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

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

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

Biographical Sketches
Missionaries

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

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

Archbishop of Canterbury in 1878, and of an honorary LL. D. from St. John's College in Annapolis, Maryland, in 1897.

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

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

Faith of Islam was translated into Urdu as *ʿAqāʾid-i-Islamiyyat* by Mawlavī Ḥamīdī Shafqat Allāh and published by the American Mission Press in 1883.[16] Though Hughes intended to assist those engaged in such controversy through his *Notes* and his *Dictionary*, he did not direct his writings to the Muslim audience as "a controversial attack on the religious system of Muhammad."[17]

Muslim Modernists

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

Upon his return to India in 1873, Amīr ʿAlī practiced law in Calcutta, gaining promotions to positions of increasing responsibility.[22] His concern for the Muslim community led him to establish the National Muhammadan Association in 1877.[23] He continued his involvement as not only a practitioner, but also as a scholar of Islamic law, when he was appointed to the Tagore Professorship of Law at the University of Calcutta.[24] He was appointed a judge of the Calcutta High Court in 1890 where he served until his retirement fourteen years later. During this time he together with his association

continued to give an effective voice to the Muslims in India, especially during the vice-royalty of Lord Ripon in the early 1880's.[25] His scholarly research took the form of a history of Islamic civilization[26] as well as a major revision of his *Critical Examination* in the form of what was to be his most celebrated and reprinted book, *The Spirit of Islam*, in 1891. When he retired to England with his British wife in 1904, he continued to be a consistent advocate for the cause of Muslims, both in India and elsewhere. He wrote numerous articles on Islam for English journals, assisted in the establishment of the Muslim League particularly the active London branch, and supported the cause of Turkey before the expulsion of the Caliph. Even in his retirement, his involvement in legal matters did not cease; he was appointed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London in 1909, the first Indian member on that committee.[27]

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

While in England, he had met with one of the leaders of Islamic modernism in India, Aḥmad Khān, who was accompanying his sons, one of whom was also studying there on a government scholarship. Aḥmad Khān was using the opportunity to research and write his *Essays*, also in response to Muir and other Orientalist writings. Amīr ʿAlī

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

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

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

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

Opposition to previous Orientalists

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

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

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

Missionary objections to "misrepresentations" of Islam

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

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

ening of the scholar missionary's arsenal for combat with spiritual opponents.[46]

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

Hughes' evangelical orthodoxy and commitment to mission constrained him from any acknowledgment of Muḥammad's divine mission. He felt that favourable portrayals of Muḥammad by other authors endangered the missionary enterprise by providing Muslims of India who read English with tools to oppose or undermine it. He cited the circulation of an Urdu translation of Davenport's *Apology for Islam* in North India as an example.[49] Indian Muslims writing in response to Western criticisms often did quote approvingly from these "conciliatory" writers while opposing those of the "confrontational" school.[50] The strength of Hughes' own religious motivation, as well as his advocacy of strong convictions on the part of scholars who wrote on Islam, is seen in his expression of dismay at Smith's prediction that soon the "highest philosophy and truest Christianity" will yield to Muhammad "the title which he claimed--that of a *Prophet, a very Prophet of God!*"[51] (Italics his). He even suggested that just as the Indian Church had received European missionaries such as C. G. Pfander and T. V. French, "to guide the Muhammadans of that country to the true Saviour, so she may have to reciprocate by sending either an Imadudeen, a Safdar Ali, or a Ram Chander, to preach Christianity to the alumni of Harrow, Rugby, or even Oxford itself."[52]

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

Emphasis on personal knowledge and experience

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

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

Like Hughes, Edward Sell also took issue with the Orientalist scholars of his day by whom, in his view, much was "written either in ignorant prejudice, or from an ideal standpoint."[60] He stressed, as did Hughes, that a greater qualification than being well-versed in the writings of the Europeans, was to live among the people and to know their literature. Not only the Orientalist scholar, but also the traveler came under criticism. With reference to practices such as divorce and polygamy, Hughes stated, "It is but seldom that the European traveler obtains an insight of the interior economy of the Muhammadan domestic life, but the Christian Missionary, living as he does for a lengthened period in the midst of the people, has frequent opportunities of judging the baneful and pernicious influence of Muhammadanism on domestic life."[61] He rested the authority of his own research on Muslim sources, confirming from living witnesses that those principles still formed the basis of their faith and practice. In the introduction to his *Dictionary* he stated that while he made use of some Orientalist works, he had also, during a long residence among Muslims, "been able to consult very numerous Arabic and Persian works in their originals, and to obtain the assistance of very able Muhammadan native scholars of all schools of thought in Islam."[62] In an earlier article, he had given as a footnote to his description of Wahhābī beliefs that his information could be considered reliable because of his intimate acquaintance with the chief disciple of Sayyid Aḥmad of Rae Bareli, and because he had "studied Islamism under the tutorship of the second son of that Wahabi divine," who was living near Peshawar at that time.[63] In addition to reli-

gious scholars he consulted in India, Hughes spent a brief time in Egypt visiting mosques and questioning scholars in places like al-Azhar.[64] However, Hughes did acknowledge a greater debt to certain European writers such as Muir, Weil, and Sprenger than Sell did.[65]

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

The desirability of direct knowledge

Hughes argued that dogmatic Christian religious convictions would not be a hindrance to scholarly research, but rather would in fact be desirable in the study of Islam, because Muslims themselves held to firm convictions. The idea that this shared commonality of strong personal religious convictions, albeit to different religions, would engender a degree of mutual understanding and respect, was also central to the concept of government neutrality in religious matters as practiced by a number of Evangelical administrators. Hughes opposed the bias of European writers who regarded "all dogmatic teach-

ing as antiquated" and who recommended that missionaries not give such teaching a prominent place in dealing with Islam.[69] He claimed that his studies showed how central dogma was in Islam, and that Muslim religious leaders would spurn teaching that ignored dogma "as unworthy of theologians whether of Islam or Christianity."[70] He did not, for example, believe that Muir's biography of the Prophet "loses value because it was written by a religious mind."[71] He suggested that those who boasted of religious neutrality and came up with a favourable view of Muḥammad and Islam were in reality influenced by another form of bias, the bias of "doubt" or skepticism.[72]

He was proposing that the Christian studying the character of Muḥammad and Islam should not "give up the truth which he has received in the Book of God." Hughes gave as examples the converts from Islam to Christianity who found it "impossible to treat their former creed as having any claim to consideration as a God-sent revelation."[73] He supported his position with the fact that Muḥammad made religious claims with respect to Jesus and other biblical prophets. Because Islam claimed to be "a continuation and confirmation of the religion of Jesus," it was only right that the claims to prophethood by its founder should be evaluated by "those who have a pious and godly conviction that Christianity is *true*."[74] This argument that Muḥammad's claim to a status comparable to that of Jesus opened him up to such an examination of his claims and character was repeated in his *Notes*,[75] as well as in his *Dictionary*;[76] and even his later articles in the *Andover Review* which demonstrate a considerable moderation in tone, still insisted that Islam's claim to supersede Christianity made controversy necessary.[77] However, in these later writings, published after the completion of his missionary career, he censured the views of missionaries who while manifesting religious commitment lack scholarly research. In itemizing reasons for a lack of success in missions to Muslims, he stated that missionaries who devoted themselves to convert Muslims had "despised their adversary," not going beyond a knowledge of Arabic, a cursory perusal of the Koran, and a slight acquaintance with merely the outline of Muslim faith."[78] So while insisting that religious commitment was not to be considered a disqualification, he recognized that that alone would be inadequate in making valid conclusions regarding Muḥammad and the religion of Islam.

Hughes' conciliatory perspectives

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

The change could be seen most notably in his new assessment of the Prophet. Previously, in his *Notes*, he had stated that attacking the character of Muḥammad was generally avoided as it was an offensive line of argument and tended to rouse opposition, yet he defended the inclusion of his character in the bill of indictment.[81] In these later writings, he took a different position, deploring those methodologies that "attack (often unjustly) the character of Muhammad in order to prove that so 'earthen a vessel' could not possibly have been the means of conveying any form of truth to mankind."[82] Whereas previously he had seen the Prophet's relations with his Coptic slave, Mary, as an unlawful deed sanctioned by a supposed revelation from God,[83] he now reversed his position, stating, "It has always been considered one of the most effectual means to disproving the divine origin of Islam to attack with the utmost bigotry the moral character of its prophet, and first and foremost in the bill of indictment is the charge of Muḥammad's adultery with Mary the Copt."[84] He went on to argue that a Muslim would be aghast at a charge of adultery since polygamy was not prohibited to the Prophet and his female slaves were as legal to him as were those of the Old Testament saints such as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to their masters.[85]

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

The novel Hughes published under the pseudonym "Evan Stanton" in 1886 also reflected this change in thinking. He seemed to retreat from a strictly exclusivist position when he presented a character of that persuasion in a negative light. Mrs. Lawson, who "kept a mental record of the religious condition of her neighbours and divided them all into 'the saved' and 'the unsaved': the 'worldly' and the 'Christian,' " was seen by the other characters as an example of what Christianity should not be.[90] The protagonist preferred a simple faith to dogmatism and complicated theology, and declared himself unqualified to answer his bride's question, "Will no Mohamedans go to Heaven?"[91] In spite of this radical evolution of his thought, Hughes was not converting to Islam; he maintained that while Islam had succeeded in transforming the world better than other religions, it still fell short of what was possible through Christianity.[92]

A later article published in another American journal indicates possible reasons for these changed perspectives. He attributed Muslim misunderstandings of Christianity to the manner of missionary work in Muslim countries, specifically the language and cul-

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

Political views

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

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

In light of this possibility, he found it "impossible to view the approach of Russia with feelings of anxiety, much less jealousy."[97] He complained of government interference in attempts to expand missionary work in Central Asia beyond the British north-western frontier. The government had insisted on political stability in the region first in light of the struggle of the British, Russian, Persian, and Afghan forces to control the region. Hughes stated that Christian missionaries had always shown a willingness to work in harmony with the wishes of the 'powers that be,' but they could not agree with delaying

their missionary endeavors when there was no sign of increasing peace."[98] Therefore, while willing to work in co-operation with the British colonial power, he clearly stated that the missionary's guiding purposes were different from that of the government, and that he should not hesitate to disobey the temporal power in order to be obedient to a higher calling.[99]

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

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

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

Descriptions of contemporary Islam

Unlike Muir who focused on the early history of Islam and made a study of early texts to construct what he imagined Islam to be, Sell and Hughes focused more attention on expressions of Islam current at their time, once again appealing to their experience and relationships with the practitioners as their authority. Sell stated in his essay on "The Church of Islam" that he had not discussed whether Muḥammad had been deceived or self-deceived, an apostle or an impostor, or other theoretical questions of the origins of

Islam, "but what Islam as a religious system has become, and is; how it now works; what orthodox Muslims believe, and how they act in that belief."[103] The factors which prompted him to do this research rather than to write a biography of the Prophet or the history of the political spread of Islam as Muir was doing, were the practical realities faced by both the missionaries and the colonialist government who had to deal with "Islam as it is, and as it now influences those who rule and those who are ruled under it."[104] Hughes also, in a brief review of the first edition of his *Notes*, was described as having represented Islam "as it really is, not as it is supposed that it might be," in contrast to "the speculations current in literary society" in England.[105]

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

Hughes, Sell and the Muslim modernists

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

Sayyid Aḥmad Kḫān

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

Sell referred to Aḥmad Kḫān's commentary with reference to his treatment of the question of the abrogation of the Christian Scriptures.[111] He pointed out what he saw as a significant discrepancy between the Urdu and English parallel versions. Whereas the English rendering appeared to completely denounce the belief that one law repealed another, in the Urdu text Aḥmad Kḫān seemed to denounce only the belief that it was because of any inherent defect that abrogation occurred. Sell stated, "To his co-religionists the Syed says in effect: 'The books *are abrogated* but not because they were imperfect'. . . . The leader of an apparently liberal section of Indian Musalmans is, in this instance, at least, as conservative as the most bigoted."[112] Interestingly, subsequent editions of Sell's book, published when Aḥmad Kḫān's modernist views were better developed and more widely known, omitted this complaint.[113] Sell did, however, go on to quote Aḥmad Kḫān extensively as an authority on the Muslim view of the Bible, seeing the Acts of the Apostles and the various Epistles as not inspired but worthy of the same respect as the Ḥadīth. He stated that Aḥmad Kḫān, after a full discussion of the matter in his commentary, endorsed the opinion of earlier commentators who held that any corruption of the Scriptures was in meaning only, not in text.[114]

Amīr 'Alī

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

Rationalism in Islamic modernism

Hughes may also have been reacting more to the rationalism of the modernists rather than to their attempts to reform Islam. His opposition to European rationalist writers has already been noted. In his later writings, he showed a preference for the spirituality of Islam in place of the rationalism that diminished the divine element. He wrote, "Missionaries have been slow to recognize the elements of divine truth contained in Islam. In these days of rampant rationalism . . . the higher teachings of Islam are precious gems of truth whereon to build the spiritual structure of a still higher faith."[120] Previously he had agreed heartily with a remark made by Muir regarding Orientalists who wrote favourably of Islam, "They labour under a miserable delusion who suppose that Muhammadanism paves the way for a purer faith."[121] Now he saw in the Muslim teachings about God, the Bible, prayer, Jesus, and future judgment, not necessarily a true spirituality but at least a preparation for Christianity that was lacking in other Asian religions.[122] Hughes had seen converts go through a period of skepticism and unbelief, sometimes never ridding themselves of these hindrances, as result of rejecting Islam on the

basis of rationalism.[123] In a conference in 1882, he had already noticed this trend and counseled his fellow missionaries to present the devotional rather than the skeptical side of the faith.[124] His resistance towards rationalist elements within Islam should be seen in this context.

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

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

Sell saw the influence of the Qur'ān from the beginning as despotic, limiting free thought and opposing innovation in all spheres of life, whether political, social, intellectual, or moral.[127] It would seem that what motivated the missionaries to oppose modernist re-formulations of the Muslim faith was their desire to see Islam as a system completely op-posed to progress and civilization, incapable of reform, and void of genuine spiritual life, leaving no options for the dissatisfied Muslim but to cast off the supposedly repressive system and accept Christianity if he wanted authentic spirituality along with Western civilization. Such a stance was consistent with their Evangelical beliefs of salvation being found exclusively in Christ Jesus, and provided a justification for their work in proclaim-ing the Gospel in India and other foreign lands.

Sell consistently supported his rejection of modernist trends by appealing to the traditional orthodoxy of the Sunni *'ulamā'* with whom he had contact and with the ortho-doxy he believed to be dominant in a Muslim state. He argued that enlightened Muslims in India seeking to reform society albeit from within the guidelines of orthodoxy, did not, in many cases, represent orthodox Islam, and their counterpart would not be found among the *'ulamā'* in a Muslim state. To judge the system of Islam "from the very liberal utter-ances of a few men who expound their views before English audiences is to yield oneself

up to delusion on the subject."[128] Sell's rejection of the fresh attempts to revive the prac-
tice of *ijtihād* on the basis of a similar rejection by the orthodox *'ulamā'* will be dis-
cussed later.

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

However, his position underwent a major shift as he continued to observe the de-
velopments within India. A decade later, at the Centenary Conference on the Protestant
Missions held in London in 1888, he took a more positive view of the "modern school of
Mohammedans in India."[132] He mentioned Amīr 'Alī and his book, *The Personal Law of
the Mohammedans* as well as Chirāgh 'Alī and his books, *The Proposed Political, Legal
and Social Reforms*, and *A Critical Exposition of the Popular "Jihād,"* and recom-
mended a study of their views on women in Islam, religious wars, and the doctrines of
inspiration and of the authority of the canon law in Islam. With regard to this last topic,
Sell found the modernists' position "more reasonable" since they, as he saw it, denied the
eternal nature of the Qur'ān and ridiculed the orthodox view of verbal inspiration.[133] He
also now considered their numbers sufficient to make a considerable impact on Islam in
India. He addressed the assembly of missionaries and those who supported them saying,
"There is a very considerable number, a growing number, of educated, cultured Moham-
medans in India who feel that whilst they retain their allegiance to Mohammed and the
Koran they can only do so by entirely throwing aside what has been considered to be, and

what has been put before you as being, the only thought in Islam about these subjects."[134] Previously he had himself insisted on such a narrow definition of Islam. Sell had come under the severe criticism of writers such as Chirāgh 'Alī and had had opportunity for controversy with such modernists. Though he might not agree with their positions or even feel that they had supported them sufficiently, he now concluded regarding this trend towards a modernist outlook, "I look upon this state of affairs with very much hope indeed."[135]

In a subsequent article in 1893, after Amīr 'Alī's thoroughly revised version of his biography of the Prophet had been published as *The Spirit of Islam, or the Life and Teachings of Mohammed*, Sell analyzed the movement in greater detail and acknowledged that this new perspective, if it gained greater currency, would force a modification or rejection of the "commonly received opinion of the immobility of Muhammadan Governments."[136] While not accepting or rejecting the new views, Sell thought it necessary to inform his readers that a growing number of educated Muslims in India held these views and saw them as a way to retain their spirituality and admiration for Muḥammad while rejecting those expressions of traditional Islam which conflicted with what they accepted of Western modernity and morality. Sell's 1896 revision of *The Faith of Islam* also contained an extensive addition on the "modern Mu'tazilas."[137] In this his review of the movement was more negative and, while repeating the same quotes from those modernist writers, emphasized that they were not generally accepted by the *'ulamā'* or by general opinion. He also mentioned in the Preface to this edition that the conclusions he made in the first edition "have not been controverted by any competent Muslim authority, except on the questions of the finality of the Muhammadan Law and of the present use of Ijtihad, on which subjects the late Maulvi Cherāgh 'Alī differs from me"[138] He dealt extensively with the latter's *Critical Exposition of the Law of Jihād* in an appendix.[139] In this, Sell demonstrated a greater willingness than Muir and other Orientalists to listen to the responses of educated Muslims to their writings, and to incorporate their scholarship in his own and interact with the conclusions they reached.

Ahl-i-Ḥadīth

Both Hughes and Sell made the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth movement, which they commonly referred to as the "Wahhābī" movement, a special focus of their study.   In his 1878 article in the *Christian Missionary Intelligencer*, Hughes traced the history of the reform movement in Arabia and also in India as led by Sayyid Aḥmad (1786-1831) of Rae Bareli in Oudh.[140] He disagreed with W. W. Hunter's (1840-1900) assessment of their political threat to the British in India, seeing their continuing influence in the subcontinent as more in the area of Muslim religious thought than in that of politics.[141] This reform movement tended to deny "the validity of medieval law schools in favor of the direct use of the textual sources of the faith, the Qur'an and the *hadis*, which were to be interpreted literally and narrowly."[142] One reason why they attracted the attention of the missionaries was that they, with the Deobandis, were in the forefront of those who debated with both reformist Hindus and Christian missionaries.[143] The political activities of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth found their most prominent expression in military campaigns against the Sikhs in north-western India under Sayyid Aḥmad in the first half of the nineteenth century. The British administration in India had launched a major effort to clean up left-over fighters on the frontier in 1863, followed by trials of suspected leaders in Ambala and Patna from 1864 until 1871.[144] In this context, it was no wonder that British administrative officials such as Hunter would see the presence of this group primarily in terms of a political threat. Aḥmad K̲h̲ān in his review of Hunter's work pointed out the fallacy of extrapolating the localized conditions of the Bengal region to include all of India, and further to include all Muslims.[145] He saw the accusations particularly inapplicable to the Pathans in the north-western frontier region. Since this was the context in which Hughes wrote his works, it is understandable that he would share Aḥmad K̲h̲ān's convictions as to the non-political thrust of the movement. During his brief stay in Egypt, Hughes made a careful search for any influence of "Wahhābīism," but found no evidence for such a religious revival there.[146]

Like Aḥmad K̲h̲ān, Hughes saw the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth movement in Islam as analogous to that of the Protestants in Christianity.[147] This would have been another major

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

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

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

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

Sell also attributed the rise of the Arab reformer, Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbdul Wahhab (1703-1792) to the latter's conviction that the Qur'ān and the traditions had been neglected in favour of "the sayings of men of lesser note and the jurisprudence of the four

great Imāms."[154] While in one sense, the movement sought to cleanse Islam from the traditionalism of later ages, in no sense could it be said that the Wahhābīs rejected Tradition.[155] They accepted as binding not only the Qur'ān, but also the Ḥadīth as recorded on the authority of the Companions. Sell did not see the resulting movement as a progressive return to first principles, but rather as one that bound "the fetters of Islam more tightly."[156] In thus denying the legitimacy of the modernists to transform Islam, Sell and other missionaries like him found in the reformist Ahl-i-Ḥadīth movement a confirmation that Islam could not change to meet the demands of a changing world and was antagonistic to the Western ideals of liberty and free thought.

Discussion of Ḥadīth

Their criticism of European writers led both Hughes and Sell to a discussion on Ḥadīth. Both were critical of writers who presumed the Qur'ān to be the all-embracing code of Islam. Such a position, they felt, ignored the fact that much of what made up Islam was based on the body of traditions that rose subsequent to the writing of the Qur'ān and were viewed as authoritative. Hughes argued that all groups—Shī'i, Sunnī, or Ahl-i-Ḥadīth--received the traditions of the sayings and practices of Muḥammad as obligatory along with the pronouncements that he declared as revealed from Allāh.[157] Sell echoed the view that there was not one sect whose faith and practice was based on the Qur'ān alone. "Its voice is supreme in all that it concerns, but its exegesis, the whole system of legal jurisprudence and of theological science, is largely founded on the Traditions."[158] In another essay he declared, "Without going so far as saying that every Tradition by itself is to be accepted as an authority in Islam, we distinctly assert that there can be no true conception formed of that system if the Traditions are not studied and taken into account."[159] He was of the opinion that it would be very difficult for someone who had not "lived in long and friendly intercourse" with Muslims to realize how the Ḥadīth were the foundation for so much of their religious life and opinions, thoughts and actions.[160] This conviction regarding the centrality of the Ḥadīth was born out of Sell's experience in discussions with Muslim religious leaders.

> Every missionary to the Muhammadans knows that for one text from
> the Koran quoted against him in controversy he will get a dozen from

the Sunnat. In vain does he say it is tradition, and not the "book." The answer is ever ready, it is to us what your four Gospels are to you--neither more or less.[161]

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

Amīr ʿAlī was of the similar opinion that although Muslim law was founded essentially on the Qurʾān, its silence on many matters resulted in it being supplemented "by oral precepts delivered from time to time by the Prophet and by a reference to the daily mode of his life as handed down to posterity by his immediate followers."[164] His perspective was that of one involved in legal matters, seeking to determine the relevance of the principles of Muslim law for the Muslim community of his time. However, he tended to reject the authority of the body of accepted traditions as binding, taking a position quite opposed to that of Hughes and Sell. He even saw the Ḥadīth as being a major factor in creating the schism between the Sunnis and the Shīʿahs, each group attaching different values to individual traditions depending on the source from which they were received.[165] Belonging to the Shīʿahs himself, Amīr ʿAlī saw that sect as approaching the traditions with a more rational and critical perspective, using the precepts of the Qurʾān as the final authority, while he characterized the Sunnis as basing their doctrines on the entirety of the traditions.[166]

Chirāgh ʿAlī also upheld the idea that the Qurʾān did not teach a precise system of precepts to regulate the minute details of life or ceremonial worship, but went further than Amīr ʿAlī in rejecting the authority of the Ḥadīth to fill in that gap. The purpose of the Qurʾān was merely to reveal certain religious doctrines and general rules of moral-

ity.[167] Neither it nor the teachings of Muḥammad were ever intended to restrict spiritual development or free thinking, or to create obstacles in any sphere of life, whether political, social, intellectual, or moral.[168] Chirāgh ʿAlī endeavored to show that Islam as taught by the Prophet had an elasticity that enabled it to adapt to changing circumstances, an idea stoutly resisted by Hughes and Sell.[169]

In their objection to the European characterization of Islam as "a simple system of Deism unfettered by numerous dogmas and creeds," Hughes and Sell were reacting to criticism of the missionary movement which was supposedly thus "fettered."[170] In contrast, in their own construction of Islam, it was the multiple layers of tradition that were added to the simple pronouncements of the Qurʾān that became a vast burden now hanging as a "dead weight" upon the religion.[171] Sell blamed this body of tradition along with the authority it had acquired as an infallible and unvarying rule of faith for the "immobility of the Muhammadan world" and its inability to progress according to the European notion of progress.[172] He described how horrified the pious Muslim would be to learn of the "progress" his English friends envisioned him making, since innovation was a crime, a sin, in his eyes.[173] Hughes, in his focus on the Ḥadīth, was also replying to those who questioned the Evangelical rejection of Muḥammad's message partly on the basis of his "private vices." He felt that these critics had a wrong estimation of the place the example of Muḥammad occupied in Islam.[174] Sell also disagreed with those who diminished the importance of the example of the Prophet in an attempt to excuse what was seen as his jealousy, cruelty to the Jewish tribes, licentiousness, and other weaknesses.[175] As was demonstrated earlier, Hughes eventually came to a more positive assessment of Muḥammad, without a diminished view of the Prophet's authority as an example to the faithful.

The approach of Sell and Hughes to the study of the Ḥadīth differed from that of Muir in its basic intention. Whereas Muir's exploration of the sources of the traditions was to arrive at a historically reliable assessment of the life and character of Muḥammad, Hughes and Sell were closer to Aḥmad Khān in their purpose for looking at the Ḥadīth. They described Islam in its contemporary form and argued that that description was ultimately an expression of Muslims' attempts to follow the example of their Prophet in all

details of life.[176] It was in the Ḥadīth that the roots of much of the contemporary expressions of Islam were to be found. It was also a study of these traditions that would assist the missionary or other European wishing to understand how normative Islam should manifest itself.

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

Definition

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

and handed down by uninspired writers, and is absolutely necessary to complete the structure of faith."[183]

Sell's definition was very similar: "It is the collection of the sayings of the prophet in answer to inquiries as to the correct ritual to be observed in worship, as to the course of action to be followed in the varied relationships of social and political life. It is too something more, *viz*., the record of the actions of the prophet."[184] With respect to inspiration, Sell stated that Muslims believed in the divine inspiration of all Muḥammad's words and actions, with the resulting high authority of the Ḥadīth in the religion. In the Qur'ān the very words were God's, while in the Sunna, "the ideas are divine, the outward form human."[185] He supported this idea with a quote from al-Ghazālī (1058-1111) on the necessity of the second part of the *kalima* or creed, emphasizing the authority of the Prophet.[186] He designated the revelation contained in the Qur'ān as "objective," while the Muḥammad's sayings as collected in the Ḥadīth were by "subjective" inspiration, but still true inspiration.[187] In *The Faith of Islam*, Sell gave a more detailed description of the degrees of inspiration.[188] *Waḥy* was considered to be inspiration given directly to the major prophets in the form of words to be written in a book, while *ilhām* was inspiration given to a saint or prophet who delivered a message about God from his own mind. The degree of inspiration applied to the Ḥadīth was a lower form of *waḥy* called *ishārat al-malak*, denoting a sign given by the angel Gabriel, but not words from his mouth. Sell noted that this was denied by some who said that the Qur'ān alone was inspired by *waḥy*, but stated, "The practical belief is, however, that the Traditions were Waḥī inspiration, and thus they come to be as authoritative as the Qurān."[189]

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

Origin and Development

According to Hughes and Sell, the prominence of the Ḥadīth and its authority derived fundamentally from the Prophet himself. Traditions stating that Muḥammad himself commanded his followers to follow his example, and those giving the subsequent practice of his Companions to that effect, abounded.[192] Hughes quoted Aḥmad Khān on the belief of every Muslim that the Prophet always acted in conformity with the injunctions of the Qur'ān, and thus became the exemplar that every Muslim must follow.[193] Hughes argued that the example of Muḥammad was for the Muslim what the example of Christ was for the Christian, an idea repeated by Sell.[194] Sell further added that, on the basis of the sinlessness of the Prophet, obedience to him was considered obedience to God.[195] He stated, "It is the belief common to all Musalmāns that the Prophet in all that he did, in all that he said, was supernaturally guided, and that his words and acts are to all time and to all his followers a divine rule of faith and practice."[196] However, both Hughes and Sell failed to include Aḥmad Khān's qualifier that Muslims saw all of the Prophet's words and actions concerning secular matters the same as those of any other virtuous and pious individual, unless they were clearly indicated to be of divine origin.[197] The position adopted by Hughes in his review of Smith's book on the comprehensive authority of the Prophet's example seems similar to that of Muir's, to which Aḥmad Khān was reacting with his insistence on the limitation of that authority. However, in his *Notes* published only a few years later, as well as in his *Dictionary*, Hughes moved closer to Aḥmad Khān's interpretation as he included the concept of secondary revelation, as Aḥmad Khān did, in reference to the authority of the Ḥadīth.[198] Hughes described this type of revelation as similar to that which Christians believed the writers of the Christian Scriptures received, a concept Aḥmad Khān had discussed in his commentary on the Bible.[199]

In tracing the development of the Ḥadīth after the death of the Prophet, both Hughes and Sell tended to follow the analysis of Muir as given in his *Life*. Hughes merely quoted Muir extensively in his *Dictionary*, with a focus on the natural tendency to fabricate stories about a past hero and on the need for broader source material generated by an expanding empire.[200] The major weaknesses of the body of traditions as explained

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

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

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

Determining authenticity

In summarizing the history of the growth of the body of traditions, Hughes stated that in spite of severe warnings from Muḥammad, many spurious traditions abounded, as evidenced by the numerous traditions Abū Dā’ūd and Bukhārī rejected from those they had collected. Since the rule of faith in Islam was based on that body of Ḥadīth, it was necessary that a science of evaluating the traditions or *‘Ilm-i-Ḥadīth* be developed. In the first edition of his *Notes*, completed during a short trip to England in 1875 after eleven years in India, Hughes had taken the rules and categories for the reception and rejection of traditions directly from Aḥmad Khān's *Essays*. In the 1877 edition, completed after returning to Peshawar with a visit to Egypt[209] on the way, he arranged the material on Ḥadīth according to the description of the various categories of Ḥadīth and the strength of the chain of transmitters as given in the Arabic treatise, *Nukhba al-Fikr*, by the 15th century Egyptian Ḥadīth scholar and jurist, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalāni.[210] Hughes recorded that copies of the six authoritative collections along with that of Imām Mālik were printed and available in India, but the most widely read, especially by the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth,[211] was the *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ* a collection of the most reliable traditions translated into Persian by Shaykh ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Muḥaddith Dihlawī (1551-1642) during the reign of Mughal emperor, Akbar (1542-1605), and translated into English by Captain Matthews in 1809.[212] Hughes used this collection extensively in his publications.[213]

Hughes combined the approaches of Muir and Aḥmad Khān in assessing the authenticity of the Ḥadīth. He expressed his confidence that "the compilers of the books of tradition were sincere and honest in their endeavours to produce correct and well authen-

ticated traditions of their Prophet's precepts and practice."[214] But sincerity would not be enough to guarantee accuracy. He quoted Muir with regard to the weakness of oral transmission in not providing the proper check against "the license of error and fabrication."[215] But along with Muir's objections to the system of Ḥadīth criticism, Hughes also took note of Aḥmad Khān's response to Muir in his *Essays*. In his *Dictionary*, Hughes quoted Aḥmad Khān's essays extensively with regard to the various styles of transmission, degree of authenticity, causes of diverse accounts, and apocryphal Ḥadīth.*[216]* However, he left out Aḥmad Khān's criticism of Christian writers ignorant of these rules regulating the study of Ḥadīth, which directly followed that section.[217] Perhaps he felt he was meeting this objection through his own thorough study. In his earlier *Notes*, he had detected a tension within Aḥmad Khān's writings between his earlier education in the traditional approach to Ḥadīth and his new modernist ideas. When he noted that Aḥmad Khān confirmed Muir's critical assessment of the reliability of the Ḥadīth, and that he considered only the Qur'ān and a few--not more than five--traditions were accepted as fully reliable and authoritative in faith and practice, Hughes wrote of him, "The learned Sayyid is in this, as in almost everything he writes on the subject of religion, his own refutation."[218] The factor leading Hughes to study the traditions was not the necessity   of gaining an accurate account of the life of Muḥammad as it was for Muir. Rather, he felt that it was significant that though "shrouded with a degree of uncertainty," this body of traditions still occupied a central place in the theological structure of Islam.[219] In this perspective of the value or importance of Ḥadīth, his approach reflected that of Aḥmad Khān more than that of Muir.

The standards used for determining authentic Ḥadīth according to Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī are similar to those of Aḥmad Khān, but not as detailed. They, too, insisted that any tradition which conflicted with positive directions in the Qur'ān were to be considered apocryphal.[220] Chirāgh 'Alī generally did not appeal to the Ḥadīth as a reliable historical record, preferring to follow the record of the Qur'ān. He wrote, "I am seldom inclined to quote traditions, having little or no belief in their genuineness, as generally they are unauthentic, unsupported, and one-sided."[221] However, they acknowledged there were tests to be applied to traditions to determine the degree of their authenticity.

Amīr 'Alī noted that the Mu'tazilis, of which he claimed to be a modern member, had eliminated "such alleged sayings of the Prophet as appeared incompatible and out of harmony with his developed teachings as explained and illustrated by the philosophers and jurists of his race."[222] He recognized that the Sunnis tended to follow the rules of *isnād*.[223] Chirāgh 'Alī similarly tended to combine traditional tests based on the technicalities of the list of transmitters with scientific and rational criticism of the content.[224]

Authorized collections and schools of fiqh

In discussing the authoritative collections of Ḥadīth for the Sunnis, Hughes followed Aḥmad Khān in giving special attention to Imām Mālik. Aḥmad Khān had included the early jurist as a seventh major collector after the standard six, Bukhārī, Muslim, Tirmizī, Abū Dā'ūd, Nasā'ī, and Ibn Mājah.[225] This reflects the tendency initiated by Shāh Walī Allāh to elevate Imām Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'* above all other collections of traditions and to place it along side the canonical collections in the highest category of reliability.[226] Hughes, while not including him with the six, stated that Imām Mālik's work was still held in great esteem and believed by many to be the source from which the others derived most of their material.[227] In his *Dictionary*, he focused on the beliefs and practices of the Sunnis primarily, with indications where the Shī'ah or Ahl-i-Ḥadīth might differ.[228] This focus was in contrast with the writings of earlier evangelical missionaries such as C. G. Pfander who drew more from Shī'i sources.[229] The matter of authoritative collections of Ḥadīth was certainly one such disagreement, and Hughes mentioned the five differing collections accepted by the Shī'ah, seeking to refute the idea of some European authors that this sect rejected tradition altogether.[230]

Hughes again quoted Aḥmad Khān who saw that literature as most in need of emendation when he evaluated *siyār* or biographical literature.[231] Hughes, however, proceeded to provide a list of both traditional and popular biographies of the Prophet. Earlier in his *Notes* he had indicated that the only "Life of Muḥammad" in the English language which he considered of any pretension to original research was that of Muir, once again demonstrating his synthesizing of selected aspects of Muir's works with those of Aḥmad Khān.[232] Amīr 'Alī also addressed the matter of the use of early biographies as historical

sources, in *A Critical Examination*. Like Aḥmad Khān, he considered the writings of al-Wāqidī and his Kātib, on which Muir's *Life* was in large measure based, as "regarded in the Mohammedan world as the least trustworthy and most careless biographers of Mohammad."[233] To support his contention, he quoted Ibn Khallikān (1211-1282) concerning the feeble authority of al-Wāqidī's traditions and the doubts as to his veracity. Amīr 'Alī also disagreed with Muir's negative evaluations of Ibn Hishām (d. 834), and stated in his preface that his own research would be based on the writings of Ibn Hishām and Ibn al-Athīr (1160-1233), the former whom he considered to occupy "the position of the most careful and trustworthy biographer of the Prophet."[234]

Sell's account of the Ḥadīth was a summary of the orthodox Sunni position, with a Ḥanafī bias, based as it was on the *Sharḥ-i-Wiqāya*,[235] and did not differ greatly from that given by Aḥmad Khān in his *Essays*.[236] He stated that the unwillingness to commit the sayings of Muḥammad to writing from the beginning was a consequence of the Prophet's own command. Another of his commands regarding careful transmission of his words resulted in the formation of rules insisting on the recitation of the chain of transmitters or *isnād* of the traditions to prevent the rise of spurious ones. Here Sell quoted the tradition word for word from the English rendering in Aḥmad Khān's work.[237] However, false traditions continued to circulate, necessitating the rise of Ḥadīth scholars to collect and sift the false from the true. Sell proceeded to list the six major collections, giving brief biographical accounts of their compilers' lives emphasizing the enormous number of traditions they dealt with as well as their piety qualifying them to make decisions on authenticity. His list did not differ from that given by Hughes, and like Hughes, only briefly mentioned the alternate authorities accepted by the Shī'ah, indicating that they flourished much later.[238] His emphasis was that no group of Muslims accepted the Qur'ān alone as their authority, even if there were differing opinions on which traditions were authoritative. "There is by no means an absolute consensus of opinion among the Sunnīs as to the exact value of each Tradition, yet all admit that a 'genuine Tradition' must be obeyed."[239] Sell followed a standard classification of the traditions based on the strength of the *isnād*, glossing over the finer details and subdivisions of class. He ended his account with a statement we have seen forming such a foundational principle for both

Muir and Aḥmad Khān, "It is the universally accepted rule, that no authentic Tradition can be contrary to the Qurān."[240]

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

In order to maintain his conception of Islam as bound for all time by unchanging traditions without any ability to adapt to changing circumstances, Sell rejected the idea proposed by "apologists for Islam," presumably lawyers such as Amīr ʿAlī, that this process of law formation could be extrapolated so that fresh imāms could arise and deduce new judgments in keeping with the times. He pointed to the *fatwas* or legal decrees issued by the *ʿulamā'* in the Ottoman empire as proof of "how firmly a Muslim State is bound in the fetters of an unchangeable law."[244] He felt a rejection of the continued use of *ijtihād* was justified on the basis of his discussions with religious leaders who insisted that no *Mujtahid*, one with authority to exercise *ijtihād*, had arisen since the four Imāms, and that discussions even in new situations must be according to one of the four schools.[245] He disagreed with Amīr ʿAlī's reinterpretation of *ijtihād* and considered it historically inaccurate, stating that even if one were to accept some of Amīr ʿAlī's revised definitions, that in no way proved that Islam had any capacity for progress.[246] He emphasized that according to the author of the *Sharh-i-Waqāyah*, following one of the

four schools of jurisprudence was a necessary extension of the authority of the Qur'ān and the Sunna.[247] Because of the abundance of spurious traditions, the four Imāms were needed, even though there had been no such institutions at the time of the Prophet. He concluded, "In short, the orthodox belief is that the only safe way is to follow the Imāms, and to believe and act according to the dogmas and rule of the Mazhab, to which the particular person belongs."[248]

In his first book, *The Proposed Political, Legal & Social Reforms under Moslem Rule*, Chirāgh ʿAlī directly addressed Sell's writings on the rigidity Islam due to the inflexibility within the schools of law. He opposed Sell's statement that no *mujtahid* had arisen after the four Sunni Imāms and that all legal decisions had to be made within the confines of their four schools of *fiqh*. [249] He argued that no such authority had been claimed by or conferred on the Imāms. The authors Sell claimed to have consulted he characterized as those who practiced *taqlīd*, those blindly following "any one of the four doctors or schools of jurisprudence, without having any opinion, insight discretion, or knowledge of their own."[250] Chirāgh ʿAlī's rating of the four Imāms was slightly different from that of Sell. He agreed that Abū Ḥanīfa had used few traditions, and that Mālik Ibn Anās and Imām al-Shāfiʿī used more. But Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal came under severe disapproval for discarding the principle of analogical deductions and incorporating 30,000 traditions in his system, most of which were inauthentic fabrications, though some justification was found in his system as a corrective to other excesses.[251] He concluded that in its historical context, "every system was progressive, incomplete, changeable and undergoing alteration and improvement."[252] Amīr ʿAlī's description of the schools was similar, with an interesting comment that Abū Ḥanīfa often quoted the sixth Shīʿi Imām as his authority for the traditions he used. He attributed Abū Ḥanīfa's willingness to use analogical reasoning to this influence of the house of the Prophet, namely ʿAlī's lineage.[253]

Conclusion

The prominent place of the subject of Ḥadīth in the writings of both Thomas P. Hughes and Edward Sell indicates that they had achieved a greater understanding of its

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

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

Their discussion of the Ḥadīth differed from that by Sir William Muir in that the questions they were asking were quite different. While Muir sought to determine the authenticity of traditional stories in order to construct what he saw as an historically accurate biography of the Prophet, Hughes and Sell sought to describe Islam "as it is." They were more concerned with current expressions of Muslim religiosity and with understanding the foundations of Islamic institutions such as its forms of worship and its legal code. These concerns led them to seek to understand the historical development of the Ḥadīth and its relevance to diverse religious groups and movements in India and the broader Muslim world.

Hughes and Sell seem to have been more open to the influence of their interaction with Indian Muslims. Due to their own limited training in Orientalist studies, they had much to learn and applied themselves to learning both from local religious leaders and from classical and contemporary writings. Thus they continually compared and contrasted the teachings of newer movements with those of the "orthodox." They felt free to

adopt the ideas concerning Ḥadīth they found in Aḥmad <u>Kh</u>ān's *Essays*, while at the same time rejecting some of his modernist trends as a complete departure from traditional Islam. The compounded effect of his writings with those of Amīr ʻAlī and of Chir<u>āgh</u> ʻAlī, however, was that both Hughes and Sell seemed to modify their views, and began to acknowledge some of the positive aspects of Islam.

Notes

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

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

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

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

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

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

7   See Introduction, note 6.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[29] Ibid., p. xi. For a brief history and description of the Akhbārīs, see Moojan Momen. *An Introduction to Shiʿi Islam: The History and Doctrines of Twelver Shiʿism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, pp. 117-118, 222. "In essence, the Akhbārī movement was a rejection of the rationalist prinicple on which *ijtihād* and the whole of Shiʿi jurisprudence had come to be based. Some Akhbārīs went further and also rejected the Muʿtazilī (i.e. rationalistic) basis of Shiʿi doctrine also. In practice this meant a move towards the Sunni principles of jurisprudence (with the Imams taking

over the position of the founders of the Sunni schools of law) and an almost-Ash'arī (i.e. Sunni) position in theology." Momen, p. 222.

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

[31] Amīr 'Alī. *Memoirs*, p. 33.

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

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

[34] Ibid., p. 57.

[35] Ibid., p. 59.

[36] Ibid., p. 60.

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

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

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

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

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

[42] Ibid., p. vii.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

56 Ibid.,p. 330.

57 Ibid., p. 331.

58 Ibid.

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

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

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

62 Hughes. *Dictionary*, p. vi.

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

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

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

66 Said. *Orientalism*, p. 67.

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

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

69 Hughes. *Notes*. p. ix.

70 Ibid., p. ix.

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

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

73 Ibid., p. 332.

74 Ibid., p. 331.

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

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

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

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

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

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

81 Hughes. *Notes*, p. 3.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[110] Ibid., p. 272.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[119] Ibid., p. 173.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[128] Ibid., p. xi.

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

[130] Ibid., p. 344.

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

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

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

[134] Ibid., p. 29.

[135] Ibid.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[143] Ibid., p. 279.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[156] Ibid., p. 106.

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

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

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

[160] Ibid., p.760.

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

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

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

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

[165] Ibid., p. 4.

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

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

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

[169] Ibid., p. ii.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[179] Ibid., p. xix.

[180] Ibid., p. xx.

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

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

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

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

[185] Ibid., p. 329.

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

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

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

[189] Ibid., p. 38.

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

[191] Ibid., p. 10.

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

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

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

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

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

[197] Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 208.

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

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

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

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

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

[203] Ibid., p. 331.

[204] Chirāgh ʻAlī. *The Proposed*, p. xviii.

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

[206] Ibid., p. xix.

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

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

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

[210] Shihāb al Dīn Abu al Faḍl Aḥmad Ibn Ḥajar al-ʻAsqalānī, (1372-1449), according to EI². Hughes gives the author as Shaykh Shahāb-ud-Dīn Ahmad, and indicates that he used a copy edited by Capt. W. Nassau Lees, LL.D. (Calcutta, 1862) in his *Notes*, p. 52, footnote. See also Aftāb Aḥmad Raḥmānī. "The Life and Works of Ibn Ḥajar al-ʻAsqalani," *Islamic Culture* 47 (Jul. 1973), pp. 266-268. Raḥmānī states, "Though considerably small, the *Nukhba* of Ibn Ḥajar has been through the centuries an extremely popular book on *uṣūl al-ḥadīth*." p. 266.

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

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

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

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

[215] Ibid., p. 59.

[216] Hughes. *Dictionary*, pp. 640-642. See Aḥmad K̲h̲ān. *Essays*, pp. 195-203.

[217] Aḥmad K̲h̲ān. *Essays*, p. 203.

[218] Hughes. *Notes*, p. 59.

[219] Ibid., p. 60.

[220] Amīr ʻAlī. *The Personal Law*, p. 9.

[221] Chirāgh ʻAlī. *The Proposed*, p. 147.

[222] Amīr ʻAlī. *The Personal Law*, pp. 9-10.

[223] Ibid., p. 10.

[224] Chirāgh ʻAlī. *A Critical Exposition*, p. 205.

[225] Aḥmad K̲h̲ān. *Essays*. p. 180.

[226] Daniel W. Brown. *Rethinking Tradition*, p. 128.

[227] Hughes. *Dictionary*, pp. 642-643.

[228] Ibid., p. v.

[229] Powell. *Muslims and Missionaries*, p. 148.

[230] Ibid., p. 643.

[231] Hughes. *Notes*, p. 162.

[232] Ibid., p. 5.

[233] Amīr ʻAlī. *A Critical Examination*, p. vii.

[234] Ibid., p. ix.

[235] Written by ʻUbayd Allāh Ibn Masʻūd al-Maḥbūbī, known as Ṣadr al-Sharīʻa al-Thānī (d. 1346) , a Ḥanafī jurist of Bukhāra. See EI², v. 3, p. 163b; v. 6, p 848a; v. 8, p. 749a.

236 Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, p. 762. The subsequent summary is taken from Ibid., pp. 757-763.

237 Ibid., p. 757, cf. Aḥmad Khān. *Essays*, p. 193.

238 Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, pp. 758-759. These are listed by name in his *Faith of Islam*, p. 16n.

239 Sell. *Faith of Islam*, p. 16.

240 Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, p.762.

241 Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, p. 331. In the 1896 edition of *The Faith of Islam* (London: Paul, 1896), he added that Abū Ḥanīfa selected so few because of the rigorous conditions the traditions and its transmitters had to meet, quoting Ibn Khaldūn as his authority; p. 27.

242 Ibid., p. 332.

243 Ibid., pp. 332-333.

244 Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. ix.

245 Sell. "The Church of Islam." *BFER*, p. 334.

246 Sell. *The Faith of Islam*, p. 34. The 1896 edition contained no significant revision of this position, except to include that Amīr 'Alī had admitted in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* (1895) that the description as given by Sell of the orthodox position was historically accurate.

247 Sell. "Muhammadan Exegesis." *BFER*, pp. 762-763.

248 Ibid., p. 763.

249 Chirāgh 'Alī. *The Proposed*, p. vi. He also joined the controversy between Sell and Amīr 'Alī on the matter of *ijtihād*, arguing that though the word was now a technical term, it had not been so in Muḥammad's time. He preferred to emphasize the principle of personal opinion by qualified jurists; see pp. xxxvii-xl. Sell continued the discussion in an appendix to his 1896 edition of *The Faith of Islam*.

250 Ibid., p. vii.

251 Ibid., pp. viii-xi.

252 Ibid., p. xii.

253 Amīr 'Alī. *The Personal Law*, p. 19.