close of this century. The Ismā'īlīTE coup d'etat, thus, dealt a severe blow at the development of the study of al-Hadith in Sind and this meant the abrupt end of the first stage of the growth of the study of al-Hadith in India.

The second stage began with the accession of the Shāfi'īTE Māmūd al-Ghaznawi (388-421 A.H.). Under him and his successors, Lahore became a seat of al-Hadith, which turned out, among other Muḥaddithūn, Imām al-Ṣaghānī al-Lahūrī (d. 630) who was one of the greatest Traditionists and the philologists of his age. His rôle as a Traditionist has been appraised in its proper place. Suffice it here to say that as the author of the Masḥīq al-Anwār and the editor of the text of the Ṣaḥīh al-Bukhārī as we have it in the present form and phraseology in the Muslim countries of Asia, al-ṣaghānī has left an enduring name.

With the foundation of the Delhi Sultanate in 602/1206 Hadith literature in India entered into its third stage of development. The early centuries of the Turkish rule in India, particularly the seventh and the eighth centuries, were the age of the Fuqaha' who were so preoccupied with the function of Qaḍa', the administration of justice, that they did not think it worth their while to spread the teaching of Hadith in the newly-founded Muslim kingdom of India. Nor did they generally appear to have borne in their hearts any soft corner for the Apostolic Traditions. In those gloomy days of Hadith literature in India, the Ṣaḥī scholars of the eminence of Shaykh Zakariyya al-Muhārī (d. 666), Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā' (d. 725), Yahyā al-Manṣūr (d. 782) and Shihāb al-Hamadānī (d. 786) came forward to study Hadith literature and introduced it among the disciples of their respective Khānqahs. Thanks to their deep and abiding interest for Hadith, the teaching of the Ṣaḥīh Sittat came in vogue in some of the Khānqahs of Northern India in the course of the 8th century of the Hijra. It is, however, a fact that so long as India's cultural relation remained confined to Central Asia, the study of al-Hadith could not make any tangible progress in India. The Central Asiatic countries, particularly Transoxiana, Khorasan and al-عراق, were in those days the home of Fiqh and Maqūlāt. As India was conquered by the soldiers of Central Asia so was it influenced by the best brains of that region. Moreover, to administer justice as provided for by Islamic Shar'īa, the Fuqaha' were in great demand in the growing Muslim empire of India, whereas the Muḥaddithūn had no such scope. Hence the former, namely, the Fuqaha', found in India a rich and covetable soil which the latter, namely, the Muḥaddithūn, did not. As a result, the Delhi Sultanate was early thronged with Fuqaha' from Central Asia. In fact, with the exception of 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Ardbihī, no Traditionist worth the name was found to have migrated to India during the pre-Renaissance period.

The fourth stage of the study of al-Hadith in India, which we have termed as the Renaissance period, commenced early in the 9th century with the opening of India's cultural relation with Arabia by the sea after the independent Muslim kingdoms of the Bahmanis in the Deccan and the Muṣafarshāhīs in Gujarāt had been set up. Thus was re-established after a lapse of four hundred years India's cultural relation with Arabia, which had remained suspended as a result of the Ismā'īlīTE coup d'etat in Sind. Now, with the coming of Traditionists from al-Ḥijāz and Egypt, Hadith literature became widely diffused in India towards the middle of the 10th century. The result was remarkable and phenomenal. Henceforth, Indian Traditionists were found in the services of Hadith literature as teachers, translators and compilers simultaneously in India and al-Ḥijāz—a state of things that continued until the foundation of the Dā
al-'Ulūm at Deoband and the Maẓāhir al-'Ulūm at Sahāranpūr at the end of the 13th century A.H. The Dār al-'Ulūm and the Maẓāhir al-'Ulūm, be it noted, marked the dawn of the modern progressive era of the culture and cultivation of the Science of al-Hadith in India. Hitherto, Muslim India had no such centralized institution for higher studies in the subject, and the Indian students had to go abroad to al-Hijaz for specialization in al-Hadith. These two great institutions have, thus, supplied the Indian Muslims with a long-felt desideratum and have made them independent and self-supporting so far as the study of Hadith literature is concerned.

PART I

INDIAN TRADITIONISTS IN INDIA
CHAPTER I

THE ADVENT OF THE ŞAHABA IN INDIA

Al-Hadith might well have been introduced into India by the Şahaba, the Companions of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (on whom be peace and blessings of Allah) themselves, had ‘Umar, the Second Caliph, allowed the enterprising Arabs who invaded India in 23/643 by land and sea to conquer the country during his Caliphate. There were, of course, important factors which, as we shall presently see, reacted on his decision regarding the Indian campaign. Although since then the frontiers of India were subjected to sporadic Arab raids, no serious attempt for territorial conquest was made until the time of the Umayyad Caliph Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik (86-96/705-15) during whose Caliphate the conquest of Sind came about.

India, therefore, cannot be regarded among those Muslim lands where Ḥadith was transmitted orally by the Companions themselves. But, fortunately for us, it was at least visited by some of these torch-bearers of Ḥadith, whose association with India it will be our humble endeavour in the following pages to trace. With that end in view, we propose to outline the early Arab expeditions to India.

CALIPHATE OF ‘UMAR [13-23/635-43]

India was invaded by the Arabs for the first time during the Caliphate of ‘Umar. In 23/643 a campaign under al-Ḥakam b. ‘Amr al-Taghlibi advanced as far as the Indus while, in the same year, naval expeditions were launched on the coast of West India. These military operations of the Arabs did not result in any
permanent territorial conquest as they had to be called off quite abruptly by the orders of the Caliph.

While directing 'Utba b. Ghazwān, a Companion of the Prophet, 1 to proceed towards Ubulba (modern al-Zašra) in 14/634, Caliph 'Umar observed, "Islam should occupy a place in the land of al-Hind." 12 In his reference to 'ārd al-Hind,' the Caliph had apparently Ubulba in mind, because in his days it was known by the name of al-Hind." Henceforth, the Arabs advanced steadily towards India reaching the Indus Valley in 23/643.

The victory of the Arabs in the battle of Nihāwand (21/641) could not make them masters of the Sassanide empire, nor was it decisive in bringing about the final collapse of the Government, although it dealt a severe blow to the power of Yazidīr III. 4 As a result, the central authority became weak and the Marzubāns or the provincial governors assumed independence.

Apprehending that the fugitive emperor might in future rally round him his scattered forces and take a stand against the Arabs, Caliph 'Umar, at the suggestion of Aḥnaf b. Qais, 7 thought it necessary to conquer the independent provinces and, thus, remove the last vestiges of the Sassanide empire. Accordingly, in 21/641, 8 he ordered a general mobilization of soldiers in Persia under the leadership of the Companions. Thus Aḥnaf b. Qais 7 was directed against Khurāsān; Mujaṣṣi' b. Mas'ud al-Sulami, 7 against Ardshīr Khurra and Shāpūr; 'Uthmān b. Abī l-Āṣ al-Thaqafi, 7 against Iṣṭakhr; Sāriya b. Janīm al-Kinnānī, 7 against Kirmān; Aṣīm b. 'Amr al-Tamīmī, 7 against Sijestān and al-Ḥakam b. ‘Amr al-Ṭaghlibī, 7 against Mukrān. 7

The first direct move towards India was made in 21/641. With a division of soldiers that attained fame in the battle of Nihāwand, ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Utbān, a Companion of the Prophet, 8 marched against Isphān, a south-eastern city of the Jībal province. 9 A fierce fighting took place near the city in which the veteran Persian general, Shahriyār, was killed. Meanwhile, reinforcements from al-Ahwāz under Abū Mūsā al-As'arī 7 arrived at Isphān. The Persians were routed. Having declared the whole province a protectorate under the Arabs, a treaty was concluded with Fājūfān, the governor of Isphān, to

matter of fact, after the victory of Nihāwand the Caliph 'found that Yazidīr would give him fight every year and that the affair would not improve so long as the fugitive emperor was allowed to remain in Persia' (vide Tabārī, i, 2634). So, the object of the mobilization, obviously, was to strike a death-blow at the power of Yazidīr, and for this the year 17/639 appears to be premature. Moreover, the order of 17/639 was to reconquer (muṣāf) Fāris (mod. Arābān in Persia) and not to concentrate troops on the provinces of Eastern Persia as Tabārī would have us believe (i, 2584-69). To reconcile between these two dates, Ibn al-Athīr (Tarikh al-Kāmil, ed. Egypt, 1301 A.H., vol. ii, p. 273; vol. iii, pp. 8-9) states that the orders were issued in 17/638 but were not executed till 21/641 or 22/642. Ibn Khaldūn (Tarikh, ed. Egypt, vol. iv, p. 152) supports Ibn al-Athīr. Considering the caution of 'Umar and the implication involved, the year 17/638 appears to us to be improbable.

2. Ibid., vol. ii, p. 55.
3. Ibid., vol. i, p. 402.
4. Ibid., vol. i, p. 217.
6. Ibid.
whom the conquered territory was restored.  

Shortly after, 'Abd Allah advanced to the province of Kirmân. Marching on the outskirts of the Great Desert, 3 he joined the forces under command of Suhail b. 'Adî who had already been on his way to Kirmân. 4 Thus strengthened, the Arabs launched an attack upon the province in 23/643. True to their traditional chivalry, the natives backed by the hardy Balûṣ of the Qufs mountains, put up a stiff resistance against the invaders, but, being unable to withstand the thrust, they retreated. Dividing the forces into two parts—one under al-Naṣāir b. 'Amr al-‘Ijilî and the other under 'Abd Allah—the Arabs pursued the retreating natives and overran the territory. 5

Traversing through the eastern side of the Great Desert, 'Asîm b. 'Amr marched towards Sijistân. Later on, 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar joined him with reinforcements. Scarcely had the Arabs reached the frontiers of Sijistân, when the natives, realizing the futility of resistance, overtook by the dams of the Helmund. 6 This, too, was of no avail. The Arab soldiers took Zaranj, the capital, by storm and this weakened the morale of the people who came to terms. A treaty was made on the basis of regular payment of tribute provided that the Arabs did not lay any claim on the produce of the land. The Arabs are said to have most scrupulously abided by the terms of the treaty. 7

The difficulty to mobilize troops through mountainous regions appears to have been a handicap for further advance of the Arabs in this part of the country, and this was, perhaps, why they retraced their march and joined the army concentrated on the frontiers of Mukrân.

The Arabs employed a strong army led by several of the Companions of the Prophet, viz., 'Asîm b. 'Amr al-Hakam b. 'Amr al-Taghlibî, 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Uthîn and Suhail b. 'Adî against Mukrân which was then being ruled over by Râ'lî, 8 the king of Sind. The king in person commanded the army constituted by Hindu warriors with numerous elephants, 'which were being daily augmented by fresh arrival of men from that country' (Sind). 9 The Mukrânis, on their part, rose equal to the occasion—thus making the line of defence apparently impregnable. Nothing, however, could stem the tide of the Arabs. In their utter confusion caused by the lightning attack of the Arabs, the natives took to their heels. A hot pursuit followed for quite a number of days and the Indians were forced to beat retreat across the Indus. Thus the Arabs reduced the entire valley of the Lower Indus. 10

The Arab General al-Hakam sent Şuhr b. al-‘Abdi, a Companion of the Prophet, 11 to 'Umar with the message of victory and sought the Caliph's permission to proceed further into India by crossing the Indus. On an enquiry about the nature of the land by the Caliph, Şuhr described it thus: "Its plains are mountainous, water supply is scanty and dates are of inferior quality. The enemies are bold."

1. For different readings of this term, see Elliot, The History of India (London, 1869), vol. ii, p. 417; Raverty, Notes on Afghanistan (London, 1889), p. 568; Tabari, p. 2767, note i; Baladhuri, Kitab Fuṭûḥ al-Indûd, ed. by De Goeje (Leiden, 1866), pp. 306-402; 428-429, Murgotta, The Origins of the Islamic States being a translation of the Fatish al-Badîn (New York, 1924) Part ii, pp. 222 seq; Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History (Bombay, 1939) p. 173. (Hodivala is not, however, right when he states that the term occurred in the Arab chronicles since A.H. 43. For, we find it in Tabari (i, 2707) as early as the year 23/643-644).

2. Raverty, loc. cit.


4. See infra.
accruing from the land is little but its evil is enormous. A large army appears to be small there and a small one will be lost. Beyond that region worse awaits.\textsuperscript{11} Thereupon, the Caliph ordered the General not to make any further advance.\textsuperscript{3} The progress of the Arabs was, therefore, arrested beyond the Indus.\textsuperscript{3}

Though the campaign was abandoned it resulted in their discovery of a land-route to India through the Mukrán coast.

The first and the earliest naval expedition of the Arabs to India was directed against Thana, a sea-port near Bombay. \textquoteleft Uthmán b. Abí 1-`As al-Thaqafl, a Companion of

1. Tabari, loc. cit.
2. Ibid., p. 2708.
3. The following verses (Tabari, vol. i, p. 2708) attributed to the General al-Hakam, state, in clear terms, that the Arabs overran the region up to the Indus which they called Mukrán (cf. Yaqut, vol. iv, p. 207) and that if the Caliph did not forbid, they would have crossed the river to penetrate farther into India.

3. \textquoteleft Uthmán al-Thaqafl accompanied the delegation from Taif that waited upon the Prophet in Ramadan, 9 December, 630, and embraced Islam. Although young, his fervour in the cause of Islam was applauded by Abú Bakr. The Prophet appointed him \textquotesingle Amīl of Taif. During the troubled days of Abū Bakr, \textquoteleft Uthmán al-Thaqafl played a conspicuous part and prevented his tribe, the Thaqi̱f, from apostasy. He held the governorship of various provinces with success and died in 61/671 or 62/672 at al-Balqa' where he had settled and where the celebrated al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110) learnt Ḥadīth from him (Tabari, Tārīkh al-Rasul wa'l-Nabī, ed. De Goeje, Leyden, 1879-88, vol. i, pp. 1068 seq.; Ibn Hajar, Isāba, Biblio. Indica, 1888, vol. i, pp. 1998 seq.; Tabrīzī, al-Dhahāfi Asmā' al-Riḍā, Lithographed with Misbāh al-Maṣūbi, ed. Delhi, p. 600). Of the twenty-nine Sahīḥ transmitted by \textquoteleft Uthmán al-Thaqafl, three have been recorded in the Sahīḥ of Muslim (Saifi al-Dīn, Ruhāna Taḥdīth al-Kamāl, ed. Egypt, p. 120) and the rest, in the Sunna works (Isāba, loc. cit.).

5. ‘Abd al-Hayy Nadawi, Nushāt al-Khawāṣṣir (MS, in possession of Dr. ‘Abd al-Azīz M.B., B.S. of Lucknow) vol. i.

7. Elliot, History of India, vol. i, p. 416, has misread Mughra as Mughaira.
9. The popular date, i.e., 15 A.H. (637 A.D.), which has been generally quoted in connection with the early Arab invasion of India is, in fact, the date when \textquoteleft Uthmán al-Thaqafl, who sent the naval expeditions to India, is said to have been appointed governor of al-Bahrain and ‘Ummān (Baladhuri, loc. cit.).
Madā‘īnī. As the date of the Indian expeditions is contingent upon that of the appointment of ‘Uthmān al-Thaqafi in al-Bahraın and ‘Umar, it remains for us to ascertain the correct date of the appointment. That the above two versions of al-Baladhorī are incorrect can be seen from the statement of Ibn Sa‘d that until the foundation of al-Baṣra in 16 or 17 A.H.,1 ‘Uthmān al-Thaqafi was not transferred from Taif where he had been appointed ‘A’mil by the Prophet in 9/630. But when the necessity of a capable governor for the new city of al-Baṣra arose, the name of ‘Uthmān al-Thaqafi was suggested to Caliph ‘Umar who, however, did not pass orders for the transfer of a governor who had been appointed by the Prophet himself. Nevertheless, the Caliph had to yield to the popular demand. Accordingly, ‘Uthmān al-Thaqafi was sent to al-Baṣra after he had been replaced at Taif by his brother al-Hakam b. Abī ‘I-‘As al-Thaqafi.2 That the account of Abū Mikhnaf3 relating to the appointment of ‘Uthmān al-Thaqafi is erroneous, is also evident from the fact that ‘Ala‘ b. al-Haḍrami, who is said to have been replaced by ‘Uthmān in al-Bahraín and ‘Umar, did not die in 14 A.H. or in the beginning of the year 15 A.H., as asserted by Abū Mikhnaf. For, according to al-Ṭabarī, ‘Ala‘ b. al-Haḍrami, was ‘A’mil over al-Bahraín and al-Yamāma in 16/637,4 led a naval expe-

5. As for the account of al-Madā‘īnī (Baladhorī, 431) it seems probable that he derived it from his teacher Abū Mikhnaf and as such there is practically no difference of opinion between the two.
disaster for the Arabs. Who knows that they would not have been killed to a man? But as it is, nothing of the kind took place. As a matter of fact, they returned home (evidently with flying colours) with not a single soul lost, as is clear from the speech of the Caliph to 'Uthmân al-Thaqafî, who was responsible for the expedition. The Arabs did not proceed further, not because their arms were not victorious, but because they were not allowed to proceed by Caliph 'Umar himself. The reason for Caliph's action is not far to seek. An empire-builder and a statesman unparalleled in world history, Caliph 'Umar did not wish to play ducks and drakes with human lives. Once an expedition had been despatched, his sole concern was to send supplies for the strengthening of the forces of Islam; he instructed his Generals to keep him informed of the developments so that he might issue necessary directions. Thus every inch of ground that his soldiers gained was the outcome more of the strict adherence, on the part of the Generals, to the superb plan and method of the Caliph than of their individual skill and knowledge of strategy. Never did he venture upon an engagement which he could not reinforce with men and munitions regularly. This, perhaps, is the reason why, with all his military genius, the Caliph 'Umar fought shy of naval expeditions. The historical data given below will further clarify the point.

The Arabs were not as experienced in naval fighting as their counterparts, the Romans and the Persians, were. As a result, the naval expedition sent against Fâris proved unsuccessful. This was undertaken without the Caliph's sanction in 17/639 by 'Ala' b.