritual leader, and, therefore, went to a remote place so that he could concentrate upon his spiritual lesson.<sup>23</sup>

However, for this idea of concealing himself there is no apparent evidence. At that time Sayyid Ahmad was not in the limelight, and for him at that stage there was no need to run away from the people.

Sindhî also has not given any historical evidence to support his statement that Sayyid Ahmad was deputed by Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. The only ground on which Sindhî builds up the story is that when Amîr Khân entered into a treaty with the British in 1817, Sayyid Ahmad was presented as objecting to it and asking the Nawwab not to sign the treaty.

After failing in his effort he left the army of Nawwâb Amîr Khân and wrote to Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz that he was going back to Delhi because the Nawwâb had come to an agreement with the British.<sup>24</sup> Besides this, Shindhî has nothing to prove his theory except his pen and his imagination.

Mihr builds his story on the ground that persons like Sayyid Ahmad do not run after bread. Sayyid Ahmad, therefore, would have not gone to Malwa for livelihood had he not been asked by God to do so; otherwise to earn his daily bread he could have gone to Lucknow which was very close to his homeland. To prove the idea of "divine inspiration", Mihr quotes the author of the Waqâ'i.<sup>25</sup> According to the Waqâ'i, Sayyid Ahmad was reported to have said while he was in the army of Amîr Khân that he had received inspiration in Rai Bareilly to go to Amîr Khân. We cannot say how far this story is genuine. However, this statement of inspiration is not found in the collection of his sayings, the Şirât-i mustaqîm. The above mentioned statement was given after his death, and was said to have been made when Sayyid Ahmad was in the army of Amîr KHÂN. Şirât-i mustaqîm was compiled after he had left the army for good and was on the tour to reform the Muslim society.

If he was really inspired by God to join the army for the purpose of jihâd, and he did not see any harm in disclosing this to the people, then he should have told such an important inspiration at least to his close friends like Shâh Ismâ'îl and Mawlânâ 'Abdul Hayy; but he did not do so. It is, therefore, difficult to accept this story at its face-value.

However, the writers, with all their differences, seem to be united on one point that Sayyid Aḥmad did not join the army like an ordinary man. They apparently reject the idea that Sayyid Aḥmad served in the army because he was a man and had the responsibility to look after his family. This denial is somehow the result of the tendency that generally followers do not like to see their religious guide indulging in what they call mundane affairs. Usually people like to see a halo round the head of their spiritual hero right from his childhood. The same is the case with Sayyid Aḥmad; but otherwise, if we consider him as a man who feels hunger and thirst, and who has a family to support, then there is no problem why Sayyid Aḥmad joined the army. This is the most practical and simple answer and it has been overlooked by many of his followers.

Sayyid Aḥmad, as we know, was not an 'âlim,



and, therefore, he did not have a chance to find a job somewhere as a muftî or qâdî, or as a teacher in a school. For him there was only one respectable profession open, and that was service in the army. It was possible for him to join the army of the East India Company, just as Mawlânâ 'Abdul Hayy or Mawlânâ Fazl-i Haqq had served the Company. But if we remember the attitude of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz towards the services under the non-Muslims, we would say that Sayyid Ahmad should not accept any post in the British army. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had said that services under non-Muslims, in which a subordinate was asked to destroy any Muslim state, were forbidden. It was a well-known fact that the British army was taking over the Indian states regardless of whether they were Muslim or non-Muslim. Had Sayyid Ahmad joined the army of the East India Company he would have had no excuse to refuse the order to attack any Muslim state. Amîr Khân at that time was not under obligation to the British. It was, therefore, easy for Sayyid Ahmad to join his army, but afterwards, probably, for the same reason, when Amîr Khân bowed down to the British supremacy, Sayyid Ahmad resigned his post from the Amîr Khân's army and went back to Delhi.

At this stage, there is only one point left unexplained: why did Sayyid Ahmad join the army of Amîr Khân, and not the army of the Nawwâb of Lucknow, who was also a Muslim? To answer this question we have to study the condition of Lucknow. Lucknow was under a Shî'î Nawwâb. At that time, as the writers say, it was not easy for a sensitive Sunnî to find a good place there.<sup>26</sup> Amîr Khân was a Sunnî. But what kind of relation did Amîr Khân have with Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz we still do not know. We only can say on the basis of available records that Amîr Khân was under the influence of Shâh Ghulâm 'Alî who had close relation with Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khân reports that Amîr Khân once begged Shâh Ghulâm 'Alî to accept his donation to meet the expenses of his khânqâh (monastery). Since it was against the nature of Shâh Ghulâm 'Alî to accept presents from the big people, he refused the offer and replied to him:

"We do not sell the honour of resignation  
and contentment,

Say to Amîr Khân that sustenance is  
prescribed by God".<sup>27</sup>

So it was possible that through this relation Sayyid Ahmad might have been known to Amîr Khân, and, therefore, he went to him. Further the elder brother of Sayyid

Aḥmad, Sayyid Ibrâhîm (d. 1809), was also in the army of Amîr Khân as the leader of prayer (imâm). This also might be one of the reasons to join the army of Amîr Khân.

However, whatever might be the reason, Sayyid Aḥmad joined the army of Amîr Khân around 1810 and went back to Delhi about 1817.

#### IV

When Sayyid Aḥmad returned to Delhi, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz put him in the same old Akbarâbâdî mosque where Sayyid Aḥmad lived before. Very soon people gathered round him and began to become his murîd.<sup>28</sup> Sayyid Aḥmad stayed in Delhi about two years. In 1819 he embarked upon jihâd against social evils and religious innovations. Many relations of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz and other prominent people from different sufi order like Shâh Abû Sa'îd, the khaliḥ of Shâh Ghulâm 'Alî from the Nagshbandî order, accompanied him. His fame was travelling before him, and wherever he arrived people began to become his murîd, and to promise to give up all un-Islamic rites and rituals.

Sayyid Aḥmad was authorized by Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz to practise and receive bay'ah (allegiance)

from the people in any of the four sufi orders, the Chishtî, the Qâdirî, the Naqshbandî, the Mujaddidî. Sayyid Ahmad, therefore, used to receive bay'ah from the people first in any of these orders and then asked them to enter into the order which he himself introduced, the Tarîqah'-i Muhammadiyah. This Tarîqah was not, however, an old established order. This was Sayyid Ahmad's own invention. Once one of his disciples, Hakîm 'Aṭâ'ullâh Khân of Rampur, asked him why he used to take bay'ah first in all four established orders and then in the Tarîqah'-i Muhammadiyah. If the other orders, he asked, were more important than the Tarîqah then what was the use of receiving the bay'ah again in the Tarîqah'-i Muhammadiyah. Sayyid Ahmad replied that the established orders like Qâdirî and others were somehow based on the spiritual teachings. The relation between those orders and the Prophet was hidden (bâṭin). But the relation between the Tarîqah and the Prophet was open (ẓâhir).<sup>29</sup> However, the Tarîqah'-i Muhammadiyah, in fact was not any new order. Sayyid Ahmad is reported as saying that since the mystical way of teaching had great esteem in the eyes of the people, he attract them Sayyid Ahmad named his way of teaching as the Tarîqah'-i

Muhammadiyah.<sup>30</sup>

In the Tarîqah'-i Muhammadiyah the emphasis was more and more on personal behaviour. Explaining the Tarîqah, Sayyid Ahmad once said:

"The Tarîqah'-i Muhammadiyah is a way of life in which every action of man must be to please God. [For example] marriage should be performed to save himself from adultery and indulgence, business and service should be done to earn lawful fortune. In the night man should repose with the intention to relax his body for the prayer before dawn and of early morning. Food should be taken to strengthen the body to perform the prayers, fasting and Hajj, and if necessary, the jihâd. In short the purpose of every action like walking, sitting, standing, sleeping, rising, eating and drinking should be to please God. In other words every individual should become a living example of the Quranic verse, 'Verily my prayers and my devotion, and my life, and my death, are for God, the Lord of all the world'. [6:162]".<sup>31</sup>

In his preachings to the people Sayyid Ahmad concentrated on eradicating all those innovations

which were embedded in Muslim society. Sindhî considers that this tour of Sayyid Aḥmad was arranged by Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz who asked him to go and take bay'ah of jihâd on his behalf against the British.<sup>32</sup> But the available materials regarding this tour do not agree with this statement.<sup>33</sup> The only subject we find him preaching in every place is to ask the people to come back to the teachings of Islam and give up "innovations".

Occasionally, however, we find stories attributed to him and relating to his activities of jihâd. For example, once in Lucknow, according to one story, Sayyid Aḥmad gave a pistol to one of his followers and said "keep arms with the intention of jihâd in the way of God, and eat fully, if God will please, we will do jihâd against the kuffâr. Take physical exercises, because, mysticism is not better than this".<sup>34</sup> According to another story one of his disciples, Shaykh Ghulâm 'Alî of Allahabad used to present him with arms. One day Sayyid Aḥmad said that he should not bring arms, because he (Sayyid Aḥmad) was going on Hajj, and there was no need of arms. Shaykh Ghulâm 'Alî replied that he did not know whether Sayyid Aḥmad would declare jihâd in this country or somewhere else. Moreover, Shaykh

Ghulâm 'Alî was not sure of his own life and therefore wanted to give arms to Sayyid Aḥmad; it was then for him to store them wherever he liked.<sup>35</sup> Another story says that when Sayyid Aḥmad reached Mecca in 1821 with hundreds of his followers he took the bay'ah of jihâd at Ḥudaybiyah,<sup>36</sup> where the Prophet had taken bay'ah of jihâd from his companions.

All these stories and the statements attributed to him have been collected from the books compiled by the order of Nawwâb of Tonk.<sup>37</sup> There is no other means available to examine the authenticity of such stories except to compare them with the writings of the leaders of the movement. None of the books, like Şirât-i mustaqîm, Taqwîyatul Îmân or Manşab-i Imâmat agree with the spirit of these stories.

However, if we carefully examine the above mentioned stories in which the idea of jihâd has been mentioned we would classify them in three categories.

1. Those in which Sayyid Aḥmad asked some of his disciples to be ready for jihâd.
2. Those in which some of his followers offered him arms for jihâd, but he was not sure whether or not Sayyid Aḥmad would

start the jihâd.

3. Those in which during the Hajj at Ḥudaybiyah Sayyid Aḥmad took the bay'ah of jihâd.

The bay'ah of jihâd at Ḥudaybiyah might be considered of little significance excepting an observance of a sunnah of the Prophet. The narrators only say that there was a bay'ah of jihâd at Ḥudaybiyah, but they do not explain whether there was any particular reference to any details. As for other stories, we can only say that Sayyid Aḥmad did not say, even in these stories, that he was going to launch a jihâd. On the question of jihâd the confusion arises from the fact that the word jihâd is now taken in an ordinary sense of fighting, whereas jihâd in its original sense refers to an attitude. Every attempt in the name of Islam, nowadays is understood to be a jihâd whether it complies with the technicalities or not. For instance, as mentioned above,<sup>38</sup> when Mawlawî Amîr 'Alî of Lucknow stood for the restoration of a mosque from the possession of Hindus, his attempt was called jihâd. According to Fiqh his action was merely a rebellion, not jihâd, because without the permission of the amîr the individual Muslim cannot start a jihâd. That is



why the 'Ulamâ' like Mawlânâ Fazl-i Haqq issued a counter fatwâ against Amîr 'Alî's jihâd movement.

Moreover, in the case of Sayyid Ahmad we must remember what Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had said about jihâd. According to him, the best jihâd was the verbal jihâd, to invite the people toward Islam. And during the life time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz we find Sayyid Ahmad and Shâh Ismâ'îl following his way and undertaking verbal jihâd against all un-Islamic practices. For example, Muslims at that time were against the marriage of a widow. Sayyid Ahmad criticised the custom and insisted that the Muslims should be rid of this social evil. He himself married a widow. In order to encourage other people Shâh Ismâ'îl had his old widow sister married. Likewise the Muslims had stopped going on Hajj, because they considered the voyage unsafe. Many of the 'Ulamâ' had issued fatwâ that in these circumstances the Hajj was not obligatory. Shâh Ismâ'îl and Mawlânâ 'Abdul Hayy issued a fatwâ that "unsafe voyage" was a lame excuse. The fatwâ was sent to Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, and he ratified whatever Shâh Ismâ'îl and Mawlânâ 'Abdul Hayy had said. To provide an example, Sayyid Ahmad accounced publicly that he was going on Hajj. Hundreds of

Muslims accompanied him and realized that the voyage was not unsafe.

However, it is also a historical fact that Sayyid Aḥmad and Shâh Ismâ'îl did advocate overt jihâd. But this happened after the death of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. He died in 1824, the same year Sayyid Aḥmad and Shâh Ismâ'îl returned from Mecca after performing the Ḥajj. They stayed there, in Delhi, for two years, and in 1826, they went to the North-West Frontier for jihâd.

The reason of this jihâd and against whom they actually fought remains outside the scope of our study.<sup>39</sup> In this study we were concerned with Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, his period and with the question as to whether he had or had not declared or preached war against the British. We have also seen that how far the Muslims of his time responded to him. The later career of Sayyid Aḥmad as the leader of jihâd was conditioned by new and changing factors and, therefore, it should be studied in the light of those factors.

## Epilogue

By now we have seen and discussed the phases relevant to our study, and we are in a position to summarize the whole discussion. The major questions which the Muslims were asking at that time were of the following type:

1. What was the legal status of the country under the British according to the Shar', and to what extent, if any, the changing political situation affected the religious life of the Muslims?
2. Could a Muslim serve a non-Muslim government?
3. Was it permitted for a Muslim to learn the English language and to wear English dress?

So far as the first question is concerned we have seen that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz said that the territory under the non-Muslims was Dârul Harb. But, as we have seen, neither was he asked, nor did he himself define what he really meant by the term Dârul Harb.

This term, however, may be understood with the help of some of his other statements. Dârul Harb, in its technical sense means a country where Muslims are supposed to restore the Islamic order, or migrate from there to some other Dârul Islâm.

But in the case of India Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz explicitly declined to consider it a country from which migration was obligatory. Regarding jihâd he has categorically defined it and shown his preference for verbal jihâd whereas this is generally regarded as the lowest type of jihâd. Thus we can say that the term Dârul Harb was not used by Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz in its strict technical sense.

Replying to a question about performing the Friday prayers in a Dârul Harb he also suggested the selection of an honest Muslim to supervise their personal and religious affairs without worrying about the political condition of the country. He suggested that such an officer should be appointed by the government of the Dârul Harb; and if the government failed to fulfil its responsibility the Muslims themselves should elect some one from amongst themselves. It is, therefore, safe to say that the term Dârul Harb was not a declaration of war against the British. It was, however, an analysis of the new situation through a familiar religious term.

One wonders why the Muslims were so anxious to understand the complexities of the new situation. Perhaps it was to bring back the old situation in

which they once lived, or perhaps there was some other motive behind their curiosity. As we have seen, in none of the questions about the legal status of the country did they ask about their duties as members of a gradually dying Dârul Islâm. On the contrary the emphasis was more and more on the rights which the changing situation could offer to them. For example, instead of asking whether or not it was obligatory for them to oust the British who were responsible for making the country Dârul Harb, the Muslims were eager to know whether or not they were permitted to take usury from the non-Muslims.

So far as the question of accepting jobs under the British and learning of the English language was concerned Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz gave his consent. At the outset he described different kinds of service. It was forbidden to hold some of them; others of them were "allowed" or "preferred". But as we have already seen the reason for forbidding was not on the ground that they were offered by the British. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz clearly gave his opinion on the basis of the nature of work involved in different services whether the employer was Christian or Muslim.

On the question of learning the English

language and wearing English dress, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz declared them lawful provided that the Muslim concerned was not intending to merge his identity with the British.

It is also very important to note, that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz met opposition from different circles of the Muslim community of India on different problems, but none of his opponents censured him for his political ideas. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, as we have already seen, was considered friendly to the British, and it is also a fact that none of the 'Ulamâ' whether Sunnî or Shî'î, criticized him on this score. The British officers also respected him. His relations and disciples, too, were on good terms with the British. Many of them, as we have seen, were in the service of the East India Company. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz not only allowed this but also defended this position if some one objected the acceptance of any position under the British administration.

In short we can say that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz saw no harm in the Muslims' living under non-Muslim government. He divided life into two parts: political and religious. For the religious aspect he advised the Muslims to depend upon the Muslim

officers appointed by the non-Muslim government or selected by themselves. In other fields of life the Muslims were advised to collaborate with the non-Muslim government as long as their religious and cultural character remained intact.

## Notes on Chapter I

1. We do not know when these letters were written. As Shâh Ahlullâh died in 1187/1772, we can only assume that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz (1746-1824) then must have been about twenty years old when he wrote these letters.
2. Muḥammad Raḥîm Bakhsh Dihlawî, Hayât-i Walî, Delhi, 1319/[1901], p. 328; Reprint, Lahore, n.d. p. 601, quotes this verse as: والى ارى الكفار اصحاب خردة. But Abul Hasan 'Alî Nadwî, Sirat Sayyid Ahmad Shahîd, Lucknow, 1948, p. 33, quotes the verse as: والى ارى الافرنج اصحاب خردة. We do not know on what authority Nadwî quoted his version. However, this word kuffâr (infidels) most probably has been altered afterwards by the word afranĵ (European). This is because in the following lines Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz clearly mentions the Sikhs and the Marhattas as the invaders.
3. Muḥammad Raḥîm Bakhsh, op. cit., Delhi edition, pp. 328, 329; Lahore ed. pp. 601, 602.
4. Ibid, Delhi ed., pp. 333, 334; Lahore ed., p. 609.
5. It is not clear to whom the word imâm refers; perhaps to the Mughal Emperor, who was considered as Imâmul Muslimîn at that time. The East India Company, however powerful, was collecting the revenue in the name of the Mughal Emperor.
6. Muḥammad Raḥîm Bakhsh, op. cit., Delhi ed., pp. 335, 336; Lahore ed., pp. 611-613.
7. Penny, Church in Madras, v. i, p. 346, as quoted in Percival Spear, The Nabobs, Oxford, 1963, p. 106.
8. Percival Spear, op. cit., p. 106.
9. Kenneth Ingham, Reformers in India, 1793-1833, Cambridge, 1956, p. 10.
10. Ibid, p. viii.



11. According to Ingham, (op. cit., p. 7), the letters of Edward Perry and Charles Grant to the President of the Board of Control, dated 8 June, 1807, are preserved in the Bodleion Library, Mss. 'Correspondence on Missions in India, 1807'.
12. Commonwealth Relations Office, Mss. Court Minutes, v. 118, fols., 572-77, as quoted in Ingham, op. cit., p. 7.
13. Ingham, op. cit., p. 8.
14. Lord Minto In India, p. 81, as quoted in Ingham, op. cit., p. 8. See also below, f. n. 36.
15. Percival Spear, op. cit., p. 128.
16. Hilton Brown, The Sahibs: The Life and Ways of the British in India as recorded by themselves, London, 1948, p. 64.
17. Church Mission Society, Ecclesiastical Papers, Mss. Package 156, North India, as quoted in Ingham, op. cit., p. 25.
18. Ingham, op. cit., p. 57.
19. 'Abdul Haqq, Marhûm Dillî Kâlîj, Awrangabad, 1933, p. 2.
20. C. F. Andrews, Zakâ Ullâh of Delhi, Cambridge, 1929, p. 34. It is not clear what was the Muslim representation in this figure. And, perhaps, there is no way to find out the answer. Moreover, 'Abdul Haqq (op. cit., p. 11) doubts the statement. According to him this 300 was the total strength of the college, not the English class only.
21. 'Abdul Haqq, op. cit., p. 148.
22. Rahmân 'Alî, Tazkirah 'Ulamâ'-i Hind, (Persian) 2nd ed. Lucknow, 1914, p. 210. Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ayyûb Qâdirî, Karachi, 1961, p. 456. See also Imdâd Sâbirî, Farangiyôn kâ jâl, Delhi, 1949, p. 266.
23. For this aspect of the life of the English gentlemen in India see, for example, Percival Spear, (op. cit.), Hilton Brown (op. cit.), J. K. Stanford, Ladies in the sun-The Mem Sahib's India, 1790-1860, London, 1962.

24. For a modern interpretation in respect of intermarriage see, for example, Muḥammad Ja'far Shāh Nadwī, Al-Dīn Yusrun, (Urdu), Lahore, 1956, pp. 172 ff.
25. For a short life account see Buckland, Dictionary of Indian Biography, London, 1906, p. 197.
26. Hugh Pears, The Hearsays, p. 53, as quoted in Percival Spear, The Nabobs, p. 92.
27. Hugh Pears, op. cit., p. 64, as quoted in Percival Spear, op. cit., p. 92.
28. There seems to be no original source available about Bēgam Samrū except what some English writers have written in their memoirs. According to W. H. Sleeman, Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official, London, 1844, v. ii, p. 378, she belonged to a Sayyid family, and according to some other writers (see for example, Brajendra Nath Banerji, Begam Samru, Calcutta, 1925, p. 14) she was a Kashmiri girl, and did not belong to a Sayyid family. However, all agree that she was a Muslim.
29. Banerji, op. cit., p. 5.
30. Sleeman, op. cit., v. ii, p. 384.
31. Banerji (op. cit., p. 18) suggests "she was baptized doubtless under the persuasion of her European officers". His opinion seems to be reasonable, because in the life time of General Samru the Bēgam was not in charge of the estate and the troops, who were chiefly Christians. After the death of General Samru the responsibility of dealing with them fell upon Bēgam Samrū, and then perhaps it was difficult to satisfy the Christian officers to serve under a Muslim woman.
32. Banerji, op. cit., p. 19.
33. 'Abdul Qādir Rāmpūrī, Waqā'i' 'Abdul Qādir Khānī, (Persian Mss.), Urdu translation, Ilm-u 'Amal, by Mu'īnud Dīn Afzalgarhī, Karachi, 1960, v. i, p. 198.
34. Abul Ḥasan 'Alī Nadwī, op. cit., p. 97. Nadwī, without mentioning the name of Bēgam Samrū,

says that the officers asked to be excused for not having seen the Sayyid earlier, because they were on duty, and the Bêgam Sâhibah was very strict in regards to duty. Evidently the Bêgam Sâhibah (Her Ladyship) means Bêgam Samrû, because at that time Sardhana was the capital of Bêgam Samrû.

35. On this point only one example is available where Sayyid Ahmad refused to accept a present from a Muslim woman of Banaras who had married a Christian businessman. (Ghulâm Rasûl Mihr, Sayyid Ahmad Shahîd, Lahore, 1952, p. 203.) But this case was rather different from the Bêgam's case. Here Sayyid Ahmad himself was involved, whereas in the case of the Bêgam his murîds (disciples) were involved. If his refusal was based on some principles, then, he must have asked his disciples also to abstain from the Bêgam's service.
36. For Christian Mission Stations in India (1793-1833), see Ingham, op. cit., Appendix C, pp. 133 ff.
37. Imdâd Sâbiri, op. cit., p. 50.
38. Ibid, p. 63.

## Chapter II

1. For biographical information, see, Rahmân 'Alî, Tazkirah 'Ulamâ'-i Hind, (Persian), Lucknow, 1894, p. 122; Urdu translation by Muhammad Ayyûb Qâdirî, Karachi, 1961, p. 302; Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khân, Tazkirah ahl-i Dihlî, (Ch. IV of Asâruş-Sanâdîd) ed. by Qâzî Ahmad Miyân Akhtar, Karachi, 1955, pp. 52-56; Fazl-i Imâm Khayrâbâdî, Tarjumân-al-Fuzalâ (being a chapter of his Amad nâmah), ed. by Muftî Intizâmullâh Shihâbî, English tr. by A. S. Bazmî, Karachi, 1956, pp. Persian text, 15-17, English tr. 30-31;
2. Shân Waliullâh, Shifâ'ul 'Alîl, Urdu translation, al-Qawlul Jamîl, by Khurram 'Alî, Bombay, 1260, pp. 89-96.

3. This Madrasah was destroyed during 1857. English administration at Delhi confiscated the property and sold it to a local Hindu businessman. Since then it has been called "Madrasah Râ'ê Bahâdur Lâlâ Râm Kishan Dâs". See Manâzir Aḥsan Gilânî, Al-Furqân, Barêlî, v. viii, No. 9-12, Shâh Walî-ullâh Nambar, p. 288.
4. A letter from one Mullâ Rashîdî Madanî of Constantinople to Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz is quoted as evidence. Mullâ Rashîdî wrote that a fatwâ in the Islamic world without the seal of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was not of great value. See Hayrat Dihlawî, Hayât-i Tayyibah, Lahore, n.d. p. 30.
5. Alṭâf Ḥusayn Ḥâlî, Hayât-i Jâwîd, Lahore, 1957, v. ii, p. 727.
6. Qadam Sharîf was the mausoleum of Prince Fath Khân son of Firôz Shâh (d. 1374). In that mausoleum there was a stone bearing a foot print. According to public belief that was the foot print of the Prophet. The mausoleum, therefore, was called the Qadam Sharîf, the Holy Foot. The people used to fill the foot print with water and drink it. cf. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khân, AsâruṣṢanâdîd, Kanpur, Nâmi Press, 1904, Ch. III, pp. 37-38.
7. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, Malfûzât, (Persian) Mêrath, 1896, p. 54; Urdu translation by Muḥammad 'Alî Luṭfî, Karachi, 1960, p. 117. [Hereafter refferd as Malfûzât only].
8. One can tell that the Rohillas were so fanatic that once a Rohilla disciple of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz left his class-room and declared that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was a Shî'î simply because one day in his sermon Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had exaggeratedly praised the fourth Khalîfah, 'Alî. See, Malfûzât, Persian, p. 32; Urdu, p. 84.
9. One current story which is very often told by later historians on the authority of Amîr Shâh Khân, (Arwâh-i Balâsah or Amîrur rawâyât, Saharanpur, 1343/[1924], p. 247, is that, during the time of Najaf Khan, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz and his family were exiled from Delhi. From the outskirts of Delhi the women and children were provided carriages by Shâh Fakhrud Dîn, a well known sūfî of that time and a close friend of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz

(for biographical information of Shāh Fakhrud Dīn, see, Khalīq Ahmad Nizāmī, Mashāyakh-i Chisht, Delhi, pp. 460-529), but Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz was not allowed to ride and he went on foot from Delhi to Jawnpur (about 500 miles), and due to this severe hardships he lost his eyesight.

We do not have contemporary documentary evidence to accept the statement of Amīr Khān. (See for example, Fazl-i Imām, d. 1829, op. cit., Persian text, pp. 15-17, English tr., pp. 3031; 'Abdul Qādir Rāmpūrī, d. 1849, op. cit., pp. 245 ff.). In 1801, Mawlānā Khayrud Dīn Muḥammad of Jawnpur compiled a Tazkiratul 'Ulamā or "A Memoir of the Learned Men (of Jawnpur)", Calcutta, 1934. In its first chapter he has given a short account of the city of Jawnpur since its foundation in 1370 till the time of Governor-generalship of Marquis Wellesley (1798-1805). But he has not referred to this incident either. Moreover, there were powerful Rohillas on his route to Jawnpur where Najaf Khan had no authority. Had Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz been exiled in such a dreadful manner he could have taken political asylum in Rohilkhand, the Rohilla state, close to Delhi.

In these circumstances it is hard to believe this story told a century later by some one whom Manāẓir Aḥsan Gīlānī (op. cit., p. 211) designates as "the story teller of Walīullāh's family".

10. Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz, Fatāwā 'Azīzī, v. i, Persian, Delhi, 1893, p. 113; Urdu translation, Kanpur, n.d., p. 202. [ Hereafter referred as "Fatāwā"]
11. Malfūẓāt, Urdu translation, the Preface by the Translator, p. 30.
12. For example explaining the verse 81:9 he declares 'azl (coitus interruptus) lawful. Then he goes farther and takes the question of abortion in the early stage of pregnancy, and the use of contraceptive medicines, and declares them lawful. cf. Tafsīr-i 'Azīzī, (Persian), v. iii, Lahore, 1277/1860, pp. 57-58; Urdu tr. Deoband, 1953, part xxx, pp. 94-95.
13. Malfūẓāt, Persian, p. 23; Urdu, p. 70.

14. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, Tuhfa'-i Ithnâ 'Ashariyah, [hereafter referred as Tuhfah] Persian, n.p., 1269/1852, pp. 1-2; Urdu tr. Karachi, n.d., Preface, pp. 1, 2.
15. Even some of the relatives of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had become Shi'î, cf. Malfûzât, Persian, p. 37; Urdu, p. 92.
16. See for example, Malfûzât, Persian, pp. 8, 37; Urdu, pp. 48, 92; Fatâwâ, v. i, Persian, pp. 12, 18; Urdu, pp. 28, 39. On the contrary we do not find this type of question about those Muslim girls who married Christians. (cf. supra, p. 10 ff.)
17. Malfûzât, Persian, p. 22; Urdu, p. 69.
18. Ibid, Persian, p. 23; Urdu, p. 70.
19. Muḥammad Ikrâm (Rawd-i Kawsar, Lahore, 3rd ed. 1958, p. 573) has given a few names of Shi'î 'Ulamâ', who wrote books to refute the Tuhfah. Among them were Dildâr 'Alî of Lucknow (for biographical information see, Raḥmân 'Alî, op. cit., Persian, p. 60; Urdu, p. 186) and Muḥammad Qulî Khân Kantûrî.
20. In the Fatâwâ (Persian v. i, p. 136; Urdu, v. i, p. 241) we find a letter from one Mirzâ Hasan 'Alî saying that the opponents claimed that the Tuhfah was a translation. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz replied that the book "Sawâ'iq-i Mûbiqah" and some other books indeed were before him when he was writing the Tuhfah, and he had followed the pattern of Sawâ'iq in the division of chapters, etc., but the Tuhfah, he said, was entirely an original work in its contents and material. We cannot say anything for or against this statement because the Sawâ'iq is not available.
21. Fatâwâ, v. i, Persian, pp. 136, 137; Urdu, p. 242.
22. According to Ikrâm (op. cit., p. 573) Mirzâ Muḥammad 'Alî, a biographer of the Shi'î 'Ulamâ' has written in his book, Nujûmus samâ' fi trâjim al-'Ulamâ', that due to Najaf Khan, Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had not published the book under his real name. (For bibliographical information about

the Nujûm cf. Storey, v.i, part ii, p. 1134) The later writers also take this view for granted that Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz had to meet adversities at the hands of Najaf Khan on account of the Tuhfah. Whether or not Najaf Khan misbehaved to him, is a question which needs investigation. But so far as the case of the Tuhfah is concerned, it was written, according to the author himself, in 1204/1789 (cf. Malfûzât, Persian, p. 23; Urdu, p. 70) whereas Najaf Khan died in 1781.

23. Fazl-i Husayn Bihârî, al-Hayât ba'd al-mamât (Urdu, biography of Mawlânâ Nazîr Husayn alias Miyân Sâhib, 1805-1902), Karachi, 1959, p. 102, says that the personal library of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was subsidized by the English Governor General of India.
24. Kamâlât-i 'Azîzî was compiled by one Nawwâb Mubâarak 'Alî Khân, and was published from Mêrath in 1873. The book recently has been republished as an appendix of the Malfûzât, Urdu edition.
25. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz has used the word "Jâhil", which not always means ignorant or illiterate. Sometimes the same word jâhil is used for rustic, rugged and rude person. By seeing the characteristic of Skinner we cannot say that the word jâhil was used in the meaning of ignorant. (For the use of word of jâhil cf. also, Toshihiko Izutsu, The Structure of the Ethical Terms in the Koran, Keio University, Tokyo, 1959, pp. 24-31.
26. Malfûzât, Persian, p. 117; Urdu, pp. 214, 215.
27. Baillie Fraser, Military Memoires of Col. James Skinner, v. ii, p. 159, as quoted in The Nabobs by Percival Spear, Oxford, 1963, p. 13.
28. 'Abdul Qâdir Râmpûrî, Waqâ'i 'Abdul Qâdir Khânî, Persian Ms. Urdu Translation, Karachi, 1960, v. i, p. 193.
29. Philip Woodruff, The Men who Ruled India: The Founders, London, 3rd empression, 1954 p. 268.
30. Percival Spear, op. cit., p. 93. [Due to this friendliness at last Fraser met his death.

For an account of his murder see Percival Spear, Twilight of the Mughals, Cambridge, 1951, pp. 182-193; and W. H. Sleeman, Rambles and Recollections of An Indian Official, London, 1844, v. ii, pp. 209-231. For Indian view point regarding his murder, cf. also 'Abdul Qādir Rāmpūrī, op. cit., p. 175, f. n. 1; and Mālik Rām, Zikr-i Ghālib, Delhi, 1955, 3rd ed. pp. 69 ff.

31. Victor Jacquemont, Letters from India, London, 1835, 2nd ed. p. 259.
32. 'Abdul Qādir Rāmpūrī, op. cit., p. 322.
33. Once Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz said that the Naqshbandī order was the best. Their system of training was like the well-organised military system of the English people. (Malfūzāt, Persian, p. 18; Urdu, p. 63) At another occasion he said that every nation has particular interest in some art. The Hindus are good in arithmetic and the Europeans are famous for handicraft and other arts. (Malfūzāt, Persian, p. 51; Urdu, 112).
34. Hayrat Dihlawī, op. cit., p. 122.
35. See supra, pp. 14 ff.
36. Malfūzāt, Urdu ed. Preface by the translator, p. 19.
37. Imdād Sābirī, Farangiyōn kā jāl, Delhi, 1949, p. 140. Imdād Sābirī (p. 137) counts Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz as the first munāẓir, but he also accepts that during the time of Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz no missionary, except a few crazy Christians, took interest in the religious debates.
38. For example, it is reported that once a missionary came to Delhi to Metcalf, the English Resident at Delhi, and wished to have a debate with some prominent 'ālim. Metcalf brought him to Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz on the condition that if the missionary would be talked down by Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz, then the missionary would pay two thousand rupees to Metcalf. Otherwise Metcalf would pay to the missionary the same amount on behalf of Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz. Both agreed and went to Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz. Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz was asked to answer the question on the ground of reason and logic without quoting the Qur'ān or the Ḥadīth.



The missionary asked if the Prophet Muḥammad was the beloved prophet of God why did he not ask God to save his grand son, Ḥusayn and his children. The assassination of Ḥusayn, he said, proved that the Prophet Muḥammad was not beloved of God. Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz replied that the Prophet did go to God for help, but God said that He could not help his grand son because He could not save His own son from crucifixion. This reply silenced the missionary, and he paid the promised amount to Metcalf. (Kamālāt-i 'Azīzī, published as an appendix to Malfūzāt, Urdu, pp. 225, 226.)

39. See for example, Fatāwā, v. i, Persian, pp. 148 ff.; Urdu, pp. 260 ff.; Kamālāt-i 'Azīzī (appendix to Malfūzāt, Urdu, pp. 227.
40. Percival Spear, Twilight of the Mughals, p. 149.
41. See Ch. III, pp. 56-59.

### Chapter III

1. See, for example, Fatāwā, Persian, v. i, pp. 91, 114, 191; v. ii, p. 119; Urdu, v. i, pp. 206, 327, 328.
2. The Persian text, vol. i, bears 242 pp. and v. ii, contains 148 pp., the Urdu translation in two volumes contains pp. 396 and 320. Most of the questions are about the rules and regulations regarding the Islamic rites like prayers, fasting, etc., and about the philosophy of mysticism etc. Out of these hundreds of pages about 10 pages in the Persian, and about 17 pages in the Urdu translation have been given to questions having some political flavour.
3. The year 1236/[1820] is mentioned in, Persian, v. i, p. 93; Urdu, v. i, p. 171; year 1238/[1822], Persian v. i, p. 111, Urdu v. i, p. 200; year 1215/[1800], Persian v. ii, p. 77, Urdu v. ii, p. 170; year 1215/[1800] Persian v. ii, p. 125, Urdu, v. ii, p. 270. None of them deals with problems which we are going to study.

4. Fatâwâ, Persian, v. i, pp. 148 ff.; Urdu, v. i, pp. 260 ff.
5. C. E. Buckland, Dictionary of Indian Biography, London, 1906, p. 156.
6. Fatâwâ, Persian, v. ii, p. 117; Urdu, v. ii, p. 254.
7. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khân, Risâlah ahkâm-i ta'âm-i ahl-i Kitâb, in the Taṣānif-i Ahmadiyah, part i, v. ii, Aligarh, 1887, p. 134; also Ahkâm-i ta'âm-i ahl-i Kitâb, Lahore, n.d. p. 4.
8. Fatâwâ, Persian, v. ii, pp. 125, 126; Urdu, v. ii, pp. 270-272.
9. Fatâwâ, Persian, v. i, p. 17; Urdu, v. i, pp. 35 ff.; for the definition of Dârul Islâm and Dârul Harb, see Encyclopaedia of Islam.
10. Amân-i awal refers to those religious, social and political rights which the Muslims and Dhimmîs enjoy in a Dârul Islâm according to the Shar'.
11. The present writer could not succeed in finding these two "distinguished" persons in the Indian History of that time. The other statement of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz about the restriction upon the entry into the city, may be fully supported by the following statement of another writer of the same period. The writer visited Delhi in 1817.  
 "On our entering the city gates, some few clerks and peons of the English Government, to our great annoyance, searched our luggage and examined us, questioning us very minutely respecting our intention and cause of coming to the city, which being directly replied to, we were left to ourselves".  
 [Lutfullah, Autobiography of Lutfullah, London, 3rd ed. 1858, pp. 87, 88.]
12. See, Husayn Ahmad Madanî, Naqsh-i Hayât, Deoband, 1954, v. ii, p. 4; and Muḥammad Miyân, 'Ulamâ'-i Hind kâ shândâr mâzî, Delhi, 1957, v. ii, pp. 85 ff.
13. Fatâwâ, v. i, pp. 33 ff., Urdu, v. i, pp. 69 ff.
14. See, Fatâwâ Hindîyah known as Fatâwâ 'Âlamgârî, Cairo, 1323/[1905], pp. 260 ff.

15. See above f.n. 10.
16. Fatâwâ 'Âlamgîrî, v. i, p. 155,
17. Fatâwâ, Persian, v. i, pp. 115 ff.; Urdu, v. i, pp. 206 ff.
18. Ibid, Persian, v. i, pp. 162 ff.; Urdu, v. i, pp. 280 ff.
19. The Indian Muslims, not only in the time of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, but even after him as late as the end of the 19th century, have been raising the same question of Dârul Islâm and Dârul Harb in connection with usury. For example let us have a look at the fatâwâ of another 'âlim, Mawlânâ 'Abdul Hayy of Lucknow, (1847-1886). He was a very famous 'âlim, the author of several books, and his fatâwâ have been collected in three volumes.

The original Persian fatâwâ were published first in 1305/1887, in three volumes, at Lucknow. An Urdu translation by Muḥammad Barkatullâh was published at Kanpur in 1349/1930. Most of the fatâwâ in the original collection have the dates when the questions were asked; but the translator, without any obvious reason, has omitted them. Moreover, the translator has also changed the original chronological order of the Persian collection, intending to compile them according to subject, and this he could not do successfully.

However, in 1299/1881 Mawlânâ 'Abdul Hayy was asked whether British India was Dârul Harb or not. He categorically replied that in accordance with the views of Abû Ḥanîfah and Abû Yûsuf and Muḥammad, India would be Dârul Islâm [see his Fatâwâ, Persian, v. i, p. 361; v. ii, p. 196]. On another occasion he was asked whether or not it was allowed for a Muslim to take usury from Hindus. This question arose because he had replied to a question saying that usury was allowed in a Dârul Harb. To this question he said that it was not allowed to take usury from Hindus, because India was Dârul Islâm [Ibid, v. i, p. 301; v. iii, p. 98]. A question came that in the British India the Muslims used to deposit their money with the Christians, and receive interest, which was called wathîqah. The Mawlânâ was asked whether or not it was lawful to take interest on deposited money. He declared

the interest to be lawful, because British India, as he said, according to Abû Yûsuf and Muḥammad, was Dârul Harb (sic) [Ibid, v. iii, p. 99].

In our present study we cannot go into detail to find out the reason for inconsistencies in Mawlânâ 'Abdul Ḥayy's answers about the political situation of India. We are only to see the motives of the question about the status of the country. As we see, during this time also the question of Dârul Harb was mainly asked in order to know the possibility of taking usury.

20. Fatâwâ 'Azîzî, Persian, v. i, pp. 144 ff. Urdu, v. i, pp. 205 ff.
21. Ibid, Persian, v. i, pp. 195 ff. Urdu, v. i, pp. 327 ff.
22. For a similar statement, see, Fatâwâ, Persian, v. ii, p. 119; Urdu, v. ii, pp. 258, 259.
23. Shâh 'Abdullâh alias Shâh Ghulâm 'Alî (1745-1824) was a famous-figure in the Nawshbandî order. He was the disciple and khalîfah of Mirzâ Maẓhar Jân-i Jânân (1699-1780).
24. Madrasah Rahîmîyah founded by Shâh 'Abdur Raḥîm, of which Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was the Principal. Shâh Ghulam 'Alî has referred to it as "our school" though he was not on the staff of the school. This is an Indian way of expression in which to avoid the feeling of criticism a critic used the word "our" instead of "yours".
25. Fatâwâ, Persian, v. i, p. 91; Urdu, v. i, p. 168.
26. see Chapter V, p. 96.
27. Fatâwâ, Persian, v. i, pp. 91 ff.; Urdu, v. i, pp. 169 ff.
28. Ibid, Persian, v. i, p. 92; Urdu, v. i, p. 170.
29. Ghulâm Rasûl Mihr, Jamâ'at-i mujâhidîn, Lahore, 1955, p. 111.
30. See chapter II, pp. 21, 22.
31. Muḥammad Miyân, 'Ulamâ-i Hind kâ shândâr mâẓî, v. iv, pp. 286, 287.

32. Fatâwâ, Persian, v. i, p. 110; Urdu, v. i, p. 199.
33. Ibid, Persian, v. ii, p. 117; Urdu, v. ii, p. 254.
34. Ibid, Persian, v. i, p. 195; Urdu, v. i, p. 335.
35. See, for example, Muḥammad Miyân, op. cit., v. ii, p. 84; Muḥammad Miyân, "Islâmî ḥurriyat kā alam-bardâr", in Shâh Ismâ'îl Shakhîd, ed. 'Abdullâh Bat, Lahore, 1955, p. 155; also 'Ubaydullâh Sindhî Shâh Walîullâh awr unkî siyâsî tahrîk, Lahore, 2nd ed. 1944, p. 71. Sindhî himself was against the idea of the hijrah (Ibid, p. 71, f.n. 2). On the point of hijrah, see also, Manâẓir Aḥsan Gîlânî, Sawâniḥ-i Qâsimî, Deoband, 1373/[1953], v. i, p. 206, f.n. 1.
36. Fatâwâ, Persian, v. ii, p. 88; Urdu, v. ii, p. 191.
37. Ibid, Persian, v. i, p. 48; Urdu, v. i, p. 98.
38. Ibid, Persian, v. i, p. 52; Urdu, v. i, p. 104.
39. See above, p. 50.

#### Chapter IV

1. See chapter I, pp. 10-14.
2. For biographical information, see A. S. Bazmee Ansari, "Faḍl-i Imâm", in The Encyclopaedia of Islam, (New edition), London, 1963, v. ii, fasciculus 34, pp. 735; Faḍl-i Imâm Khayrâbâdî, Tarjumanul Fuḍalâ, Karachi, 1956, pp. i-iii; 'Abdul Qâdir Râmpûrî, Wagâ'i, Karachi, 1960, pp. 255-257; Raḥmân 'Alî, Tazkirah 'Ulamâ'-i Hind, (Persian), Lucknow, 1894, p. 162, Urdu tr. Karachi, 1961, p. 376-377; Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khân, Tazkirah ahl-i Dihlî, Karachi, 1957, pp. 85-86.
3. See, Raḥmân 'Alî, op. cit., Persian, pp. 93-94, Urdu, pp. 247-249; 'Abdul Qâdir, op. cit., pp. 274-275; Sir Sayyid, op. cit., pp. 57-70.
4. Sir Sayyid, op. cit., p. 98; 'Abdul Haqq, Marḥûm Dihlî Kâlij, Awrangabad, 1933, p. 148.

5. 'Abdul Qâdir, op. cit., pp. 25-44.
6. A. S. Bazmee Ansari, "Faḍl-i Haqq" in the Encyclopaedia of Islam, (New Edition), London, 1963, v. ii, fasciculus 34, pp. 735-736.
7. Muḥammad Miyân, 'Ulamâ'-i Hind kâ shândâr mâẓî, v. iv, p. 487.
8. Ibid, p. 488; see also, Ghaws 'Alî Shâh, Tazkirah Ghawsîyah, Lahore, 7th ed. 1955, p. 136.
9. Raḥmân 'Alî, op. cit., Urdu, p. 383, f.n. 1; 'Abdul Qâdir, op. cit., p. 258, f.n. 1.
10. For a detail account see, Najmul Ghanî Râmpûrî, Târîkh-i Awadh, Lucknow, 1919, v. v, pp. 199-236.
11. Ibid, p. 222.
12. Ibid, p. 222. Sayyid Kamâlud Dîn Ḥaydar, a contemporary historian, has collected several other fatâwâ issued at that time by Sunnî and Shî'î 'Ulamâ; see his book, Qayṣarut tawârîkh or Tawârîkh-i Awadh, Lucknow, 2nd ed. n.d. v. ii, pp. 108-110.
13. Intizâmullâh Shihâbî, Îst Indiyâ Kampanî awr Bâghî 'Ulamâ, Delhi, n.d., pp. 52-53.
14. Nawâ'-ê Âzâdî, Adabî publishers, Bombay, 1957, p. 8.
15. Faḍl-i Haqq, al-Thawrah al-Hindîyah, Urdu translation given in Bahâdur Shâh Safar awr unkâ 'ahd, Lahore, 1955, p. 891. [tr. Ra'îs Aḥmad Ja'farî].
16. Ibid, p. 874.
17. Ibid, pp. 880-881.
18. Jîwan Lâl, Rôznâmchah, as quoted in Muḥammad Miyân, op. cit., v. iv, p. 494.
19. al-Thawrah, as quoted in Ja'farî, op. cit., p. 890. For an English translation of the Thawrah see, Moinul Haq, The Story of the War of Independence (being an English translation of Allamah Faḍl-i Haqq's Risalah on the war), in the Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society, Karachi, v. v, Part I, January, 1957, pp. 49-50.

20. "The capital of the kingdom" here means Lucknow, because, Khayrâbâd from where the Mawlânâ was arrested, was situated in the region of Awadh, of which the capital was Lucknow.
21. Moin, op. cit., p. 51; Ja'farî, op. cit., p. 891.
22. Ikrâm, Rawd-i Kawsar, Karachi, n.d., p. 418.
23. Najmul Ghanî, op. cit., v. iii, p. 347.
24. 'Abdul Qâdir, op. cit., p. 134.
25. Ibid, p. 246.
26. Muḥammad Miyân, op. cit., v. iv, p. 418.
27. Lutfullah, Autobiography of Lutfullah, London, 3rd ed. 1858.
28. Lutfullâh, op. cit., p. 95.
29. Ibid, p. 96.
30. Ibid, p. 128.
31. Ibid, p. 139.
32. Ibid, p. 168.
33. Ibid, p. 166.
34. Ibid, p. 355.
35. Ibid, p. 409.
36. Ibid, p. 389.
37. Ibid, pp. 383, 384.
38. Ibid, p. 363.
39. Ibid, p. 274.
40. cf. Raḥmân 'Alî, op. cit., Persian, 2nd ed. Lucknow, 1914, p. 179, Urdu, p. 413; 'Abdul Qâdir, op. cit., p. 161. See also, below, f. n. 44. -  
Mawlawî Muḥammad Ismâ'îl was sent to London by  
41. Nâṣirud Dîn Haydar to arrange his affairs directly with the Directors of the East India Company, and,

therefore, among the people of Lucknow, he was known as Mawlawi Landani (Sayyid Kamāl Haydar Husaynī, op. cit., p. 334, v. i.). He married there, an English woman called Miss Duff (Mis Daf).

Rahmān 'Alī (see above, f.n. 40) says that he was a free thinker (āzād ṭab'). On his way to India, he says, when Ismā'īl passed by Aden, his Christian wife told him to pay a visit to the Ka'bah, but he replied that he did not have any respect for stones. His character has been described in the same way by Najmul Ghanī (op. cit., v. iv, pp. 328, 329). But both the writers are of later period.

'Abdul Qādir Rāmpūrī, who met him, has not given any such stories. On the contrary he was impressed by him and was delighted by seeing a "mawlawī" who was enlightened with new knowledge ('Abdul Qādir, op. cit., p. 161). Sayyid Kamāl Haydar Husaynī (op. cit., v. i, p. 334), a contemporary historian, does not tell this story, though he seems to be unhappy with his marriage with a Christian girl. He also states that Ismā'īl went again to London, where his Christian wife died. Then he married another Christian girl. On his way back to home, he died in Bombay, and his wife returned to London.

41. Mrs. Meer Hassan Ali, Observations on the Mussulmauns of India, ed. by W. Crooke, Oxford, 2nd ed. 1917.

By the title it appears as if this is a study of the life of Muslims of India, but, in fact, this is the study of the social life of Muslims of Lucknow in particular, and of Awadh in general.

42. Ibid, Introduction by the Editor, p. x. The editor does not tell us into what language the book was translated, but most probably into Urdu, or as then called the Hindustani language.

43. Ibid, p. xv.

44. W. Crooke, the editor, on the authority of a "tradition from Lucknow" (Ibid, pp. x, xi) says that Mīr Ḥasan 'Alī was sent to London on a secret mission by Naṣīrud Dīn Ḥaydar. But most probably the editor has mistaken him for Mawlawī Muḥammad Ismā'īl who was sent to London by Naṣīrud Dīn Ḥaydar. (see above note 40).



45. Mrs. Meer Hassan Ali, op. cit., pp. 421, 422.
46. Ibid, p. 401.
47. Ibid, p. 80.
48. Ibid, p. 423.

## Chapter V

1. For example, the fugahâ' (jurists) say that after the birth of a child it is recommended to sacrifice a goat or sheep for a girl, and two in case of a boy. The meat should be divided in three parts. One should be given to poor people, and the other to the relations, the third part should be eaten at home. This is called 'aqiqah'. The Indian Muslims made a restriction on the parents against eating the meat of the 'aqiqah'. This restriction could not<sup>3a</sup> back to the Prophet or to the companions. Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz was asked about this restriction to which he replied that there was no harm if parents follow the custom and did not eat that meat. (cf. Malfûzât, Persian, p. 8; Urdu, p. 49)
2. Malfûzât, Persian, p. 54; Urdu, p. 117.
3. Madâr and Sâlâr are the name of two Indian saints, whose historical background are in darkness.
4. Shâh Ismâ'îl, Taqwiyatul Îmân, Lahore, 1956, p. 15; English translation by Mir Hashmat Ali, Support of Faith, Lahore, reprint, n.d. pp. 1, 2.
5. Margoliouth (Encyclopædia of Islam, Luzac, 1934, v. iv, p. 1090 a, also Shorter Encyclopædia of Islam, Luzac, 1953, p. 621 b; art. Wahhâbiyah) seems mistaken when he says that Muḥamm Ismâ'îl was the nephew of Sayyid Ahmad.
6. Ḥayrat Dihlawî, Ḥayât-i ṭayyibah, Lahore, n.d., pp. 61-241.
7. The present writer has been able to see only last four books of this list. The rest are not available, and the introduction has been borrowed from Ḥayrat Dihlawî, Ḥayât-i ṭayyibah.

8. Shâh Ismâ'îl, Manşab-i Imâmat, Persian, Delhi, n.d., p. 1; Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ḥusayn 'Alawî, Lahore, 1949, p. 1.
9. Ibid, persian, p. 55; Urdu, p. 63.
10. See below, pp. 97-99.
11. Shâh Ismâ'îl, Şirâṭ-i mustaqîm, Lahore, n.d., p. 16.
12. According to Hunter the book was translated into Urdu by one Mawlawî 'Abdul Jabbâr Kânṭūrî. cf. Hunter, The Indian Musalmans, Calcutta, 1945, p. 58; fn. 1; Urdu translation by Şâdiq Ḥusayn, Hamârê Hindustânî Musalmân, Lahore, 1944, p. 99, fn., 1.
13. See above, p. 88.
14. See above, p. 87.
15. Shâh Ismâ'îl, Şirâṭ-i mustaqîm, pp. 220-225.
16. Ibid, p. 221.
17. Râ'ê Barêlî is about 80 miles east of Lucknow. There is another city known as Barêlî or Bârs Barêlî which is about a hundred miles west of Lucknow. Sayyid Aḥmad is generally called "Sayyid Aḥmad Barêlawî", though he does not come from Barêlî. Very often people mix Barêlî with Râ'ê Barêlî. Ikrâm (Mawj-i Kawsar, Lahore, n.d., p. 52) also has mistaken it when he said that Mawlânâ Aḥmad Razâ Khân was born in the same city which was the birth place of Sayyid Aḥmad. But the fact is that Aḥmad Razâ Khân was born in Barêlî, not in Râ'ê Barêlî (cf. Raḥmân 'Alî, Tazkirah 'Ulamâ'ê Hind, Lucknow, 1894, pp. 15-18; Urdu translation, Karachi, 1961, p. 98).
18. Abul Ḥasan 'Alî Nadwî, Sîrat Sayyid Aḥmad Shahîd, Lucknow, 1948, p. 70.
19. Historians differ on the question of date as to when Sayyid Aḥmad reached Delhi. Ghulâm Rasûl Mihr ( Sayyid Aḥmad Shahîd, Lahore, 1952, p. 63) has discussed this point. According to him Sayyid Aḥmad reached Delhi in 1803 or 1804.
20. Nadwî, op. cit., p. 82.

21. 'Ubaydullâh Sindhî, Shâh Waliullâh awr unkî Siyâsî tahrîk, Lahore, 2nd ed., 1944, p. 92.
22. Mihr, op. cit., p. 90.
23. Hayrat Dihlawî, op. cit., p. 501; Nadwî, op. cit., p. 86.
24. Hayrat Dihlawî (op. cit.) and Ja'far Thânesarî (Tawârîkh 'Ajîbah mawsûm bih Sawâniḥ Aḥmadî, Delhi, 1309/1891) say that Sayyid Aḥmad played a role in this treaty between Amîr Khân and the British, and that he persuaded Amîr Khân to sign the treaty. But nowadays both of the writers are disregarded. Their statements are considered by the later writers as somewhat twisted in favour of the British. Of course Hayrat and Ja'far have not given any proof for their statement. But the position of later writers too may not be very strong. All of them quote the above part of the letter of Sayyid Aḥmad to Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, and say that his departure from the army means he was not in favour of the treaty. They also quote a statement by some other persons who had compiled the biography of Sayyid Aḥmad in which they say that Sayyid Aḥmad was against the treaty. In fact both the statements are hearsay. No later writers give the full text of Sayyid Aḥmad's alleged letter to Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. This part of the letter is in Urdu, and we are not sure whether it was originally written in Urdu, or in the Persian and translated afterwards by some one. Sayyid Aḥmad, as we know, usually expressed himself into Persian. The collection of his sayings, Ṣirât-i mustaqîm, was in Persian. His other letters also were written in Persian. One may, therefore, hesitate to accept this letter as a valid proof.
25. After the death of Sayyid Aḥmad, Nawab Wazîrud Dawlah of Tonk (1807-1864) called for the relatives and friends of the Sayyid and asked them to write down their memoirs about Sayyid Aḥmad. The people used to sit in a mosque and narrate every incident which they could remeber. The inscribers were provided by the Nawab to note down every narration in the words of narrator. If some one had any objection, he could give his opinion also. In this way many of the memoirs were compiled, and the

Waqâ'i was one of them. The first volume was started in 1274/1857, and was completed in 1276/1859. (cf. Mihr, op. cit., pp. 15-16).

At the present this literature is generally considered by the writers as the most authentic source, because it is believed it was compiled by the eye-witnesses of the movement. However, one should be cautious of accepting all the statements narrated by those eye-witnesses. Makhzan-i Ahmadî, for example, is one of those books. The author, as Nadwî says (op. cit., p. 8), was the nephew of Sayyid Ahmad, and was one of the eye-witnesses. According to him when Sayyid Ahmad returned to Delhi from the army of Amîr Khân, Shâh 'Abdul Qâdir suggested to Mawlânâ 'Abdul Hayy that he become the murîd of Sayyid Ahmad. (see Thânêsarî, op. cit., pp. 20 ff.; Nadwî, op. cit., p. 90)

But the fact is that Shâh 'Abdul Qâdir had already died before Sayyid Ahmad reached Delhi. Mihr (op. cit., p. 116, fn., 2) suggests it is a slip of the pen. He thinks that the suggestion came from Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. But this is what Mihr thinks, otherwise the writings of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz are silent on this issue.

26. cf. Hayrat Dihlawî, op. cit., pp. 482 ff.; also, Ghulâm Rasûl Mihr, "Têrahwîn şadî kâ mujaddid", in al-Furqân, Shahîd Nambar, Barâli, 1355/[1936], v. iii, Nos. 8-9, p. 52.
27. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khân, Tazkirah ahl-i Dihlî, pp. 13-14.
28. It is generally said that after his coming to Delhi, Mawlânâ 'Abdul Hayy and Shâh Ismâ'îl realizing Sayyid Ahmad's spiritual status entered into his formal bay'ah (cf. Mihr, Sayyid Ahmad Shahîd, p. 116; Nadwî, op. cit., p. 89). But we have to think over this bay'ah. At that time people usually preferred to become a murîd at an early age. Shâh Ismâ'îl at that time was about 38 years old. Mawlânâ 'Abdul Hayy was a little older than the latter. It would seem somehow strange if by that time these two men had not yet entered into the bay'ah of even Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz. It seems probable that these two men had already been in the bay'ah of Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, and when Sayyid Ahmad came to Delhi and started a reform movement, they also joined him, and were like humble disciples. The people

afterwards interpreted this as becoming his murîd in the technical sense. Malfûzât-i 'Azîzî was compiled during the same period, but there is no reference about this allegiance. This story of being murîd has been told by the people who compiled the life of Sayyid Ahmad, after his death, under the supervision of Nawab of Tonk (cf. above fn. 25). Ja'far Thânesarî (Sawâniḥ Ahmadi, p. 21) does not say that these two persons entered into the bay'ah. According to him they learnt from Sayyid Ahmad how to pray to God with full attention of heart.

29. Ja'far Thânesarî, Sawâniḥ Ahmadi. p. 29.
30. Ibid, p. 30.
31. Ibid, p. 29; also, Mihr, Sayyid Ahmad Shahîd, pp. 130-131.
32. Sindhî, Shâh Walfullâh awr unkî Siyâsî tahrîk, p. 96.
33. For a full account of the tour, see Nadwî, op. cit., pp. 91-250.
34. Târiḫ-i Ahmadiyah, known as Manzûrah, as quoted by Nadwî, op. cit., p. 166.
35. Waqâ'i', as quoted by Nadwî, op. cit., p. 194.
36. Makhzan-i Ahmadi, as quoted by Nadwî, op. cit., p. 265.
37. See above fn. 25.
38. See above Ch. iv, p. 68.
39. According to Nationalist Indian Muslims the jihâd was purely against the British to free the country. According to them British diplomacy instigated the Sikh army against Sayyid Ahmad, and that is why he had to fight with them (cf. Muḥammad Miyân, "Islâmî ḥurriyat kâ 'alambardâr", in al-Furqân, Shahîd nambar, p. 77; and Musalmanôn kâ shândâr mâzî, v. ii, p. 272).

To be aware of another viewpoint we should read the following lines:

"To deal with one enemy at a time is a common sense. Of the two, namely the East India Company and the Sikhs, the Sikhs were obviously the lessor power and the chances of success against them were consequently greater".

(cf. Mahmud Husayn, "Sayyid Ahmad Shahid" in A History of the Freedom Movement; Being the Story of Muslim struggle of the Freedom of Hind-Pakistan, 1707-1947, Karachi, 1957, v. i, p. 578.

For a similar viewpoint see Ghulâm Rasûl Mihr, Sayyid Ahmad Shahîd (chapter 22: Sikh awr Angrêz), pp. 250 ff.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. 'Abdul 'Azîz, Shâh  
Fatâwâ 'Azîzî, Persian, 2 volumes.  
Vol. I, Delhi, Maṭba'-i Muṣṭabâ'î, 1311/1893;  
Vol. ii, " " " " 1314/1896.
2. ...  
Surûr-i 'Azîzî, Urdu translation of Fatâwâ 'Azîzî, by Muḥammad 'Abdul Wâjid Ghâzîpûrî,  
2 vols., Kanpur, Maṭba'î Majîdî, n.d.
3. ...  
Kamâlât-i 'Azîzî, compiled by Nawwâb  
Mubârak 'Alî Khân, Mêrath, Maṭba'-i Zîyâ'î,  
1873; Karachi, 1960.
4. ...  
Karâmât-i 'Azîzî, compiled by Sayyid  
Şahîrud Dîn, alias Sayyid Aḥmad, 3 vols.  
n.d., n.p.
5. ...  
Majmû'ah-i Rasâ'il: containing (1) Kamâlât-i 'Azîzî, (2) Irshâd-i 'Azîzî, (3) Mujarrabât-i 'Azîzî, Kanpur, Maṭba'-i Qayyûmî, 1330/1911.
6. ...  
Malfûzât (Persian)  
Mêrath, Maṭba'-i Muṣṭabâ'î, 1314/1896
7. ...  
Malfûzât-i Shâh 'Abdul 'Azîz, Urdu translation  
by Muḥammad 'Alî Lufî and Intizâmullâh  
Shihâbî, Karachi, Pakistan Educational  
Publishers, 1960.
8. ...  
Mujarrabât-i 'Azîzî, [Published as and  
appendix of Malfûzât, Urdu ed.]  
Karachi, 1960.
9. ...  
Tafsîr Fathul 'Azîz or Tafsîr-i 'Azîzî, Persian,  
Part I, Sûrah Baqr: Lahore, 3rd ed. Maṭba'-i  
Muḥammadî, 1312/1894;  
Part II, Pârah XXIX, Lahore, Maṭba' Ummîd, and  
Part III, Pârah XXX, " " " " , 1277/1860.

10. 'Abdul 'Azîz, Shâh  
Tafsîr-i 'Azîzî, Urdu translation by  
 Muḥammad Ḥasan Khân Râmpûrî,  
Pârah XXIX, 2nd ed. Bombay, Maṭba'-i  
 Ḥaydarî, 1296/1879;  
Pârah XXX, first published in 1261/1845,  
 Deoband, Kutub Khânah Raḥîmîyah, 1373/1953.
11. ...  
Tuḥfah'-i Ithnâ 'Asharîyah, (Persian),  
 n.p. Fakhrul Maṭâbi', 1296/1852
12. ...  
Tuḥfah'-i Ithnâ 'Asharîyah, Urdu translation  
 by Sa'd Ḥasan Khân Yûsuffi,  
 Karachi, Nûr Muḥammad, n.d.
13. 'Abdul Haqq  
Marḥûm Dihlî Kâlîj,  
 Awrangabad, Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu, 1933.
14. 'Abdul Qâdir Râmpûrî  
Waqâ'i 'Abdul Qâdir Khânî, Persian Ms.  
 Urdu translation (with the title, 'Ilm-ô-  
 'amal, vol. i,) by Mu'înuddîn Afzalgarhî,  
 ed. by Muḥammad Ayyûb Qâdirî,  
 Karachi, Academy of Educational Research, 1960.
15. Aḥmad Khân, Sir Sayyid  
Asbâb-i Baghâwat-i Hind, ed. Abul Layth  
 Siddîqî,  
 Karachi, Urdu Academy Sindh, 1957.
16. ...  
Tazkirah ahl-i Dihlî, [chapter iv of his book  
Asârus Sanâdîd], ed. by Qâdî Aḥmad Miyân  
 Akhtar Jûnâgarhî,  
 Karachi, Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu Pakistan, 1955.
17. Al-Furqân Shahîd Nambar,  
 ed. Muḥammad Manẓûr Nu'mânî, Barêlî, v. iii,  
 No. 8, 9, 1355/1935.
18. Al-Furqân Shâh Walfullâh Nambar  
 ed. Muḥammad Manẓûr Nu'mânî, Barêlî, v. iii,  
 No. 9, 10, 11, 12, 1359/1940.
19. Andrews, C. F.  
Zaka Ullah of Delhi,  
 Cambridge, 1929.



20. Banerji, Brajendranath  
Begam Samru,  
Calcutta, 1925.
21. Brown, Hilton (ed.)  
The Sahibs,  
London, 1948.
22. Butt, Abdullah (ed.)  
Aspects of Shah Ismail Shahid,  
Lahore, Qawmî Kutub Khânah, 1943.
23. ...  
Shâh Ismâ'îl Shahîd,  
Lahore, Qawmî Kutub Khânah, 1955.
24. Fârûqî, Khwâjah Aḥmad (ed.)  
Dillî Kâliḥ Urdû Maygzin: Qadîm Dillî  
Kâliḥ Nambar,  
Delhi, Delhi College, 1953.
25. Faruqi, Ziya ul Hasan  
The Deoband School and the Demand for the  
Pakistan,  
Bombay, 1963.
26. Faḥl-i Ḥaqq  
al-Thawrat al-Hindîyah, (Arabic)  
English translation under the title "The  
Story of the War of Independence, 1857-1858,  
by Allamah Fadl-i Haqq of Khayrabad", by  
S. Moinul Haq, in the Journal of the Pakistan  
Historical Society,  
Karachi, v. v, part i, January, 1957.  
Urdu translation by Ra'îs Aḥmad Ja'farî,  
in Bahâdur Shâh Zafar awr unkâ 'ahd,  
Lahore, 1955.
27. Faḥl-i Ḥusayn Bihârî  
al-Ḥayât ba'd al-mamât, (Urdu) [Biography  
of Mawlânâ Nazîr Ḥusayn alias Miyân Şâhib]  
Karachi, Maktabah Shu'aybîyah, 1959.
28. Faḥl-i Imâm  
Tarjumânul Fudalâ' [Persian, a chapter of  
his book, "Amâd Nâmah], ed. by Intizâmullâh  
Shihâbî with English translation by A. S.  
Bazmee Ansârî,  
Karachi, Pakistan Historical Society, 1956.

29. Ghaws 'Alî Shâh Qalandar  
Tazkirah Ghawsîyah, ed. by Gul Hasan,  
First published, 1884,  
Lahore, 7th ed. 1955.
30. Hayrat Dihlawî  
Hayât-i Tayyibah,  
Lahore, n.d.
31. Hunter, W. W.  
The Indian Musalmans,  
Calcutta, reprint from the 3rd ed., 1945.
32. ...  
Hamârê Hindustânî Musalmân, Urdu translation  
by Şâdiq Husayn,  
Lahore, Iqbâl Academy, 1944.
33. Ikrâm, Shaykh Muḥammad  
Mawj-i kawsar,  
Lahore, Urdu Book Stall, n.d.
34. ...  
Rawd-i kawsar,  
Firozsons, Lahore, 3rd ed., 1958.
35. Ingham, Kenneth  
Reformers in India, 1793-1833,  
Cambridge, 1956.
36. Ismâ'îl [Shahîd], Shâh  
Manşab-i Imâmat (Persian),  
Delhi, Maṭba'-i Fârûqî, n.d.
37. ...  
Manşab-i Imâmat, Urdu translation by Muḥammad  
Husayn 'Alawî,  
Lahore, Gîlânî Press, 1949.
38. ...  
Şirât-i mustaqîm,  
Lahore, M. Ashraf, n.d.
39. ...  
Taqwîyatul Îmân,  
Lahore, Maktabah Salâm, reprint, 1956.

40. Ismâ'îl [Shahîd], Shâh  
Support of the Faith, English translation  
of the Taqwâyatul Imân, by Mir Hashmat Ali,  
First published in 1852,  
Lahore, Orintalia, Reprint, n.d.
41. ... ..  
Tazkirul Ikhwân, translated into Urdu by  
Muhammad Sulţân, in 1257/1841,  
Lahore, Iqbal Academy, reprint, 1948.
42. Jacquemont, Victor  
Letters from India, 2 volumes,  
London, 2nd ed., 1835.
- Ja'far Thânesarî, see Thânesarî.
43. Khayrud Dîn Muhammad Jawnpûrî  
Tazkiratul Ulama or A Memoir of the Learned  
Meñ (of Jawnpur), ed. and tr. into English  
by Muhammad Sanaullah: Text with translation,  
Calcutta, Abul Faiz & Co., 1934.
44. Lutfullah  
Autobiography of Lutfullah  
ed. by Edward B. Eastwick,  
London, 3rd ed., 1858.
45. Mahmud Husain  
Sayyid Ahmad Shahid I, (Life and Teaching),  
Sayyid Ahmad Shahid II, (Jihad),  
A History of Freedom Movement, v. i, pp. 556-600;  
Karachi, 1957.
46. Mâlik Râm  
Zikr-i Ghâlib,  
Delhi, Maktabah Jamiah, 3rd ed., 1955.
47. Maṅglôrî, Tufayl Ahmad  
Musalmânôn kâ rawsham mustaqbil,  
Delhi, Kutub Khâna 'Azîziyah, 5th ed., 1945.
48. [Mrs.] Meer Hassan Ali  
Observations on the Mussulmauns of India,  
ed. by W. Crooke,  
Oxford, 2nd ed., 1917.
49. Mihr, Ghulâm Rasûl  
1857 kâ mujâhid,  
Lahore, Kitâb Manzil, 1957.

50. Mihr, Ghulâm Rasûl  
Jamâ'at-i mujâhidîn,  
Lahore, Kitâb Manzîl, 1955.
51. ... ..  
Sayyid Ahmad Shahîd,  
Lahore, Kitâb Manzîl, 1952.
52. Muḥammad Miyân,  
'Ulamâ'-i Hind kâ shândâr mâzî, v. ii, iv,  
Delhi, Jam'iyat Book Depot, 1957, 1960.
53. Muḥammad Raḥîm Bakhsh Dihlawî  
Ḥayât-i Walî,  
Lahore, Maktabah Salaffiyah, reprint, 1955.
54. Muḥammad Shaffî', Miyân  
1857: Pahlî jang-i âzâdî,  
Lahore, Maktabah Jadîd, 1957.
55. Nadwî, Abul Ḥasan  
Sirat Sayyid Ahmad Shahîd, vol. i,  
Lucknow, 3rd ed. 1368/1948.
56. Nadwî, Mas'ûd 'Âlam  
Hindustân kî pahlî Islâmî tahrîk,  
Rawalpindi, Maktabah Millîyah, 2nd ed., 1948.
57. Nôshahrawî, Abû Yahyâ Imâm Khân  
Tarâjîm 'Ulamâ'-i Ḥadîth-i Hind, v. i,  
Delhi, Jayyid Press, 1938.
58. Raḥmân 'Alî  
Tazkirah 'Ulamâ'-i Hind, Persian,  
Lucknow, Nawalkishor Press, 1894.
59. ... ..  
Tazkirah 'Ulamâ'-i Hind, Urdu translation,  
ed. and tr. by Muḥammad Ayyûb Qâdirî,  
Karachi, Pakistan Historical Society, 1961.
60. Şâbirî, Imdâd  
Farangiyôn kâ jâl,  
Delhi, 1949.

Shâh Ismâ'îl see Ismâ'îl [Shahîd], Shâh.

61. Shihâbî, Intizâmullâh  
Allamah Fadl-i-Haqq, in the Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society, v. i, part ii, Karachi, 1953.
62. ... ..  
Ghadar kê chand 'Ulamâ'  
Delhi, Nayâ Kitabghar, n.d.
63. ... ..  
Îst Indiya Kampnî awr Bâghî 'Ulamâ',  
Delhi, Dînî Book Depot, n.d.
64. ... ..  
Mashâhîr-i jang-i âzâdî,  
Karachi, Qur'ân Maḥall, 1376/1956.
65. Şiddîqî, Muḥammad 'Aṭîq  
Gilchrist awr uskâ 'ahd,  
Aligarh, Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu, 1960.
66. Sindhî, 'Ubaydullâh,  
Shâh Walîullâh awr unkî siyâsî taḥrîk,  
Lahore, Sindh Sagar Academy, 2nd ed., 1944.
67. Sleeman, W. H.  
Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official,  
2 vols.  
London, 1844.
68. Spear, Percival  
The Nabobs,  
Oxford, 1963.
69. ... ..  
Twilight of the Mughuls,  
Cambridge, 1951.
70. Stanford, J. K. (ed.)  
Ladies in the sun-The Mem Sahib's India; 1790-1860,  
London, The Galley Press, 1962.
71. Thânesarî, Muḥammad Ja'far  
Tawârikh-i 'ajîbah mawsûm bih Sawâniḥ Ahmadi,  
Delhi, Matba' Fârûqî, 1309/1891.
72. Woodruff, Philip  
The Men who Ruled India: The Founders,  
London, 3rd impression, 1954.