CHAPTER 4

The Dār al-Ḥadīth in Medina and the Ahl al-Ḥadīth

ILLUSTRATION 7 *Dār al-ḥadīth in Medina, photo by Chanfi Ahmed.*

In this chapter I address the role played by the scholars of the Dār al-Ḥadīth College (named after the Ahl al-Ḥadīth movement in South Asia)[1] in Medina

1 For the history and doctrine of Ahl al-Ḥadīth in South Asia, see Martin Riexinger, *Sanāʾullāh Amritsarī (1868–1948) und die Ahl-i-Ḥadis im Punjab unter britischer Herrschaft* (Wüzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2004); Jan-Peter Hartung, *Viele Wege und ein Ziel: Leben und Wirken von Sayyid Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī al-Ḥasanī Nadwī 1914–1999* (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2004). What is now the Ahl al-Ḥadīth started in Mecca and Medina in the eighteenth century. The principal aim of this school of thought was to restore the precedence of the *ḥadīth* (after the Qurʾān) over the *madhāhib*. On the main figures of this movement who influenced the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of South Asia, see J.O. Voll, "Muḥammad Ḥayyā l-Sindī and Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbd Al-Wahhāb: An Analysis of an Intellectual Group in Eighteenth-Century Madīna," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 38 (1975): 32–39; J.O. Hunwick, "Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī (1752/3–1803): The Career and Teachings of a West African *ʿālim* in Medina," in *In Quest of an Islamic*

 | DOI 10.1163/9789004291942_006

ILLUSTRATION 8 *Library of the Dār al-ḥadīth in Medina, photo by Chanfi Ahmed.*

and its branch in Mecca in the consolidation of Āl Saʿūd power. The Indian *ʿulamāʾ* of the Dār al-Ḥadīth would not have succeeded without the support they received from the West African and Middle Eastern *ʿulamāʾ*, particularly the *ʿulamāʾ* from the Anṣār al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya, a Salafī movement founded in Egypt in 1926 by Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqqī. The collaboration among these three clusters of *ʿulamāʾ* best illustrates the encounters in question.

The main argument of this chapter is that the *ʿulamāʾ* of the Dār al-Ḥadīth did not help Saudi Arabia as a political entity, but rather as an Islamic *umma* (the worldwide community of believers). And for the Dār al-Ḥadīth, the Islamic *umma* was not a political entity, it was a spiritual entity. The second aim of the chapter is to show how this institution, originally established in South Asia,

Humanism: Arabic and Islamic Studies in Memory of Mohamed al-Nowaihi, ed. A.H. Green, pp. 139–154 (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 1984); J.O. Hunwick, "Ṣāliḥ al-Fulānī of Futa Jallon: An Eighteenth-Century Scholar and *Mujaddid*," *Bulletin IFAN* 10 (1978): 879–885; Bernard Haykel: *Revival and Reform in Islam: The Legacy of Muhammad al-Shawkānī* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Qāsim Aḥmad Ghālib, *Min aʿlām al-Yaman: Shaykh al-islām al-mujtahid Muḥmmad b. ʿAlī l-Shawkānī* (Cairo: Maṭābiʿ al-Aḥrām al-Tijāriyya, 1969); Ḥusayn b. ʿAbdallāh al-ʿAmrī, *al-Imām al-Shawkānī rāʾid ʿaṣriḥi* (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1990).

came to be directed in Medina by *'ulamā'* from West Africa. This will be done by tracing a biographical outline of two West African scholars, namely Shaykh 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī and his student Shaykh 'Umar Fallāta, successive directors of the Dār al-Ḥadīth in Medina, from the 1940s to the end of the 1970s.[2] This also shows the role the West African *'ulamā'* played in the broader Islamic reform movement, which many *'ulamā'*, organized in networks throughout the Muslim world, promoted during this period. This study demonstrates the fallacy of the Orientalist tradition, which focuses almost exclusively on Islam of the Arab world or an Arab, Turkish, and Iranian Islam and marginalizes the role of Islam in Africa south of Sahara, in South Asia, and in Southeast Asia. This compartmentalization of Islam and Muslims, though certainly dominant in the Islamic studies, produces an incomplete understanding of Islam.

While there was a Dār al-Ḥadīth movement in Baghdad since the eleventh century (a result of what G. Makdisi calls the victory of traditionalism over rationalism),[3] one should remember that the Dār al-Ḥadīth movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is an offshoot of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of al-Ḥaramayn in the eighteenth century. This is a religious reform movement that originated in the eighteenth century in Mecca and Medina, but especially in Medina. The ideas of this movement were then propagated in Yemen, North

2 The primary source in European languages on 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī is the article by J.L. Triaud, "'Abd al-Rahman l'Africain (1908–1957). Pionnier et précurseur du wahhabisme au Mali," in *Radicalismes Islamiques*, vol. 2: *Maroc, Pakistan, Inde, Yougoslavie, Mali*, ed. O. Carré and P. Dumont (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1986), pp. 162–180. This article is essentially a biographical note. J.L. Triaud (with the collaboration of Sidi Mohamed Mahibou) based it on Shaykh 'Umar Fallāta's article, "al-Shaykh 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī: Ḥayātuḥu wa āthāruhu" (Shaykh 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī: His life and his work). The article was initially a conference paper given by 'Umar Fallāta at the Islamic University of Medina on 13/04/1397 (1976). It was then published in the journal of the University (in *Majallat al-Jāmi'a al-islāmiyya*, in volume 5 of the six volumes of the papers given at conferences held at the university between 1394 (1974) and 1399 (1978). The same text is also found in 'Umar Fallāta, *Lamahāt 'an al-madīnat al-nabawiyya*, pp. 201–240. Triaud also based his article on the book by the colonial officer and bureaucrat Marcel Cardaire (*L'Islam et le terroir africain*), which mentions 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī and other personalities from West Africa. My research on 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī began with this information, to which I added material taken from another biographical note on 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī written in Arabic. I gathered these biographical notes during two fieldwork studies in Saudi Arabia (in 2008 and in 2010) and during fieldwork in Mali in 2009. I conducted interviews in Saudi Arabia and in Mali with the relatives of 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī, some of his students, the relatives and students of Shaykh 'Umar Fallāta (particularly his sons), and former colleagues and students of these two well-known twentieth-century *'ulamā'* of Saudi Arabia. I also rely on the writings of these two *'ulamā'*.

3 G. Makdisi, *L'Islam hanbalisant* (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1983), p. 37.

and West Africa, Asia, and particularly South Asia. In the nineteenth century, the movement was infiltrated by the Wahhābiyya-Salafiyya, which adopted its ideas. Only in South Asia was the movement able to maintain its organizational independence, even though its doctrine was close to that of Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Wahhāb. Despite the apparent dominance of the Wahhābiyya-Salafiyya on the Ahl al-Ḥadīth, the situation allowed the latter to operate in other parts of the Muslim world, even in Mecca and Medina. However, it was completely aligned with the Wahhābiyya-Salafiyya doctrine, so much so that today nothing distinguishes these two schools of thought, except that the Wahhābīs follow the Ḥanbalī *maddhhab* while the Ahl al-Ḥadīth reject all the *madhāhib* (sing. *madhhab*) and follow only the Qurʾān and the *ḥadīth*. Moreover, the legacy of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of the eighteenth century is now the backbone of the Wahhābiyya-Salafiyya doctrine.

The Dār al-Ḥadīth in Medina is a Salafī Islamic teaching institution founded in 1350/1931 by an Indian *ʿālim* named Aḥmad al-Dihlāwī. He immigrated to Medina in 1345/1926 from Delhi, his hometown, where he was educated and trained in the Salafism of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth until he become an *ʿālim* activist of this movement. After ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Saʿūd took power, Dihlāwī was among the Indian Muslims who engaged in the campaign in India in favor of the new king of Saudi Arabia against his rival, Sharīf Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī of Mecca. When Dihlāwī arrived in Medina, he began the work for the *daʿwa* in teaching at the Mosque of the Prophet until he established the Dār al-Ḥadīth, with the approval of King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. In 1350/1931, he founded the Maktabat Ahl al-Ḥadīth (Library of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth) and in 1364/1944 the Madrasa Dār al-Ḥadīth.[4]

Dakhilullah ʿAbdallāh al-Khaydarī, the author of *al-Taʿlīm al-Ahlī fī l-Madīna al-Munawwara min 1344/1925 ilā 1408/1987: Dirāsa tārikhiyya waṣfiyya* [The non-state education system in Medina from 1344/1925 to 1408/1987), mentions that

4 Dār al-Ḥadīth, *Madrasa dār al-ḥadīth, niẓām aʿmāl madrasat dār al-ḥadīth bi-l-madīna al-munawwara maʿa bayān bi-l-wāridāt wa-l-mutaṣarrafāt 1357/1358* (typed report) (1938/1939), pp. 3–7 and pp. 23–24; Saḥr bint ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Muftī al-Ṣiddīqī, *Athar al-waqf al-islāmī fī l-ḥayāt al-ʿilmiyya bi-l-madīnat al-munawwara* (Medina: Markaz Buḥūth wa Dirāsāt al-Madīna al-Munawwara, 1424/2003), pp. 346–377; Dakhīlullah ʿAbdallāh al-Ḥaydarī, *al-Taʿlīm al-ahlī fī l-madīna al-munawwara min 1344 ilā 1408: Dirāsa tārikhiyya waṣfiyya* (Medina: Nādi al-Madīna al-Munawwara, 1412/1996), pp. 119–144; al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya, *Maḥḍar al-manhaj al-dirāsī li-shuʿbay al-ḥadīth bi-makka wa-l-madīna* (typed report) (Medina, 1400/1979); al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya, *al-Niẓām al-dākhilī li-shuʿbay al-ḥadīth bi-makka wa-l-madīna* (typed report) (Medina, 1400/1979); al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya, *al-Kitāb al-wathāʾiqī ʿani al-Jāmiʿa al-islāmiyya bi-l-madīna al-munawwara al-ṣādira bi-munāsabat al-iḥtifāl bi murūr miʾat ʿām ʿalā taʾsīs al-mamlaka al-ʿarabiyya al-saʿūdiyya* (Jedda: Maṭbaʿa Muʾassasat al-Madīna li-l-Ṣaḥāfa wa-l-Ṭibāʿa wa-l-Nashr, 1419/1998), pp. 361–374.

> what probably prompted King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz to accept the opening of the Dār al-Ḥadīth in Medina is the fact that he was reassured of the Salafī doctrine, to which the founder of the Dār al-Ḥadīth adhered, because, on the one hand, he knew that the Dār al-Ḥadīth belonged to the movement of Ahl al-Ḥadīth of Delhi in India. Second, at the time, the kingdom had a serious need for people well trained in the sciences of the Qurʾān and *ḥadīth* who would be able to support the new government in fighting superstitions (*khurāfāt*) and blameworthy innovations (*bidaʿ*), which were numerous at that time. So that Medina could become again the source of light and goodness that had spread among the Muslims, as was the case during the period of the Prophet.[5]

This passage, which is also referred to in *al-Jāmiʿa al-islāmiyya: al-Kitāb al-wathāʾiqī*[6] shows clearly the mission entrusted to the Dār al-Ḥadīth and its *ʿulamāʾ*, namely, to support the new Saudi regime. It also confirms that the Salafiyya doctrine of Muḥammd b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb was already embodied in the movement of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth in India and elsewhere.

In the mission statement of the Dār al-Ḥadīth (*Niẓām aʿmāl Madrasat Dār al-Ḥadīth*),[7] the founder, Dihlāwī, states that the principal objective is:

> To teach the sciences of the Qurʾān and *ḥadīth*; revitalize these sciences in the Hijaz by teaching and publishing books based on the principle of *daʿwa*, namely wisdom and good preaching—just as the *madrasa* has to train the *ʿulamāʾ* who will be at the same level as that of the *muḥaddithūn* (experts in *ḥadīth*) and of the *ʿulamāʾ* of the past. Such *ʿulamāʾ* will be able to call people to comply with authentic Islam and to spread the doctrine (*ʿaqīda*) of the Ahl al-Sunna wa-l-Jamāʿa (lit. people of the Sunna and the community). The *madrasa* will also teach secular subjects such as grammar, mathematics, geography, and other sciences not prohibited by Islam. The *madrasa* is forbidden to teach logic (*manṭiq*), chemistry, geometry, the science of *kalām* (Islamic speculative theology), and other sciences prohibited by Islam.[8]

---

5 al-Ḥaydarī, *al-Taʿlīm al-ahlī fī l-madīna*, p. 120.

6 al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya, *al-Kitāb al-wathāʾiqī*, p. 361. This book was published by the Islamic University of Medina on the occasion of the commemoration of the centenary of the founding of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

7 Cited by al-Ḥaydarī, *al-Taʿlīm al-ahlī fī l-madīna*, pp. 121–122.

8 It could be that Dihlāwī banned the teaching of these subjects for religious reasons that were salient at that time. Geography was especially suspect because of the Copernican theory of

With regard to the teaching of *fiqh*, the Dār al-Ḥadīth, despite the anti-*madhhab* tradition of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth from which it emerged, complied with the imposition by the Āl Saʿūd of the Ḥanbalī *madhhab* as the official *madhhab* of the kingdom—but not completely: the Dār al-Ḥadīth also taught the jurisprudence of the others schools (*madhāhib*). Later the Islamic University of Medina and other educational institutions in Saudi Arabia taught the jurisprudence of the four schools (through *Fiqh al-sunna*[9] or *al-Fiqh ʿalā l-madhāhib al-arbaʿa*[10] or *Fiqh madhhab al-muḥammadiyya*), though they focused on the Ḥanbalī *madhhab*. Since its inception in 1350/1931, the course of study at the Dār al-Ḥadīth has comprised ten years at three levels: four years of primary education (*ibtidāʾiyya*), four years of high school (*mutawassiṭ*), and two years of upper level (*ʿāliyā*).

ILLUSTRATION 9 *Dār al-ḥadīth in Mecca, photo by Chanfi Ahmed.*

---

the rotation of the earth on its axis and around the sun. Logic was criticized because of its connection to philosophy, which was regarded as contrary to Islam. Chemistry was frowned upon because it involves the transformation of matter into another substance, which some regarded as an interference with God's creation. Geometry, especially that used to forecast the weather, is a prediction of the unknown that is reserved unto God. *Kalām* was banned because of its relation to philosophy.

9 al-Sayyid Sābiq, *Fiqh al-Sunna* (Sidon and Beirut: al-Maktaba al-ʿAṣriyya, 1391/1972; 1427/2006).

10 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Juzayrī, *al-Fiqh ʿalā l-madhāhib al-arbaʿa* (Sidon and Beirut, 1426/2005).

The Dār al-Ḥadīth in Mecca

In 1351/1932, one year after the opening of the Dār al-Ḥadīth in Medina, its founder Shaykh Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Dihlāwī, after performing the pilgrimage, opened a branch in Mecca called Dār al-Ḥadīth li-Jamāʿat Ahl al-Ḥadīth fī Makka al-Mukarrama (Mecca's Dār al-Ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth).

Dihlāwī advanced the funding to begin the project and called upon ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. ʿAbd al-Jabbār al-Dihlāwī and ʿAbdallāh al-Dihlāwī to support Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir Abū l-Samḥ (an *imām* and preacher in the al-Ḥaram Mosque in Mecca) to realize the project. The establishment of the Dār al-Ḥadīth in Mecca could only take place with King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's permission; this he granted on the condition that any teaching at the Dār al-Ḥadīth would put particular emphasis on Ḥanbalī *fiqh*, without denigrating the other *madhāhib*.[11]

The participation of Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir Abū l-Samḥ in the foundation of the Dār al-Ḥadīth in Mecca demonstrates that King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was supported by Salafiyya movements and personalities outside Arabia. Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir Abū l-Samḥ came from the Anṣār al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya—the Salafī movement founded in Cairo in 1926 by Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqqī.

Reinhard Schulze attributes, incorrectly, the initiative of the creation of the Dār al-Ḥadīth in Mecca to Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir Abū l-Samḥ; Guido Steinberg and Stéphane Lacroix repeat this error.[12] Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir Abū l-Samḥ and Shaykh Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Rāzzāq Ḥamza, his successor as director of the Madrasa Dār al-Ḥadīth in Mecca, were members of the Egyptian Salafī movement Jamāʿat Anṣār al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya. Almost immediately after Ibn Saʿūd's conquest of the Hijaz in 1925–26, Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqqī came to Mecca to support Ibn Saʿūd, who appointed him a teacher at the al-Ḥaram Mosque and head of the government printing house in Mecca. Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqqī's two colleagues from the Anṣār al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya, Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir Abū l-Samḥ and Shaykh Muḥammad

11 "... Fa idhā kānat al-madrasa allatī turīdūna fatḥahā anhu yuʿallamu fīhā l-ḥadīth wa-l-fiqh wa bī-l-akhaṣṣ fiqh al-imām Aḥmad wa ʿadam al-iʿāba ʿalā aḥadin mina al-aʾimma fahādhā naḥnu muʾminūna fīhi wa nuwāfiq ʿalayhi," see the response of King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya, *al-Kitāb al-wathāʾiqī*, pp. 369 and 368–373.

12 R. Schulze, *Islamischer Internationalismus im 20. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Islamischen Weltliga* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), p. 143; G. Steinberg, *Religion und Staat in Saudi Arabien. Die wahhabitischen Gelehrten, 1902–1953* (Würzburg: Ergon, 2002), pp. 285–85; S. Lacroix, *Les islamistes Saoudiens. Une insurrection manquée* (Paris: Presses Universitaire de France, 2010), p. 108.

ʿAbd al-Rāzzāq Ḥamza, soon followed him to Mecca. Schultze, Steinberg, and Lacroix forgot to consider that since 1926, members of the Egyptian Anṣār al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya worked together with members of the Indian Ahl al-Ḥadīth to support the Salafiyya-Wahhābiyya doctrine of Ibn Saʿūd, which they all shared. In fact, these authors forgot the fundamental role of the Indian Salafīs (such as Ahl al-Ḥadīth) and West African Salafīs; they focus exclusively on the role of Arab Salafīs like the Anṣār al-Sunna. This tendency, I believe, arises from the tradition that gives sole credit to the Arabs for spreading the teachings of Islam.

In addition, it would appear that Lacroix did not understand the nature of the curriculum of the Dār al-Ḥadīth in Medina and Mecca. He understood it to be an institute for research on *ḥadīth*s. In fact it was (and still is) a school that includes both elementary and secondary levels (i.e., a level below that of a university), one that teaches all the subjects taught in public schools in Saudi Arabia. The only difference is that the Dār al-Ḥadīth dedicates more attention to the teaching of *ḥadīth*s than public schools do.

When the Dār al-Ḥadīth in Medina was founded in in 1350/1931, there were only a few schools in the Hijaz. The most important were the al-Ḥarām Mosque in Mecca; the Mosque of the Prophet in Medina (Masjid al-Nabawī); the Madrasat al-Falāḥ in Jedda, Mecca, and Medina;[13] the Madrasat al-ʿUlūm al-Sharʿiyya[14]

13 On the history of this school, see, among others, Aḥmad al-Sibāʿī, *Tārīkh Makka: Dirāsāt fī l-siyāsat wa-l-ʿilm wa-l-ijtimāʿ wa-l-ʿumrān* (Mecca: Nādi Makka al-Thaqafī, 1414/1994), p. 582. It was Shaykh Muḥammad ʿAlī Zaynal who had the idea of establishing the first *madrasa* in Jedda. The name of Madrasat al-Falāḥ was suggested by al-Ḥabīb Aḥmad b. Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭās, a well-known Ḥadramī *ʿālim*. The first founding of the *madrasa* was guaranteed by Khadīja ʿAbdallāh Zaynal, the wife of Shaykh Muḥammad ʿAlī Zaynal. The first Madrasat al-Falāḥ in Jedda opened its doors in 1323/1905. After seven years, teaching began at the first Madrasat al-Falāḥ in Mecca. Shaykh Muḥammad ʿAlī Zaynal opened other *madāris* al-Falāḥ in Medina, in India, in Bahrain, in Dubai, etc. See Abkar, *Turāth Makka*, pp. 106–107.

14 This *madrasa* was founded in 1340/1921 by the Indian as-Sayyid Aḥmad, also known as al-Faydh Abādī. He was the brother of Shaykh Ḥusayn Aḥmad, the shaykh of the Madrasa Deoband in India. See Zaydān, *Dhikrayāt al-ʿuhūd al-thalātha*, p. 36; al-Ḥaydarī, *al-Taʿlīm al-ahlī fī l-madīna*, pp. 202–242. We must distinguish this *madrasa* from another *madrasa* that had almost the same name, i.e., Madrasa Dār al-ʿUlūm as-Salafiyya al-Ahliyya. The latter was founded in 1367/1947 by an Indian *ʿālim* Shaykh Rashīd Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm al-Anṣārī al-Muẓaffir Naqrī. He had studied at Deoband before immigrating to Medina, where he began to teach in the Madrasa al-ʿUlūm al-Sharʿiyya and at the Prophet's Mosque in Medina. When he wanted to found his *madrasa*, the Saudi state gave him permission, provided that his *madrasa* would be supervised by the same council of *ʿulamāʾ* that was also responsible for overseeing the Madrasa Dār al-Ḥadīth. This

in Medina; the Madrasat al-Ṣawlatiyya[15] in Mecca; and the Madrasat al-Fakhriyya (1298/1880). Most of these schools (*madāris*, sing. *madrasa*) were founded and financed by Indian benefactors who came on pilgrimage (*ḥajj*). Some of them completed a *hijra* (emigration) and settled permanently in the Hijaz while others returned to India after spending a long period in the Hijaz, during which they completed the *ḥajj*, studied with *ʿulamāʾ*, and conducted business.

The founder of the Dār al-Ḥadīth established his institution as a private (not governmental) institution, to be financed by donations from within and outside of Medina. Most of its benefactors were Indian pilgrims (*ḥujjāj*). To attract donations, Dihlāwī likened the establishment and support of the Dār al-Ḥadīth to a *jihād*. In the statutes of the Dār al-Ḥadīth written by the founder we read, "Let those who love the Sunna of Muḥammad (*muḥibbu al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya*) . . . involved in this great and good work by their financial means, because this is the greatest *jihād* of our time."[16]

Thus, in Medina, after the Madrasat al-ʿUlūm al-Sharʿiyya was founded in 1340/1921 by the Indian Deobandi Sayyid Aḥmad al-Faydh Abādī (the brother of Shaykh Ḥusayn Aḥmad, the Shaykh of Deoband Madrasa in India), the Madrasa Dār al-Ḥadīth occupied second place. Therefore, we can say that the Indians of the Deoband School and those of Ahl al-Ḥadīth, both of which taught the Salafī doctrine, supported King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz against his rival Sharīf Ḥusayn.

Dihlāwī died in 1375/1955. But before his death, he appointed his student ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Yūsuf al-Ifrīqī as his successor. As he had already assisted Dihlāwī in the management of the Dār al-Ḥadīth, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī, was

---

council consisted of the following personalities: Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Ṣāliḥ (imām and preacher of the Prophet's Mosque in Medina and also President of the Sharīʿa Courts (al-Maḥākim al-Asharʿiyya)); Shaykh ʿAbdallāh al-Kharbūsh (imām of the Prophet's Mosque in Medina, and responsible for Islamic education in Medina and its region); Shaykh ʿUmar Muḥammad Fallāta (Director of the Dār al-Ḥadīth in Medina); Aḥmad Bū Shannāq (Director of Madrasa al-Ṭayyiba Secondary School); and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Rabīʿ (Director of the National Education System in Medina and its region). See, among others, al-Ḥaydarī, *al-Taʿlīm al-ahlī fī l-madīna*, pp. 278–282.

15 The *madrasa* was built in 1290/1873 and teaching started in 1291/1874. The idea and design of the *madrasa* was the work of an Indian *ʿālim*, Shaykh Muḥammad Saʿīd Raḥmatallāh al-Hindī. An Indian woman named Ṣawlata al-Nisāʾ provided the funding, hence the name Madrasa al-Ṣawlatiyya. See, among others, ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad Abkar, *Turāth Makka al-mukarrama fī l-qarn al-rābiʿ ʿashar al-hijrī* (Riyadh, Mecca, Beirut, Damascus: Muʾassasa ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān, 1425/2004), pp. 103–106.

16 al-Ḥaydarī, *al-Taʿlīm al-ahlī fī l-madīna*, p. 124.

the ideal successor; he was able to implement his reforms, his vision, and his commitment to modernize the Dār al-Ḥadīth in Medina.

The Establishment and Expansion of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth Movement in the Eighteenth Century

We do not know much about the establishment and expansion of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth movement in the eighteenth century, yet it left a fundamental, indelible mark on the evolution of Islamic revivalism and reformism in the Muslim world. On the history of this movement in al-Ḥaramayn (Mecca and Medina) in the eighteenth century, I have used the works of two authors: John Voll[17] and J.O. Hunwick.[18] Voll relies mainly on ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Jabartī,[19] Muḥammad al-Amīn al-Muḥibbī,[20] and Muḥammad Khalīl al-Murādī.[21] In early eighteenth-century Medina, the first group of the movement was formed by *ʿulamāʾ* such as ʿAbdallāh b. Sālim al-Baṣrī (1040–1134/1640–1722), Muḥammad al-Nakhlī (1044–1130/1634–1717), Ḥasan b. ʿAlī l-ʿUjaymī (1049–1113/1639–1701), Ibrāhīm b. Ḥasan al-Kūrānī (1025–1101/1616–89, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Rasūl al-Barzanjī (1040–1103/1630–91), and Abū l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Hādī l-Sindī (d. 1138/1725). These scholars studied the science of *ḥadīth* from the man who was considered the great *muḥaddith* (expert of *ḥadīth*) of the time, the Egyptian Muḥammad b. ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Bābilī (1000–1077/1591–1666). He represented the teaching tradition of the *ʿilm al-ḥadīth* (science of *ḥadīth*s) in the Mashriq. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Maghribī, a *muḥaddith* of al-Ḥaramayn from the Maghrib, also greatly influenced this group. He represented the teaching tradition of the *ʿilm al-ḥadīth* in the Maghrib, a tradition based on the teaching of *al-Muwaṭṭaʾ* of Imām Mālik b. Anas. The third major influence in Medina were the scholars from South Asia, represented by Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī (d. 1163/1750), originally from Sind. His teaching

17 J.O. Voll, "Hadith Scholars and Tariqahs: An Ulama Group in the Eighteenth Century Haramayn and their Impact in the Islamic World." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 15, nos. 3–4 (1980): 264–273; Voll, "Muḥammad Ḥayyā l-Sindī and Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbd Al-Wahhāb."

18 Hunwick, "Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī"; idem, "Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī of Futa Jallon."

19 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Jabartī, *ʿAjāʾib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa-l-akhbār*, ed. Ḥasan Muḥammad Jawhar, et al. (Cairo: Lajna al-Bayān al-ʿArabī, 1958–67), 1: 208–210.

20 Muḥammad al-Amīn al-Muḥibbī, *Khulāṣat al-athar fī aʿyān al-qarn al-ḥādī ʿashar* (Beirut: Dār al-Ṣādir, 1248/1867–8), 4: 39–42.

21 Muḥammad Khalīl al-Murādī, *Silk al-durar fī aʿyān al-qarn al-thānī ʿashar* (Baghdad, 1301/1883–4), 1: 171–172.

and that of his colleagues at the time was spread in India by members of the first nucleus of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth, including Shaykh Walī Allāh Dihlawī (1703–63). Thus, a network of cosmopolitan *ʿulamāʾ* who wanted to spread their teaching of *ʿilm al-ḥadīth* around the Muslim world was established in Medina. The legacy of this movement has in fact been carried on by the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of India, which since the nineteenth century was influenced by the following persons: Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī (d. 1163/1750), Shaykh Walī Allah Dihlawī (1703–63) (both from India), the Medinan from West Africa, Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī (1752/3–1803), the Yemeni Muḥammad b. ʿAlī l-Shawkānī (1173–1250/1760–1832), Ṣādiq Ḥasan Khān (1834–1890), and Nadhīr Ḥusayn Dihlawī (1805–1902). In the nineteenth century in India, the last two figures were the first leaders of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth movement who gave it a structured formal organization. In the twentieth century, Ṣanāʿullāh Amristarī (1868–1948) was the true representative of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth in India.

Shaykh Walī Allāh Dihlawī, Ṣādiq Ḥasan Khān, Nadhīr Ḥusayn Dihlawī, and Ṣanāʿullāh Amristarī were the first to influence the movement of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth regarding the dissemination of its teaching in the *madāris* (sing. *madrasa*) and mosques. With their writings, Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī l-Shawkānī, and Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī were the thinkers of the movement.

Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī (d. 1163/1750)[22]

Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī was born in a village in the Sind region, which is in Pakistan today. There, he gained a basic knowledge of Islam before going to perform the pilgrimage in Mecca and Medina and settling permanently in the latter city in order to study. He later became a renowned teacher in the Mosque of the Prophet Muḥammad in Medina. Abū l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Hādī l-Sindī, also a native of Sind, was among his teachers in Medina. After the death of the latter, he succeeded him in the teaching in the Prophet's Mosque. Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī was one of the leaders of *ʿilm al-ḥadīth* in al-Ḥaramayn at that time, and among his students was the famous Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb. Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī taught the young Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb to refuse to imitate and follow blindly (*taqlīd*) the classical commentators and the writings of other *ʿulamāʾ*, including the founders of the four Sunnī schools of law (*madhāhib*). He taught him to use *ijtihād*, to reject popular Sufi practices such as visiting the graves of saints, and to follow

22 Voll, "Muḥammad Ḥayyā l-Sindī and Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb."

only the Qur'ān and the *ḥadīth*s. He taught him the importance of the texts (*naṣṣ*), especially of the *ḥadīths*, as the basis of Islamic knowledge. Thus, as we see, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and Ibn Taymiyya were not the only inspiration for Wahhābism. The teaching of *'ilm al-ḥadīth* by Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī and the group that gravitated around him also greatly contributed.

Although Muḥammad Hayāt al-Sindī influenced Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb, their relationship to Sufism differed. While the latter rejected Sufism absolutely, the first kept an affiliation, though not very close, to the Khalwatiyya order (*ṭarīqa*). Moreover, some of his students became founders of other orders. This is the case with Muḥammad al-Sammānī, founder of the Sammāniyya order.

In addition to his influence as one of Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb's teachers, Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī's writings continued to influence—even a century later—the precursors of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth movement in India, such as Nadhīr Ḥusayn and Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān.

Walī Allāh Dihlawī (1703–63)[23]

Though many historians attribute the beginning of Islamic reformism in India to the teachings of Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī (Sirhind) in the seventeenth century, in fact it was the teaching of Shaykh Walī Allāh Dihlawī (1703–63) that really marked the beginning of this movement. He was born into a family descended from the Prophet (*shurafā'*, sing. *sharīf*). By the time of the death of his father (1718), who was his first teacher, Walī Allāh had already acquired sufficient knowledge to make him an accomplished scholar in the Islamic tradition of India; he also remained tied to the tradition of his second teacher, Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī.

He set out to make the pilgrimage to Mecca when he was twenty-seven years old. He remained there for one year to study mainly Malikī and Shafi'ī *fiqh*, two schools of jurisprudence that were not familiar to him, as his studies to that point were limited to that of Ḥanafī *fiqh*. In addition, he realized that these two schools of *fiqh* attach greater importance to *'ilm al-ḥadīth* than does the Ḥanafi school. While in Medina, he was influenced by the teaching of Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī, particularly by his teachings related to the importance of

23 Sayyid Athar Abbas Rizwi, *Shāh Walī-Allāh and His Times* (Canberra: Ma'rifat Publishing House, 1980); Fazlur Rahman, *Islam* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1979), pp. 202–206; Riexinger, *Sanā'ullāh Amritsarī*, pp. 71–81; J.M.S. Baljon, *Religion and Thought of Shāh Walī Allāh Dihlawī 1703–1762* (Leiden: Brill, 1986).

*ḥadīth*s and the rejection of the sectarianism of the schools of law. It was at this time that Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī introduced him to the ideas of Ibn Taymiyya. After his return to India, he began to spread, through his teachings, the ideas of Ibn Taymiyya and the sciences of *ḥadīth* (*ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*). Dihlawī's ideas corresponded to that of other specialists in *ḥadīth*s who believed that if a Qurʾānic verse or *ḥadīth* contradict something from one of the four schools of law (*madhāhib*), on any matter, the *naṣṣ*—the Qurʾānic verse or *ḥadīth*—must prevail. Dihlawī wrote a considerable number of books in Arabic and Persian in which he explained his particular understanding of *ijtihād*, *taqlīd*, and the importance of the science of *ḥadīth*s. But his most important work remains his translation of the Qurʾān into Persian.

Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī (1752–3/1803)[24]

This is the person that Shaykh ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī in his book *Jawāb al-Ifrīqī* calls "al-nāṣir al-sunna al-muḥammadiyya, al-Imām Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī," when he refers to the book of the latter entitled *Īqāẓ himam uli al-abṣār*.

In the article that J.O. Hunwick devotes to Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī (1752/3–1803), a scholar of the sciences of *ḥadīth*, he shows that this leading figure was presented by the Indian Muḥammad Ashraf al-Ṣiddīqī l-ʿĀẓīmābādī (d. 1905) in his book *ʿAwn al-maʿbūd ʿalā sunan Abī Dāwūd* as the *mujaddid*[25] (renewer, regenerator) of Islam in the twelfth century (eighteenth century). Hunwick notes that al-ʿĀẓīmābādī, a member of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth, lists among the *mujaddidūn* (sing. *mujaddid*) of Islam, after Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī, the names Nawwāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān al-Qinnawjī (d. 1307/1890) and Sayyid Nadhīr Ḥusayn (d. 1320/1902) as the two regenerators (*mujaddid*) of the thirteenth century (twentieth century). The latter are considered the founders of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth movement in

24 Hunwick, "Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī" (1752/53–1803); Hunwick, "Ṣāliḥ al-Fulānī of Futa Jallon"; Muḥammad Ashraf al-Ṣiddīqī l-ʿAẓīmābādī, *ʿAwn al-maʿbūd ʿalā sunan Abī Dāwūd* (Delhi, 1323/1909–7; repr. Beirut, n.d.), vol. 4, p. 181; ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Salām al-Dāghistānī (Ms., Cambridge University Library, Add. 785, ff 56r–57v); Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ḥayy al-Kattānī, *Fihris al-fahāris* (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1402/1982), vol. 1, pp. 209–210, vol. 2, pp. 267–268; al-Jabartī, *ʿAjāʾib al-āthār*, vol. 1, pp. 414–415; al-Murādī, *Silk al-durar*, vol. 3, p. 206; Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Makhlūf, *Shajarat al-nūr fī ṭabaqāt al-mālikiyya* (Cairo, 1349/1930–1, repr. Beirut, n.d.), biography no. 1351; Khayr al-Dīn al-Ziriklī, *al-Aʿlām* (Beirut, 1389/1969), vol. 5, p. 65; ʿUmar Riḍā Kaḥḥāla, *Muʿjam al-muʾallifīn* (Beirut, c. 1958), vol. 7, p. 30.

25 According to a *ḥadīth* of the Prophet, "God sends to the Muslim community at each turn of the century someone who regenerates the Islamic religion."

India. Thus, al-Fullānī appears on a level with the founding figures of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth in India.

Hunwick refers to the primary source on Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī as the biography written by the Moroccan, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ḥayy al-Kattānī (d. 1962), in his *Fihris al-fahāris*. The Moroccan scholar was intellectually linked to al-Fullānī through chains of transmission (*sanad*) dating back to many scholars authorized by al-Fullānī to transmit his knowledge. One of these chains produced two branches: one contains the name of Aḥmad al-Madanī (d. 1914) and his father Ismāʿīl, the former *muftī* of Medina. The other branch includes four generations of *ʿulamā'* of a Mauritanian family that begins with Muḥammad al-Hāfiẓ al-ʿAlawī (d. 1830), the propagator of the Tijāniyya *ṭarīqa* among the Idaw ʿAlī. Other chains of transmission from al-Fullānī include branches that list Indian scholars. Thus, from Mauritania to India through Medina, we see the extent to which the teachings of al-Fullānī spread.

Al-Fullānī was born in the small village of Futa Jalon in what is today Guinea. He learned his elementary knowledge in his village with his maternal uncle. He began his travels in search of knowledge at the age of twelve. He spent one year with the famous grammarian Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhtār b. Buna in the south of Mauritania and then four years with Shaykh Muḥammad b. Sinna al-Fullānī l-Shinqīṭī (d. 1186/1772–3). This last scholar, who had traveled throughout the region of Sudan (*bilād al-Sudān*) and to Morocco in search of knowledge, is seen by Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī as the best of all his teachers. Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī left this scholar in 1770, and after studying one year in Timbuktu, another in the main Tamgrut *zāwiya* of the Nāṣiriyya *ṭarīqa* (a branch of the Shādhiliyya), and six months in Marrakesh, he stayed for a long time in Tunis and Cairo. In Cairo he met and learned from several *ʿulamā'*, including Murtaḍā l-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1791), who is considered, like Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī, to be a *mujaddid* of the thirteenth century. Zabīdī granted his colleague from West Africa a general *ijāza* to transmit his work and the works of the other *ʿulamā'* from whom he received *ijāza*. Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī left Cairo in 1187/1773–4 for the Hijaz, where he finally settled in Medina and remained until his death in 1218/1803.

Before becoming a renowned *ʿālim* and above all an unparalleled scientist of *ḥadīth*s (*muḥaddith*), Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī studied with the *ʿulamā'* of the Hijaz including Muḥammad Saʿīd b. Muḥammad Ṣafar (d. 1192/1778) and Abū l-Ḥasan al-Sindī, the commentator of the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal. Another teacher who strongly influenced Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī was Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Hāshimī (1213/1799), a Yemeni from Sanaa but residing in Mecca, where he also died. Though Zaydī, he spoke against *taqlīd* or blind acceptance of the *madhāhib* and called the faithful to comply (*ittibāʿ*) with the *Sunna* of the Prophet. This is also the main theme in the teachings of Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī and

of Muḥammad al-Shawkānī. Both (especially al-Shawkānī) had a remarkable influence on the movement of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth in India. It seems that around 1203/1788–9, Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī developed the conviction that he had completed his studies. So he started writing a large register (*thabt*) of works that had been transmitted to him (that is to say, the books he learned from different teachers) and their chains of transmission. This large register is divided into two parts: a long version (*al-Thabt al-kabīr*) also known as *al-Thamar al-yānīʿ* [lit., the ripe fruit], which has not yet been published, and an abridged version (*al-Thabt al-ṣaghīr*) also named *Qaṭf al-thamar* [lit., fruit picking], which was published in 1328/1910 in Hyderabad, like other works of the same nature, for example the *Ithāf al-akābir* of al-Shawkānī.

The *Qaṭf al-thamar* deals with several books of all specialties of Islamic religious sciences and Arabic. But the sciences of *ḥadīth* are, of course, the most represented. This book gives the reader a sense that Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī had read all the major Islamic writings of his time—and in all disciplines. Another important book by Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī is the *Īqāẓ himam ūlī l-abṣār* [Waking the ardor of sensible people] (Cairo: Maktabat al-Munīriyya; reprinted in Beirut, 1398/1978). According to Hunwick, the *Īqāẓ* is Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī's major work and summarizes his opinions about and opposition to the schools of law. The full title of the book reflects its content:

> Waking the ardor of the sensible people to follow (Muḥammad) the guide of the emigrants (*muhajirūn*) and helpers (*anṣār*) and to warn them against the blameworthy innovations so prevalent among the jurists (*fuqahāʾ*) of our time in cities and towns, blameworthy innovations which consist in following the schools of law with zeal and narrow-mindedness.

The introduction, titled: "The obligation to obey God and His Messenger, to comply (*ittibāʿ*)[26] with the Qurʾān and the Sunna, to refrain from following *raʾy* (personal opinion) and *qiyās* (analogical reasoning), except those supported by the first two sources (Qurʾān and Sunna)," gives an explanation of the *fasād* (iniquity) that results from blind acceptance of others' opinions on religious issues (*taqlīd*), the invalidity of *taqlīd*, and the difference between *taqlīd* and *ittibāʿ* (acting in accordance with) to the Qurʾān and the Sunna of the Prophet.

In the primacy he gives to the authority of the text of the Qurʾān and the *ḥadīth*, Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī says that the four *ʿulamāʾ* founders of the four Sunnī *madhāhib* (*al-aʾimma al-mujtahidūn*) each condemned *taqlīd*. He appealed

26 The term *ittibāʿ* is occasionally replaced by *iqtidāʾ*. Both mean "acting in accordance with" rather than imitating (*taqlīd*).

to anyone who joins one of the four schools to exercise his duty of *ijtihād* to seek, to the extent possible, the *naṣṣ* (the text of the Qurʾān or the *ḥadīth*s) on which all religious acts should be based. If he finds a Qurʾānic text or *ḥadīth* contrary to the opinion of the school of his *imām*, he must reject the view of his *imām* and adopt that of the Qurʾān and the *ḥadīth*. This is what he calls *ijtihād al-naṣṣ* (exercising personal effort to find a text of the Qurʾān or *ḥadīth* to justify religious acts) as opposed to *ijtihād al-raʾy* (finding a justification for one's act based solely on reason). If he is not able to make this personal effort, he must, according to Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī, ask the opinion of an expert on the Qurʾān and the Sunna. This kind of opinion is not new among Muslims. This is a recurring theme in the history of Islam. Of the four *madhāhib*, that of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal is the closest to this opinion. Ibn Taymiyya and his student Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya developed this opinion to make it acceptable to a wide audience among the Sunnīs. In his *Īqāẓ*, Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī often refers to Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya, and particularly to their respective books *Talbīs Iblīs* and *Iʿlām al-muwaqqiʿīn ʿan rabbi al-ʿālamīn*. Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī also refers to Muḥammad Ḥayāt al-Sindī, who was a teacher of Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, and several scholars who were teachers of Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī himself. It is clear that the teachings of Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī are congruent with his other books, among them his two unpublished works: *Taqwīm al-kaffa fī mā li-l-ʿulamāʾ min ḥadīth al-janna wa-l-kaffa* and *Jamʿ al-aḥādīth al-qudsiyya*, which influenced movements such as the Wahhābiyya-Salafiyya in Arabia and the Ahl al-Ḥadīth in India.

When he arrived in Medina, Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī was twenty-one years old; he began teaching at the age of thirty-six, though he continued to learn from other colleagues throughout his life, as is the Islamic tradition. Among the students and disciples of Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī we should mention the Meccan and Medinan students like ʿAbd al-Ḥāfiẓ al-ʿUjaymī (d. 1820), who became a judge (*qāḍī*) in Mecca; Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ and Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, two Ashrāf of the Jamal al-Layl clan; and Muḥammad ʿAbīd al-Sindī (d. 1257/1841), who was also a student of al-Shawkānī. Among his students in the Mashriq was Wajīh al-Dīn al-Kuzbarī (d. 1846), whose father had taught Ṣāliḥ. Among his students in the Maghrib were the Moroccan grammarian Ḥamdūn b. al-Ḥajj al-Fāsī (d. 1857) and a well-known Shinqīṭī, namely Muḥammad al-Ḥāfiẓ, the Idaw ʿAlī propagandist of the Tijāniyya *ṭarīqa*. He also had students from Sudan (*bilād al-Sudān*), including some of the Fullānī ethnic group.

In order to understand how the views of Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī influenced the Ahl al-Ḥadīth in India, we must look to his students. The influence of al-Shawkānī on this movement is clear, since one of his students, ʿAbd al-Ḥaq b. Faḍl al-Hindī, taught Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān. Al-Shawkānī taught other Indian students

who were also students of Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī, for example Muḥammad al-ʿAbīd al-Sindī. Though we do not have evidence of it, it is possible that Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī and al-Shawkānī met or at least corresponded through the same Indian students they taught. Perhaps their students exported a synergism between the teachings of the two teachers to India. We do know with certainty that the *Īqāẓ himam ūlī l-abṣār* of Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī exerted a great influence on the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of India. This book and his *Qaṭf al-thamar* were published in India by members of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth, and Ṣiddīq Ḥasan considered Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī the *mujaddid* of his time.

We may also note that an important book (the author of which remains unknown) that summarizes the Ahl al-Ḥadīth doctrine confirms the influence of Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī. This work, written on the margins of Ibn Taymiyya's book *Iktifāʾ al-ṣirāṭ* by a member of the movement of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth, was published in Delhi in 1301–02/1884–85. It contains the opinions of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth on *tawḥīd* and on the primacy of the text of the Qurʾān or the *ḥadīth* (*naṣṣ*) as the only final proof for deciding any religious act. In addition, in several passages of the four volumes of the book, there are recurrent attacks against *taqlīd* and *bidʿa*. According to Hunwick, this book, in its discussion of *taqlīd* committed by the followers of *madhāhib*, undoubtedly bears the mark of the opinions of Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī. Although we have no evidence that Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī was directly influenced by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, the similarity of their teachings is clear, with two exceptions: their relationship to Sufism and their relationship to *madhāhib*. While Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Wahhāb rejected any form of Sufism, Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī was introduced to the Sammāniyya *ṭarīqa* and maybe to other *ṭuruq*, though he was not formally initiated into a Sufi order. With regard to their relationship to *madhāhib*, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Wahhāb actually followed the *madhhab* of Ibn Ḥanbal through the school of Ibn Taymiyya, while Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī did not adhere to any school and was strongly opposed to the *madhāhib*.

Muḥammad b. ʿAlī l-Shawkānī (1173–1250/1760–1832)[27]

Muḥammad b. ʿAlī l-Shawkānī was born and grew up in a Zaydī-Hādawī family of Hijrat Shawkān village, not far from Sanaa. He came from a family of

27 Haykel, *Revival and Reform in Islam*; Ghālib, *Min aʿlām al-Yaman*; al-ʿAmrī, *al-Imām al-Shawkānī*; Muḥammad Muṣṭafā Balḥāj, "al-Taharrur al-fikrī wa-l-madhhabī ʿinda al-imām al-Shawkānī," *Dirāsāt Yamaniyya* 40 (1990): 247–259; Ibrāhīm Ibrāhīm Hilāl, *al-Imām al-Shawkānī wa-l-ijtihād wa-l-taqlīd* (Cairo: Dār al-Nahḍa al-ʿArabiyya, 1979); Riexinger, *Sanāʿullāh Amritsarī*, pp. 71–81; Baljon, *Religion and Thought of Shāh Walī Allāh Dihlawī*.

scholars; his father was judge (*qāḍī*) at Khawlān and served the imamate for forty years. Muḥammad al-Shawkānī also entered the legal profession, first as *qāḍī*, then *qāḍī l-quḍāt* (head judge). Al-Shawkānī was certainly influenced by his father, but later he influenced his father. Al-Shawkānī's second and most important teacher was Sayyid ʿAbd al-Qādir b. Aḥmad al-Kawkabānī, who traveled through Yemen on his way to Mecca and Medina to study and perform the *ḥajj*. Al-Shawkānī, by contrast, did not study beyond Sanaa and did not perform the *ḥajj*, yet he was well aware of the reformist ideas current at the time, through his teacher and his own reading.

At the age of twenty, he gave several *fatwa*s in response to queries sent from throughout Yemen, including regions where the dominant *madhhab* was the Shāfiʿī *madhhab*. He taught both at the mosque and in his home, and was a prolific author who wrote in defense of Sunnī Islam against the Zaydī-Hādawī *madhhab*. He gave precedence to the *naṣṣ* (text of the Qurʾān or *ḥadīth*) over *taqīd*. In his teaching he gave priority to the teaching of *ḥadīth* and its sciences. In this sense, he followed the tradition of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth movement in Mecca and Medina in the eighteenth century, which had also influenced his teachers. He himself later became a reference for the Ahl al-Ḥadīth movement that appeared in India in the nineteenth century. Many Indian *ʿulamāʾ* who were going on or returning from the *ḥajj* spent time in Sanaa to learn from him. For example, in 1822, a large group of Indians who were returning from the *ḥajj* remained in Sanaa; among them were Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Banārsī (d. 1276/1860) and ʿAbd al-Ḥayy Shahīd Badhanwī (d. 1828). This group was led by Ismāʿīl Shahīd (a grandson of Shaykh Walī Allāh) and Sayyid Aḥmad Barelwī (b. 1786 and d. 1831), the founder of the Muḥammadiyya *ṭarīqa* that led a *jihād* in Afghanistan and the region against the Sikhs. The Muḥammadiyya *ṭarīqa* lost the war against the Sikhs in 1831 and Sayyid Barelwī died fighting there. After this defeat, the Muḥammadiyya split into two groups, one remained attached to the Ḥanafī *madhhab*, while the second group around Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Banārsī and other *ʿulamāʾ* influenced by the teachings of al-Shawkānī founded the Ahl al-Ḥadīth. But it was only in 1864 that the movement in the person of Nadhīr Ḥusayn Dihlawī dared to publicly reject the tradition of following the *madhāhib*.

Among the works of al-Shawkānī, the best known are *Nayl al-awṭār min asrār muntaqā l-akhbār* [To reach the goal in the explanation of the best chosen traditions]. This is a book of *fiqh* based on *ḥadīth*s. It is still commonly studied even by Shāfiʿī and Ḥanbalī scholars. *Fatḥ al-qadīr* [Triumph of the most powerful] is a commentary on and explanation (*tafsīr*) of the Qurʾān.

In his conception of *ijtihād*, al-Shawkānī did not differ from Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī, except that al-Shawkānī found himself in an environment very hostile to his ideas. Al-Shawkānī claimed that the door of *ijtihād* was still open; he believed

that *ijtihād* should not be based on *raʾy* (personal rational opinion), but on the texts of the Qurʾān and *ḥadīth* (*naṣṣ*). He rejected even *ijmāʿ* (the consensus of the Muslims) and *qiyās* (analogical reasoning). He argued that *ijmāʿ* is not mentioned in the Qurʾān and in *ḥadīth* as a source of law. In addition, he stated that it is impossible to obtain the *ijmāʿ* of all Muslims in the world or even the *ijmāʿ* of their *ʿulamāʾ*. In his defense of *ijtihād*, al-Shawkānī quotes the following *ḥadīth* of the Prophet: "Until the Day of Judgment, there will always be a group of my community who will defend the truth." He recognized himself as a *mujtahid*. His contemporary disciples and all his supporters who came after his death gave him the title of *mujaddid*. He himself merely quoted the *ḥadīth* that teaches that, at the beginning of each century (*hijra*), God sends someone who regenerates His religion.

While al-Shawkānī based his teaching on *ḥadīth*, he also referred to the views of famous *ʿulamāʾ* of the Sunnī *madhāhib*, including Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (Shāfiʿī), and Taqī l-Dīn Aḥmad b. Taymiyya (Ḥanbalī). The teaching of al-Shawkānī was adopted by the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of India and by the Wahhābī of Saudi Arabia and elsewhere, who saw him as a follower of the teaching of the *salaf al-ṣāliḥ* (the pious predecessors). In the early 1970s, the Islamic University of Medina, then headed by Ibn Bāz (who later became Grand Mufti of Saudi Arabia), published some writings of al-Shawkānī, such as *al-Tuḥfat fī madhāhib al-salaf* and *Sharḥ al-ṣudūr bi taḥrīm rafʿal-qubūr*.[28]

Nadhīr Ḥusayn Dihlawī (1805–1902)[29]

Nadhīr Ḥusayn Dihlawī was born in 1805 into an aristocratic *sharīf* family in northern India, in Monghyr in the province of Bihar. In 1824 he moved to Delhi to study with Mawlawī ʿAbd al-Khāliq at Aurangābadī Mosque. From 1828 on, his principal teacher was Muḥammad Isḥāq. The latter was at that time a well-known *muḥaddith* in India. After Muḥammad Isḥāq emigrated to the Hijaz, Nadhīr Ḥusayn Dihlawī replaced him as a teacher in Aurangābadī Mosque. His turbulent relations with the British in Delhi improved, largely because the British saw him as the only scholar of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth who could work to calm the conflicts (often involving ritual practices) that arose between the Ahl al-Ḥadīth and the followers of the Ḥanafī *madhhab*. These conflicts resulted in civil disturbances, which the British wanted to prevent. Moreover, Nadhīr Ḥusayn knew English, which was very rare at the time among *ʿulamāʾ*.

28 Schultze, *Islamischer Internationalismus*, p. 198.

29 Riexinger, *Sanāʾullāh Amritsarī*, pp. 122–128.

In 1883, when he left to perform the *ḥajj*, the British granted him a letter of recommendation to the British Vice Consul in Jedda. In fact, he did not have to present it, because the Indian followers of the Ḥanafī *madhhab* had already denounced him as Wahhābī to the Ottoman governor of Jedda. In Jedda, the governor stopped him and put him in prison. The British vice consul intervened and Nadhīr Ḥusayn was released. Upon his return to India after the *ḥajj* he continued to teach the sciences of *ḥadīth* and Qur'ān to many students who came from different parts of India, Afghanistan, and Central Asia. His extensive knowledge of the religious sciences of Islam earned him the epithet *shaykh al-kull* (lit., the shaykh of all knowledge). The solicitude of the British gained Nadhīr Ḥusayn the favor of the moderate Muslims of Alighar Institute (starting with its founder Sayyid Ahmad Khan), such that when he died in 1902, the *Alighar Institut Gazette* dedicated to him an obituary full of praise. While Nadhīr Ḥusayn left writings, it was his teaching and the people that he trained that contributed most to his reputation.

Ṣādiq Ḥasan Khān (1834–90)[30]

Ṣādiq Ḥasan Khān was born in 1834 to a Shīʿī family in Kanauj (Awadh), but rejected Shīʿīsm when he was still young. His father died three years after his birth. He studied with Ṣadruddīn Āzurda in Delhi and with ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Rāfiʿuddīn and ʿAbd al-Qādir, the sons of Walī Allāh. He also had teachers who had been students of al-Shawkānī, for instance ʿAbd al-Ḥaq Bannārsī, Muḥammad Yaʿqūb Dihlawī, and the Yemeni, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn al-Anṣārī l-Ḥudaydī and Ḥusayn al-Anṣārī l-Ḥudaydī. He contributed to the propaganda of the Muḥammadiyya *ṭarīqa* by writing and distributing pamphlets, though he did not engage in the *jihād* against the Sikhs. After living for years in great poverty, Sikandar Begum, the sovereign of the state of Bhopal, commissioned Ṣādiq Ḥasan Khān with the task of writing the history of the state. In 1868, Ṣādiq Ḥasan Khān performed the pilgrimage to Mecca and spent some time in Mecca and Medina to study with renowned *ḥadīth* specialists. Upon his return, he passed through Sanaa, where he met and studied with al-Shawkānī. He brought to India al-Shawkānī's *Fatḥ al-qadīr* and *Nayl al-awṭār*. In 1871, he married Sikandar Begum, a marriage that brought him financial security and access to the state's institutions, including the state printing office, which he used to propagate the writings of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth. He brought to Bhopal many Ahl

30 Ibid., pp. 128–138; Saeedullah, *The Life and Works of Siddik Hasan Khan Nawab of Bhopal (1248–1307/1832–1890)*, Lahore, Ashraf, 1973.

al-Ḥadīth *ʿulamāʾ* to teach in mosques and *madrasa*s and to work in the administration, perhaps in an effort to make Bhopal the center of Ahl al-Ḥadīth. The British, concerned about the Wahhābiyya of Arabia, the pan-Islamism of the Middle East, the Mahdism of Sudan, and the Indian Ahl al-Ḥadīth (which they considered proto-Wahhābiyya), suspected Ṣādiq Ḥasan Khān of concentrating around him all these "subversive" Islamic ideologies, especially given his close relations with Arab countries. Ṣādiq Ḥasan Khān was ultimately removed from the office of Chief Secretary of Bhopal state. Apart from propaganda pamphlets, Ṣādiq Ḥasan Khān's writings do not bear any mark of originality; they are all heavily influenced by the writings of Ibn Taymiyya and al-Shawkānī.

Ṣanāʿullāh Amristari (1868–1948)[31]

Ṣanāʿullāh was born in 1868. Six years after his birth, he lost his father. His mother died when he was fourteen years old, from which time he lived with his older brothers and helped them in their work of sewing and embroidery. Given the family's poverty, he could not go to school; it was only when the financial situation of his brothers improved that he began to attend school. After receiving a rudimentary education with various local teachers, he went to Delhi to study under Nadhīr Ḥusayn. He was not satisfied to study only from the Ahl al-Ḥadīth *ʿulamāʾ*, but wanted to learn from the *ʿulamāʾ* of the various Sunnī schools, particularly the Ḥanafīs, as well as Sufi *ʿulamāʾ*. This was still possible at that time, before the Ahl al-Ḥadīth grew in importance, became radicalized, and conflicts between them and other religious groups increased.

After Delhi, Ṣanāʿullāh went to study at Deoband and, in Kanpur, at the Madrasa Faiz-i ʿĀmm. This *madrasa* was, at that time, one of the few schools (*madāris*) that taught disciplines such as physics, mathematics, logic, English, etc. Logic was his favorite discipline. He would later use it perfectly in disputes (*munāẓara*) with representatives of various religious denominations such as Christian missionaries, those of the Arya Samaj, and the Ahmadiyya. Though he studied English, his knowledge of this language remained rudimentary. After the *madrasa*, he attended Punjab University. He then took another path, that of a publicist-*munāẓir*. He began to challenge the Arya Samaj, the Aḥmadīs, and the Christian missionaries in public disputations (*munāẓara*). In 1900, he founded the monthly *Musalmān*, which lasted until 1947.

In 1903, he founded the magazine *Ahl-i Ḥadīs*, which was published until 1947. The aim of this publication was to defend and to propagate the doctrine

31 Riexinger, *Sanāʿullāh Amritsarī*.

of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth movement and to respond to attacks from opponents of the movement, such as Arya Samaj, the Baralwī (a Sufi group), the Deobandi *ʿulamāʾ*, the Aḥmadīs, and the Christian missionaries. The magazine also published *fatwa*s, answers to questions from readers, and small articles to popularize some scientific questions. Ṣanāʿullāh left a large body of writings, among them many pamphlets and articles which were written in reply to or to attack opponents of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth and their doctrine. But the most controversial of Ṣanāʿullāh's writings was his commentary on the Qurʾān. This book made him unpopular in India for a long time, even among some of his colleagues in the Ahl al-Ḥadīth movement. At the same time, it was popular in the Middle East and among famous non-Indian *ʿulamāʾ*, such as Rashīd Riḍā. After his opponents tried unsuccessfully to discredit him through King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and the Saudi *ʿulamāʾ*, Ṣanāʿullāh established close relations between the Indian Ahl al-Ḥadīth and the Wahhābīs. He supported many aspects of the modernization policy of King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, such as modern education and training and the king's decision to form agreements with the Anglo-American Oil Company. After the partition of India and the creation of the state of Pakistan in 1947, Ṣanāʿullāh migrated there, where he died after just a few months, on 15 March 1948.

The Doctrine of Ahl al-Ḥadīth as Reflected by These *ʿUlamāʾ*

The discussion initiated by the *ʿulamāʾ* discussed in this chapter revolves around which *ʿaqīda* (doctrine) should be considered authentic. According to these *ʿulamāʾ*, the traditional Islamic speculative theology (*kalām*) with its schools (Ashʿariyya, Muʿtazila, Qadariyya, Jabariyya, Māturīdiyya, etc.) should be rejected in favor of an *ʿaqīda* based solely on the Qurʾān and the *ḥadīth*. For them, the works of Ibn Taymiyya and his student Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya are the ideal references. They condemn the blind imitation (*taqlīd*) of the doctrines of the four founders of the *madhāhib* and recognize these founders only as great *ʿulamāʾ* who practiced *ijtihād* (effort of judgment) and who may be right or mistaken about this or that question. Therefore, they call the faithful to comply (or *ittibāʿ*, *iqtidāʾ*) only with what the Qurʾān and the *ḥadīth*s require, because to comply with anything other than that is to practice a *bidʿa*. According to Hunwick, some *ʿulamāʾ* like Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī went so far as to encourage every Muslim to practice *ijtihād* by measuring each scholar's recommendation against the authority of the *naṣṣ* (Qurʾānic or *ḥadīth* text).[32]

32 Hunwick, "Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī," pp. 145, 147, 149.

In fact, this focus on the texts as the only authority and the rejection of anything else as *bidʿa* has been a recurring theme throughout the history of Islam. The movement initiated by Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya, to which these *ʿulamāʾ* of al-Ḥaramayn (Mecca and Medina) largely refer, is the latest of these movements in Islam. What is new, I believe, can be summarized in the following points. (1) The study of *ḥadīth* as the focused discipline of the movement. (2) The protagonists of the eighteenth-century al-Ḥaramayn movement formed a network of cosmopolitan *ʿulamāʾ* from around the Muslim world; this network was based on people who had studied together in Medina and then spread their disciplines in their home regions (West Africa, North Africa, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Yemen, Iraq and Syria). (3) The emergence of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth in India and elsewhere and that of the Salafiyya of Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb in the Arabian Peninsula, whose repercussions are still heavily felt today in the Muslim societies is new. (4) Another movement that originated among these *muḥaddithūn* of al-Ḥaramayn is what Fazlur Rahman described as neo-Sufism,[33] personified later in Ibn Idrīs and his school (*madrasat Ibn Idrīs*)[34] and also known as the Muḥammadiyya *ṭarīqa*. This has branched into various other orders, in particular the Sanūsiyya[35] in North Africa and the Sudanese Mirghāniyya. With renewed focus on studying *ḥadīth*s and the doctrine that formed around it (rejection of *taqlīd*, *madhāhib*, and *bidaʿ*), as well as the emphasis on the practice of *ijtihād*, etc., Sufism was forced to reform, especially because many *muḥaddithūn* were also Sufis. Proponents of this reform of Sufism wanted to eradicate the ecstatic aspect of Sufi practices and the metaphysical aspect of Sufi thought, as exemplified in the pantheism of Ibn ʿArabī (i.e., *waḥdat al-wujūd*, or union of the substance, identifying God and the world), and replace these views with the mystical union with the spirit of the Prophet Muḥammad. This is the origin of the emergence of the con-

33 Rahman, *Islam*, pp. 194–195, 206–209; on neo-Sufism, see also Voll, "Hadith Scholars and Tariqahs"; Bernd Radtke, "Ijtihād and Neo-Sufism," *Asiatische Studien* 48 (1994), pp. 909–921; Radtke, "Kritik am Neo-Sufismus," in *Islamic Mysticism Contested: Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics*, ed. De Jong and B. Radtke (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 163–173; R.S. O'Fahey and Bernd Radtke, "Neo Sufism Reconsidered," *Islam* 70 (1993): 52–87.

34 Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Yaḥyā, *Madrasat Aḥmad b. Idrīs al-maghribī wa-atharuhā fī l-Sūdān* (Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1413/1993); R.S. O'Fahey, *Enigmatic Saint: Ahmad Ibn Idris and the Idrisi Tradition* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990).

35 Knut S. Vikor, *Sufi and Scholar on the Desert Edge, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Sanūsī and his Brotherhood* (London: Hurst and Company, 1995); J.L. Triaud, *La légende noire de la Sanûsiyya: une confrérie musulmane saharienne sous le regard français (1840–1930)* (Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1995).

cept called *ṭarīqa muḥammadiyya*,[36] or sometimes *madhhab muḥammadiyya*; in sum, this means that Muslims should follow only the *ṭarīqa* or *madhhab* that adheres to the sayings and the deeds of Muḥammad. This new concept of Sufism is in line with the creed of Ahl al-Ḥadīth, who called on Muslims to follow only the strict example of Prophet Muḥammad. Many Sufi orders in the eighteenth century, especially those founded by the disciples of Aḥmad Idrīs al-Maghribī (such as the Sanūsiyya and Khatmiyya/Mirghanīyya) began to put the Prophet Muḥammad, not the founding Shaykh, at the center of their institutions, such that any *silsila* (chain of transmission) began with Muḥammad, passed through a number of shaykhs, then linked him to the founder of the *ṭarīqa*. The specific litany (*wird*) of each *ṭarīqa*, which the founding shaykh normally wrote by hand, came to be presented by the founders and followers of the Muḥammadiyya orders as given directly by Prophet Muḥammad to the founder of the *ṭarīqa*, either in their dreams or while awake. Aḥmad al-Tijānī, in making this claim to have taken the Tijāniyya litany from Muḥammad, went so far as to forbid all members of his order from joining another order at the same time. By this, he meant that his *ṭarīqa* was the only true Muḥammadiyya order. This shows how the concept of the *ṭarīqa muḥammadiyya* was travestied and emptied of the original meaning that it had at the time of the reform of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of al-Ḥaramayn and Aḥmad Idrīs. So we can say that today the *ṭuruq* founded by the disciples of Aḥmad Idrīs and the other *ṭuruq muḥammadiyya* that derive from the eighteenth-century *muḥaddithūn* movement of al-Ḥaramayn do not differ very much from other "traditional *ṭuruq*." The true legacy of the eighteenth-century *muḥaddithūn* of al-Ḥaramayn is the Salafiyya doctrine of Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and that of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of India.

A Brief Political History of the Hijaz in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries[37]

Since the Arabs were under the authority of the Ottomans (sixteenth century), the Hijaz was also under that authority. This lasted until 1916, when the

36 See, among others, Harlan Otto Pearson, "Islamic Reform and Revival in Nineteenth Century India: The ṭarīqah-i Muhammadiyah" (PhD thesis, Duke University, 1979).

37 Among the references in European languages on this subject are William Ochsenwald, *Religion, Society and the State in Arabia: The Hijaz under Ottoman Control, 1840–1908* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984); Ochsenwald, *The Hijaz Railroad* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1980); Gerald de Gaury, *Rulers of Mecca*

Arabs, under the leadership of Sharīf Ḥusayn of Mecca with the support of the British, rebelled against the Ottomans, only to fall under the yoke of the British and the French. The Hijaz was not seriously affected by the secular reforms initiated in Istanbul and in other regions under Ottoman rule, rather the influence of religion on politics remained predominant. The Hijaz was ruled by two political leaders at the same time: the Turkish Ottoman *valī* and the Arab *amīr* of Mecca. The latter was chosen by the Ottomans from the clans of Mecca who claimed descent from the Prophet Muḥammad. Two clans established themselves as providers of *'umarā'* (sing. *amīr*): the Dhaw ʿAwn and the Dhaw Zayd. In theory, the *valī* was to deal only with political affairs and the *amīr* with religious affairs. In reality, they both dealt with both political and religious matters. However, the *valī* of Mecca took precedence and enjoyed greater de facto power than the *amīr*.

In the first decade of the 1800s, when supporters of the Āl Saʿūd conquered the Hijaz, including the two holy cities of Mecca and Medina, the Ottoman governor of Egypt, Muḥammad ʿAlī Pasha, succeeded in driving the supporters of Āl Saʿūd out of the Hijaz, thereby preserving the prestige and religious legitimacy of the Ottomans as protectors of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina and so of the *ḥajj* (pilgrimage to Mecca). In this way, Muḥammad ʿAlī Pasha ruled the Hijaz on behalf of the Ottomans from 1811 to 1840, but by 1840 his ambition and the dissatisfaction of the population of the Hijaz led to his removal by the Ottomas, who then assumed power directly. There were periodic rebellions and riots, which the Ottomans were able to neutralize. In Istanbul, the pace of reform accelerated, along with the move toward secularization. The constitutional revolt of 1908, which brought down the sultan of the time, strengthened the forces who favored secularization. The revolt also coincided with the nomination of Sharīf Ḥusayn as the new *amīr* of the Hijaz. Sharīf Ḥusayn, encouraged by the British, took advantage of the weakening of the empire to advocate for the emancipation of the Hijaz and other Arab regions from the Ottoman Empire. The Arab Revolt of 1916, led by Sharīf Ḥusayn and T.S. Lawrence, put an end to Ottoman power in the Hijaz. The fact that the Ottomans allied with the Germans against the British and the French in World War I (1914–18) eventually brought the final blow to the empire. In 1924, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk proclaimed the Turkish Republic and finally buried the Ottoman Empire.

In the Arabian Peninsula, King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who had already conquered the Najd, began his conquest of the Hijaz. The conquest was completed in 1926, Sharīf Ḥusayn was ousted and King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz dominated all the territories that Saudi Arabia occupies today.

(London: Harrap, 1951); Saleh al-Amr, "The Hijaz under Ottoman Rule, 1869–1914" (PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 1974).

Educational Institutions Founded in the Hijaz by the Ottomans and the Ashrāf

Besides the private schools such as the Dār al-Ḥadīth and Madrasat al-ʿUlūm al-Sharʿiyya, known as *madāris ahliyya* (community schools or non-governmental schools), there were also some *madāris* that had been founded by the Ottomans and the Ashrāf of Mecca, but these were insufficiently funded and consequently had very low standards. The *madāris* established by the Ottomans in the two holy cities of Mecca and Medina were particularly shunned by natives because of their emphasis on learning Turkish rather than Arabic. The people of the Hijaz did not want to support what they called the "Turkization of the Arabs" (*tatrīk al-ʿarab*), as was said at that time. In addition, parents feared that enrolling their children in Ottoman schools would lead to military service in the Ottoman army. This fear was not without foundation, since most children who attended these schools became officials and otherwise served close to the center of Ottoman power.[38]

Between 1900 and 1916, that is to say during the last period of the Ottoman rule in the Hijaz,[39] the Ottomans established only a small number of public schools in Mecca, Medina, and Jedda. For example, they established in each of these three cities a school structured on three levels: *ibtidāʾī* (elementary) for three years; the *rushdiyya* level (lit., 'maturity,' equivalent to middle school) for three years; and the *iʿdādī* level (preparatory) for three years. The authorities also established a technical school, an agricultural school, and a teacher training school.[40] Around 1900, the Ottomans founded in Medina a *madrasa iʿdādiyya* whose level corresponded to that of the secondary schools in Istanbul. The staff and the teachers were almost all Turks sent from Istanbul. The school taught religious matters (*al-ʿulūm al-dīniyya*), secular subjects (*al-maʿlūmāt al-madaniyya*), Arabic, Turkish, Persian, algebra, Islamic and Ottoman history, geography, mathematics, and geometry.

In 1327/1909, the Dār al-Muʿallimīn (teacher training institute) was established; it enrolled all those who had just finished their education at the *madrasa iʿdādiyya*. The Dār al-Muʿallimīn trained the teachers who later taught in various governmental primary schools. The languages of instruction in the Dār al-Muʿallimīn were Turkish and Arabic. The state gave

38 See Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Shāmikh, *al-Taʿlīm fī Makka wa-l-Madīna. Ākhir al-ʿAhd al-ʿuthmānī* (Riyadh: Dār al-ʿUlūm, 1402/1982), pp. 33 and 81–82.

39 In the Hijaz, Ottoman power ended in 1334/1916, except in Medina where it continued until 1337/1919.

40 al-Shāmikh, *al-Taʿlīm fī Makka wa-l-Madīna*, p. 27.

students a small scholarship, but because these Turkish governmental schools remained unpopular (parents preferred private schools, *madāris ahliyya*), the Dār al-Muʿallimīn was forced to close its doors. Some of those who completed their training at the Dār al-Muʿallimīn later continued their studies at the Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī College (Kuliyya Ṣalāh al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī) in Jerusalem, at the Madrasat al-Sulṭāniyya in Damascus, or at one of the institutions of higher education in Istanbul. Even with Ottoman scholarships to students who had completed their *iʿdādiyya* studies, travel to Istanbul remained unpopular. But, as mentioned above, the real reason for refusing was their rejection of Turkish hegemony over the Arabs—a refusal to accept the Turkization of the Arabs (*tatrīk al-ʿarab*).[41]

The practice of the state sending delegations (*biʿthāt*, sing. *biʿtha*), or groups of students to continue their education in order, on their return, to participate in national development had a long tradition in the Ottoman Empire and in the Egypt of Muḥammad ʿAlī Pasha. The Saudi state under ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz continued this tradition. For example, the first school founded in Mecca, in 1355/1936, was the Madrasa Taḥḍīr al-Biʿthāt—a school specifically to prepare student delegations to study abroad. At that time, the delegations were mainly sent to Egypt; later they were sent to Europe and America, largely thanks to state funding made possible by the wealth gained from oil exploitation.[42]

In 1337/1918,[43] Sharīf Ḥusayn conquered Medina and drove the Ottomans from the city. In 1338/1919 in Medina the sons of Sharīf Ḥusayn opened four preparatory schools (*taḥḍīriyya*), namely al-ʿAbdaliyya, al-Fayṣaliyya, al-Zaydiyya, and al-ʿAlawiyya—named after the sons of Sharīf Ḥusayn. These schools lasted only two years. Some time later, the Ashrāf opened a public elementary school named al-Madrasat al-Ibtidāʾiyya al-Rāqiya, which operated on a four-year

41 Ibid., pp. 77–78.

42 See Abkar, *Turāth Makka*, pp. 113–114.

43 In this year, the soldiers of Sharīf Ḥusayn, commanded by his sons, prepared to fight the Ottoman military in Medina under the command of Fakhr Pasha, whose defense strategy involved emptying the city of its inhabitants (who sought refuge in Turkey, Egypt, Syria, and other parts of the Hijaz). The city suffered greatly for a long period. On the 5th of Rabīʿ al-Awwal 1337/1918, Fakhr Pasha and his soldiers withdrew from Medina and the sons of Sharīf Ḥusayn took control of the town almost without firing a shot. A few years later, in 1344/1925, the Ashrāf were, in turn, forced to leave Medina after having been surrounded for more than ten months by the armed forces of King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. See ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ Badr, "al-Ḥayāt al-thaqāfiyya fī l-madīna al-munawwara fī ʿahd al-malik ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz," *al-Madīna al-Munawwara*: *Majallat markaz buḥūth wa dirāsāt* [al-Madina al-Munawwar: Research and Studies Center Journal] 22 (Rajab 1428/Aug.–Oct. 2007): 57–96.

model. Children who had completed two years in one of the four preparatory schools (*taḥḍiriyya*) were enrolled. The financial difficulties these schools faced prompted people to open private schools (*madāris ahliyya*), similar to a small number that existed before the Ashrāf conquered Medina.

It was in this context that the Indian Deobandi scholar, Shaykh Aḥmad al-Fayḍ Abādī, founded the Madrasat al-ʿUlūm al-Sharʿiyya in 1341/1922 with financial support from donations given by pilgrims (*ḥujjāj*) from India and other countries. Some time later, officials in Medina forced Aḥmad Abādī to close his *madrasa* because they suspected, rightly or wrongly, that this school was propagating the doctrine of the Salafiyya. Aḥmad Abādī wrote to Sharīf Ḥusayn and personally requested that he reopen the *madrasa*; Sharīf Ḥusayn accepted and the *madrasa* was reopened. After 1344/1925–26, the year in which the Āl Saʿūd drove the Ashrāf from Medina, the Madrasat al-ʿUlūm al-Sharʿiyya (supported by the new government) expanded until it became the most important educational institution in Medina, along with the Dār al-Ḥadīth and the Mosque of the Prophet.

The reign of the Āl Saʿūd, which began in Medina and its region in 1344/1925–26, inaugurated a policy of public education through the creation of two institutions, the Madrasa Āmīriyya (later named al-Madrasat al-Nāṣiriyya) and the

ILLUSTRATION 10
Madrasat al-ʿUlūm al-Sharʿiyya and its founder Shaykh Aḥmad al-Fayḍ Abādī, photo from *ʿTayyiba wa dhikrayāt al-aḥibbaʾ, by Aḥmad Amīn Ṣāliḥ Murshid, p. 61, vol. 1, 1416/1995; courtesy of the Library of Dār al-ḥadīth in Medina.*

Madrasat al-Manṣūriyya.[44] In the first were gathered all the students who had been enrolled in the four schools established by the Ashrāf. The second was a primary school (*ibtidāʾī*).

Nation-State or Umma-State: *ʿUlamāʾ* Support of the Saudi State

In the writings of these scholars, one is struck by the lack of discussion of politics. At the very least, however, there are some passages relating to the European colonization of Africa. In his book *Riḥlat al-ḥajj* [Travel account to Mecca], the Mauritanian Āb Wuld Ukhtūr (Muḥammad al-Amīn al-Shinqīṭī) mentions in passing only two political issues: one related to the legitimacy of Israel's existence and the other on what a group of Muslims should do if a political leader of a group (the *amīr*) sides with an invader of their country. In one text, the Tuareg Shaykh Ḥammād al-Anṣārī refers to the story of the emigration of the Tuaregs to the Hijaz after the French colonization of the Tuaregs' land. We know that Shaykh Alfā Hāshim's life, from West Africa until his death in Medina, was intertwined with politics, yet he left no substantial writing on the subject, except one on the emigration of Aḥmad b. Ḥāj ʿUmar (*Hijratu Aḥmadu*) with his soldiers, from Nioro (Mali) to northern Nigeria after the battles he fought against the French. Although Shaykh ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ifrīqī left Mali for the Hijaz after an argument with a Islamophobic French colleague of the colonial administration, he did not problematize this issue in his writings. Yet for a long time (probably until his death) he remained under the surveillance of the French intelligence services, who suspected him of converting West African pilgrims (*ḥujjāj*) to Wahhābism and instigating them against the French colonial power after their return to West Africa. Of all the scholars discussed in this book, the one who wrote on politics was Shaykh Taqī l-Dīn al-Hilālī. His references are almost entirely criticism of the European colonial power. That said, we can nevertheless be certain that these scholars all opposed the establishment of the colonial state in their region. This is the reason they made the *hijra* to Mecca and Medina and settled there as *mujāwirūn*.[45]

---

44 In the word Nāṣiriyya there is an implicit reference to Nāṣir (lit. the Helper, i.e., the Āl-Saʿūd) and in the word Manṣūriyya there is an implicit reference to Manṣūr (lit. the rescued, i.e., Medina).

45 To be in the neighborhood of the main mosque in Mecca (*masjid al-ḥaram*) and of the Prophet's Mosque in Medina (*masjid al-nabawī*).

They followed the Qur'ānic verse that says that he who takes refuge in Mecca will be saved.[46] They did not want to live under the power of non-Muslims.

They could not have anticipated the sort of political powers they would meet in the Hijaz. Once they arrived, they were law-abiding citizens who complied with all of the various people in power. They understood how much power in the Hijaz (and in the whole of Arabia) fell under the control of the English. They did not, it would seem, advocate the establishment of one state for the whole Islamic *umma*, but they did expect that at least the land of the holy cities of Islam should remain immune from the power of infidels; it was not and they were surely distressed by this. But since the Hijaz was their last refuge, they adopted a low profile, and banned all political discourse to focus only on the activity of teaching Islam in its Wahhābī version, a version they adhered to.

With Ibn Saʿūd's successful conquest of the Hijaz in 1926, he positioned himself and his kingdom as defenders of all Muslims and their interests all over the world. He agreed (or rather pretended to accept) the idea of making Mecca and Medina a territory under the authority of all Muslim states, an idea that was especially propounded and defended by Indian Muslims.[47] The first advisers and close associates of Ibn Saʿūd came from Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and other parts of the Muslim world. For example the Egyptian Ḥāfiẓ Wahba was for many years the chief councilor of Ibn Saʿūd as well as minister and envoy plenipotentiary of Saudi Arabia in London. Yūsuf Yasīn, the head of the *dīwān* and personal secretary of Ibn Saʿūd, was a Syrian from Latakia. Fūʾad Ḥamza, who organized the ministry of foreign affairs, was a Druze from Lebanon.[48] He was the first assistant of ʿAbdallāh Damlūjī, the deputy of Amīr Faiṣal, the foreign minister, viceroy, and governor of the Hijaz.

Likewise, the early scholars who supported the politico-religious project of Ibn Saʿūd came from outside the Arabian Peninsula, and included the Egyptian scholars of the Anṣār al-Sunna movement founded in 1926 by Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqqī and the scholars of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth in India. For the scholars from West Africa, these were signs that indicated that the political and religious project of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was not just a project of the people from Najd alone, but a project of all Muslims. This thesis was reinforced by the fact that, some time after their arrival, they obtained Saudi citizenship. In

46 "wa man dakhalahu kāna āminan.", (3: 97).

47 Philby, *Arabian Days*; Martin Kramer, *Islam Assembled: The Advent of Muslim Congresses* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), especially chap. 10: "The Fate of Mecca. The Congress of the Islamic World 1926," pp. 106–122; Wahba, *Jazīrat al-ʿarab*, pp. 286–299.

48 H.C. Armstrong, *Lord of Arabia: Ibn Saud. An Intimate Study of a King* (London: Arthur Barker, 1934), p. 25.

addition, each was invested by the Saudi government as a representative of his community. For example, when a Mauritanian or a Tuareg wanted to settle in Saudi Arabia, he had first to seek (and receive) both the support of Shaykh Muḥammad al-Amīn al-Shinqīṭī and that of Shaykh Ḥammād al-Anṣārī, who would declare themselves guarantors of the person (*kafīl*). At that time, newcomers who spoke Arabic were likely to obtain a residence permit and even very quickly Saudi citizenship, if they wanted.

Perhaps the Islamic conference in Mecca hosted by Ibn Saʿūd and representatives of the Muslim world to decide the future of the Hijaz and the two holy cities of Islam illustrates better than anything else how King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz succeeded in presenting his political project as a project of all Muslims.[49] Indeed after Jedda surrendered to Ibn Saʿūd forces on 23 December 1925, the conquest of the Hijaz that was launched in 1924, first in Taif then in Mecca, was considered complete. Shortly before, Ibn Saʿūd had accepted the idea suggested by Ḥāfiẓ Wahba to hold a conference in Mecca with representatives of all the Muslim world to decide the future of the Hijaz. But, on 7 January 1926, Ibn Saʿūd issued a decree canceling the conference, ostensibly because the Muslim representatives had not responded to the idea of the Islamic conference. On the same day, i.e., 7 January 1926 and in the same decree, Ibn Saʿūd declared himself *Maliku al-ḥijāz wa-sulṭān najd wa-mulḥaqātuhā* (King of the Hijaz and Sultan of Najd and its region). After the heads of state of Egypt, Turkey, and Iran, and representatives of the Muslims of India, Indonesia, and elsewhere criticized this fait accompli, Ibn Saʿūd reversed his decision and agreed to hold the Islamic conference in Mecca under the condition that his power and his administration of the Hijaz not be called into question. In the month of May 1926 after the *ḥajj* (actually 20/11/1344), the conference was held in Mecca, but without any positive results. According to Ḥāfiẓ Wahba, the conference failed because of "the lack of agreement on the demands of the foreign delegations participating in the conference among each other, on the one hand, and between them and the representatives of Najd, on the other."[50]

49 On this conference, see Kramer, *Islam Assembled*, pp. 106–122; Reader Bullard, *Two Kings of Arabia: Letters from Jeddah 1923–25 and 1936–39* (Reading, UK: Ithaca Press, 1993), p. 104; Philby, *Arabian Days*, p. 22; Wahba, *Jazīrat al-ʿarab*, pp. 286–299.

50 Wahba, *Jazīrat al-ʿarab*, p. 296.

Maʿhad al-Riyāḍ al-ʿIlmī (Riyadh Institute of Islamic Religious Sciences)[51]

This institute was established in Riyadh in 1950/1370. It was officially inaugurated in 1371/1951 by Crown Prince Saʿūd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (then the minister of education) together with Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Āl al-Shaykh Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, chief of the *ʿulamāʾ* (*raʾīs al-ʿulamāʾ*). One should bear in mind that when the government created the Dār al-Iftāʾ (Office of fatwas) in 1373/1953, it appointed Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhim Āl al-Shaykh to serve as *muftī* of the country. When the office of chief judge (*riʾāsat al-quḍāt*) was established in 1376/1956, he was appointed in this capacity for Najd, the north region, and the east region. After the death of Shaykh ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥasan Āl al-Shaykh in 1378/1958, who had been chief of the judges (*raʾīs al-quḍāt*) in the Hijaz and in the western region (*al-manṭiqatu al-gharbiyya*), his functions were transferred to Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Āl al-Shaykh, who become the de facto chief of all the judges of the kingdom of Saudi Arabia (*raʾīs quḍāt al-mamlaka al-ʿarabiyya al-saʿūdiyyat*).

In his article,[52] Shaykh Ḥamad al-Jāsir wrote that in 1369/1949 he (as secretary general of the ministry of education) delivered a report to Prince Saʿūd (then minister of education) proposing the establishment in Riyadh of an institute (*maʿhad*) that would have three departments, one for religious studies (*qismun li-l-takhaṣṣuṣ al-dīnī*), another for training secondary school teachers (*qismun li-l-muʿallimīn*), and a third to prepare delegations of students to be sent to study abroad (*qismun li-l-biʿthāt*). Prince Saʿūd supported the project, but first wanted the agreement of Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm. The latter gave his consent, for, as Ḥamad al-Jāsir wrote, he also was thinking of realizing such a project in Riyadh. He wanted to make Riyadh a training center for *ʿulamāʾ*, especially since young people from Riyadh and the Najd in general went in large numbers to the Hijaz to study, particularly in the al-Ḥaram Mosque in Mecca or in the Maʿhad al-Saʿūdī, which had just been created by the new regime. Shaykh ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥasan Āl al-Shaykh, chief judge and head of religious affairs in the Hijaz and in the western region,[53] encouraged young

51 The sciences in question here are those of the *sharīʿa* (*ʿulūm al-sharʿiyya*), such as *tafsīr* (the commentary of the Qurʾān), the teaching of *ḥadīth*, etc. On the history of this institute, see, among others, Rashīd, *al-Shaykh ʿAllāma Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm*; al-Jāsir, "Fī maʿhad al-Riyāḍ al-ʿilmī," p. 21.

52 Ḥamad al-Jāsir, "Fī maʿhad al-Riyāḍ al-ʿilmī".

53 In the Hijaz and in the Western Region (*al-manṭiqa al-gharbiyya*), he filled this position until his death in 1958/1378. Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm fulfilled the same functions

people to come to study in the Hijaz. He appointed them *imām*s and preachers in mosques or incorporated them into the morals police (*hay'at al-amr bi-l-maʿrūf wa-l-nahy ʿan al-munkar*). Shaykh ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥasan's strong commitment to spreading Islamic education in its Wahhābiyya form in the Hijaz was supported by the political efforts of the governor of Hijaz at the time, Prince Faiṣal b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, the most politically active of all the sons of King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and later the third king of Saudi Arabia. However, even if these young people recruited by Shaykh ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥasan propagated the Wahhābiyya-Salafiyya, a doctrine that originated in the Najd, the concentration of efforts in education in Hijaz reinforced the tradition of Islamic knowledge and teaching in this region, which had long been the center of Islamic knowledge and its transmission in the Arabian Peninsula. Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm wanted to reverse this trend and make Riyadh, too, a center of Islamic learning.

At the time, the only educational center in Riyadh (and probably in the Najd) was the mosque of Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm's uncle and master, al-Shaykh ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Āl al-Shaykh. The latter was the head of the *ʿulamā'* of Najd and Arabia when ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz took power. Shaykh ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Āl al-Shaykh was a great scholar of *ḥadīth*, a specialty in which he had been trained at length in India. This mosque called Masjid al-Shaykh (Shaykh Mosque) was and still is in the district Dukhna (Ḥayyu Dukhna) in Riyadh. Shaykh ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf, the highest religious authority under King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, advised the latter to appoint in his place after his death his nephew and pupil Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm. Thus, after the death of the uncle, the nephew, then aged only twenty-eight, was appointed chief of the scholars (*raʾīs al-ʿulamā'*) in the country. He took on all the responsibilities that his uncle had held, in particular teaching in his mosque. He used to teach there from morning to night with only a few interruptions for the five daily obligatory prayers and for a short rest in his house, which was close to the mosque.

Thus, the opening of the Maʿhad al-Riyāḍ al-ʿIlmī in Riyadh was the beginning of education with modern methods (*al-taʿlīm al-niẓāmī*) in Riyadh and in the whole Najd region. Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm appointed his brother Shaykh ʿAbd al-Laṭīf b. Ibrāhīm Āl al-Shaykh Institute Director and Shaykh Ḥamad al-Jāsir Assistant Institute Director. Shaykh Ḥamad al-Jāsir recalls that in reality Prince Saʿūd wanted Ḥamad al-Jāsir to become the director of the institute and the brother of Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm's assistant,

---

in the Najd, the Eastern Region (*al- manṭiqa al-Sharqiyya*), and in the Northern Region (*al-manṭiqa al-shimāliyya*). After the death of Shaykh ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥasan Āl al-Shaykh, his functions were transferred to Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm. Thus, the latter became chief judge (*raʾīs al-quḍāt*) and head of religious affairs of all Arabia.

but apparently the latter wanted his brother to become the director. Shaykh Ḥamad al-Jāsir notes that he was not really eager to become the deputy director, because he wanted to be the director. But he accepted the agenda of Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, whom he respected very much. Shaykh Ḥamad al-Jāsir tells how one day he was invited by Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm to his home to ask him, in the presence of his brother, to agree to direct the institute together with the latter. Shaykh Ḥamad al-Jāsir accepted the proposal; then a few days later, Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm sent him on mission to Cairo to look for teachers, books, and other materials for teaching in the institute. He made contact with al-Azhar University and took inspiration from its curriculum. Thus, al-Azhar University was the main source of inspiration for the Maʿhad al-Riyāḍ al-ʿIlmī (as well as for the Islamic University of Medina later). The institute had three levels: preparatory (*tamhīdī*), secondary (*thānawī*), and a higher level of specialization (*al-qism al-ʿālī*). The institute also accepts a few blind students. Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm had become blind at the age of fourteen. His famous student and successor in the office of *muftī*, Shaykh Ibn Bāz, also went blind at an early age. During the first year it was open, the institute had 300 students. Each student of the institute received from the state a monthly stipend of 262 Saudi riyals, a significant sum at the time.

The program of the institute was continually changing, both in terms of the content of the subjects and of the books used. The focus of the teaching has remained the same until now, namely the religious sciences of Islam and Arabic (*al-ʿulūm al-dīniyya wa-l-ʿarabiyya*). Attempts have been made to introduce other specialties, but these have failed, given the resistance of the country's conservative *'ulamā'*. Shaykh Ḥamad al-Jāsir mentions a reform proposal for the institute made by the Arab League in 1953, but it was not accepted. Indeed, a delegation from the Arab League visited the institute in 1373/1953 and sent a report with recommendations to reform the teaching program of the institute. The report proposed the following main points.

1. Dividing the higher level of specialization into three different branches that would be appropriate for the needs of civil servants in the country at the time. The first branch would focus on religious studies and studies of the Arabic language. The second would be devoted to educational and teaching methods. The third would train civil servants for the state administration. These civil servants would therefore have to gain basic knowledge in management, administration, accounting, economics, and business.

2. Adding algebra and natural sciences to the high school curriculum. Thus, students would acquire, in addition to theoretical knowledge, practical skills that would prepare them for daily life. Ḥamad al-Jāsir added that Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm "did not want to change anything whatsoever that has

not been endorsed by his fellow *ʿulamāʾ* of the country. In most cases, they were not favorable to including modern sciences."[54]

The institute quickly opened similar small institutes, first in Najd and then in other regions. Thus, in 1372/1952, a branch (*farʿ* pl. *furūʿ*) of the institute was opened in Burayda with 120 students for the first year. Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm appointed Shaykh Muḥammad al-Nāṣir al-ʿUbūdī as director of this institute in Burayda; he later became the first secretary general (*amīn al-ʿāmm*) of the Islamic University of Medina, a position he held until the 1980s. Then he became deputy secretary general of the World Islamic League. Similar institutes were opened in ʿUnayza in 1373/1953 and in Shaqrāʾ, Mujmaʿa, Ṣāmiṭa, and al-Aḥsāʾ in 1374/1954. Other institutes opened in the following years in other cities of the kingdom.

To ensure that the graduates from these institutes could receive a higher education, in 1373/1953 the state opened a Faculty of Sharīʿa (*kulliyyat al-sharīʿa*) in Riyadh, a Faculty of Arabic Studies (*kulliyyat al-lugha al-ʿarabiyya*) in 1374/1954, and the Higher Institute for Judicial Education (*al-maʿhad al-ʿālī li-l-qaḍāʾ*). Students who had finished their studies in the Maʿhad al-Riyāḍ al-ʿIlmī and its branches could continue their studies in one of these three institutions. The two faculties mentioned above later became the core of the University Imām Muḥammad b. Saʿūd al-Islamiyya in Riyadh. When King Faiṣal officially established the Hayʾat Kibār al-*ʿulamāʾ* (Council of *ʿulamāʾ*) of the kingdom in 1389/1969, he appointed Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm president of this institution. When the Muslim World League (Rābiṭat al-ʿĀlam al-Islāmī) was founded in 1379/1959 and the Islamic University in Medina in 1961/1381, Shaykh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm was named the first head of these two institutions. This shows how important his power, his authority, and his services were to the state. To this day, no later Saudi scholar has had such broad powers.

54 al-Jāsir, "Fī maʿhad al-Riyāḍ al-ʿilmī," p. 22.