

Conclusion

Summary of the discussion of the Ḥadīth

The perception of the nature and importance of the Ḥadīth by Muslims in India was already undergoing change before the impact of Western ideologies was felt. The reformist movement, led in the eighteenth century by Shāh Wali Ullāh and in the early nineteenth century by his sons and grandsons, had rejected *taqlīd* and found a new dynamic in a fresh evaluation of the Ḥadīth. A call to follow the Sunna of the Prophet as found in the Ḥadīth provided an alternative source of authority to that of the established legal doctrines which were seen as restricting fresh applications. Modernists such as Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān received their early training in this reformist tradition and were strongly influenced by it.

European scholars began a fresh study of the Ḥadīth at this time as a result of a new access to primary source material through the colonialist acquisition of a number of Muslim territories. Motivated by a desire to fit this new information into their theoretical frameworks and to understand the Orient from their scientific and rationalistic world view, they analyzed the historical sources seeking to find in them definitive answers for their questions regarding the origins and present expressions of Islam. Manuscripts were collected from conquered territories or studied in library collections in those territories, and analyzed with the critical methodologies that had recently been applied to the Scriptures of the Jews and Christians. The Ḥadīth figured prominently in Orientalist studies not only as a source for constructing the early history of Islam, but also as an interpretative principle used to explain the rigidity of Islamic institutions of the day. They saw Muslims as bound to their traditions, unable to adapt to change, specifically to modern, Western civilization. The missionaries, who shared the perspectives of the Orientalists to some extent, included a religious element, seeing Islam as a form of spiritual bondage preventing people from seeing the true light of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Again they saw the accumulated weight of centuries of tradition forging a chain of bondage in Islam. The three English authors examined in this thesis, Muir, Hughes, and Sell, were active in writing such critical analyses.

These new analyses of Islam and the Prophet Muḥammad provoked a response from Muslim scholars, particularly from those who were seeking to integrate some aspects of Western philosophy with their Islamic faith in an attempt to revitalize the Muslim community. The three Muslim authors examined in this thesis, Aḥmad Khān, Amīr ‘Alī, and Chirāgh ‘Alī, answered the critiques from a modernist perspective. They, too, dealt with the subject of Ḥadīth, combining some of the literary criticism of the West with their own reformist tradition. While they were convinced that the historical record confirmed their belief in the superiority of Islam in matters of culture, they increasingly doubted the authority of the majority of Ḥadīth in the practice of Islam, relying more on the Qur’ān as their authoritative standard.

Muir’s book, *The Life of Mahomet*, sparked numerous rejoinders. With the new access to Arabic manuscripts of early Muslim biographies of Muḥammad, particularly the one by al-Wāqīdī, Muir concluded that the other traditional literature was highly unreliable when examined in their light. His motivation was to establish a solid basis for writing a new, critical biography of Muḥammad, freeing it from the legends that had encrusted the historical account. He attributed the origin of these legends to religious and political biases that sought to glorify that Prophet after his death, or to promote a particular faction to gain political advantage over another. He found the evaluation of traditions by their *isnād* to be woefully inadequate in light of the rigorous methods of historical scholarship practiced in Europe, and suggested a set of alternate criteria which focused more on content than on transmission of the Ḥadīth, being one of the first Europeans to prepare such detailed guidelines. His other major sources were two Orientalists, Gustav Weil and Aloys Sprenger, who were also utilizing these newly available biographical accounts and applying the European methods of historical criticism to Ḥadīth. Muir’s analysis of the collection of the Ḥadīth and of the traditional methods of determining its authenticity was contained in the first chapter of his *Life*.

Aḥmad Khān found Muir’s portrayal of Islam and of Muḥammad to be offensive, and feared the effect it might have on the new generation of Muslims that was being trained in the Western system of education. He opposed Muir’s characterization of the collectors of Ḥadīth as being motivated by a desire to please their political masters. Al-

though he did not defend the record of the miracles of the Prophet, he argued for an equitable standard that would not ridicule the same aspects in the life of Muḥammad that were revered in the lives of other prophets such as Moses and Jesus. Aḥmad Khān also accused European writers of ignorance regarding the traditional method of evaluating the Ḥadīth by *isnād*, maintaining that if the tests were properly understood and applied, many errors in their assessment of the life of Muḥammad would have been avoided. By this standard, he rejected the biography written by al-Wāqidī and endorsed the canons of traditions as collected by the six accepted *muḥaddithūn* as more reliable. He opposed Muir's position that Muslims believed every action and teaching of Muḥammad to be sacred and binding in terms of religious practice. In later writings he went even further to argue that very few of the traditions had the necessary authenticity to be considered as authoritative for doctrine and jurisprudence.

Amīr 'Alī's contribution to the debate during this period consisted of his biography of the Prophet and his introduction to Islamic law. Like Aḥmad Khān, he took strong exception to the portrayal of Muḥammad in Muir's *Life of Mahomet*. He moved beyond a defense of Islam to attack the history of Christianity in which he found evidence for the same faults and weaknesses Muir had found in the history of Islam. He did not deal extensively with the matter of the Ḥadīth as a valid historical source or with the methodology of determining the authenticity of individual accounts. Where he did refer to these subjects, he tended to follow the pattern set by Aḥmad Khān in rejecting the accounts of al-Wāqidī as invalid and pointing out the inconsistency of Muir's practice of denying the miracles of Muḥammad while accepting those of Jesus Christ. He considered the traditional method of evaluating the Ḥadīth as developed by past Muslim scholars to have been their unique contribution to historiography. With his background in law, Amīr 'Alī was deeply concerned with the legal implications of the traditions, and argued against the limiting of *ijtihād* to the first few centuries of Islam. He considered the re-evaluation of the Muslim law to be an continuing process, making Islam adaptable to any age or cultural context. He considered himself to be an intellectual heir of the Mu'tazili position, arguing for a theology based on rationalism that included evaluating the content of the Ḥadīth from a rational basis.

A major motivation for Hughes and Sell to enter the discussion regarding the Ḥadīth was their objection to the writings on Islam by other Europeans who tended to ignore the vast body of traditions underlying Muslim faith and practice, and to portray Islam as limited to the teachings of the Qur’ān. Both Hughes and Sell insisted that Islam as it appeared in India in their day was based more on the Ḥadīth than on merely the Qur’ān. In this they disagreed with the positions of Aḥmad Khān and Amīr ‘Alī who expressed decreasing confidence in the Ḥadīth in their writings. Unlike Muir, the purpose of these two missionaries was not to determine the accuracy of the accounts of the life of Muḥammad, but to determine the normative beliefs and practices of Islam and to show how the Muslim community was forever bound within this culturally inferior and spiritually false system. In their view, the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth reflected more accurately “true” Islam than did the rationalists such as Aḥmad Khān and Amīr ‘Alī. Sell in particular took a strong stand against the continuance of *ijtihād*, arguing that all legal developments, at least for the Sunnis, were circumscribed within the principles as put forth by the four standard schools of *fiqh*.

Chirāgh ‘Alī continued Aḥmad Khān’s point-by-point critique of Muir on the matter of *jihād*, as well writing an extended response to Muir, Sell, Hughes and others who considered Islam bound by tradition and unable to change. He did not consider the Ḥadīth as a reliable historical record, nor binding upon the Muslim community for faith and religious practice. He based his refutation of Muir’s negative portrayal of Muḥammad on the fact that the traditions used by Muir were unreliable because of their weak *isnāds*, and on an appeal to the Qur’ān as a final arbitrator in all questionable matters. But like Amīr ‘Alī, Chirāgh ‘Alī also quoted Muir’s account on those occasions when it supported his argument.

Conclusions regarding the Christian-Muslim discourse

An analysis of European perceptions of India and Indian religions reveals a multiplicity of “Orientalisms.” Because of the overlapping of categories, some of the distinctions are somewhat arbitrary. Colonial administrators such as Muir who professed an Evangelical faith tended to have more in common with their missionary friends than with

their fellow administrators, though in general they displayed a greater concern for the administration of the empire than the missionaries did. Indigenous Christians and converts also viewed other religious systems with the same antipathy as their Evangelical counterparts, but also manifested a concern for the indigenous control of the national church. A growing western-educated elite among the Muslims, meanwhile, tended to echo some of the same criticisms of traditional forms of religions as Evangelical administrators and missionaries, but from a different premise altogether, expressing at the same time a severe criticism of Evangelical assessments of their religious beliefs and practices. Moreover, the interaction of these various groups produced a continuous dialectic that transformed the views of all the participants. With this qualification in mind, several important conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the Christian-Muslim discourse on the Ḥadīth.

Presuppositions evident in the interaction

In examining the writings of Orientalists, Evangelicals, and missionaries or of the Muslim scholars who responded to them, it is seen that each approached the interaction with his own particular biases that shaped his conclusions. While for the most part not acknowledging such bias, all the authors examined in this thesis appealed rather to an ideal of objective research, and judged the opinions of those who disagreed with them by that standard. Muir, Hughes, and Sell found previous Christian scholarship and secular Orientalist scholarship equally lacking in objectivity. They rested their own claim to objectivity on their access to original sources in the Arabic and other Muslim languages unavailable to previous scholars, coupled with their use of the tools of Western critical methodologies, or on their presence in a Muslim context where contact and interaction with believing Muslims was frequent and extensive. Yet they openly professed their belief that Christianity provided the only valid religious experience and that all systems that opposed it were false and doomed to fail. The Evangelicals refused to accept Muḥammad as the Prophet of God with a message superseding that of Christ, and thus rejected the accounts of the miracles of Muḥammad because they considered miracles to be the divine authentication of a messenger from God. As a result, they viewed the body of Ḥadīth lit-

erature as highly suspect because of its numerous stories glorifying the Prophet. Hughes did acknowledge that the accusation could be made that missionaries would be necessarily biased in whatever they wrote on Islam because their work involved the persuasion of people to leave their former religion and adhere to a new one, but he felt that in his case this danger was negated by his direct access to Muslims and regular interaction with them.

Aḥmad Khān, Amīr ‘Alī, and Chirāgh ‘Alī considered their own work, however, to be free of bias and based on rationality, while at the same time stating explicitly their goal to present a positive picture of Islam. If the Evangelicals were unwilling to accept the finality of Muḥammad’s message and its ability to adapt to the contemporary context, the Muslim modernists were likewise unwilling to accept the exclusive nature of the Evangelical message of salvation only in Christ Jesus. Aḥmad Khān, after emerging from a somewhat conservative theological position, promoted positive relationships between Muslims and Christians including the British government in his writings and example. Amīr ‘Alī likewise was very positive towards English society, receiving a significant portion of his education there, marrying an English woman, writing his books in that language, and eventually spending his retirement years there. He was attracted by the Unitarian approach to Christianity, and counted many of its exponents as his friends. Yet both men were solidly committed to the religion of Islam, despite accusations of apostasy by their co-religionists in India. While they found the Ḥadīth containing many accounts that were contrary to the standard of reason they had adopted, they were committed to the message of Muḥammad as contained in the Qur’ān and rejected analyses of Islam by Orientalists portraying its history as bound by its law in “primitive” social customs such as slavery, polygamy, and holy war.

Their defense of Islam was passionate and based partly on the traditional system of evaluating the Ḥadīth by its *isnād* and partly on the European critical methodologies that evaluated the content rather than the transmission record. They uniformly rejected the accounts of al-Wāqidi, so loved by the Orientalists, as inferior and unreliable in historical information, and insisted that each traditional account must first of all not violate any clear teaching of the Qur’ān nor accepted standards of reason. In this evaluation, they

were similarly influenced by religious bias as were the Evangelicals; they were unable to accept any possibility that Islam could not become as “progressive” as European civilizations, or even that the message of Muḥammad if correctly interpreted could possibly have tolerated the social evils detailed by the Orientalists. Taking the offensive, they argued that basic Christian doctrines such as the Trinity were illogical. Attacks on the historical character of Islam were countered with equally negative examples from Christian history. They quickly pointed out that the scholarship of the Evangelicals was warped by a prejudiced view of Islam and of Muḥammad, and that the Christians inconsistently applied critical tools to the study of Islam which they did not apply to their own religion. In this manner, each side seemed quick to recognize bias in the writings of the other, but not in its own work. A willingness to admit his own bias and an effort to adapt his critical methodology accordingly would have strengthened the argument of each scholar. Their appeals to objectivity coexisting with clear statements about their commitments either to Islam or against it caused other scholars to question their research.

Evangelical Distinctives

In examining the writings of Evangelicals on Islam in this thesis, the aspects in which they departed from the standard Orientalist perspective, have been emphasized. In contrast to Inden’s depiction of the Orientalist’s self-understanding, Evangelicals did not see Western Man as the perfect embodiment of what mankind should be.¹ Their division of humanity was not between the European and the Oriental, but on a completely different basis--that between the “lost” and the “saved.” “The most important polarity was not to be found in race or culture, but in the individual’s morality and relationship with God.”² On this basis then, they would equally criticize the excesses of both British colonial administrators who did not share their Evangelical commitment as well as those of the non-Christian peoples around them, calling both groups to repentance and faith in Christ. That this approach was an extension of evangelistic efforts at home was seen in that descriptions of the plight of the lost in Britain were almost as harrowing as the descriptions of the condition of the Oriental ‘heathen.’³ Thus Muir’s efforts in assisting Christian endeavors were not so much to bring the light of civilization as to bring the

light of the Gospel. Hughes approached his research with a conviction that Islam was a system providing a false hope of salvation, and that his calling was to guide Muslims to the sure hope of the Gospel. Their writings demonstrate a definition of the Other that was evidence of their closer affiliation with Indian Christians than with European secularists. Unlike other Orientalists, they could accept Indian converts as their “brothers” and “sisters,” equal to themselves before God. Several modern scholars, however, see contradictions between this theoretical ideal and the actual practice of missionaries. Whereas they would describe converts as equal in the Kingdom of God, they still constructed powerful images of the non-western Other and tended to dominate, though more from spiritual rather than material or political considerations.⁴

In addition to a fundamental difference between the underlying philosophies of the colonialists and the Evangelical missionaries, their aims and objectives also differed. Whereas British officials were primarily concerned with the maintenance or development of empire, missionaries, for the most part, aimed at the conversion of individual souls (and administrators who were also Evangelical, such as Muir, combined both objectives).⁵ Often the objections of missionaries to certain social and cultural practices were expressed in terms of denunciations of the religions with which they were connected. The opposition of men like Hughes and Sell to reform movements that sought to eradicate those same practices was not as contradictory as it might appear, since the reformers were seen as another barrier to the acceptance of the Christian gospel. In addition to seeking the conversion of individuals and the removal of barriers to such conversion, missionaries, as well as the Evangelical administrators, were also concerned with the material and spiritual progress of the converts, the establishment of communities and churches to facilitate such progress, and general humanitarian concerns such as education and other social and economic reforms.⁶ At times these objectives would overlap with those of the colonialists, and at such points there would be co-operation, but such confluence of objectives should not be seen as automatic, as was demonstrated by Hughes’ writings on the Afghan situation. Maw describes the missionary as existing “At the periphery of the colonial and native communities, in touch with both but a part of neither.”⁷

In their portrayal of the Orient and the Oriental, the missionaries were at times influenced by some of the same cultural prejudices which affected many other Europeans.⁸ They at times displayed the same sense of cultural superiority and painted a very negative picture of the “Heathen.” However, in this latter practice, the missionaries were once again operating from a different set of objectives than those of the colonialists seeking political or economic control. “Because the Evangelicals and missionaries wanted to demonstrate the need for missionaries in India, gain access to the East India Company’s territory, recruit more volunteers, secure increased funding and also suppress ‘certain dreadful practices,’ there was considerable pressure on them to select and highlight the more negative aspects of India’s religious and social system.”⁹ But in these descriptions, too, one must be wary of generalizations that include all missionary organizations and missionaries as a homogenous group. While most did not question the role the West was destined to play in bringing the benefits of modernity to the world, there were those throughout this period who criticized the imperialist system from their Christian standpoint. “Missionaries were to be found on all points of the spectrum, from uncritical advocates of collaboration between imperialism and mission to those who argued for careful separation.”¹⁰

Muslim contribution to shaping the views of the Europeans

The thesis demonstrates that it must not be assumed that the colonized peoples had no voice or influence in shaping the knowledge of the Orientalists. Several writers have criticized Said for portraying the production of knowledge about the Orient as an exclusively western affair. Such a vision “neglects the important ways in which the so-called Orientals have shaped not only their own world but also the Orientalist views criticized by Said. It would be a serious mistake to deny agency to the colonized in our effort to show the force of colonial discourse.”¹¹ The interplay of indigenous and Orientalist discourses was a vital aspect in the formation of authoritative knowledge about the Orient, and was certainly true in the case of the interaction in northern India on the matter of the Ḥadīth. There was no “monolithic imperial project” nor a “monolithic subaltern response,” rather a set of complicated interactions and encounters in which both sides were

changed.¹² The cultures of the colonized should not be seen as “being at once both all-embracing systems, strong enough to shape social and economic life, but also predominantly static and strangely fragile to any external touch” ready to shatter at the arrival of any colonial power.¹³ The indigenous culture was constantly evolving, responding to a variety of external and internal stimuli, which it continued to do with the arrival of the colonizers.

As discussed earlier, the Muslims in northern India were already vitally involved in a re-evaluation of their use of the Ḥadīth before the arrival of the British. Aḥmad Khān had been schooled in these reformist trends and his response to Western writers was merely a further step in an already on-going process. By availing himself of the opportunity to respond to Muir, Aḥmad Khān regained the capacity to have true knowledge, in Inden’s terminology. By first publishing his book in English and quoting numerous European sources, he gained a greater hearing among European writers. Amīr ‘Alī and Chirāgh ‘Alī in their writings also had a considerable influence on subsequent European writings on India and Islam, both by missionaries and more secular Orientalists. Although the arrival of the printing press introduced a new methodology, this was eagerly adopted and adapted by various groups within the Muslim communities in India for their own purposes. But it would be inaccurate to consider the various forms and expressions of discourse as all being imposed from without. Bayly states, “For while the Baptists, the CMS and the crypto-Christian administrators unwittingly helped to engender an Indian critical public, its rapid development owed much to patterns in debate, publicity and the diffusion of knowledge which were already in place in India.”¹⁴ Factors such as these underline the need to resist sweeping generalizations in analyzing the works of British writers in colonial India.

Interactive aspect of the discourse

In their writings on Ḥadīth, both British and Indian participants did not remain unaffected by the encounter, but reflected in their work an awareness of each others’ writings and on-going attempts to define each other. This mutual influence reflects Inden’s argument that Euro-American Selves and Indian Others have not simply interacted

as entities that remain fundamentally the same. “Far from embodying simple, unchanging essences, all agents are relatively complex and shifting. They make and remake one another through a dialectic process in changing situations.”¹⁵ Kennedy confirms this when he states that post-colonial theory has demonstrated that “imperialism was a process of mutual interaction, of point and counterpoint that inscribed itself on the dominant partner as well as the dominated one.”¹⁶ This thesis demonstrates that mutual interaction and the changing representations of each other that resulted.¹⁷

The writings of Muir, Sell, and Hughes differed from those of the stereotypical Orientalist in that as they lived, worked, and conducted their research in a Muslim context, Muslim evaluation of their research was both immediate and interactive. Hughes and Sell incorporated the ideas of both Muir and Aḥmad Khān, as well as interacting with Sayyid Amīr ‘Alī and Chirāgh ‘Alī, who, in turn, critiqued the writings of the Europeans. Thus they broke with the pattern of the Orientalist analyzed by Said who, upon later reflection on his book, *Orientalism*, wrote, “None of the Orientalists I write about seems ever to have intended an Oriental as a reader.”¹⁸ Muir’s works were not purely for Western consumption, though he may have intended that missionaries be the primary ones to benefit. His biography of Muḥammad was written while in India, available to scholars there, and responded to by a number of Indian scholars. Some of his other works were written or translated into Urdu or Arabic and addressed to Indian Muslim readers.

Where the missionaries differed from Muir, was in their greater willingness to interact with the ideas of the Muslim modernists. Prior to the Revolt of 1857, Muir had been closely acquainted with the current writings of Muslims regarding the Prophet Muḥammad, critiquing those works in a number of reviews in the *Calcutta Review*. However, subsequent to the publication of his own biography of the Prophet, he gave no indication of an awareness of the response of Muslims to his findings. His abridged edition of the book in 1877¹⁹¹⁵ contained no acknowledgment of the criticisms of Aḥmad Khān and Amīr ‘Alī, both of which had appeared earlier in that decade. This silence is difficult to explain, when he had interacted with much less scholarly works earlier, and since his government position brought him in contact with Aḥmad Khān and his educational endeavors at Aligarh. In contrast, both Hughes and Sell freely quote Aḥmad Khān as an au-

thority in their books on Islam. Their relatively recent arrival in India and their lack of extensive formal education in England may have made them more receptive to learning from contemporary Muslim scholars. Unlike Muir who was researching the early history of Islam, both Hughes and Sell were also concerned with portraying Islam as it was being practiced at that time. Thus they were more diligent in analyzing the recent trends of thinking in the Muslim community, including the rise of the modernists and the growth of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth. However, in spite of this openness to interact with the new ideas of the modernists, Hughes and Sell initially rejected their conclusions regarding the flexibility of Islam, preferring to see it as a rigid system, bound by its traditions, in need of replacement. In their later writings, this harsh assessment was somewhat modified. Hughes still opposed the resort to rationalism, but saw in Islam a true quest for spirituality, in some ways a purer expression than certain expressions of Christianity. Sell's perception of the modernists also evolved to the extent that he saw their "New Islam" as a positive development.

The question of whether the Muslims altered either their assessment of the Ḥadīth or their methodology in evaluating the traditions, as a result of interaction with the Evangelicals such as Muir, Hughes, and Sell is unclear. Certainly they reflected the thinking of Muir in their own conclusions regarding the historical accuracy of the traditional accounts, but that could have been the consequence of their wider interaction with Western scholarly methodology. However, an examination of their writings demonstrates that Muir, Sell, and Hughes figured predominantly in the sources they quoted or reacted against. Amīr 'Alī and Chirāgh 'Alī went further in their rejection of the authority of the Ḥadīth than did Aḥmad Khān, possibly reflecting a greater influence of Muir's writing on their thought. However, their opposition to Muir's conclusions regarding the nature of Muḥammad and Islam was more detailed and sharp. In summary, although the interaction of Christian missionaries with this educated elite of the Muslim community was characterized by confrontation, they caused each to reassess their own deeply-held religious presuppositions and their perceptions of the other, resulting in a fuller understanding of, though not agreement with, the other.

Notes

- ¹ Inden, "Orientalist Constructions," p. 416.
- ² Oddie, "'Orientalism,'" p. 29.
- ³ Ibid., p. 30.
- ⁴ Dube. "Paternalism and Freedom," p. 199; Oddie. "'Orientalism,'" pp. 38-40. See also Webster's discussion on the struggle for ecclesiastical independence in the Punjab in his "British Missions in India," pp. 42-44.
- ⁵ Ibid., p. 31.
- ⁶ Ibid., pp. 31-32.
- ⁷ Maw. *Visions of India*, pp. 4-5.
- ⁸ Oddie. "Orientalism," p. 37.
- ⁹ Ibid., p. 37. See also Sharma. *Christian Missions*, p. 42.
- ¹⁰ Wilbert R. Shenk. "Reflections on the Modern Missionary Movement: 1792-1992." *Mission Studies: Journal of the International Association for Mission Studies*, 9, 1 (1992), p. 70.
- ¹¹ Peter van der Veer. "The Foreign Hand: Orientalist Discourse in Sociology and Communalism." *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*, p. 23.
- ¹² Though in denying the absoluteness and uni-directionality of colonial hegemony and ascribing agency to both colonizers and colonized, scholars would still insist in a resulting colonial domination going far beyond the intention of any of its principal actors. See Carol A. Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer. "Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament." *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*, p. 10.
- ¹³ Andrew Porter. "'Cultural Imperialism' and Missionary Enterprise." North Atlantic Missiology Project, Position Paper Number 7. Cambridge: NAMP, [1996], p. 9.
- ¹⁴ Bayly. "Returning the British," p. 9.
- ¹⁵ Ronald Inden. *Imagining India*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1990, pp. 2-3.
- ¹⁶ Kennedy. "Imperial History," p. 359.
- ¹⁷ Wilfred Cantwell Smith discusses this type of interaction between religious traditions, specifically the deliberate attempt of a foreign missionary to initiate change and possible consequences, in his article, "Participation: The Changing Christian Role in Other Cultures." *Occasional Bulletin from the Missionary Research Library*, 20, 4 (Apr., 1969), pp. 1-13. His student, Arvind Sharma, applies this approach in his "Hinduism and Christian Missionary Activity: A Case Study for the 19th Century, the Ramakrishna Mission." *Indian Church History Review*, 7, 2 (1973), pp. 151-158.
- ¹⁸ Said. *Orientalism*. 1994 ed., p. 336.
- ¹⁹ William Muir. *The Life of Mahomet from Original Sources*. New and abridged ed. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1877. In this edition, the extensive introduction on the authority of the Qur'ān and the Ḥadīth has been reproduced in an appendix, almost identical in content, but without the detailed footnotes containing quotes from the Ḥadīth collections and commentary by Weil and Sprenger.