Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb: the Man and his Works

by

'Abd-Allāh Ṣāliḥ al-'Uthaymīn



Thesis presented for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy of the
University of Edinburgh

September, 1972.

Abstract

The modern state of Su'ūdī (Saudi) Arabia had its ideological foundations in a movement of religious revival initiated towards the middle of the 18th century by a Najdī scholar named Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb (1703/04-1792), and to the present day the doctrines of this reformer remain as the spiritual core of the state. The nature of these doctrines has often been misrepresented, in the East no less than in the West, attracting to itself the hostility which was inevitably aroused by the expansionist political power with which it was associated. The present work attempts to relate the teachings of the movement to the life of its founder, and to examine in detail all the works attributed to him in which these find expression. Those points of his doctrine which aroused controversy and opposition are fully discussed, and the conclusion is reached that it was as a reformer rather than an innovator that he should be regarded.

All the known materials relative to the period and the movement have been used, and particular attention has been paid to the social organization of Central Arabia at that time, showing in what respects it was influenced by the new doctrine and the forces which it released. Efforts have been made to locate manuscripts of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb's works in order to control the various texts in print, and a first tentative attempt at a chronology of these is made.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My grateful thanks are due to the University of Riyadh for its generous scholarship during my period of study as a bursary student at Edinburgh University.

I would like to express my gratitude to my advisors in the Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies, in particular to Mr. J. Walsh and Professor W.M. Watt for their encouragement, patience and advice during the period of preparation for this thesis.

Deep gratitude is also to all friends and colleagues for their help and co-operation, especially to Miss Catherine Halley, Sayyid ʿAbd-Allāh al-Ḥuyayd, Mr. Muḥammad al-Hadlaq and Mr. ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz al-Mānīʿ.

The work is indebted to the help and materials afforded by Edinburgh University Library, the British Museum Library and the School of Oriental and African Studies Library, as well as to Mrs. Williams for her patience in typing it.

Abbreviations

Asinna: al-Asinna l-Ḥidād fī Radd Shubuhāt ʻAlawī l-Ḥaddād, by Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥmān.

Bariyya: Fatḥ Rabb al-Bariyya bi-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥamawiyya, by Muḥammad al-ʻUthaymīn.

Burūq: al-Burūq an-Najdiyya fī Ktisāḥ aẓ-Ẓulumāt ad-Dajawiyya, by ʻAnd-Allāh al-Qaṣīmī.

Dalā'il: Dalā'il ar-Rusūkh fī r-Radd ʻalā l-Manfūkh, by ʻAbd-al-Laṭīf Ibn-ʻAbd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Ḥasan.

Ḍiyā': aḍ-Ḍiyā' ash-Shāriq fī Radd Shubuhāt al-Mādhiq al-Māriq, by Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥmān

Durar: ad-Durar as-Saniyya fī r-Radd ʻalā l-Wahhābiyya, by Aḥmad Zaynī Daḥlān.

EI[1]: Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st edition, Leiden, 1913-34.

EI[2]: Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd edition, Leiden and London, 1960, in progress.

Futūḥāt: al-Futūḥāt al-Islāmiyya Baʻd Muḍī l-Futūḥāt an-Nabawiyya, by Aḥmad Zaynī Daḥlān.

GAL: Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur, by Brockelmann.

Ghayāhib: Kashf Ghayāhib aẓ-Ẓalām ʻan Awhām Jalā' al-Awhām, by Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥmān.

Hadiyya: al-Hadiyya s-Saniyya wa-t-Tuḥfa l-Wahhābiyya n-Najdiyya, ed. by Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥmān.

Ḥawādith: Ta'rīkh Baʻḍ al-Ḥawadith al-Wāqiʻa fī Najd wa Wafayāt Baʻḍ al-Aʻyān wa Ansabi-him wa Binā' Baʻḍ al-Buldān, by Ibrāhīm Ibn-ʻIsā.

Intiṣār: al-Intiṣār li-Ḥizb Allāh al-Muwaḥḥidīn, by ʻAbd-Allāh Abū-Buṭayn.

JCAS: Journal of the Central Asia Society.

JRAS: Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Khulāṣa: Khulāṣat al-Kalām fī Bayān Umarā' al-Balad al-Ḥarām min Zaman an-Nabī 'alay-hi ṣ-Ṣalāt wa-s-Salām ilā Waqti-ha Hādhā bi-t-Tamām, by Aḥmad Zaynī Daḥlān.

Khiyār: Khiyār mā Yultaqaṭ min ash-Shi'r an-Nabaṭ, ed. by 'Abd-Allāh al-Ḥātam.

K.T.: Kitāb at-Tawḥīd alladhī huwa Ḥaqq Allāh 'alā l-'Abīd, by Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb.

Lam': Lam' ash-Shihāb fī Sīrat Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, by Ḥasan ar-Rubkī.

Majmū': ed. at the expense of 'Īsā Ibn-Rumayḥ.

MḤN: Majmū'at al-Ḥadīth an-Najdiyya, ed. by Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā.

Minḥa: al-Minḥa l-Wahbiyya fī r-Radd 'alā l-Wahhābiyya, by Dāwūd al-Khālidī.

Miṣbāḥ: Miṣbāḥ aẓ-Ẓalām fī r-Radd 'alā man Kadhab 'alā sh-Shaykh al-Imām wa Nasaba-hu ilā Takfīr Ahl al-Īmān wa-l-Islām, by 'Abd-al-Laṭīf Ibn-'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Ḥasan.

MRMN: Majmū'at ar-Rasā'il wa-l-Masā'il an-Najdiyya.

MSM: Majmū'at ar-Rasā'il as-Su'ūdiyya, ed. by 'Alī Ṣubḥ al-Madanī.

M.T.N.: Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd an-Najdiyya, ed. by Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā.

Rawḍa: Ta'rīkh Najd al-Musammā:Rawḍat al-Afkār wa-l-Afhām li-Murtād Ḥāl al-Imām wa Ta'dād Ghazawāt Dhawī l-Islām, by Ḥusayn Ibn-Ghannām.

Ṣawā'iq: aṣ-Ṣawā'iq al-Ilāhiyya fī r-Radd 'alā l-Wahhābiyya, by Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb.

Sīra: Mukhtaṣar Sīrat ar-Rasūl, by Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb.

Tawḍīḥ: Kitāb at-Tawḍīḥ 'an Tawḥīd al-Khallāq fī Jawāb Ahl al-'Irāq wa Tadhkirat Ulī l-Albāb fi Ṭarīqat ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, by Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-Allāh.

'Unwān: 'Unwān al-Majd fī Ta'rīkh Najd, by 'Uthmān Ibn-Bishr.

CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abbreviations	iii
Introduction	1
Survey of the sources	4

CHAPTER I

Central Arabia at the Advent of the Wahhābī Movement.

A.	Historical background	18
B.	Social life:	
	1. Urban dwellers	32
	2. Nomads	45
C.	Religious situation:	
	1. Scholars and education	51
	2. Beliefs and practices	55

CHAPTER II

Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb before the Alliance with Āl-Su'ūd.

A.	Family and birth	62
B.	Early life and studies	66
C.	His travels	70
D.	His stay at Ḥuraymilā'	84
E.	His move to al-'Uyayna and the first application of his doctrines	88
F.	Reactions and consequences	93

Page

CHAPTER III

Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb after the Alliance with Āl-Su'ūd

A. Āl-Su'ūd at ad-Dir'iyya 105

B. The Shaykh's move to ad-Dir'iyya and his alliance with Āl-Su'ūd 110

C. The expansion of Wahhābī doctrines and Su'ūdī influence 115

D. The Shaykh's rôle in the formation of the Su'ūdī state 143

CHAPTER IV

The Works of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd al-Wahhāb 151

CHAPTER V

Wahhābī Doctrines

A. Preface 212

B. Tawḥīd 221

C. Intercession 234

D. Visitation of graves and erection of domes 241

E. Takfīr and qitāl 249

F. Bid'a 260

G. Ijtihād and taqlīd 266

H. Imāma 275

I. Al-amr bi-l-ma'rūf wa-n-nahy 'an al-munkar 278

Conclusion 282

Bibliography 288

INTRODUCTION

It may be said that the existence of the modern state of Su'ūdī (Saudi) Arabia is to a great extent one of the results of the movement which was initiated by Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb towards the middle of the eighteenth century. The adherence of the early Su'ūdī rulers to his doctrines and their willingness to defend them by the sword were responsible for their success in extending and maintaining their influence over a great part of Arabia. Rentz[1] has already dealt with the historical aspect of the early period of the Wahhābī movement, and Sha'afy[2] has studied the administrative, military and economic features of the first Su'ūdī state. Winder's work is devoted to the history of the region in the nineteenth century.[3] The present study attempts to present the Shaykh as a man and a thinker, to analyze his numerous works and discuss the doctrines he preached.

It is surprising that the works of the founder of such an important movement have not yet been analyzed and studied in detail. The misrepresentation of his doctrines in the past must have been the reason for the misconceptions about

---

1. George Rentz, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb (1703/04-1792) and the Beginning of Unitarian Empire in Arabia, unpublished doctoral dissertation (Berkeley, 1948).
2. Muḥammad Sha'afy, The First Sa'ūdī State in Arabia (with special reference to its administrative, military and economic features) in the light of Unpublished Materials from Arabic and European Sources, unpublished doctoral thesis (Leeds, 1967).
3. Bayly Winder, Saudi Arabia in the Nineteenth Century (London, 1965).

them held by certain early scholars, such as De Sacy. It is a fact that certain Muslim scholars knew these doctrines very well and opposed them sincerely, but it is equally true that political motives played a great part in presenting a false picture of the Shaykh's teachings. A correct understanding of the Wahhābī position is only to be gained from the works of its own scholars, particularly those of the founder himself; and it is in comparison with the information found therein that the views and arguments of their opponents should be evaluated.

As the circumstances in which man lives and works are always influential in moulding his views and attitudes, a detailed study of Central Arabia before the rise of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb will be made in the first chapter. This includes an historical survey of the region, a description of the struggle between the city-states and tribes, the social situation, education, religious practices and beliefs. The second chapter treats of the Shaykh's family, his early studies, travels in search of knowledge, the beginning of his movement and the first reactions to it. Chapter III deals with the course of the movement after its alliance with the Su'ūdīs, describing the Shaykh's rôle in the new state and the final years of his life. The military aspects of the struggle of the Su'ūdīs with their adversaries do not directly concern the theme of this study and hence, only the most significant events of this nature are given attention. The fourth chapter examines the written works attributed to the Shaykh, describing them as to content and their significance in the Wahhābī doctrinal position. The fifth and final

chapter discusses the major points of doctrine which were matters of dispute between the Wahhābīs and their opponents.

The position Muḥammad Ibn-ʿAbd-al-Wahhāb held among his followers was such that when they said "the Shaykh" they meant him alone, and his descendants, too, are named Āl-ash-Shaykh. Therefore, it has been thought proper, as well as more concise, to refer to him thus in the present work. It should be noted, too, that "Wahhābiyya" is the name that was given to the movement by its adversaries and that its adherents always referred to themselves only as "Muwaḥḥidūn" or "Muslimūn". However, in recent years, they too have come to accept this designation, and it can be accepted as the familiar name; it is in this light that it is used here. With the exception of very important events, dates throughout have been given according to the Muslim calendar, it being felt that correspondence with Western chronology had little relevance to the subject in hand.

SURVEY OF THE SOURCES

A. Works in Arabic:

Attempts to record local events had been made by certain Najdī scholars before the rise of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. Among these were Aḥmad Ibn-Bassām (d. 1040), who composed a chronicle of the years 1015 to 1039 and Aḥmad al-Manqūr (d. 1125) whose work covers the years from 948 to 1125.[1] Their notes - for such they are rather than true history - throw some light on the affairs of Central Arabia. However, serious historical writing started after the advent of Wahhābism, which gave this region a new importance.

Ḥusayn Ibn-Ghannām (d. 1225) was the first local historian to write about the life of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb and of his alliance with the Su'ūdī family. He was a Mālikī scholar from al-Aḥsā', who had come to ad-Dir'iyya at the invitation of Su'ūd Ibn-'Abd-al-'Azīz to be a teacher of Arabic grammar.[2] It was during his stay in this town that he wrote his history, the first volume of which is entitled Rawḍat al-Afkār wa-l-Afhām li-Murtād Ḥāl al-Imām, and the second, Kitāb al-Ghazawāt al-Bayāniyya wa-l-Futūḥāt ar-Rabbāniyya wa Dhikr as-Sabab alladhī Ḥamal 'alā Dhālik. Both are published under the simple title, Ta'rīkh Najd al-

1. The dates of the deaths of both are to be found in the Ḥawādith, pp. 50, 90. Both works are included in the manuscript of 'Unawān al-Majd fī Ta'rīkh Najd, in my private possession.
2. Ḥamad al-Jāsir, "Mu'arrikhū Najd", Majallat al-Jāmi'a - University of Riyadh - III (1379) p. 42.

Musammā Rawḍat al-Afkār wa-l-Afhām li-Murtād Ḥāl al-Imām wa Ta'dād Ghazawāt Dhawī l-Islām.[1]

The first volume is divided into five chapters. In the first, the author speaks of the religious disintegration and the spread of polytheistic practices in Najd, al-Aḥsā' and the neighbouring countries before the Wahhābī movement. In the second, he gives information about the lineage of the Shaykh, his early activities and the reaction of contemporary scholars to his teachings. The third chapter is devoted to some of the Shaykh's letters to different people, while the fourth contains his answers to various religious questions submitted to him. The fifth chapter consists of the Shaykh's interpretation of certain Qur'ānic verses.

The second volume is concerned mainly with the military and political activities of the movement, though it also contains some polemical tracts on its doctrines.[2] It begins with an account of the events which led to the Shaykh's move from al-'Uyayna to ad-Dir'iyya in 1157,[3] and after describing his early activities there, it goes on to a detailed chronology

---

1. There are two manuscripts of this work in the British Museum, under Add. 23,344-5 and Add. 19,800. Another copy, written by the celebrated scholar Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥmān in 1304, is in my possession. It has been printed twice: (Bombay, 1319) and (Cairo, 1368). The last edition is the one used in the present work, and it is referred to as Rawḍa.
2. Rawḍa, II, pp. 20-44, 204-232.
3. Ibid., p. 4. Ibn-Bishr, however, mentions ('Unwān, p. 25) that this event took place in the following year.

of events, ending abruptly in the year 1212. It is known that he continued the history down to 1225, the year of his death, but the only known manuscript which contains this section is not yet available for study.[1]

In order to demonstrate his ability in Arabic, Ibn-Ghannām adopts a rhymed prose style, often using unfamiliar and archaic words, including verses of his own composition.[2] However, his work must hold first place in the study of the subject: he was contemporary with the events he describes and had personal acquaintance with the individuals involved. Although he was enthusiastic about the Wahhābī cause, he did not hesitate to describe the results of battles, whether won by the Su'ūdīs or their opponents.[3] Moreover, he includes in the first volume certain of the Shaykh's letters, answers to religious questions and his interpretations of certain Qur'ānic verses which are of paramount importance in revealing the circumstances in which many aspects of the doctrine were first expressed.

The still unpublished work (untitled) of al-Fākhirī

---

1. According to Ḥamad al-Jāsir (al-'Arab, XI, 1388, p. 1013), this manuscript, in which events down to the year 1225 are recorded, was presented to King 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Su'ūd.
2. Rawḍa II, pp. 67-68, 71-72, 86-88, 155-156, 190-192 and 237-242.
3. Ibid., p. 66.

(1186-1277) is also an important source.[1] He recorded the events between the years 850 and 1277, and his son continued the work down to 1288. Though organized chronologically, certain years are passed over without any event being recorded. For example, the author immediately jumps from the year 850 to 912 and from there to 928. In his writing, al-Fākhirī occasionally violates the rules of Arabic grammar and employs colloquial expressions.[2] His style is very concise, especially in the first part of the work, but as he proceeds he goes into rather more detail. Although reference is sometimes made to events in other countries, the work deals mainly with local matters. Its importance lies in the fact that it gives information about the region before the movement of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, and in his attitude towards the Su'ūdī state which is more neutral than that of Ibn-Ghannām and Ibn-Bishr.

However, the work which rivals the Rawḍa in importance is 'Unwān al-Majd fī Ta'rīkh Najd by 'Uthmān Ibn-Bishr (1210-

---

1. Muḥammad Ibn-'Umar al-Fākhirī was born in at-Tuwaym, a small town in Sudayr, in the year 1186. When his father died in 1222, he left this place with his family for al-Aḥsā' where he was to spend seven years. After returning to his native town for a time, he again left to go to Ḥarma where he remained until his death. See Ḥamad al-Jāsir, "Mu'arrikhū Najd", Majallat al-Jāmi'a, III, (1379), p. 43. The work used for this study is a photocopy of a manuscript in the possession of Muḥammad al-'Umarī. It consists of 70ff., each containing fifteen lines, and was copied by a certain 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Nāṣir.
2. Cf., for example, f.6 where he uses hathal as meaning "took refuge in villages", and f. 38 where he writes balaghū khamsūn instead of khamsīn.

1290).[1] He was interested in learning from his early youth and, therefore, left his native town Julājil in the region of Sudayr for ad-Dir'iyya, where many scholars were teaching at that time. In the year 1224, he attended the lectures there on Kitāb at-Tawḥīd given by the Shaykh's son Ibrāhīm. In ad-Dir'iyya he acquired the learning and scholarship which allowed him to compose works on various subjects.[2]

In his 'Unwān, Ibn-Bishr set out to record the events associated with the Su'ūdī rulers, with whom he had an intimate relationship, and the movement of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, from which, in his opinion, the true history of Najd started.[3] Accordingly, he commenced his work from the year 1158, when the Shaykh moved to ad-Dir'iyya and made an alliance with its chief Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd. However, he did not want to neglect the past entirely and, thus, he made brief notes of previous events which are introduced in various parts of the work. Each such event is described by the term sābiqa.[4]

---

1. One of the earliest manuscripts of this work, dated 1270, is in the British Museum, Or. 7718. Another copy, written by 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Salmān in 1314, is in my private possession. It was first published in Baghdad in 1328, and has since been reprinted many times. The last edition, which is used here, was made in Beirut, 1387.
2. 'Unwān, p. 88. Among these works are Suhayl fī Dhikr al-Khayl, al-Ishāra fī Ma'rifat Manāzil as-Sab' as-Sayyāra and Bughyat al-Ḥāsib.
3. Ibid., p. 15.
4. In the Beirut edition, these are collected together as a supplement.

The _'Unwān_ consists of two parts, the first of which ends with the year 1237. The second commences from the beginning of Turkī's reign in the following year and comes down to the end of 1267.[1] In his introduction, Ibn-Bishr states that the Najdīs did not in the past bother to write the history of their country, and he notes that even the events of the Su'ūdī state were not recorded, except for a very short work by Muḥammad Ibn-Sallūm.[2] This, however, is not entirely true, and in fact he himself must have used the work of al-Fākhirī for events before 1158. A comparison between the latter and the _sawābiq_ of Ibn-Bishr shows a very close similarity; the author of the _'Unwān_ actually quotes the words of al-Fākhirī when describing the destruction of ad-Dir'iyya in 1233.[3] Again, for the history of the Su'ūdī state it is most likely that the _Rawḍa_ was one of the main sources of Ibn-Bishr, though he does not refer to it. However, the fact that he studied in the place where Ibn-Ghannām used to teach, as well as the familiarity he shows with his other less important works, increase such a probability.[4] In addition, close examination of the texts of the _Rawḍa_ and the _'Unwān_ reveals the dependence of Ibn-Bishr on the former.

---

1. The two parts and the _sawābiq_ are edited in one volume, having continuous pagination.
2. _'Unwān_, p. 14. Ibn-Sallūm was born in al-'Aṭṭār in Sudayr in 1161. An opponent of the Wahhābīs, he left Najd for al-Aḥsā', whence he again moved to Iraq, where he died in 1246. Ibn-Bishr's is the only mention of this work.
3. _Ibid._, p. 209. Compare al-Fākhirī, f. 47.
4. _Ibid._, p. 144. The author mentions that Ibn-Ghannām wrote many books among which is _al-'Iqd ath-Thamīn fī Ma'rifat Uṣūl ad-Dīn_.

Still, the work of Ibn-Bishr holds an exceptional importance as a source for the history of Najd. In writing about the events of this region before the year 1158, especially those connected with Āl-Su'ūd, the author gives more detailed information than any historian. For the period that followed, he did not confine himself to the written sources - which, of course, he pretended did not exist, except that of Ibn-Sallūm - but used to ask the people who had participated in the events themselves.[1] Moreover, he recorded the events of the years between 1212 and 1267 which are not in the Rawḍa. Ibn-Bishr gives more accurate and pertinent information about the tribes, the income of the Su'ūdī state and its administration, etc., than Ibn-Ghannām. His style, too, is simpler and clearer than that of the latter, and because of this his work became the most popular history of Najd at that period.[2]

Another local annalist, Ibrāhīm Ibn-'Īsā (1270-1343), also supplies valuable information.[3] He wrote two works on the history of Najd; the first, called 'Iqd ad-Durar,[4]

1. Ibid., p. 15.
2. A study on this work, made by 'Abd-al-'Azīz al-Khuwayṭir, was published in Riyadh (1390) under the title 'Uthmān Ibn-Bishr: Manhaju-hu wa Maṣādiru-hu.
3. After studying for a while in his native town Ushayqir, Ibn-'Īsā made extensive travels, mainly in pursuit of knowledge, to al-Aḥsā', az-Zubayr, Basra and India. After his return, he taught in the mosque of his town, attracting many students. In 1342, he moved to 'Unayza where he died the following year. See the Introduction to Ḥawādith, pp. 17-18.
4. The complete title of this work is 'Iqd ad-Durar fī-mā Waqa' fī Najd min al-Ḥawādith wa-l-'Ibar fī Awākhir al-Qarn ath-

[Contd.

continues the story from the year in which Ibn-Bishr stopped until 1303, and the other, which is more important in relation to the present study, is entitled Ta'rīkh Ba'ḍ al-Ḥawādith al-Wāqi'a fī Najd.[1] In the latter, his aim was to give a brief account of events which had taken place in the region from 700 to 1340, including the deaths of certain prominent figures, their lineages and the establishment of various towns and villages. In writing this, he states that he relied on the works of certain Najdī scholars, such as Ibn-Bassām and al-Manqūr, as well as on oral accounts of contemporary people. Though he does not acknowledge such dependence, he must certainly have used the 'Unwān for most of the material in the Ḥawādith is taken from the sawābiq of Ibn-Bishr. The importance of Ibn-'Īsā's work is that it gives detailed information about the genealogy of some notable Najdī families, including the Wuhaba to which the Shaykh belonged.

The works of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb himself are, of course, mainly concerned with matters of doctrine and contain only incidental material of an historical nature.[2] The

---

Contd.] Thālith 'Ashar wa Awwal ar-Rābi' 'Ashar. It was published as a supplement to Abū-Buṭayn edition of the 'Unwān (Cairo, 1373).

1. The title of this work in full is Ta'rīkh Ba'ḍ al-Ḥawādith al-Wāqi'a fī Najd wa Wafayāt Ba'ḍ al-A'yān wa Ansābi-him wa Binā' Ba'ḍ al-Buldān. It was published and edited by Ḥamad al-Jāsir (Riyadh, 1386) and it is referred to here as Ḥawādith.
2. The works of the Shaykh are described in detail in the fourth chapter.

same may be said of the writings of other Wahhābī scholars of Najd, such as those included in Majmū'at ar-Rasā'il wa-l-Masā'il an-Najdiyya,[1] Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd an-Najdiyya,[2] and al-Hadiyya s-Saniyya wa-t-Tuḥfa l-Wahhābiyya n-Najdiyya.[3] However, as the discussion of the Wahhābī doctrine forms one of the main objectives of the present study, these works are of exceptional importance.

Najdī folk-poetry of the period, too, has something to offer in the illustration of certain events and traditions, and often provides a useful supplement to the works of the historians. The first volume of Khiyār mā Yultaqaṭ min ash-Shi'r an-Nabaṭ contains verses composed by various contemporary poets.[4]

1. This consists of four volumes which were published separately in Cairo in 1344, 1345, 1346 and 1349. It contains treatises by the Shaykh's son 'Abd-Allāh, his grandsons 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Ḥasan, Ḥasan Ibn-Ḥusayn and Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-Allāh, as well as works by 'Abd-al-Laṭīf Ibn-'Abd-ar-Raḥmān, 'Abd-Allāh Abū-Buṭayn, Ḥamad Ibn-Mu'ammar, Sa'īd al-Ḥajji and others. It is referred to here as MRMN.
2. This was edited by Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā (Cairo, 1346). It includes some of the Shaykh's works and rasā'il by his son 'Abd-Allāh and his grandsons Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-Allah and 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Ḥasan, as well as Qurrat 'Uyūn al-Muwaḥḥidīn fī Taḥqīq Da'wat al-Anbiyā' wa-l-Mursalīn by the latter, which is a commentary work on Kitāb at-Tawḥīd. It is referred to here at MTN.
3. This was edited by Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥmān, and it contains treatises by 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, 'Abd-'Allāh Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Ḥamad Ibn-Mu'ammar, 'Abd-al-Laṭīf Ibn-'Abd-ar-Raḥmān and his son Muḥammad.
4. This volume was published by 'Abd-Allāh al-Ḥātam (2nd edition, Damascus, 1387). It is referred to here as Khiyār.

The anti-Wahhābī viewpoint is represented by certain scholars and historians contemporary or near contemporary with the Shaykh. Chief among these were Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Yāsīn al-'Umarī and Aḥmad Zaynī Daḥlān. The first was the author of aṣ-Ṣawā'iq al-Ilāhiyya fī r-Radd 'alā l-Wahhābiyya,[1] a work important for two reasons: it is one of the earliest refutations of Wahhābism, and it reflects the local opposition shown by one of the Shaykh's own family.[2] Al-'Umarī wrote ad-Durr al-Maknūn fī Ma'āthir al-Māḍiya min al-Qurūn, a history starting from the first year of the Hijra and ending in 1228.[3] Though not important in respect of the Shaykh's life and doctrines, it is valuable in demonstrating the views of the Ottoman governors in Iraq during their struggle with the Su'ūdī rulers. Daḥlān in both al-Futūḥāt al-Islāmiyya and Khulāṣat al-Kalām gives intimate information about the struggle between the Sharīfs of Mecca and the Wahhābīs, writing from the viewpoint of the former.[4]

1. This work was published in Bombay, 1306, and it is referred to in the present study as Ṣawā'iq.
2. Although Sulaymān was for a long time hostile to his brother's doctrines, he was reported to have joined his movement later on. See below, pp. 133-4.
3. Al-'Umarī, who was born in Mosul in 1158, belonged to a distinguished family which had produced several scholars. A manuscript of his work is in the British Museum under Add. 23,312-3.
4. For the title of these two works in full see bibliography. The former was published in Mecca in 1302, comprising two volumes, and it is referred to here as Futūḥāt. The latter was printed in Cairo in 1305, and it is referred to as Khulāṣa.

In another of his works entitled Kitāb ad-Durar as-Saniyya, he tries to refute the doctrines of the Shaykh.[1]

Another work, not as hostile as these, Lam'ash-Shihāb fī Sīrat Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb has enjoyed a wide reputation. Its author has not been definitely identified, but it seems likely that he was a certain Ḥasan ar-Rubkī.[2] It is a history of the Wahhābīs from the beginning of their movement until the destruction of their capital ad-Dir'iyya by Ibrāhīm Pāshā in the year 1233. It is divided into five chapters and a conclusion. In the first, the author speaks of the Shaykh's genealogy and travels, much of his information being inaccurate. In the second, he describes his early activities and the consequences of the rise of his movement, and here too he is for the most part confused. In the third, he gives a lineage of Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, which is totally incorrect; and in the fourth he speaks of the government of the Su'ūdīs and certain of their campaigns. The fifth chapter is devoted to the Su'ūdī raids against the border regions of the Arabian Peninsula and their struggle with the Turko-Egyptian forces which invaded Najd. Here there are given

1. The complete title of this work is Kitāb ad-Durar as-Saniyya fī r-Radd 'alā l-Wahhābiyya. It was published in Cairo (1302), and it is referred to here as Durar.
2. The only known manuscript of this work is in the British Museum, Add. 23,346, which was written in 1233 by this individual. This, too, is the date of the compilation of the work, and it seems likely that the manuscript is the author's autograph. It was edited by Aḥmad Abū-Ḥākima (Beirut, 1967). It is referred to here as Lam'.

some useful details of the geography of the area and the territories of the tribes. Although the author makes many mistakes in his last two chapters when speaking about the origins of the tribes, he nevertheless gives some interesting information about the Su'ūdī rulers and the Shaykh's relatives which are not to be found in other sources. In the conclusion, he mentions certain doctrines of the Shaykh which he proceeds to refute. In addition to the inaccuracy which is so striking, especially in the first three chapters, the work lacks the dating of many events, and these have to be supplied from other sources. Though not markedly hostile to the Wahhābīs, the author of the Lam' cannot be described as being unprejudiced against them, as Abū-Ḥākima believes.[1] In fact, he considers the mission of the Shaykh as bid'a,[2] and the refutation of his doctrines is manifest proof of his lack of sympathy.

B. Works in European languages:

The first account of the Wahhābīs in a European language was made by Carsten Niebuhr in 1772. The author was the only survivor of the scientific expedition sent in 1760 by the King of Denmark to Arabia and adjacent countries. In his two accounts ~~Beschreibung v. Arabien~~ Travels in and Description de l'Arabie he gave the Western world its first introduction to the Wahhābīs, and these works were to remain the main source for

1. Abū-Ḥākima, History of Eastern Arabia (1750-1800) (Beirut, 1963), p. 10.
2. Lam', pp. 26-27.

many later writers.[1] The information he collected on the Wahhābī movement was, however, based on hearsay; for he was not able to reach the regions under its influence at the time of his journey. Although his description of the tribes and local traditions is interesting and valuable for the study of this period, his summary of the Shaykh's doctrines is totally inaccurate.

Corancez's Histoire des Wahabis, Rousseau's Description du Pashalik de Bagdad and Raymond's Memoire sur l'origine des Wahabys give interesting information about the Wahhābī attacks against the northern parts of Arabia in the first years of the nineteenth century.[2] However, they are practically worthless for the early period and, moreover, they contributed to the current erroneous notions about the doctrines of the Wahhābīs.

Scott Waring, in his Tour to Sheeraz, gives a brief account of the Wahhābīs, but his information is most unreliable; both the names of the leaders and activities of the movement are confused, as are his notes on its doctrines. The same can be said of Malcolm's History of Persia.

---

1. The first appeared in German, Copenhagen, 1772, and afterwards in French translation, Amsterdam, 1776-80. It was, also, translated into English by R. Heron, Edinburgh, 1792. The second was published in French, Amsterdam, 1774. For the full titles of both see the bibliography.
2. Corancez was a member of the Commission of Science and Art which was constituted in Egypt by Bonaparte, and Rousseau was the Consul of France in Baghdad at that time. Raymond, too, was in this city as a French official. For the full titles of their works see the bibliography.

The most reliable near-contemporary European account is certainly that of the Swiss traveller Burckhardt, who spent some time in the Hijaz during its occupation by Muḥammad ʿAlī of Egypt. Here, he learned as much as he could about the Wahhābīs by questioning the people he met, and in his two works: Travels in Arabia and Notes on the Bedouines and Wahábys, he shows a neutral attitude. In the latter, his exposition of the Wahhābī doctrines, administration of justice, revenues and military affairs is accurate and revealing. His description of tribal warfare and traditions is also indispensable.

Next to Burckhardt's works in importance is the account given by Sir Harford Jones Brydges, who was a British official in Basra, Kuwait, and Baghdad successively. His work A Brief History of the Wahaubys, which forms the second volume of his An Account of His Majesty's Mission to the Court of Persia in the Years 1807-11, is partly taken from Burckhardt's Notes and partly the fruit of his own observations during his stay in the area. It gives some valuable information, especially on the struggle between the Wahhābīs and their neighbours in Eastern and North-Eastern Arabia.

Later European travellers, such as Palgrave, Doughty, etc., came too late for their work to be regarded as important sources for the formative years of the Wahhābī movement under consideration here.

CHAPTER I

Central Arabia at the Advent of the Wahhābī Movement.

A. Historical background:

Najd, which forms the centre of the Arabian Peninsula, is divided into central, southern and northern districts. The central districts are al-'Āriḍ, al-Maḥmal, Sudayr and al-Washm. The main districts of the south are al-Kharj, al-Aflāj and Wādī ad-Dawāsir. In the north of the province lie the districts of al-Qaṣīm and Jabal Shammar.[1]

The region, as a whole, had lost a great deal of its political importance long before the 12th/18th century. After the Islamic expansion, al-Yamāma, which included, besides al-Kharj, parts of the central districts, maintained its position as the most prominent province of Najd. It was the seat of the rulers of the whole region, and these were usually appointed by the Caliphs. A notable figure among these rulers was Ibrāhīm Ibn-'Arabī al-Kinānī, who had been installed by 'Abd-al-Malik Ibn-Marwān.[2]

In the middle of the third century of the Islamic era, Ismā'īl Ibn-Yūsuf, a member of the 'Alawī family, led a rebellion among the nomads in the areas surrounding Mecca, the result of which was terrorist actions against the inhabitants of Mecca, Medina and Jidda.[3] He died soon after,

1. On geographical features of the region, see G. Rentz "al-'Arab: Djazīrat" and "al-'Āriḍ". EI^2.
2. Ḥamad, al-Jāsir, Madīnat ar-Riyāḍ 'Abr Aṭwār at-Ta'rīkh (Riyadh, 1386) p. 61.
3. Ibn-Khaldūn, Kitāb al-'Ibar wa Dīwān al-Mubtada' wa-l-Khabar, (Cairo, 1287) IV, p. 98.

in 252, and his brother Muḥammad, called al-Ukhayḍir, escaped to al-Yamāma. Here, he seized power and established an independent state, the governorship of which remained in the hands of his family for more than half a century.

The Ukhayḍirs suffered a decisive defeat at the hands of the Qarmaṭīs in the year 317,[1] which put an end to their effective rule in the area. Following this, Najd fell into the hands of numerous rulers, all of whom were subject to the supreme authority of the Qarmaṭīs.

The Qarmaṭīs, whose strongholds were in the eastern part of Arabia, had emerged as powerful groups towards the end of the third century of the Hijra. In the second half of the following century, they became weak. Al-Aṣfar, the leader of the Muntafiq tribe, won a great battle over them in 378,[2] after which they remained confined to their home territories in al-Baḥrayn.

Supported by the Seljūqīs, 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Alī al-'Uyūnī attacked the Qarmaṭīs in their strongholds of al-Aḥsā' and al-Qaṭīf, and in the year 467 conquered them and established his own rule.[3]

The dominion of the 'Uyūnīs over Eastern Arabia lasted for about 170 years. Although their influence was, at a certain time, felt in Najd, they do not seem to have exercised

---

1. Ḥamad al-Jāsir, Madīnat ar-Riyāḍ, p. 77.
2. Ibn-al-Athīr, al-Kāmil fī t-Ta'rīkh, (Leiden, 1863) IX, p. 40.
3. The 'Uyūnīs belong to the tribe of 'Abd-al-Qays. Much information about this family can be found in the poems of Ibn-al-Muqarrab (572-630), a member of the 'Uyūnīs. His Dīwān, edited by 'Abd-al-Fattāḥ al-Ḥilw, was published in Cairo, 1963.

an effective power in the region. In the thirties of the seventh century A.H. the last ruler of this family, al-Faḍl Ibn-Muḥammad, was not able to resist the challenge from Banū 'Uqayl and finally he had to relinquish his power.[1]

The sovereignty of the region passed from one family to another, and it was not until the second half of the 9th century that Āl-Jabr came to be distinguished among the rest of Banū 'Uqayl as a strongly ruling family. However, information about the rise of Āl-Jabr to leadership is very scant. What is known is that Sayf Ibn-Zāmil Ibn-Jabr seized power from Banū Jarwān. When he died, he was succeeded by his brother, Ajwad.[2] It was during the reign of the latter that the dominion of Āl-Jabr was fully established. He was described by as-Samhūdī[3] as: "the head of Najd and Sulṭān of al-Baḥrayn".[4]

Ajwad, a follower of the Mālikī rite, was renowned for his sympathy with scholars and for his encouragement of learning. His military strength can be seen from the large number of followers who used to accompany him on the occasion of the pilgrimage. It was estimated that 15,000 men arrived with him in Mecca in the year 893. This number was doubled

---

1. Muḥammad 'Abd-al-Qādir, Tuḥfat al-Mustafīd bi-Ta'rīkh al-Aḥsā' fī l-Qadīm wa-l-Jadīd, ed. by Ḥamad al-Jāsir (Riyadh, 1379), I, p. 177.
2. as-Sakhāwī, aḍ-Ḍaw' al-Lāmi' Li-Ahl al-Qarn at-Tāsi' (Cairo, 1353), I, p. 190.
3. Wafā' al-Wafā' bi-Akhbār Dār al-Muṣṭafā (Cairo, 1326), II, p. 288.
4. al-Baḥrayn, here, means the eastern parts of the present Su'ūdī Arabia and the island of Bahrain which was called Awāl.

eighteen years later.[1] The year 912 seems to have marked the zenith of the military power of the state; for not only was it able to protect its territories but, also, to come to the aid of others in order to settle their internal troubles. Immediately after the performance of the pilgrimage in this year, its forces, under the command of Muḥammad Ibn-Ajwad, arrived in Mecca in response to a request made by Sharīf Barakāt Ibn-Muḥammad, who had been troubled by the Bedouins in the adjoining areas.[2]

The military potency of Āl-Jabr and their influence are, also, asserted by Albuquerque, the leader of the Portuguese invaders, who mentions that the Jabrī dominion was, at a certain time, recognized over the Arabian littoral including parts of Muscat and Dhofar, as well as inland, as far down as the territories of the chief of Aden.[3]

Another distinguished ruler of Āl-Jabr was Muqrin Ibn-Ajwad, who witnessed the Portuguese invasion of his country and who died defending its territories in the year 927.[4]

---

1. al-'Iṣāmī, Simṭ an-Nujūm al-'Awālī fī Anbā' al-Awā'il wa-t-Tawālī (Cairo, 1380) IV, p. 305.
2. Anonymous, "Min Ta'rīkh al-Aḥsā'", al-'Arab, VII (1387), p. 605.
3. Miles, S.B. The Countries and Tribes of the Persian Gulf (London, 1919), p. 148.
4. Ibn-Iyās, Badā'i' az-Zuhūr fī Waqā'i' ad-Duhūr, ed. by Muḥammad Muṣṭafā (2nd edition, Cairo, 1380) V, p. 431. G. Rentz ("al-'Arab: Djazīrat", EI^2) is mistaken in stating that Muqrin was the uncle and successor of Ajwad; for Ajwad was apparently succeeded by his son, Muḥammad. On the other hand, Muqrin was the son - and not the uncle - of Ajwad.

Following the death of Muqrin internicine quarrels among Āl-Jabr, as well as the Portuguese attacks against their land weakened them in face of the challenge from Rāshid Ibn-Mughāmis and his supporters, to whom the sovereignty of the country passed in the year 932.[1]

The importance of the dynasty of Āl-Jabr to Najd was great, and their influence was felt in many parts of the region, despite the then rising power of Banū Khālid and Banū Lām.[2] It was their presence that seems to have prevented the Sharifs of Mecca from interfering in the affairs of Najd.

Reacting to the aggressive policy of the Portuguese towards Arabia, the Ottomans moved to protect the coasts of the Peninsula. The Hijaz entered officially under their dominion as a result of their conquest of Egypt which had supremacy over the region in Medieval times. During the reign of Sulaymān the Magnificent their influence extended to other parts of Arabia. After the establishment of their authority in the Hijaz, they advanced southwards and occupied the Yemen and Aden. At the same time they had been penetrating into Eastern Arabia from the Gulf. When Sulaymān the Magnificent took Baghdad in 941, Basra immediately offered loyalty. Embassies bearing homage and congratulations from the Arab chiefs of al-Qaṭīf and al-Baḥrayn were sent to him in the same year. Later, Muscat was occupied for a short

---

1. Muḥammad ʻAbd-al-Qādir, op.cit., I, p. 121.
2. Juʻaythin al-Yazīdī, in the praise of Muqrin says:
   wa Najd ḥamā rib ʻī zāhī falāti-hā
   ʻalā r-raghm min sādāt Lām wa Khālid.
   See Anonymous, "Min Taʼrīkh al-Aḥsāʼ", al-ʻArab, VII (1387), p. 607.

time, and an army under the command of Muḥammad Pāshā captured al-Aḥsā' in 963.[1]

The fall of al-Aḥsā' to the Ottomans seems to have had an impact on Najd which was now almost surrounded by territories under their influence. This was an advantage for the Sharifs of Mecca who appreciated the new situation which had arisen, and tried to exploit it for their own interests. Fortunately for them it was at that time, too, that strong personalities such as Abū-Numayy II held the power. Thus, they started raiding Najd; Ḥasan Ibn-Abī-Numayy penetrated into the heart of the region as deep as al-'Āriḍ, and attacked Mi'kāl, a part of the present city of Riyadh, in the year 986. Three years later, he again struck against places and strongholds in an area further south.[2] These raids continued sporadically throughout the 11th century A.H., affecting other districts of Najd.

It is to be noticed that the Sharifs directed their military operations, in general, against the inhabitants of

---

1. Muḥammad 'Abd-al-Qādir, op.cit., I, p. 121. Ibn Bishr ('Unwān, p. 392), who seems to have copied al-Fākhirī (f.4), makes two mistakes concerning this matter. He states that the Turks took al-Aḥsā' from Āl-Ajwad the Jabrīs in 1,000. In fact, the rule of Āl-Ajwad came to an end about 932, and the Turks must have taken this region before the date he gives. On the memorial stone of a mosque called Masjid ad-Dibs in al-Aḥsā', it is written that it was built by the governor of al-Aḥsā', Muḥammad Pāshā, in the year 963. Both Rentz in his thesis (p.6) and Philby (Saudi Arabia, London, 1955, p. 25) have followed Ibn-Bishr and made the same mistakes.
2. 'Unwān, p. 392. Compare al-'Iṣāmī, op.cit., IV, p. 368.

the Najdi towns or villages. Although the reason for these raids is not given, they were probably not motivated by any need to protect the pilgrims and caravan routes from people who were peaceful urban dwellers. The desire to obtain booty and impose a supreme authority over the region must have been the strongest motives of the Sharifs. Certain towns had to pay an annual tribute to the rulers of Mecca, who secured their interests by occasionally nominating local chiefs.[1] Failure to pay the fixed tribute or attempt at rebellion would usually be severely dealt with. When 'Unayza, for example, took the opportunity of disorders in the Hijaz to rebel in 1097, it was savagely reduced to obedience as soon as order had been restored at home.[2]

Judging by the huge size of the Sharīfī army reported to have been engaged in action against certain towns, together with the employment of cannon, the places attacked cannot have been weak or defenceless.[3]

Meanwhile, the power of Banū Khālid was increasing. During the 8th century A.H. this tribe was but a small clan living under the protection of Āl-Faḍl, which was a major

---

1. Muḥammad Ibn-Faḍl was appointed ruler of Mi'kāl in 986, and Rumayzān Ibn-Ghashshām amīr of ar-Rawḍa in the district of Sudayr in 1056. See 'Unwān, pp. 392, 402.
2. Ḥawādith, p. 70; Gerald de Gaury, Rulers of Mecca (London, 1951), p. 158.
3. Ibn-Bishr ('Unwān, p. 392), states that Ḥasan Ibn-Abī-Numayy was accompanied by 50,000 troops when he besieged Mi'kāl and that he used cannon in his attacks against the strongholds of al-Kharj, as-Silmiyya and al-Badī' in 939.

division of Banū Lām.[1] However, Banū Khālid seems to have acquired reasonable success in the struggle for power in the area, and it became independent from the protection of others towards the end of the 9th century A.H. Being a strongly developing force throughout the 10th century A.H. it attracted many groups, as well as individuals, from different tribes. As an example of these may be cited Āl-Mahāshīr, which belonged to Banū Ḥājir, and Āl-Qirasha which was from Banū Qaḥṭān.[2] Consequently, Banū Khālid became, during the 11th century A.H., a confederation of clans belonging for the most part to Banū 'Āmir, which had been the dominating power in the province of al-Aḥsā' since the decline of the 'Uyūnī dynasty in the 7th century A.H., and to which belonged Āl-Jarwān, Āl-Jabr and Āl-Mughāmis which had successively ruled the area.

As early as the first Sharīfī raids on Najd, the power of Banū Khālid was strong in the region and it was in a position to attempt a serious challenge to the invaders. Ḥasan Ibn-Abī-Numayy might have suffered a severe defeat on his return home in the year 989, had he not received information through his agents about the Khālidī preparations directed against him.[3] Under the leadership of Āl-Ḥumayd, the military strength of Banū Khālid became fully established in Eastern Arabia in the second half of the 11th century A.H.

Simultaneously, the influence of the Ottomans, who had already evacuated the Yemen, became weaker in Arabia due to

---

1. Banū Lām was divided into three main groups: Āl-Mughīra, Āl-Kathīr and Āl-Faḍl. See Ḥamad al-Ḥuqayl, Kanz al-Ansāb wa Majma' al-Ādāb (Beirut, 1387), p. 137.
2. Fu'ād Ḥamza, Qalb Jazīrat al-'Arab, (Cairo, 1352), p. 146.
3. 'Unwān, p. 392.

the problems facing the Empire at that time. Seizing this opportunity, Barrāk Ibn-Ghurayr, the chief of Āl-Ḥumayd, fell upon the garrison at al-Kūt and expelled the Turks from the whole province of al-Aḥsā' in 1080.[1] Thus, he became the ruler of the townsmen as well as the chief of the tribesmen of the region. Immediately after the consolidation of their dominion in al-Aḥsā', Āl-Ḥumayd started their attempts to spread their influence over certain parts of Najd. Barrāk attacked Āl-Nabhān near Sadūs in the year 1081,[2] and seven years later plundered Āl-'Assāf at az-Zulāl near ad-Dir'iyya.[3] The raids of Banū Khālid in Najd continued, and as their influence over parts of the region progressed, that of the Sharīfs of Mecca approached its end. Although the latter did not stop their raids on certain Najdī districts, these could not be carried out as formerly against the inhabitants of al-'Āriḍ apparently because of the Khālidī presence in the area.

A prominent figure of Āl-Ḥumayd was Sa'dūn Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Barrāk whose reign lasted from 1103 till 1135. Following his death, the ruling family was divided and struggles for the succession took place between his brothers, 'Alī and Sulaymān, and his sons, Dujayn and Munay'. The sons were defeated, and an attempt by Dujayn in the following year to seize power was unsuccessful. Although an agreement was soon

1. al-Fākhirī, f. 6; 'Unwān, p. 404; Ḥawādith, p. 62.
2. 'Unwān, p. 405; Ḥawādith, p. 64.
3. 'Unwān, p. 406.

reached, hostilities were renewed three years later when Dujayn, supported by the tribes of al-Muntafiq and aẓ-Ẓafīr, attacked al-Aḥsā'. However, the invaders were repelled.[1]

The rule of Āl-Ḥumayd was of particular importance for the people of al-Aḥsā', as well as Najd. Their leadership, which was both sedentary and nomadic in its composition, could supply the townsmen under their dominion with the protection customarily sought from the tribes. On the other hand, their rule of the oasis of al-Aḥsā', which had been a place of migration for the inhabitants of Najd when faced with severe droughts,[2] gave them control of the trade between Central Arabia and the Gulf where the Najdīs used the harbours of al-'Uqayr and al-Qaṭīf to import sugar, coffee, spices and other goods from India and the Yemen.[3] It was, also, their economic and political influence in al-'Āriḍ which put pressure on Ibn-Mu'ammar causing the expulsion of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb from al-'Uyayna, as will be seen in the following chapter.

However, the influence of Banū Khālid over parts of Najd and the power of the Sharīfs of Mecca over others did

---

1. Ibn-Bishr's report of these events is rather obscure; while mentioning (Ibid, p. 421) that Alī became the new ruler after Sa'dūn, he points out (p. 422) that the attempt of Dujayn in 1136 was made against his uncle Sulaymān which implies that the latter was in power at that time. On the other hand, he states (p. 424) that the other attempt of Dujayn was repelled by 'Alī.

   It is possible that Sulaymān was participating in the leadership or that 'Alī was away when Dujayn made his attempt in 1136 and the authority at home was in the hands of Sulaymān.

2. 'Unwān, pp. 406, 421.
3. Abū-Ḥākima, op.cit., p. 40.

not bring stability to the region. The bitter fighting between the Najdī towns did not cease, and the warfare among different tribes continued as ever. Besides droughts, hostilities forced weaker tribes to leave their territories. Throughout modern history, the general direction of the migrations of the tribes in the area seems to have been from the south, west and south-west to the north, east and north-east.[1]

Meanwhile, certain Najdī families had been consolidating their political and military power. The most notable of these was Āl-Mu'ammar at al-'Uyayna. The history of this family goes back to as early as the middle of the 9th century, when its ancestor, Ḥasan Ibn-Ṭawq, a member of Banū Tamīm, bought the place from Āl-Yazīd of the Ḥanīfa tribe, and took up permanent residence there.[2]

By the beginning of the 11th century, al-'Uyayna had achieved prestige throughout the whole region, and families from different districts found more opportunities of work and earning there than in their home towns or villages. A distinguished figure among these was Aḥmad Ibn-Bassām, who had been the Judge of Ushayqir and Malham respectively before

---

1. While large sections of Banū 'Anaza left the heart of Arabia for the north and Banū Muṭayr later migrated to the north-east, groups of Banū Qaḥṭān moved from the Hijaz and Tihāma into Najd and divisions of Banū 'Utayba and Banū Ḥarb shifted from the Hijaz to Central Arabia.
2. al-Fākhirī, f. 6; 'Unwān, p. 387.

he moved here in 1015.[1]

Feeling strong enough, Ḥamad Ibn-Mu'ammar penetrated the district of Sudayr, took ar-Rawḍa and expelled its chief, Rumayzān Ibn-Ghashshām, in the year 1052.[2] This, being a challenge to the authority of the Sharīfs of Mecca over the area, provoked a severe reprisal five years later when Zayd Ibn-Muḥsin went to ar-Rawḍa, killed its new ruler, and restored Rumayzān to power.[3]

Although the Sharīf plundered a group of the inhabitants of al-'Uyayna near Banbān in the same year, he did not attack their town itself, and the military strength of Āl-Mu'ammar does not seem to have suffered; it actually increased, and during the reign of 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Muḥammad (1096-1138) it reached its zenith. His generosity, combined with his political prestige and military power, encouraged poets from different districts to make their way to al-'Uyayna, hopeful of receiving his favour.[4]

---

1. Ḥawādith, p. 50. Ushayqir in the district of al-Washm was a flourishing town and a centre of learning in Najd during the 10th century. It was, also, a home town of prominent families such as Āl-Bassām, Āl-Musharraf and Āl-Ismā'īl to which many scholars belonged.
2. al-Fākhirī, f. 4.
3. 'Unwān, p. 401; Ḥawādith, p. 56.
4. Ḥumaydān ash-Shuway'ir, a native from al-Qaṣab, was among these. He was the most famous poet of his time in Najd, and was known of his satirical poetry composed in a simple style. Many Najdi towns and villages suffered his criticism. He died about 1160. See his long poem in praise of Ibn-Mu'ammar in Khiyār, I, pp. 111-113.

Although the rulers of al-'Uyayna were powerful and could carry out raids on other districts, they do not seem to have been in a strong enough position to expand and maintain occupation. Indeed, certain towns could challenge their ambition. Ḥuraymilā', for example, was able to show resistance and continue its military operations against other places. In the year 1096, it was attacked by Ibn-Mu'ammar, but shortly afterwards in the same year we find its people raiding and plundering al-Qurayna.[1] Two years later, Ibn-Mu'ammar repeated his attack and again Ḥuraymilā' was still able to play a major rôle in the invasion against Sadūs and the destruction of its stronghold.[2]

At the beginning of the 12th century negotiations between al-'Uyayna and Ḥuraymilā' were concluded. However, peace was broken when Ibn-Mu'ammar, with the inhabitants of al-'Āriḍ and Banū Subay', renewed his attacks on Ḥuraymilā' in 1121. This must have been incited by Banū Subay', which had been plundered by the people of this town and Ibn-Bujād three years earlier.[3]

'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Mu'ammar died in 1138 as a victim of the plague which hit al-'Uyayna causing the death of a large number of its inhabitants including, besides the great ruler, his son and some of the fighting men.[4] This coincided

1. 'Unwān, p. 409.
2. Ḥawādith, p. 71.
3. al-Fākhirī, f. 15; 'Unwān, p. 416.
4. Ibid., p. 422; Ḥawādith, p. 98.

with the internecine quarrels among the leaders of Banū Khālid, who were supporters of Āl-Mu'ammar at the time, following the death of Sa'dūn Ibn-Muḥammad. Thus, al-'Uyayna became weak, and this induced Zayd Ibn-Markhān, the chief of ad-Dir'iyya, to advance up the valley with a company of Āl-Kathīr and Banū Subay' to plunder the stricken place. But the new ruler, Muḥammad Ibn-Ḥamad, tricked Zayd and a party of his men into his castle, where his men shot Zayd down. The rest of the party escaped and fortified themselves in a strong position. Having been given safe-conduct, they left the area and returned home under the leadership of Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, who became the ruler of ad-Dir'iyya and later on, made an alliance with Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb.

B. Social life:

The Arabian peninsula is the cradle of the Arabs, who formed and still form the vast majority of its population. The Arabs, who are proud of the accuracy with which they have preserved their genealogies, are traditionally divided into two main groups, the Qaḥṭānīs and the 'Adnānīs. Sometimes, these two are referred to as the original Arabs and the Arabized Arabs, or the southern Arabs and the northern Arabs respectively. However, sections or individuals belonging to either group may, for certain reasons, join and assimilate themselves into a tribe from the other.

Although certain tribes have held social superiority, yet, all Arabian tribes are generally regarded as being intrinsically noble. The ability to demonstrate a pure

Arabian genealogy is of great importance, especially in intermarriages. Failure to do so makes it almost impossible for a man to marry the daughter of an Arab, whatever his career may have been. Indeed, there are many urban settlers who have not been able to trace their descent from Arabian tribes, and who are accordingly called "Khaḍīrīs" to be distinguished from the "Qabīlīs" whose original tribes are known. Yet in most anthropological features these "Khaḍīrīs" exhibit the characteristic of a distinctly Arab stock.

Outside these two divisions, there exist small minority groups who are certainly non-Arab in origin. They are mainly from two sources: pilgrimage and slavery. Although those from the former usually take residence in the sacred cities of the Hijaz, yet, a number of their artisans and tradesmen may also be found in other towns of Central Arabia.

According to their mode of life, the inhabitants of the region are divided into sedentary dwellers and nomads. Cases exist in which a distinct line between these two groups cannot be clearly drawn.

1. Sedentary dwellers:

A great part of Najd is not suitable for urban settlement because of the lack of water sources. Thus, the urban population of the region is mainly concentrated along the two sides of the great valleys, the most important of which are Wādī r-Rumma, Wādī Ḥanīfa and Wādī d-Dawāsir. In such places water is usually found close to the surface of the ground. The soil, too, is arable; for it is regularly fertilized with the sedimentary deposits of the streams. Besides

these places, there are some oases in certain districts such as al-Kharj and al-Aflāj where people can exploit the springs and small lakes for their farms.

The towns or cities of present-day Najd either developed from a single small village or are the result of the combination of a number of adjacent villages. The establishment of such villages mostly followed a certain pattern: a family or a division of a tribe settled near a well or on the ruins of an old village and started cultivating the surrounding area. Huts or small houses were built and inhabited, replacing tents. Often these residential quarters were encircled by a wall built of stone and mud. At the first stage of the establishment of a village, the inhabitants lived a semi-nomadic life, and did not cut themselves off wholly from their previous mode of existence. Part of the time was devoted to the cultivation of crops and part to the pasturing of animals. The pasture ground, commonly known as mafla, mar'a or ḥimā, was not any less important in the formation of a village than the houses and the arable land. This importance was fully appreciated by the people of Ḥarma when they asked 'Abd-Allāh ash-Shammarī to move away from their area lest he should encroach upon their pasture grounds.[1] If a village was inhabited by more than one composite group, each group established its own quarter. Although close neighbours, these different groups did not fully integrate, and a shortage of water might even cause war among them. However, a peaceful solution for such a problem could usually be reached.

---

1. Ḥawādith, p. 32.

The inhabitants of Ushayqir, composed of Āl-Wuhaba and Āl-Wā'il, provided a good example of this type of compromise. A just programme was arranged between both sides in accordance with which one party was to take its animals to the pasture ground for a day during which the other party was making full use of the water for its farms. Exchange of rôles took place the following day. Unfortunately, this situation did not last. Fearing domination, Āl-Wuhaba planned to rid themselves of Āl-Wā'il whose number had been increasing due to an influx of relatives. While the latter were out pasturing their cattle, their women and children were driven outside the fence, which was then guarded by armed sentries from Āl-Wuhaba. Āl-Wā'il were prevented from re-entering the village though they were allowed to carry away their chattels and later on to sell their estates.[1]

At the oases of al-Kharj and al-Aflāj, the cultivation of the land was easier than in other parts of Najd; for the water in these oases was always obtainable and did not need to be drawn. In the other parts of the region, farmers were faced with two problems: the first was drawing water from wells, requiring the use of animals and human attention; the second and the more serious was the occasional oozing away of water sources as a result of scarcity of rainfall. In the year 1136, for example, many of the inhabitants of Sudayr had to leave their homelands because of this problem. Indeed, among the people of al-'Aṭṭār, in the same district, only

---

1. Ibid., p. 30.

four families could be supported there with only two wells yielding water.[1] Moreover, farmers from time to time met with other grave disasters. Severe cold or heavy rains accompanied by wind or hail destroyed their crops. Locusts, too, were another enemy, the depredations of which they often had to suffer. In 1122, the corn of Malham was damaged by hail, and in the same year a variety of small locust, called dibā, destroyed the harvest in other parts of the region.[2]

The variety of soils in the country diversified the agricultural products, the most common crops being wheat, barley, maize and millet. Wheat was the most important, providing the best nourishment for the inhabitants. The poor people mixed it with barley in their food. Plain barley, or barley with dates of low quality, was given to horses and asses. Maize, alone or added to a little quantity of wheat, was a common dish taken in the early mornings of winter, being enough for breakfast and lunch at the same time. Mixed with leftovers of meals, it was given to the milch cows and goats. Millet was rare and was only used as food for animals or, mixed with other grains, by the poorest inhabitants.

Among the fruit trees in Najd, there were apple, peach, pomegranate, lemon, citron and vines.[3] By far the most important and common of these were the palm-trees of which almost every district had its own variety. They were highly

---

1. ʿUnwān, p. 421.
2. Ḥawādith, p. 89.
3. Andrew Crichton, History of Arabia, Ancient and Modern (Edinburgh, 1833), II, p. 415.

esteemed by the people, and the local poets composed poems praising them.[1] The esteem in which they were held can be appreciated when the importance of these trees in the economic life of the inhabitants is taken into consideration. Every part of them was utilized to serve many local demands. Their fruit constituted the staple nourishment of the people throughout the whole year. It was the most practical food, especially for travellers; for it did not require any effort to prepare. Failure of this crop, either from the ravages of locusts or other reasons, caused a general distress among the inhabitants.[2] The date-stones, after being soaked for two or three days in water until they became soft, were sometimes given as food to goats and cows instead of barley and maize. The wood was used for rafters and firewood, the leaf-stalks for the construction of the ceilings of houses, the fibres for ropes or mats, and the leaves for cages, baskets, mats and other articles for domestic use.

The Najdī farmers, also, cultivated several pot-herbs such as onions, leeks, beans, okra, aubergines, gourds, pumpkins, melons and water-melons.

Added to these crops, fruit trees and vegetables, other

---

1. Ḥumaydān ash-Shuway'ir, for example, was among these. See Khiyār, I, p. 130.
2. Crichton, op.cit., II, p. 418. Here, he mentions that palm-trees are seldom known to produce more than three or four successive years; after which they become exhausted. This is not true, for in fact they usually continue bearing fruit for many more years than he maintains.

plants were cultivated, such as barsīm or Egyptian clover, which was excellent food for all domestic animals. Among the trees common in the country was athl, which was mainly planted in the suburbs of towns and villages or around the farms, and used in the construction of houses or as firewood. Besides, there were several wild trees such as tragacanth, samr and ghaḍā, which were used as firewood. Their leaves offered shelter for the cattle and were eaten by camels.

Trade:

The trade of Najd was of three types: local, regional and external. The first was confined to the settled population themselves, the second between these and the nomads of the region and the third was their commercial intercourse with other countries.

Agricultural products were sold in various ways. In villages they were mostly delivered to or collected by the consumers. In towns they were often taken to the market and sold either directly or through a dealer. Sometimes, these were bought by the local merchants for resale to their customers. Manufactured products, such as articles for the kitchen, furniture, farm implements etc., were marketed in the same way.

Mutual needs necessitated business relations between the nomads and the townsmen. The former regularly visited towns and villages to buy their requirements of wheat, barley, maize, dates, salt, coffee etc. as well as clothes, water vessels, saddles, arms and articles for cooking. In exchange, they sold camels, sheep, goats, butter, dry cheese, skins,

wool etc. Sometimes the urban traders visited the common wells where the tribal peoples camped, to buy animals and their products.

The price of food and other goods varied according to the state of the harvest and to demand. In the year 1096, a ṣā' of wheat was sold for three Muḥammadiyyas. Three years later, five ṣā's were only worth one Muḥammadiyya.[1] In 1124, a hundred wazna of dates were at first being sold for one Aḥmer; but when groups of Banū 'Anaza started buying up this crop, its price doubled.

Najd, however, could not supply all the needs of its inhabitants, and certain goods had to be imported. At the same time, the region was able to export some of its own products. Thus, the Najdi merchants made their way outside their region, selling and buying goods. Although they had commercial relations with the countries bordering Najd, those with the northern and north-eastern places were the most important. Camels were the main export of Najd, which was entitled umm al-bill or the mother of camels, because of its richness in them. Horses were to some extent important in the export list of Najd to the Yemen, the Hijaz, Syria and Iraq. From Basra, they were taken to India.[2] Through the harbours of al-Qaṭīf and al-'Uqayr in al-Aḥsā', the Najdīs received sugar, spices, and other goods from India.[3] They,

1. al-Fākhirī, f. 20; 'Unwān, pp. 408, 410.
2. Burckhardt, Notes, II, p. 69.
3. Abū-Ḥākima, op.cit., p. 4.

also, imported coffee, frankincense and storax from the Yemen.[1]

The 'Abā'a (a woven cloak) manufactured in al-Aḥsā', as well as rice from here and Southern Iraq were imported by the Najdī tradesmen for local consumption. Due to the lack of political stability in the area, however, the external trade was always risky. Although accompanied by armed men, the caravans were often at the mercy of plunderers.

Besides the agricultural crops, the products of husbandry and the manufactured goods, there were to be found in the Najdī markets other things such as charcoal, locusts, kama' or truffle and ḥinnā' which was used as a cosmetic.

It should be mentioned here that the Najdīs who went to neighbouring countries as merchants were but a small proportion among the others who accompanied them looking for work. Many of the latter were employed in the pearl fishing in the Arabian littoral of the Persian Gulf. Others found work in Iraq and Syria. Those who went to Baghdad achieved considerable influence there, and were at a certain time so powerful that the Pāshā of the city sought their support in his struggles against his enemies.[2]

Pilgrimage:

The pilgrimage was of extreme economic importance not only to the population of the sacred cities of the Hijaz, but also to the other inhabitants of the Arabian peninsula.

---

1. Lam', p. 83.
2. Burckhardt, Notes, II, p. 29.

The Najdi towns situated on its routes were frequented by the pilgrims for supplies of food and other needs.[1] However, the caravans were exploited by the nomads more than by the urban dwellers of Najd. The pilgrims hired camels from the tribes, gave presents to their chiefs, paid duties for the passage through their territories, employed guards and guides, and bought sheep, goats, butter etc. Moreover, they were sometimes molested by the nomads, as happened to the Pilgrims of al-Aḥsā' in 1142.[2] Although the security of the routes could often be achieved by peaceful arrangements with the tribes inhabiting these places, surprise attacks on the caravans by other tribes, with which such arrangements had not been undertaken, were not uncommon. Indeed, there existed certain tribes such as 'Awf, a division of Banū Ḥarb, which made plundering and robbing the pilgrims a regular occupation.[3] Customarily, every caravan had to be accompanied by a guardian or khawī from every tribe expected to be met on the road. The tribe of the guardian would usually respect the safe-conduct which he had promised; for to molest a caravan under such circumstances was regarded as an infringement of the honour of the whole tribe. The duties paid to the tribes for safe-passage varied according to their power and relations with the rulers of the countries from which the caravan set out.

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 420. Compare Peter Holt, Egypt and the Fertile Crescent, 1516-1922 (London, 1966), p. 149.
2. Ḥawādith, p. 102.
3. Burckhardt, Notes, II, p. 35.

Leading families:

The prestige of a family among the urban inhabitants of Najd could be assured by a variety of factors, such as descent from a great tribe, having numerous members, having produced scholars or brave and generous men. The first of these was of particular importance; indeed all prominent families in the region belonged to well-known tribes. Many of these were from Banū Tamīm, which had widespread representation in the Najdī towns and villages. Moreover, groups from this tribe were to be found in other countries bordering Najd particularly in Iraq and Qatar, where the present ruling family, Āl-Thānī, is also from Banū Tamīm.[1] Āl-Wuhaba from this tribe held a special position, being a clan to which several families famous for learning and in other ways influential, were related. Notable among these were Āl-Musharraf, to which belonged the family of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Āl-Bassām, Āl-Fayrūz and Āl-Shabāna. The other clans of Banū Tamīm had, also, their own influential families which played an important rôle in the political life of the region. As examples of these may be cited Āl-Mu'ammar, under whose leadership al-'Uyayna became the most powerful town in the area, Āl-Māḍī, Āl-Ḥujaylān and Āl-'Inqrī, who were, respectively, the rulers of ar-Rawḍa, Burayda and Tharmadā'.[2]

---

1. Ḥamad al-Ḥuqayl, op.cit., p. 82; Crichton, op.cit., II, p. 179; Ḥawādith, p. 224.
2. 'Unwān, p. 402; Ḥawadith, pp. 56, 87, 119, 232.

The fact that the power in many towns in the widely separated district of Najd was held by families belonging to Banū Tamīm shows the influence of this tribe among the population of the region.

The country was divided into many small town-states or principalities each of which was independent from the other. Tribal ties which might have existed between some of the chiefs of these emirates failed to play any significant rôle in the creation of a friendly atmosphere, much less any unification of their different districts under a single leadership. Thus, the natural result of the disunity was instability in the whole region. The need for territorial expansion or the desire to have booty made military clashes among these petty chiefs inevitable. Under such circumstances, the ruler had to be militant, always ready to attack other territories and to defend his own. For the establishment and maintenance of his power, the chief depended upon his position within his family and its powerful members. Sometimes, the ruler made his way to power by force of arms or by assassination. The struggle for power was not confined to elements from different clans; it, also, took place among close relations on certain occasions. In the year 1101, Markhān Ibn-Waṭbān, the chief of ad-Dir'iyya, was killed by his brother, Ibrāhīm, in such a struggle,[1] and 'Uthmān Ibn-Naḥīṭ, the ruler of al-Ḥuṣūn, was captured and expelled from the place by his sons, who had been inspired to do so by the

1. 'Unwān, p. 411.

chief of Julājil in the year 1111.[1] On another occasion, Ibrāhīm Ibn-'Uthmān was assassinated by his father over the chiefdom of al-Qaṣab in 1138.[2]

Because leadership was often achieved by force, power over the subjects was expressed in repression and intimidation and was mostly arbitrary and tyrannical.[3] The urban dwellers, whose ties with the land were firmly established, could not easily escape the oppression they suffered under their local rulers. To escape they would have to migrate, leaving behind all the immovable property; otherwise, the only resistance was by physical force. Both of these were risky. The place of refuge could not always be assumed to be more secure and rebellion, if unsuccessful, could only lead to more severe oppression. Even when successful, the rebels had henceforth to live in fear of revenge. Under such circumstances, the subjects had no other course but to accept their terrible situation. Ibn-Bishr in his description of the life in Najd at that period states that the rulers of the region dealt with their subjects in oppressive and tyrannical ways.[4] His statement is supported by the historical events

---

1. 'Unwan, p. 414; Ḥawādith, p. 82. A full description of this event is to be found in a poem by Ḥumaydān ash-Shuway'ir. See Khiyār, I, p. 118.
2. al-Fākhirī, f. 39; 'Unwān, p. 423.
3. This was explicitly expressed by the local contemporary poet Jabr Ibn-Sayyār. See Khiyār, I, p. 104.
4. 'Unwān, p. 17.

recorded by other local chroniclers as well as by native poets. Examples of migrations and assassinations most likely resulting from such relations between the ruler and the ruled, are to be found in the works of al-Fākhirī and Ibn-'Īsā as well as by Ibn-Bishr.[1] Certain rulers used to impose taxes upon the natives at harvest time. Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, for example, levied such duties,[2] but he abandoned this practice ~~since~~ after he had increased his revenues by the spoils of war, following his alliance with Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. The inhabitants of ad-Dākhila had to turn over a quarter of their crops to Ibn-Māḍī, the ruler of ar-Rawḍa.[3]

However, those individuals who had to leave their towns or villages, for whatever reason, could easily find refuge in other places. The Arabian tradition of offering protection to whoever sought it assured a good reception to the migrant, who was most likely to go to a region ruled by a person hostile to his former chief.

Nevertheless, certain rulers seem to have exercised their power justly, as for example, 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Mu'ammar, who died in 1138. The chief function of the ruler was to lead his men in the defence of the town or against other towns or villages in raiding for booty. In times of peace, it fell on him to execute the sentences of the judge upon the disputants.

---

1. al-Fākhirī, ff. 7, 28; 'Unwān, pp. 405, 407, 414; Ḥawādith, pp. 64, 68, 76, 81.
2. 'Unwān, p. 20.
3. This is referred to by Ḥumaydān ash-Shuway'ir in Khiyār, I, p. 137.

2. Nomads:

The mode of existence of the Najdī nomad at the advent of the Wahhābī movement was, in most respects, the same as it had been for centuries. Being confined to his special environment, there was no opportunity for change or evolution. The desert, the tent and the camel described the limitations of his life and his livelihood. In his eyes the desert was not merely a habitation, but a preserver of his traditional characteristics and values. There was no place more congenial to his temperament than the wilderness with the mobility it allowed to his movements, and it was, too, his most effective defence against the enemy from outside. In his opinion, all military qualities and skills were confined to the sons of the desert and could not, therefore, be found in settled folk. The reaction of the townsmen to this attitude was varied: some protested that such qualities could also exist among the urban dwellers,[1] while others looked upon the Bedouins as ignorant people who could only respond to oppression.[2]

Rain was important above all in the life of the nomad, the true source of his happiness and prosperity: drought was the enemy which, when severe, rendered him a refugee in the towns or villages.[3] Hard life due to the lack of rain-

1. Among these was the Najdī poet al-'Inqarī. See Fahd al-Mārik, Min Shiyam al-'Arab (2nd edition Beirut, 1383) III, p. 99.
2. This outlook was shown by Ḥumaydān ash-Shuway'ir. See Khiyār, I, p. 133.
3. 'Unwān, pp. 403, 421.

fall was not unusual in Najd. When only a limited area, inhabited by a certain tribe, received rain, this would usually incite other tribes to move in, using force if necessary.

The camel was the most useful animal to the nomad; a source of milk and meat, a means of transportation and, to some extent, a medium of exchange. Many social affairs, such as compensation for injury, payment of blood-money, dowry of bride etc., were estimated in terms of camels. Najd was abundantly rich in them and also produced an excellent breed.[1] According to Burckhardt, a tribesman from Banū 'Anaza possessing only ten camels was considered poor and one who had sixty was reckoned wealthy. However, there were tribes in which a family having ten was regarded prosperous, and other such as Banū Qaḥṭān which was so rich that the average wealth of a family was more than sixty camels.[2]

Horses were perhaps not so numerous among the Najdī tribes as among those dwelling in the plains of Syria, Mesopotamia and on the banks of the Euphrates, which had rich pastures. However, Najd must have been quite rich in horses for they were among its exports. On the other hand, the number of horses in the region decreased during the reign of Su'ūd Ibn-'Abd-al-'Azīz whose custom was to confiscate a nomad's mare as a punishment for unlawful conduct or disloyalty and to impose an obligation on every owner of a

---

1. Burckhardt, Travels in Arabia (London, 1829), p. 461.
2. Burckhardt, Notes, I, p. 69.

horse to join his army on any occasion.[1] The horse was an animal of luxury and to possess one was a presumption of wealth. To own a swift horse was among the prime distinctions of which a Bedouin chief might boast. However, the care and feeding of such an animal was not easy for the nomad. The main value of a horse was in its speed which could assure the success of raids and allow greater mobility vis-à-vis an enemy.

Sheep and goats constituted a significant part of the Bedouin's wealth. Besides the great utility of their meat and dairy products for the family itself, their butter, cottage cheese, skins and wools were the principal products which the nomad could sell in order to buy his other requirements of food, clothes, arms, etc.

Warfare:

Most of the tribal warfare was motivated by the economic conditions of the nomadic life. Disputes over watering-wells and pasture-grounds were the chief causes of conflict. An area in which the cattle of a tribe grazed and the wells it frequented were considered its own property. Other tribes could not, therefore, enter the area or use the wells without permission, otherwise clashes between the two parties would be unavoidable. A tribe, thinking itself strong enough, might try to dispossess another tribe of its land and wells, forcing it to emigrate from the area, as happened to Banū Ẓafīr when it was obliged by Banū 'Anaza to abandon the district of Sudayr in 1118.[2] Thus, the attitude of tribes towards their

1. Ibid., II, p. 55.
2. 'Unwān, p. 417.

neighbours was generally suspicious and unfriendly. Although peace could easily be concluded, hostility would be renewed at the slightest pretext once one party felt prepared to fight.

The wars among the tribes were often of short duration and involved only certain sections of the man-power. Long campaigns were rarely fought. The attitude of the nomad in demanding from the others whatever he needed was always a potential source of conflict. A group would be organized in order to raid camps or grazing cattle belonging to other tribes. Because the object of such raids was plunder, they were usually not bloody. As soon as the raiders met with serious resistance they would retreat: on the other hand, the attacked people, when feeling overpowered, would not attempt to resist but, instead, would hopefully await an opportunity to retaliate against the enemy.

Plundering could take another form as when a very small group would infiltrate under darkness of night to a camp and take away camels or other property. This kind of robbery was not considered shameful; on the contrary, it was regarded as a manly sport. The raids, to the nomad, were not only a solution for certain economic problems but, also a relief to the monotony of his social existence.

The great and serious battles among the Bedouins were those fought for revenge or for the defence of the tribe's honour and fame. Here, the battles would be bloody and the fighters would display an exalted courage and endurance, being excited by the songs of their tribeswomen. Such bravery could

also be demonstrated by the nomad when defending his guest.[1]

Spoils and booty would often be equally divided amongst the raiders. However, it might happen that every fighter would keep what he had gained for himself. If the battle was fought under the command of the tribe's chief, he would take from the booty more than his own share; a right which had been commonly granted to him to cover some of his expenditure on receiving the guests of the tribe.

The women of a defeated tribe were always respected by the victorious tribesmen. The men, too, were rarely taken as prisoners of war. The raids were among the factors which made the wealth of tribesmen insecure. A wealthy man could be reduced to poverty and could, again, become rich in a few days.

Political life of the nomads:

The tent, representing a family, was the basis of the nomadic society. An encampment of tents constituted a farīq, and groups of farīqs formed a clan. Kindred clans, grouping together would be called a tribe. Although kinship was important in the composition of a tribe, strictness on this point might sometimes be relaxed. There were cases when a small clan belonging to a certain tribe joined a more powerful tribe and assumed its name in order to enjoy its protection and also to qualify for a share of the booty gained in its wars. The strong tribe, in turn, welcomed these new members as an

1. Burckhardt, Notes, I, p. 148.

increment to its military power. An example of this was the case of Āl-Mahāshīr, originally from Banū Hājir, which became a division of Banū Khālid.[1] Sometimes, a tribe would be divided within itself as a result of rivalry over leadership.

There was a chief for every clan, and all clans from a tribe acknowledged one shaykh, who "had no fixed authority but endeavoured to maintain his influence by the means which wealth, talents, courage and noble birth offered".[2] The absence of a fixed authority of the great chief upon the individuals of his tribe was a natural result of the economic conditions of the nomadic life. The property of the tribesman, being moveable, made him free to reject any power, and able to leave the tribe's encampment at any time without endangering his wealth.

The chief of the tribe did not levy yearly tributes on the tribesmen, and his expenses of presents and hospitality to strangers were defrayed by plunder from the enemy or by gifts and duties taken from the caravans.[3] His function consisted of leading his people against the foes, negotiating peace or war and fixing an area for dwelling. Even in these questions his power was not absolute, and he had to consult the heads of different clans and distinguished men of the

---

1. Fu'ād Ḥamza, Qalb Jazīrat al-'Arab, p. 146.
2. Burckhardt, Notes, I, p. 284.
3. Niebuhr, Travels through Arabia and other Countries in the East, tr. into English by R. Heron, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1792), II, p. 164.

tribe for decisions concerning matters of importance. However, his advice was respected and often followed.

The accepted political freedom of nomads could reach the point of anarchy. The right of extending protection to any one, even if unlawful, was an example of such freedom. Effective influence on the nomad in disputes with individuals could only be exercised by his relations. If this failed, conflicts might commence between the two families of the disputants.

The great chief was freely chosen by the prominent men of the tribe, who would tell him that he had become the head of the tribe. His chiefdom might come to an end once someone with greater qualification for the leadership appeared. After the death of a chief, he would usually be succeeded by one of his sons or other relations provided they had the qualities necessary for the task. Struggles over chiefdom might, however, arise as happened between the sons and the brothers of the chief of Banū Khālid following his death.

C. Religious situation:

1. Scholars and education:

The Ḥanbalī rite had been followed by the Najdī scholars long before the rise of the Wahhābī movement. The available sources do not, however, supply us with information about these scholars before the tenth century. Aḥmad Ibn-'Aṭwa, who died in 948, is the first scholar mentioned by the local historians. It was the custom of some Najdī students to travel abroad to complete their studies, and Ibn-'Aṭwa likewise

UNIV. EDINBURGH

went to Damascus where he attended lectures, mainly on fiqh, by several Ḥanbalī scholars, amongst them Shihāb-ad-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn-'Abd-Allāh al-'Askarī. On his return to Najd, he was recognized throughout the region as an authority on the Ḥanbalī rite and he transmitted his learning to a number of students, one of whom was Aḥmad Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Musharraf. Ibn-'Aṭwa issued many fatwas and wrote two works called: at-Tuḥfa l-Badī'a wa-r-Rawḍa l-Anī'a and Durar al-Fawā'id.[1] The subject matter of these is not given by the sources, but it can be assumed to be fiqh since the learning of the author was concentrated on this field of studies.

Najd produced other scholars during the tenth century of the Hijra. Seven of these, who were contemporary to Ibn-'Aṭwa, are mentioned by Ibn-Bishr, and he says that two of them, Ibn-Musharraf and Zāmil Ibn-Sulṭān, studied abroad.[2]

Throughout the 11th century, most of the Najdī towns appear to have had their own qāḍīs, all of whom were Ḥanbalites. The scholars of the region were in touch with the prominent Ḥanbalites in Egypt and Syria. Shaykh Manṣūr al-Buhūtī, a well known Egyptian scholar,[3] for example, had several Najdī

1. 'Unwān, p. 391; Ibn-Ḥumayd, as-Suḥub al-Wābila 'alā Ḍarā'iḥ al-Ḥanābila, f. 43.
2. 'Unwān, p. 391.
3. al-Buhūtī was the head of the Ḥanbalī scholars in Egypt to whom students came from different countries to study. He wrote several works among which were Kashf al-Qinā' 'an al-Iqnā', a commentary on al-Iqnā', by al-Ḥijjāwī and ar-Rawḍ al-Murbi', a commentary on Zād al-Mustaqni', by Ibn-Qudāma. Both are on fiqh. Shaykh Manṣūr died in 1052. See 'Unwān p. 401; Muḥammad al-Muḥibbī, Khulāṣat al-Athar fī A'yān al-Qarn al-Ḥādī 'Ashar (Cairo, 1284), IV, p. 426; GAL, I, 398, S, I, p. 688; S, II, p. 447.

students, notably 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, who was to become the qāḍī of al-'Uyayna until his death in 1056.[1] Mar'ī Ibn-Yūsuf, who was, also, a celebrated Ḥanbalī scholar at al-Azhar,[2] sent a copy of his work, Ghāyat al-Muntahā, to the scholars of Najd, giving his regards to two of them called Khamīs Ibn-Sulaymān and Muḥammad Ibn-Ismā'īl.[3] The latter was famous in Ushayqir and had students who were later to become prominent, such as Aḥmad Ibn-Bassām, Aḥmad al-Quṣayyir and 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Dhahlān. Shaykh Ibn-Dhahlān was to become the qāḍī of Riyadh and the teacher of several well-known scholars such as Aḥmad al-Manqūr and Muḥammad al-'Awsajī. He died from the plague which hit the region in 1099. In the same year three other scholars also died.[4] However, the scholar most distinguished among the Najdīs in the 11th century

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 401.
2. Mar'ī Ibn-Yūsuf was from Palestine. In Egypt he became a student of Manṣūr al-Buhūtī. He wrote works on different subjects. Among these were Ghāyat al-Muntahā fī Jam' al-Iqnā' wa-l-Muntahā, Dalīl aṭ-Ṭālib, both on fiqh, Dalīl aṭ-Ṭālibīn li-Kalām an-Naḥwiyyīn, on Arabic grammar, and Qalā'id al-'Iqyān fī Faḍā'il Salāṭīn Banī 'Uthmān, on history. See 'Unwān, pp. 394-95; Ismā'īl Pāshā, Īḍāḥ al-Maknūn fī dh-Dhayl 'alā Kashf aẓ-Ẓunūn (Istanbul, 1945), II, pp. 142, 238; GAL, II, pp. 103, 369, S, II, p. 496.
3. 'Unwān, p. 394; Ḥawādith, p. 59.
4. Ibid., p. 74.

A.H. was Sulaymān Ibn-'Alī, the grandfather of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb.[1]

It is apparent that the scholars of Najd at that time concentrated their studies on jurisprudence, little attention being paid to other branches of religious knowledge. The main purpose of education in the region was to provide sufficient scholars to act as judges in the towns. A man able to read and understand the Ḥanbalī works on fiqh would most probably be entitled shaykh or 'ālim and have an opportunity to become a qāḍī. However, 'Uthmān Ibn-Qā'id appears to have been an exception. He was born in al-'Uyayna and received his early instruction from 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Dhahlān. Eager for knowledge, he left Najd for Damascus where he attended lectures by celebrated scholars. Finally, he settled in Cairo where he died in the year 1097.

Besides his works on jurisprudence such as Hidāyat ar-Rāghibīn and Risāla fī r-Raḍā', Ibn-Qā'id wrote a book on theology called Najāt al-Khalaf fī 'Iqād as-Salaf.[2] This book is of particular importance for it seems to have been the only work on the subject done by a Najdī scholar during that period. Moreover, it shows the author's concern about the beliefs of contemporary Muslims and his conviction that there should be a return to the practices of the early age of Islam.

1. 'Unwān, p. 403. H. Laoust ("Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb", EI^2) mistakenly gives the name of the shaykh's grandfather as Sulaymān Ibn-Muḥammad. For more information about Sulaymān Ibn-'Alī, see below, pp. 64-5.
2. GAL, S, ii, p. 531; 'Umar Kaḥḥāla, Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn (Damascus, 1378), VI, p. 249. The Najāt was printed in Damascus, 1350.

Najd continued to produce scholars, and during the first half of the 12th century A.H. more than twenty scholars are mentioned by the local chroniclers. Notable among these are Ḥasan Abā-Ḥusayn[1] and Aḥmad al-Manqūr, the author of al-Fawā'id al-'Adīda fī l-Masā'il al-Mufīda[2] on jurisprudence. Added to these two scholars are 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Abū-Buṭayn, who is said to have written a book called al-Majmū' fī-mā huwa Kathīr al-Wuqū' on fiqh,[3] Aḥmad al-Ḥuṣaynī at-Tamīmī, 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Uḍayb, who was the judge of al-Midhnab and 'Unayza respectively, and 'Abd-al-Wahhāb Ibn-Sulaymān Ibn-'Alī. The latter was the qāḍī of al-'Uyayna until his dismissal from the office by Ibn-Mu'ammar in the year 1139. Although he was prominent, he was neither in his knowledge nor in his influence as great as his father and certainly much less than his son Muḥammad.

2. Beliefs and practices:

Various uncanonical innovations had during the successive centuries been introduced into the religious practices of the Islamic community, and many superstitions had crept into the beliefs of a considerable section of the Muslims. An example of this was the construction of buildings over the graves of pious persons and the use of their tombs as places for worship. Some people, too, believed in the ability of

1. Ibn-Bishr, 'Unwān, p. 410, states that he saw valuable notes written by Ḥasan Abā-Ḥusayn on different subjects.
2. This work was published in two volumes, see Ibid., note 6.
3. Ibid., p. 418; Ḥawādith, p. 89.

dead saints to intercede for them before God. Accordingly, they visited their tombs and perambulated around them asking for their mediation. There were others who, out of ignorance, held the conviction that these saints had the power to bring good and prevent evil. Moreover, there were those who used to venerate certain rocks or trees and attach rags to them in order to secure their blessing.

By the 12th century, these innovations and superstitions appear to have been excessive, and many aspects of the religion of Islam were corrupted. These were not confined to a particular country; indeed they were to be found in all Muslim regions, although not to the same degree everywhere.

As for Najd with which we are here concerned, it was, in the light of information given by the Wahhābī authors, one of the regions most corrupted by idolatrous beliefs and practices. In the words of Ibn-Bishr: "Polytheism was widespread in Najd and elsewhere. It was common for trees and rocks to be invested in supernatural powers, tombs were venerated and shrines built about them, and all were regarded as sources of blessing and objects of vows. The people sought refuge from the jinn, made sacrifices to them and put food for them in the corners of their houses believing that by doing so they would cure their sick relatives, bring good and prevent evil. Moreover, swearing by other than God, and similar forms of both major and minor polytheism were widely practised".[1]

Trying to give reasons for this religious disintegration in the region, the Najdī chronicler goes on to say: "The cause

1. ʿUnwān, p. 16.

which brought about such a situation in Najd was (God is the most knowing!) that if the Bedouins, camping on the outskirt of towns or villages at the time of harvest, were accompanied by medicine - men or women, the family of anyone sick among the townspeople would come to these healers asking for a prescription to cure the disease. The latter, in order to prove their skill to those ignorant people, would tell them to go to such-and-such a place and sacrifice a completely black lamb or a small-eared ram without mentioning the name of God on slaughtering. Then, they were to give the sick person a certain part of the sacrificed meat and leave the rest at the spot. Perhaps God would cure the patient as a trial (fitna) to them or it might simply be time for the disease to come to an end. Anyhow, people believed that the cure was due to the prescription and such practices and beliefs increased until in course of time they became dominant".[1]

Another description of the religious situation in Najd, al-Aḥsā' and the neighbouring countries is given by the Wahhābī historian, Ḥusayn Ibn-Ghannām. He mentions that the majority of the inhabitants had sunk into the abyss of paganism. They had forsaken the Qur'ān and the right path. The pure Islamic doctrines and the unity of God had been replaced by animistic beliefs and practices.

Having given a general account of the decline of religious morality, Ibn-Ghannām goes on to speak about the different countries, one after another, citing examples of

1. Ibid., p. 17.

actions regarded by the orthodox Muslims as idolaterous.

"In Najd" he states "at a village called al-Jubayla in Wādī Ḥanīfa, high respect was shown to the tomb of Zayd Ibn-al-Khaṭṭāb, a Companion who was killed during the wars of Apostasy, and the people used to visit it, seeking solace for their grief. At a place called Qaryūh in the same district, graves associated with other Companions were also venerated and worshipped. In the valley of Ghubayrā', at a grave said to be that of Ḍarrār Ibn-al-Azwar, abominable actions were committed. Moreover, at the village of al-Fidā' there grew a palm-tree from which men and women would seek blessings, and to which unmarried women would come and clasp the trunk firmly to their bosoms, crying: "Oh! Stallion of stallions! I want a husband before the coming of next year". A tree at aṭ-Ṭurfiyya had rags attached to it by the people when a woman gave birth to a male child, believing that such an act would keep him safe and healthy. Forgiveness was sought from God by leaving food at a cave near ad-Dir'iyya, which was claimed to have been specially created as a refuge for a lady called Bint-al-Amīr in response to her cry for help after an attempt at rape upon her by an adulterer".

The author, also gives the name of Tāj, a certain blind saint from al-Kharj, who was venerated by some people of al-'Āriḍ. His devotees, believing that he possessed powers not to be ascribed by true Muslims to any being but God, offered sacrifices and directed prayers to him.

Similar animistic beliefs and practices, as well as immoral conduct, are cited by the same historian in order to illustrate the religious situation in al-Aḥsā', the Hijaz,

the Yemen, Syria, Egypt and Iraq.[1]

The account of Ibn-Ghannām concerning this matter is mainly in conformity with the other authors. Aṣ-Ṣan'ānī,[2] for instance, states that the inhabitants of the Yemen, Syria, Najd, Tihāma and other Muslim countries used to associate created beings with God in worship.[3] Another writer, ash-Shawkānī (1172-1250), mentions that the dwellers in the area between the Hijaz and Ṣa'da had completely neglected all the obligations of Islam and were in absolute moral ignorance before coming under the Su'ūdī rule.[4]

Niebuhr, who visited Arabia about that period, asserts that the Sunnites, the prevalent sect in the region, although forbidden by the Qur'ān to perform any act of worship to created beings, regarded their saints with very singular veneration.[5] Even after the expansion of Wahhābism, which must have influenced the religious life in the area, Burckhardt recounts that the Bedouins, like the townsmen, used to make sacrifices to the tombs of the saints and to visit them in

---

1. Rawḍa, I, pp. 5-14.
2. Muḥammad Ibn-Ismā'īl aṣ-Ṣan'ānī was born in Kaḥlān in the Yemen in 1059. After studying in Ṣan'ā' and the Holy cities of the Hijaz, he became an authority in Ḥadīth at Ṣan'ā'. He died in 1182. The most famous of his works is Subul as-Salām, a commentary on Bulūgh al-Marām by Ibn-Ḥajar, on Ḥadīth. (GAL, S,ii, pp. 74, 556, 562).
3. Taṭhīr al-I'tiqād 'an Adrān al-Ilḥād (Cairo, 1340), p. 2.
4. al-Badr aṭ-Ṭāli' bi-Maḥāsin man Ba'd al-Qarn at-Tāsi' (Cairo, 1348), II, p. 4.
5. Description de l'Arabie, p. 301.

a way similar to that of the pagans in the pre-Islamic era'.[1]

In expounding his doctrines, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb maintained that Banū 'Anaza and Banū Ẓafīr did not believe in the Resurrection, and that those who know their religion, perform the prayers and pay the alms in the region are less than those who do not.[2]

However, it is to be noticed that Ibn-Ghannām, while giving details of polytheistic actions practised by the people of al-'Āriḍ, does not mention examples of these in other Najdī districts. This may imply that these parts of the province were not badly affected by what the author describes as a general decline of the religion. The fact that Najd was the most isolated part of the Arabian peninsula and an area where the Ḥanbalī rite was the maḍhhab followed by the local scholars, would argue for an adherence to Islamic traditions and a rejection of innovations. The surviving colloquial poetry does not contain any indication of anti-Islamic ideas held by the authors; on the contrary, high respect for religious principles and obligations is evident.[3] Although relaxation in observance of the religious duties and disbelief in certain aspects of Islamic doctrines might have been true of some ignorant people, particularly the nomads, the majority of the inhabitants of the region appear to have been practising their religious obligations in

---

1. Notes, II, p. 103.
2. Rawḍa, I, pp. 108, 144.
3. Khiyār, I, pp. 104, 122.

accordance with the Sharī'a. Thus, statements like that of Palgrave "All traces of Islam had disappeared in Najd, the recitation of the Qur'ān, the daily prayers, the pilgrimage as well as the alms had been forgotten",[1] are not to be accepted unreservedly.

1. Narrative of a Year's Journey through Central and Eastern Arabia (1862-63), 2 Vols. (London, 1865), II, p. 370.

CHAPTER II

Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb before the Alliance with Āl-Su'ūd.

A. Family and birth:

Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb belonged to a family called Āl-Musharraf,[1] which was a branch of a Tamīmī clan known as Āl-Wuhaba. Musharraf was the tenth ancestor of the Shaykh whose pedigree, according to Ibn-Ghannām[2] and Ibn-'Īsā,[3] is: Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb Ibn-Sulaymān Ibn-'Ali Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Aḥmad Ibn-Rāshid Ibn-Burayd Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Burayd Ibn-Musharraf. Ibn-Bishr, however, omits the eighth and ninth individuals from this family tree.[4] Minor alterations are made by certain other biographers,[5] and the author of the Lam' (p. 24) mentions an ancestral line of the Shaykh which is suspect in respect of most of the names included.[6]

1. Later, the family became known as Āl-ash-Shaykh.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 25.
3. Ḥawādith, p. 125. See, also, MRMN, III, p. 379.
4. 'Unwān, p. 82.
5. While 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Nāṣir ('Unwān as-Sa'd wa-l-Majd fī-mā Stuẓrif fī Akhbār al-Ḥijaz wa Najd, f.6) transposes Aḥmad and Rāshid, 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh ('Ulamā' ad-Da'wa Cairo, 1386, p. 6) omits the name Burayd Ibn-Musharraf from the pedigree.
6. Margoliouth in the EI[1], s.v. "Wahhābīya", seems to have relied on this work. Accordingly, he erroneously relates Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb to Banū Sinān. Brockelmann, too, (GAL, S, II, p. 531) mistakenly mentions that the Shaykh was Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb Ibn-Dā'ūd, and Palgrave, (op. cit., I, p. 363) wrongly states that he belonged to Āl-Maṣalīkh from Banū 'Anaza.

The pedigree which is given by Ibn-Ghannām and Ibn-'Īsā is most likely the correct one, for the latter is a famous Najdī genealogist and statements by different scholars[1] concerning the lineage of prominent families of the same origin accord with his biography of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. Although Ibn-Ghannām does not mention the ancestors of the Shaykh before Musharraf, Ibn-Bishr traces the family tree to Wuhayb, who was the progenitor of other well-known families besides Āl-Musharraf.[2]

Reference had already been made to the influential rôle which individuals from Banū Tamīm had played in the political life of Najd. The position of Āl-Musharraf, the immediate family of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, is an illustration of Tamīmī influence in this region, in other fields of activity.

The native place of this family was Ushayqir, which was the centre of learning in Najd during the tenth and eleventh centuries of the Hijra, and from here its members migrated to other towns and villages of the region. Politically, the rôle of Āl-Musharraf was insignificant, but in the field of education the family achieved great prestige. As early as the tenth century its fame was already heard of. 'Abd-al-Qādir Ibn-Burayd Ibn-Musharraf was a prominent judge, and one of the five scholars to whom an argument between Shaykh Ibn-'Aṭwa and 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Raḥma over certain points of jurisprudence was referred.[3] His nephew, Aḥmad Ibn-Muḥammad

1. Ḥawādith, pp. 205-231.
2. Among these families were Āl-Bassām, Āl-Rayyis, and Āl-Thānī.
3. 'Unwān, p. 391.

was, also, a distinguished scholar and teacher, among whose students was the eminent jurisprudent, Muḥammad Ibn-Ismā'īl.[1]

During the eleventh century, scholars from Āl-Musharraf were to be found holding high positions in different Najdī towns. Aḥmad Ibn-Nāṣir (d. 1049) was the judge of Riyadh,[2] and 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb (d. 1056) was the qāḍī of al-'Uyayna,[3] the most flourishing town in the region at that time. This Shaykh 'Abd-Allāh was one of the few Najdīs who completed their studies outside the country. He travelled to Egypt, where he attended lectures given by the celebrated scholar, Manṣūr al-Buhūtī. After his return, he taught fiqh according to the school of Ibn-Ḥanbal, one of his students being his son 'Abd-al-Wahhāb, who was also to become a prominent scholar.[4]

The most outstanding scholar in Najd during that period was Sulaymān Ibn-'Alī, the grandfather of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. He was born in al-'Uyayna, where he studied under 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Ismā'īl. Later on, he became the judge of the town, with a reputation as an authority on Ḥanbalī fiqh in Najd, to whom scholars of the region used to refer all difficult questions. He was the author of a book on the rites of the pilgrimage called: Tuḥfat an-Nāsik fī Aḥkām al-Manāsik, and was reported to have written, also, a commentary on al-Iqnā' by al-Ḥijjāwī. On learning that al-Buhūtī

1. Ḥawādith, p. 51. Some of Ibn-Ismā'īl's answers to certain points on fiqh are to be found in MRMN, I, pp. 737-742.
2. al-Fākhirī, f.4; 'Unwān, p. 400.
3. Ibid., p. 401.
4. Ibid., pp. 401, 419.

had already made a commentary on this same work, he is said to have destroyed his composition.[1] The MRMN contains some of his answers to questions on certain points about jurisprudence.[2] Besides his position as judge of al-'Uyayna, Shaykh Sulaymān was, also, a teacher whose students included his two sons, 'Abd-al-Wahhāb and Ibrāhīm, and Aḥmad al-Quṣayyir.[3]

'Abd-al-Wahhāb Ibn-Sulaymān, the father of Shaykh Muḥammad, too, was a scholar of considerable local fame. Although neither his knowledge nor his influence was as great as his father's, he was still qualified to become the qāḍī of al-'Uyayna.

The local sources do not mention anything about the economic status of the Shaykh's family. However, it can be presumed to have been comparatively wealthy; for the qaḍā', which some of its members held, was a profitable career. The stipends paid to the judges from waqf endowments, as well as the fees occasionally given to them by the disputants, must have been sufficient income to support the recipient family and offer its youngsters an opportunity for education.

Thus, it was into such a family, of which many scholars were engaged in learning, qaḍā' and teaching, that Muḥammad

---

1. Ibid., p. 404. However, Ibn-Ḥumayd (op.cit., f.64) mentions that Sulaymān Ibn-'Alī merely intended to write such a work; but when he learned that it had already been done by al-Buhūtī, he dropped the idea.
2. MRMN, 1, pp. 510-23; IV, p. 585.
3. al-Fākhirī, f.15; 'Unwān, p. 415. Fatāwī by Shaykh Aḥmad al-Quṣayyir are found in the MRMN, I, pp. 727-32.

Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb was born in al-'Uyayna in the year 1115/1703-4.[1]

B. The Shaykh's early life and studies:

Details about this subject are only scantily given by Ibn-Ghannām and Ibn-Bishr. However, it was traditional that the sons of scholars would follow in the footsteps of their fathers. Just as Shaykh Sulaymān Ibn-'Alī had encouraged and instructed his two sons, Ibrāhīm and 'Abd-al-Wahhāb, in his own way of life, so did the latter towards his sons, Muḥammad and Sulaymān. According to Ibn-Ghannām,

---

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 24; al-Fākhirī, f. 30; 'Unwān, p. 416. Certain authors are confused about the date and place of the Shaykh's birth. While Burckhardt (Notes, II, p. 97) mentions that the Shaykh was born in al-Ḥawṭa, Palgrave (op.cit., I, p. 363) states that this took place in Ḥuraymilā'. Chodzko ("Le Déisme des Wahhabis expliqué par eux-mêmes", Journal asiatique, IX, 4éme ser., 1848, p. 168) says that his birth-place was ad-Dir'iyya, and Zwemer in his article "The Wahhabis", (Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute, XXXIII, 1901, pp. 311-30) as well as in The Mohammedan World of Today (New York, 1906, p. 104) states that the Shaykh was born in Wāsiṭ in 1691. Although he correctly mentions in Arabia; the Cradle of Islam (New York, 1929, p. 192) that the Shaykh was born in al-'Uyayna, he still mistakenly gives the date of his birth as 1691. Fernea, too, (Moslems on the March, London, 1955, p. 65) erroneously says that he was born in al-Aḥsā', and Daḥlān (Futūḥāt, 11, p. 229) mentions that his date of birth was 1111. J. Zaydān (Ta'rīkh Miṣr al-Ḥadīth, 2nd edition, Cairo, 1333, II, p. 155) says that he was born in 1106/1694, and R. Nickolson (A Literary History of the Arabs, Cambridge, 1966, p. 466) states that it took place about 1720.

Muḥammad Ibn-ʿAbd-al-Wahhāb showed himself at an early age to be interested in learning to the extent that he, unlike other children, did not spend much of his time in play.[1]

The first task of the child was to learn the Qur'ān, and it was reported that he memorized it when he was only ten years old.[2] Following this, he started receiving religious education, particularly jurisprudence according to the Ḥanbalī mathhab.[3] Together with personal characteristics of intelligence, eloquence and memory, which were much above the average, the young boy lived in a favourable atmosphere for learning. In addition to his father's encouragement and instruction, he must have gained much from association with his other relatives. His uncle Ibrāhīm was versed in the texts of religion and law, and both his brother Sulaymān and his cousin ʿAbd-ar-Raḥmān were, also, students. As his father was the judge of the town, his house was a meeting-place for the scholars of the district and their students. It was here that problems and disputes on religion and law were considered and argued, and to be present at these times must have greatly contributed to his early education. According to his brother, ʿAbd-al-Wahhāb was so amazed at the understanding and perception shown by the young boy that he said: "I have benefitted from my son Muḥammad in learning

---

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 25.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.; ʿUnwān, p. 16. Edward Sell (The Faith of Islam, 2nd edition, London, 1896, p. 152) mistakenly says that the Shaykh was first a Ḥanafī, and later on became a mujtahid.

certain points of the Sharī'a.[1]

A description of the boyhood of the Shaykh is reported to have been given by his father in a letter to one of his friends:

> "He had an excellent understanding and intelligence. Had he spent a continuous year in learning, he would be an example (āya) in memorization and accuracy. I knew for certain that he reached maturity before completing his twelfth year. I felt that he had become fitted to lead the congregational prayers, because of his maturity and knowledge of religion, so I brought him forward to the task. I found a wife for him in the same year after which he asked me to allow him to make the pilgrimage to the Sacred House of God. I granted his request and assisted him to achieve his aim".[2]

The youth's reported marriage, which was most probably at his father's wish, should not be considered extraordinary, for early marriages were not uncommon among wealthy Arabian families at that time. What is peculiar, here, is that a boy at the age of twelve should have a desire for pilgrimage, especially after a recent marriage. However, 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh states that the young Muḥammad's pilgrimage took place before his marriage,[3] while Ibn-Bishr mentions neither of the two events. Whether his pilgrimage was made when he was twelve years old or shortly afterwards, he must have been impressed by the spectacle of Muslim brotherhood among people from many countries, speaking various languages and wearing different costumes. Impressive, too, would be the sight of large circles of people round great scholars and preachers in the Holy Mosque. Having performed his

---

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 25.
2. Ibid., p. 26.
3. Op.cit., p. 7.

pilgrimage, the young boy left Mecca for Medina where he stayed two months before returning home.[1] It was probably during this sojourn at the town of the Prophet that he became acquainted with Shaykh 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Ibrāhīm Ibn-Sayf, who was to become one of his influential teachers.

At home in al-'Uyayna, young Muḥammad's education was progressing. While continuing his study of Ḥanbalī jurisprudence under his father, he was enthusiastically reading works on exegesis, Tradition and tawḥīd.[2] This private and unsupervised study was later to be adduced by his opponents as one of the main reasons for his aberration. According to Ibn-Bishr, the Shaykh was so deeply versed in what had been written by the 'ulamā' on the unity of God and polytheism that he knew this subject perfectly. As a result of this knowledge he formed the conviction that the conduct of many people around him was contrary to the true religion of Islam. Thinking it his duty to speak out against misleading innovations, he started denouncing certain aspects of current beliefs and practices. Some of those who listened to his arguments found them convincing; but they did not take any steps to prevent the ignorant masses from committing sins or to put an end to these innovations. Realizing that his effort was having only a slight effect, he decided to leave the place.[3] However, this preaching activity by the young

---

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 26; MRMN, III, p. 380.
2. 'Unwān, p. 16.
3. Ibid., p. 17. Laoust (Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Taki-d-Din Aḥmad b. Taymiyya, Cairo, 1939, p. 507) states that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb preached against the cult of saints before his travels as a reaction

[Contd.

Muḥammad - which, moreover, seems very unlikely to have taken place at this stage in his life - is not mentioned by Ibn-Ghannām. The first reference by the latter to such activity is during Muḥammad's stay at Basra some time later.[1]

The educational climate at al-'Uyayna appears to have been far from satisfying the ambition of the diligent youth who, accordingly, was determined to seek knowledge somewhere else. The memory of his first pilgrimage and the impressions which he formed on that occasion were still alive in his mind. It was natural, therefore, that he turned his face toward the Hijaz. Once again he set off to the Holy Land with the intention, this time, to stay there and acquire further education, thus ending the first stage in his early career and starting another.

C. His travels:

The Shaykh's travels are of great significance and consequence. Not only were they important in the widening of his understanding and knowledge, but also in the formation of his ideas and doctrines. Although the information given by Ibn-Ghannām and Ibn-Bishr about these journeys seems to be adequate in respect of the places to which he went, the events are not specifically dated. The first country

Contd.] to the neighbouring Shī'ism at Karbalā', al-Kāẓimiyya and al-Ahwāz. This cannot be accepted; for the young Muḥammad at that time was living far from these places in the isolated district of Najd.

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 17. See also MRMN, III, p. 381 and 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh, op.cit., p. 8.

visited by the Shaykh in his successive travels was the Hijāz. No reference is made by the available sources as to his exact age when he left home, but it seems that he was then in his late teens.

The journey began by visiting Mecca where he made his second pilgrimage. Certain sources point out that he studied under the great 'ulamā' of al-Ḥaramayn,[1] which includes Mecca and Medina. This implies that he stayed for a while in the former place, but Ibn-Bishr definitely states that the Shaykh left the Holy City immediately after his pilgrimage had been performed.[2] Sooner or later, however he arrived at Medina where he started his studies. Unlike what he had known in his town al-'Uyayna, where the teaching was almost limited to Ḥanbalī jurisprudence, the newcomer found himself among eminent 'ulamā' at the Mosque of the Prophet lecturing on different branches of Islamic learning. This was an opportunity for him to choose the teachers he liked, as well as the subjects he wanted to learn. Although he must have joined the circles of a number of scholars,[3] it was with Shaykh 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Ibrāhīm Ibn

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 26; Tawḍīḥ, p. 16; Miṣbāḥ, p. 6; MRMN, III, p. 380.
2. 'Unwān, p. 17.
3. According to certain authors, he studied during his stay at Medina under 'Alī d-Dāghistānī and Ismā'īl al-'Ajlūnī. See Tawḍīḥ, p. 17; Aḥmad Abū-Ṭāmī, ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb: 'Aqīdatu-hu s-Salafiyya wa Da'watu-hu l-Iṣlaḥiyya wa Thanā' al-'Ulamā' 'alay-hi, ed. by 'Alī Ṣubḥ al-Madanī (Cairo, 1383), p. 64. Both Ṣiddīq Ḥasan (Abjad al-'Ulūm, Bhopal, 1879, III, p. 821) and 'Abd al-Karīm al-Khaṭīb (Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd al-Wahhāb al-'Aql al-Ḥurr wa-l-

[Contd.

Sayf and Muḥammad Ḥayāt as-Sindī that he most associated.[1] He was carefully instructed by these two scholars who exercised a great influence on him while he was still at an impressionable stage.

Shaykh Ibn-Sayf belonged to a prominent family, the early ancestor of which was the founder of al-Majma'a, a small town in the Najdī region of Sudayr. Apparently for pious reasons his father migrated to Medina after having converted his house into a mosque, with some of the revenue of his estate to be paid to its imām. In Medina 'Abd-Allāh acquired his education and became a well-known scholar. Besides his knowledge of Ḥanbalī jurisprudence, he was a Traditionist. Among the traditions Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb heard from him was an interesting ḥadīth successively traced by Ḥanbalī scholars to Anas Ibn-Mālik, who narrated that the Prophet said to his companions: "When God wishes one of His slaves well, He makes use of him". The Companions asked him how God makes use of His slave, and the Prophet answered: "He permits him to succeed in doing good work before his death".

Contd.] Qalb as-Salīm, Cairo, 1379, p. 50) state that the Shaykh studied, here, under Abū-l-Mawāhib al-Ba'lī. This seems very unlikely; for the latter, according to al-Jabartī ('Ajā'ib al-Āthār fī t-Tarājim wa-l-Akhbār (Bulāq, 1297, I, p. 72) died in the year 1126.

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 26; 'Unwān, p. 17. Laoust (Essai, p. 507) mistakenly states that the Shaykh came to know Ibn-Sayf during a journey from Medina to al-Majma'a. The fact is that he knew him at the former place and became his student there.

The citation by Ibn-Ghannām of this tradition, together with the long chain of authorities on which it was based, shows the particular importance which he gives to it and suggests that it was, also, important to the Shaykh himself. Whether or not he had already started thinking of the mission awaiting him at home, there can be little doubt that he was impressed by this tradition and encouraged to consider applying it to his own life. Shaykh Ibn-Sayf authorized his student Muḥammad to recite and teach all the traditions selected by Abū-l-Mawāhib al-Ba'lī from the reliable six books of the Ḥadīth.[1]

Ibn-Sayf was an admirer of Ibn-Taymiyya, and no doubt he drew the attention of his student to this celebrated scholar and assisted him in the study of his works. Moreover, he appears to have fully understood the religious and social situation in Najd and to have felt the urgent need for its reform. This, in his opinion, could be achieved by education. One day, he asked his student if he would like to see the kind of arms he had been preparing for al-Majma'a. Then, he took Muḥammad to a room full of books, pointing out that these were what was most urgently needed there.[2]

An event of great importance took place when Shaykh Ibn-Sayf introduced his student to an eminent scholar called Muḥammad Ḥayāt as-Sindī, who was an authority on Ḥadīth and

---

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 27; Tawḍīḥ, p. 17.
2. 'Unwān, p. 27.

its branches.[1] He was opposed to the imitation (taqlīd) commonly accepted by the followers of the four Sunnī schools, advocating instead ijtihād. On the other hand, he was so extremely against innovations that he seems to have considered those who practised them similar to the idolaters, applying to them Qur'ānic verses concerning the old pagans. To illustrate this attitude a report by Ibn-Bishr of a conversation between Muḥammad Ḥayāt and his student may be cited. One day, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb was watching a group of people near the tomb of the Prophet, calling upon him for intercession, when his teacher joined him. The student asked him what he thought of the conduct of those people. The answer was: "Surely this they are engaged upon shall be shattered, and void is what they have been doing".[2]

Thus, we can detect three factors which influenced the Shaykh's thinking during his stay at Medina, and put him on the first stage of the road he was to take for his mission. These were the reading of Ibn-Taymiyya's works, the association with Muḥammad Ḥayāt as-Sindī who was extremist in his criticism of innovations, and the spectacle of practices bordering on idolatry by certain visitors to the Prophet's tomb.

The sources do not mention the means by which the Shaykh covered his expenditure during his stay at Medina. Although he may have received support from the waqf endowments usually granted to the students in this city, it is

---

1. Among his works on the subject are Tuḥfat al-Anām bi-Ḥadīth an-Nabī 'alay-hi Afḍal aṣ-Ṣalāt wa-s-Salām, and Tuḥfat al-Muḥibbīn fī Sharḥ al-Arba'īn. See Ibid., p. 31.
2. 'Unwān, p. 18. Compare Qur'ān, 7/138.

most likely that he was receiving money from his family, and that he lived as a guest in the house of Shaykh Ibn-Sayf.

Having widened his knowledge and experience, and convinced of the need for reform, the Shaykh left Medina for Najd. Neither Ibn-Ghannām nor Ibn-Bishr mentions how long he remained at home before he again set out on his travels. 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh, however, states that he stayed for a year.[1] During this period at al-'Uyayna he is likely to have continued his reading of Ibn-Taymiyya, and he seems to have privately denounced certain aspects of current beliefs and practices. His preaching of tawḥīd and the discouraging response to it by the distinguished people of his town, which Ibn-Bishr places before his journey to the Hijaz,[2] most probably occurred at this period. This being presumably the case, and inspired by his admiration for the writings of Ibn-Taymiyya, the Shaykh proposed to make a visit to Damascus, the cradle of the celebrated scholars of neo-Ḥanbalism, where an active Ḥanbalī school was still maintained. He appears to have been then about twenty-two years old. According to certain authors, he travelled to Basra, where he was to continue his journey to Syria, but on his arrival there, he settled down and resumed his studies.[3] However, it seems that he stopped in al-Aḥsā' for a while instead of going

---

1. Op.cit., p. 7.
2. 'Unwān, p. 17. See also Laoust, Essai, p. 507; Lammens, Islām: Beliefs and Constitutions, tr. into English by Sir E.D. Ross (London, 1929), p. 181.
3. 'Unwān, p. 18; al-Ḥaydarī, 'Unwān al-Majd fī Bayān Aḥwāl Baghdād wa-l-Baṣra wa Najd (Baghdad, 1962), p. 221; 'Abd ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh, op.cit., p. 7.

directly to Basra. In a letter, apparently written in 1157, to 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Abd-al-Laṭīf, the Shaykh refers to a discussion which they had there twenty years earlier,[1] which would place him in al-Aḥsā' about 1137. Al-Aḥsā' is situated on the road between al-'Uyayna and Basra and was visited by the Shaykh twice; once on his way to Iraq and the other on his return. The region was at that time a centre of learning,[2] where students from Najd, as well as other parts of Eastern Arabia came to study under scholars representing different Sunnī schools.[3] Here, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb met such 'ulamā' and studied under some of them,[4] although the sources do not mention whether this study took place before or after his visit to Basra.

The period which the Shaykh spent at Basra was the longest he ever passed far from home in the course of his studies.[5] It was also of particular consequence both for his education and his preaching. Here, he widened his knowledge of the Tradition and jurisprudence, studying, also, Arabic grammar and copying many works on these subjects.[6]

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 50.
2. 'Uthmān Ibn-Sanad (Sabā'ik al-'Asjad fī Akhbār Aḥmad Najl Rizq al-As'ad, British Museum, MS, Or. 7565) gives biographies of some learned men of this region at this period.
3. While 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Abd-al-Laṭīf was, for example, Shāfi'ī, Ibn-Ghannām was Mālikī and Ibn-'Afāliq was Ḥanbalī.
4. Rawḍa, I, p. 26; Miṣbaḥ, p. 6; Tawḍiḥ, p. 17; MRMN, III, p. 380; 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Nāṣir, op.cit., f. 7.
5. Rawḍa, I, p. 27; MRMN, III, p. 380.
6. Rawḍa, I, p. 27.

One of his teachers was Muḥammad al-Majmū'ī, who was later to support his student's doctrines.[1] At Basra, a commercial town and a centre of trade, there must have been many aspects of daily life which were contrary to the purity of Islam, especially in the eyes of a conservative Ḥanbalī from Central Arabia. Moreover, the Shaykh came into contact with the Shī'īs. Nearby were an-Najaf, where pilgrimage was made to 'Alī's shrine, and Karbalā', where the tomb of al-Ḥusayn was regarded a sacred spot. The gap between the Sunnīs and the Shī'īs was wide, and there was much in Shī'īsm that was sharply rejected by the Sunnīs. In reaction to the situation in which he found himself, the Shaykh began to denounce both privately and publicly all innovations and idolatrous practices. Thus, he was not just a student but also a preacher, with a circle of listeners.[2] Arguments and disputes took place between him and his opponents, and describing this atmosphere, the Shaykh himself says:

> "Certain men among the idolatrous people of Basra used to bring equivocations (shubuhāt) and pose them on me. Then I would say while they were sitting in front of me: The whole worship belongs to no one but God, whereupon they would all be astonished and silent".[3]

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 18. 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh, (op.cit., pp. 7-8) is contradicting himself. While saying that al-Majmū'ī was an eminent scholar in tawḥīd, he mentions that the Shaykh explained to him this subject and the meaning of "there is no god but Allāh".
2. This might be the reason for certain authors to say that he travelled to propogate his ideas. See MRMN, III, p. 340; Rousseau, Description du Pachalik de Bagdad (Paris, 1809), p. 131.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 28.

Although the doctrines of the Shaykh were approved by his teacher al-Majmū'ī and a few others, they did not receive a sympathetic hearing from the rest of the inhabitants. Indeed, they were resented by the chief men in the town, and the preacher was looked on as an upstart and a trouble-maker. Such an attitude was natural, and the inevitable consequences had to come. The Shaykh was forced to leave the town. Ibn-Bishr narrates the circumstances of his departure, stating that one day he was attacked by certain people, including some leaders of the society, and was expelled from the town at midday. He headed on foot for az-Zubayr unaccompanied, and on the way he almost died of exhaustion and thirst, but he was rescued by a certain merchant called Abū-Ḥumaydān, who was very impressed by his gravity and dignity. Accordingly, he gave him water and let him ride his donkey to az-Zubayr.[1] Ibn-Ghannām, however, does not mention this expulsion and departure for az-Zubayr.

Neither Ibn-Ghannām nor Ibn-Bishr mentions how the Shaykh supported himself during his stay at Basra. According to certain authors he was a part-time merchant,[2] and it is likely, too, that he earned some money through teaching.

Although the Shaykh's stay at Basra seems to have come to an unhappy end, it was certainly successful in certain other respects. The subjects which he studied here, particularly Arabic grammar, were useful and necessary for the

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 18. See also al-Ḥaydarī (op.cit., p. 221), who seems to have copied Ibn-Bishr in this matter.
2. Rehatsek, "The History of the Wahhábys in Arabia and in India", JRAS, Bombay Branch, XIV (1878-80), p. 275.

presentation of his ideas. The disputes which occurred between him and his opponents developed in him a skill in argumentation. Even though he met with strong opposition, he succeeded at least in propagating his cause and letting his doctrines be heard.

From az-Zubayr, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb intended to travel to Syria, but due to a financial problem he could not carry out his plan, and had to prepare to return home. Shortly after, he left az-Zubayr, and on his way he broke off his journey at al-Aḥsā', where he was the guest of Shaykh 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Abd-al-Laṭīf.[1] From here he set off for Ḥuraymilā' to join his father, who had been living there since his dismissal from the qaḍā' of al-'Uyayna in 1139.[2] Thus ended his travels outside Najd.

There is no mention by the Najdī authors, the followers and the relatives of the Shaykh, that his travels extended beyond the Hijaz, Basra and al-Aḥsā'. However, more extensive and wider travels are reported by some other sources. Some of those who have written about the life of the Shaykh appear to have partially[3] or entirely[4] relied on the account given by the author of the Lam'. According to him, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb left Najd for Basra when he was thirty-seven

1. 'Unwān, p. 18; al-Ḥaydarī, op.cit., p. 221.
2. al-Fakhiri, f. 41; 'Unwān, p. 18; Ḥawādith, p. 101.
3. See, for example, Margoliouth "Wahhābīya", EI[1].
4. Here can be cited as an example Khaz'al in Ḥayāt ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb (Beirut, 1388), pp. 60-67.

years old. Here, he spent six years preaching his ideas and studying astronomy (_'ilm al-hay'a_) and geometry (_handasa_). Then he travelled secretly to Baghdad, where he studied theology under 'Abd-ar-Raḥīm al-Kurdī, and married a wealthy woman, who died leaving him 2,000 dīnārs. In the sixth year after his arrival in this city, he departed to Kurdistān, and after having spent a year here he moved to Hamadhān, where he was to remain for two years. From here he left for Iṣfahān at the commencement of Nādir Shāh's reign. Here, he studied for four years peripatetic philosophy and for another three years illuminist wisdom and the systems of the Ṣūfīs. Then he moved to ar-Rayy, and from there to Qumm, where he stayed for a month. Following this, he went to Turkey, where he met a group of people and spoke with them in their own language. Then he spent six months in Aleppo, a year in Damascus and two months in Jerusalem. From here, he went to Egypt[1] and spent more than two years studying astronomy (_'ilm al-usturlāb_). Finally, he returned home through Suez, Yanbu', Medina and Mecca.[2]

The inaccuracy of this author is clear, and his report can be easily rejected for many reasons. Concerning the dates, the account places the commencement of the journey in a year by which time it had surely ended. Since the Shaykh was born in 1115, he must have begun his travels

---

1. Ḥamīd Ibn-Ruzayq, the author of _aṣ-Ṣaḥīfa l-'Adnāniyya_, British Museum, MS, Or. 6569, f. 135, mistakenly mentions that the Shaykh spent a long time in Egypt.
2. _Lam'_, pp. 15-22.

according to this account in 1152. It is known for certain that by this time the Shaykh was back from his journeys. Spending twenty-three years or so in travel, as the report claims, would place the return of the Shaykh to Najd in the year 1175; but by this time 17 years had already passed since the alliance between Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb and Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd. The account suggests that the Shaykh knew Persian; for he spent not less than nine years in Persia, and definitely states that he spoke Turkish. There is no evidence that he knew either of these two languages. Furthermore, had the Shaykh studied philosophy, illuminist wisdom and mystic systems, as maintained by the account, traces of these subjects would have appeared in his works. On the contrary, his style and writings are far from being influenced by, or linked with, philosophy and mysticism.

Apart from the dates and the subjects which he claims the Shaykh studied, the author of the Lam' does not, however, stand alone. Certain authors, who could not have seen his work, state that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb travelled to regions beyond those referred to in the Najdī sources. Persia, Baghdad and Damascus are among the places mentioned. Niebuhr says that the Shaykh "made several journeys to Baghdad, and through Persia".[1] On the other hand, 'Abd-al-Laṭīf ash-Shushtarī, a contemporary of the Shaykh and the author of Tuḥfat al-'Ālam, mentions that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb had first learned elementary Arabic grammar and

---

1. Travels, II, p. 131.

basic Ḥanafī jurisprudence at home, and then moved to Iṣfahān where he studied uṣūl and perfected himself in philosophy. In or about 1171, he was a leader of his people, disassociating himself from the Ḥanafī school and establishing a new madhhab.[1] Basing his information on Mirzā Muḥammad 'Alī, who apparently relied on ash-Shushtarī, Chodzko mentions the Shaykh's study of Arabic grammar and Ḥanafī jurisprudence in Najd, his travels to Iṣfahān, fixing his return home in 1171.[2] The statements of both Niebuhr and ash-Shushtarī concerning the visit of the Shaykh to Persia cannot be unreservedly accepted. The information given by them in respect of other matters of his life and doctrines is certainly wrong,[3] so this on his travels is most likely to be so, too. Ḥamad al-Jāsir, who accepts only that the Shaykh travelled to the Hijaz, Basra and al-Aḥsā', sees in the allegation by the author of the Lam' about the journeys of the Shaykh to Persia and his study of the subjects mentioned an attempt to distort the truth of his doctrines.[4] This could have been the case, and both Niebuhr and ash-Shushtarī might, also, have relied on baseless rumours about all aspects

1. An article by Ṣāliḥ ash-Shahrastānī in al-Ikhā' (23d Shaw., 1389), reproduced by Muqbil al-'Īsā in al-'Arab, IX (1390) pp. 859-63, under the title "Jawānib min Ḥayāt ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb".
2. Op. Cit., p. 171.
3. For example, ash-Shushtarī's claim that the Shaykh was at first a Ḥanafīte, and Niebuhr's statement (Travels, II, p. 134) that the Wahhābīs do not consider Muḥammad a Prophet, but only a great man.
4. al-'Arab, X (1390), p. 944.

of the movement of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb which were current at that time.

The Shaykh's visit to Baghdad is more widely reported than his journeys to Persia. Apart from Niebuhr, it is mentioned by Waring,[1] Rousseau,[2] Hogarth,[3] Rehatsek[4] and al-Ḥaydarī.[5] The latter's report is of particular importance, for he states that his father told him that the Shaykh was in Baghdad where he studied under his great grandfather, the celebrated scholar Ṣibghat-Allāh al-Ḥaydarī. As a token of the friendly relations between the family of al-Ḥaydarī and the Shaykh, As'ad Ibn-Ṣibghāt-Allāh was the most honoured guest of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb and Su'ūd Ibn-'Abd-al-'Azīz, when he stopped at ad-Dir'iyya on his return from Mecca to Iraq. On the authority of al-Ḥaydarī, al-'Ajlānī thinks it most likely that the Shaykh visited Baghdad.[6] Yet we must treat this with reserve, for it is a common place to attribute travels in the pursuit of learning to every scholar of importance. Had Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb made a journey to Baghdad and studied under such a renowned teacher,

---

1. Op.cit., p. 119.
2. Op.cit., p. 131.
3. Arabia (Oxford, 1922), p. 100.
4. Op.cit., p. 275.
5. Op.cit., p. 236. See also Crichton, II, p. 289; Brockelmann, History of the Islamic Peoples, tr. into English by T. Carmichael and M. Parlmann (2nd edition, New York, 1960), p. 352; Cash, The Expansion of Islam, (London, 1928), p. 191.
6. Ta'rīkh al-Bilād al-'Arabiyya as-Su'ūdiyya (Beirut, 1385/1965), p. 196.

this would certainly have been mentioned by some of those who wrote about his life from among his students, his followers and his relatives. It seems, therefore, unlikely that he ever visited Baghdad.

While the Najdī sources which, being most proximate, are most likely to be reliable, definitely state that he could not have made a journey to Damascus,[1] certain other authors assert that such a journey was undertaken. Some just refer to his study there,[2] while others mention that he propagated his ideas.[3] According to Waring, he was forced to leave Damascus, after which he headed for Mosul where he resumed his preaching. However, we can rely on the information given by the Najdī authors and accept their statements that the Shaykh did not travel to Damascus; for they were in a position to know the details of his life more than the others. Thus, it can be deducted that he most probably never made any journey beyond the Hijaz, Basra and al-Aḥsā'.

D. His stay at Ḥuraymilā':

As mentioned earlier, the Shaykh ended his travels outside Najd when he rejoined his father and family at

1. 'Unwān, p. 18; MRMN, III, p. 340; 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh, op.cit., p. 8.
2. Luṭf-Allāh Juḥāf, Durar Nuḥūr al-'Īn bi-Sīrat al-Imām al-Manṣūr wa A'yān Dawlati-hi l-Mayāmīn, f. 16; az-Ziriklī, al-A'lām (2nd edition, Cairo, 1954-59), VI, p.137.
3. Rousseau, op.cit., p. 131; Brydges, op.cit., II, p. 7; Waring, op.cit., p. 120.

Ḥuraymilā'.[1] Here, again, the Najdī sources, including Ibn-Ghannām and Ibn-Bishr, do not give the date of this event. Amīn Sa'īd states that it was in the year 1139,[2] but this date seems much earlier than the probable one. Chodzko on the other hand places it in 1171,[3] and this can unreservedly be rejected; for by this time thirteen years had already passed since his settlement at ad-Dir'iyya. Al-'Ajlānī holds the opinion that it took place about 1147,[4] and this is likely to have been the fact. However, this writer contradicts himself when mentioning somewhere else in his work that the Shaykh stayed at Ḥuraymilā' for only four years; two before his father's death and two afterwards.[5] Since his father died in 1153, this implies that his arrival here was in 1151.

On his arrival, the Shaykh found that there had been no improvement in the social and religious situation of his native region during his absence; therefore he resumed his preaching and attack against innovations and certain polytheistic acts currently practised by some of the inhabitants. As demonstrated in the first chapter, the prescribed rites of Islam were definitely observed by all self-respecting

---

1. See above, p. 79.
2. Sirat al-Imām ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb (Beirut, 1382), p. 20.
3. Op.cit., p. 173.
4. Op.cit., p. 208. Laoust's assumption ("Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb", EI^2) that the Shaykh's departure from Basra, which had taken place before his return to Ḥuraymilā', was about 1152 cannot be accepted.
5. Ibid., p. 211.

people in the towns and villages of Najd, yet there were some ignorant people who certainly had a laxity in the observance of these rites, and held superstitious beliefs. His criticism seems to have been so bitter that he met with strong opposition, and even disputes with his father are reported to have taken place,[1] though they do not seem to have come to an open break between the two. Ibn-Bishr, who mentions these disputes, does not precisely give the point over which they occurred. However, according to an anonymous author, the Shaykh remonstrated with his father over the bribes which he used to accept in the performance of his office.[2] Since 'Abd-al-Wahhāb appears to have been against the cult of saints, magic arts and innovations, the cause of disputes between father and son might have been on some issue affecting the practice of qaḍā'. The fees which were normally received by judges in the area, were regarded by the Shaykh as bribery.[3] On the other hand, the differences could have been due to the father's fear of the consequences of his son's activities or, perhaps, just the cautiousness of age against the rashness of youth. Anyhow, it seems that as long as his father remained alive, the Shaykh tried to win followers by setting a good example and by persuasion, though not concealing his views and doctrines. While his adherents were

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 18.
2. Kayf Kān Ẓuhūr Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. No. 6061, f. 1.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 133.

increasing, he concentrated during this period on teaching jurisprudence, Tradition and exegesis, as well as composing his most famous work, Kitāb at-Tawḥīd,[1] in which he set forth the principles of his doctrine. Copies of this work spread quickly and widely over all the districts of the region.

The death of his father in 1153 was the signal for the adoption of a more emphatic line;[2] for he felt less constrained than before. Henceforth, he vigorously declared war on those who by word or act were violating the doctrines of the oneness of God, and even more on those who defended them or did not join him in his mission. The contention between him and his opponents was fierce, but those who accepted his doctrines, though at first a minority, were determined and faithful to him under all circumstances. For them his words and actions were a guidance and an example. In a comparatively short time, he focused the attention of the inhabitants on himself and his prestige extended to other towns and areas. Adherents from almost every part of al-'Āriḍ flocked into Ḥuraymilā' to hear the new reformer.[3] Moreover, his doctrines found support from certain rulers, the most notable being 'Uthmān Ibn-Mu'ammar, the chief of al-'Uyayna. According to Ibn-Bishr, the inhabitants of Ḥuraymilā' were divided into two main factions, each under

---

1. Ibid., I, p. 29.
2. 'Unwān, p. 19.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 29.

its own leader, and not recognizing the authority of the other. One of these two had freedmen called Āl-Ḥumayyān, who were notorious for their immoral and unlawful behaviour, and the Shaykh intended to execute the literal application of religious law against them. Knowing his intentions, they decided to get rid of him, but their attempt against him failed when certain people saw them climbing the wall of his house, and they were obliged to retreat. As a result of this, he became alarmed and finally, determined to leave the town.[1]

E. His move to al-'Uyayna and the first application of his doctrines:

The story given by Ibn-Bishr about the Shaykh's departure from Ḥuraymilā' is not supported by Ibn-Ghannām, whose account of this event is more likely to be true. According to him, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb left Ḥuraymilā' for al-'Uyayna when 'Uthmān Ibn-Mu'ammar accepted his doctrines.[2] Al-'Uyayna, being comparatively powerful and united under a sympathetic leader, offered a more favourable centre for the success of the movement than Ḥuraymilā' which was weak and divided. Thus, the Shaykh moved there in or about the year 1155.[3]

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 19. See also al-Ḥaydarī, op.cit., p. 225; 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh, op.cit., p. 10, and Muḥammad 'Abd-al-Qādir, op.cit., I, p. 126.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 30.
3. Philby (Arabia, London, 1930, p. 9); M.A. Khan ("A Diplomatin Report on Wahhabism of Arabia", Islamic Studies, VII, 1968, p. 34) and 'Abd-al-Ḥamīd al-Batrik (Turkish and Egyptian Rule in Arabia (1810-1814), unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1947, p. 25) mistakenly

[Contd.

This move to al-'Uyayna meant to the Shaykh a return to the place of his birth where he had spent his childhood and acquired his early education. It meant, also, coming to a town in which his family used to hold a high social position. And more important, it was a principality, the chief of which had shown sympathy towards his doctrines. On his arrival, he was received with honour and given a warm welcome, and not long after he married al-Jawhara, the daughter of the great ruler 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Mu'ammar and the aunt of 'Uthmān, the then chief of the town.[1] It was not the reputation of her family alone that attracted the Shaykh to her, but also her own influential rôle and prestige. For example, it was only on her guarantee for the good conduct of her nephew Muḥammad, who was then ruler of al-'Uyayna, that Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd and his men agreed to evacuate their position and return home, following their unsuccessful attempt upon his life in the year 1139. Thus, the relations between the reformer and the political leader were strengthened, and 'Uthmān ordered his townsmen to show respect to the Shaykh and to follow his teachings. This, combined with his growing renown and his eloquent tongue, made it easier and quicker for him to win the confidence and sympathy of the inhabitants.

Contd.] mention that the Shaykh's return to al-'Uyayna was in the year 1157-8/1744. This date was, in fact, the date of his move to ad-Dir'iyya. On the other hand, Laoust ("Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb", EI^2) states the Shaykh's departure from Ḥuraymilā' was in 1153.

1. 'Unwān, p. 19.

By this time, the Shaykh appears already to have had visions of victory for his mission, both spiritually and materially. One day, he said to 'Uthmān: "I hope if you rise in support of the unity of God, He will grant you His aid to rule Najd and its Arabs".[1] His confidence of success had been strengthened by the increase in his supporters, and he thought that the time was propitious to carry out his ideas and embark on his scheme. Most annoying to him was the spectacle of idolatrous practices in the area. As mentioned in the first chapter,[2] blessings were sought by ignorant people here, from certain trees; and nearby, at al-Jubayla, stood a shrine marking the spot where Zayd Ibn-al-Khaṭṭāb was believed to be buried, as well as tombs of other Companions, all of which were objects of veneration where sacrifices were offered. Therefore, he made it his aim to put an end to these practices by cutting down these trees, demolishing the shrine and destroying the tombs.

According to Ibn-Ghannām, the Shaykh discussed the matter with 'Uthmān and won his approval, and thereupon the two, accompanied by a group of townsmen, set out to the spot and destroyed the shrine and the tombs. As for the trees, the Shaykh with a number of his friends cut down the most famous one called Shajarat adh-Dhīb, while another tree known as Shajarat Qaryūh was uprooted by his followers from ad-Dir'iyya, among them the brothers Thunayyān and Mushārī

1. Ibid., p. 19.
2. See above, pp. 56-8.

Ibn-Su'ūd, and Aḥmad Ibn-Suwaylim.[1]

Ibn-Bishr, on the other hand, mentions that the Shaykh paid a certain person to cut down a tree secretly, while he himself uprooted another. When he arrived at the spot, he found a shepherd and gave him some piece of clothing in order to prevent his interference or his disclosure of the event. Following this, the Shaykh conversed with 'Uthmān about the destruction of the dome on the grave of Zayd Ibn-al-Khaṭṭāb, which "was founded", as he maintained, "on falsehood and deceit". Thinking that the inhabitants of al-Jubayla would resist such an action, the two leaders advanced to the spot with six hundred men, thus making any local interference impossible. 'Uthmān hesitated to start the operation, and the Shaykh was the first to begin the demolition.[2]

Whatever way these actions might have taken place, the two authors agree on the end result that within a comparatively short time after his arrival at al-'Uyayna the spectacle of all idolatrous practices in the district had been removed. Nothing could have been more effective in convincing the ignorant people of what the true Islamic faith was and in making them abandon their superstitious belief in these tombs and trees than the demonstration of their inability to do any harm against those who destroyed them. These activities were, in fact, the practical declaration of the beginning of the movement.

Linked with these matters is the account by certain

---

1. Rawḍa, I, pp. 30-31.
2. 'Unwān, pp. 19-20.

authors who report that the movement of the Shaykh started one evening when he was sitting on the roof of his house. A man, whose camel had strayed, passed by invoking in a loud voice the local saint, Sa'd. The reformer asked him if he would not rather call on the God of Sa'd. The story of this incident spread throughout the town and discussions on the matter divided the inhabitants into two parties: one for the belief in the saint and the other for the views of the reformer.[1]

This event might have taken place, and the name Sa'd can be easily connected to Zayd; but to make the incident an issue of dispute among the townsmen, marking the beginning of the movement, is most likely incorrect; for the doctrines of the Shaykh, including such as this, had certainly been known by the inhabitants before that time.

Simultaneously, the Shaykh had been continuing with his plan to establish a community in which the Islamic law had to be obeyed and followed strictly. Such an intention was illustrated by an incident which was to become of considerable consequence. A woman, who had committed adultery, came to him and admitted her crime. She repeated her admission four separate times, and the Shaykh tried in vain to avoid the consequences of her admission by inspiring her to say that she was raped, but she insisted on repeating her confession. Having enquired about her mental state, he found out that she was sane. Even then, he deferred the case for

---

1. Palgrave, op.cit., I, p. 374; Rehatsek, op.cit., p. 278. See, also, el-Batrik, op.cit., p. 27.

a few days in the hope that she might deny the crime, but again she clung to her confession. Accordingly, by his instructions she was executed by stoning.[1]

This incident is significant not only in illustrating how strictly the Shaykh carried out the religious law, but also in reflecting the depth of sincerity among individuals of the new community towards the doctrines of Islam as he preached them, to the extent that one who violated the law would voluntarily admit the crime, knowing its inevitable punishment.

F. Reactions and consequences:

Although it seems that the Shaykh regarded himself as the intellectual superior of his local opponents and in a position to make contacts with other scholars, such as those of Basra,[2] he continued arguing with the Najdī 'ulamā' over his doctrines. The nature of his polemical activities is illustrated in his correspondence with a number of these scholars, which is cited by Ibn-Ghannām. Among these were 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Īsā, 'Abd-Allāh al-Muwayyis and Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥaym.

'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Īsā was the judge of ad-Dir'iyya and appears to have been of considerable renown and influence. Thus, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb sent a message to the inhabitants of Manfūḥa and Riyadh through him, in order that his sympathetic commentary on it would dispose them towards accepting the doctrines included. The Shaykh himself

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 2; 'Unwān, p. 20.
2. al-'Azzāwī, Ta'rīkh al-'Irāq Bayn Iḥtilālayn (Baghdad, 1373), VI, p. 336.

describes him in this message as the greatest scholar in the region.[1] Whether this description was genuine and true or just as a courtesy from the reformer and an attempt to persuade others, the favourable attitude of Ibn-'Īsā was a great factor in winning supporters to the movement.[2] However, under the influence of his son, he disagreed with Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb over certain issues, and there is evidence that the latter was anxious to regain his former support.[3]

Shaykh al-Muwayyis, who had studied in Syria, was the judge of Ḥarma, and he appears to have adopted an unfriendly attitude towards the Shaykh from the very beginning of his movement, though, as will be seen, it was only later on that he became extremely active in his opposition and animosity.

However, at this time, it was Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥaym from Riyadh who was most prominent among the Najdī scholars in his enmity to the reformer, and in his efforts to frustrate him. Although he maintained for a while that the Wahhābī doctrines were right,[4] lately he vigorously opposed them. The Shaykh gives two main reasons for this change. The first was the fear of losing social reputation; for the people would question his knowledge and sincerity since he had not taken the initiative in criticizing the current

---

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 146.
2. Ibid., p. 156.
3. Ibid., pp. 156-58.
4. As claimed by the Shaykh. See Ibid., pp. 114, 140.

practices which were attacked by Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. And the second was the latter's denouncement of what had been practised by Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥaym and others as bribes and ill-gotten. Feeling that he and the local scholars were intellectually in an inferior position, Ibn-Suḥaym sent a letter to the 'ulamā' of al-Aḥsā', Basra, and al-Ḥaramayn, urging them to refute the Wahhābī doctrines lest the common people be deceived. He began this letter to the "Muslim 'ulamā', the servants of the Sharī'a" with these words: "In our region has arisen an ignorant, heretical, astray and misleading man, who has neither knowledge nor piety".

The charges which Ibn-Suḥaym made against the Shaykh were: "he burned the book: Dalā'il al-Khayrāt[1] because its author referred to the Prophet as our master (sayyid) and our client (mawlā)...he also burned the work: Rawḍ ar-Rayāḥīn[2] and re-named it Rawḍ ash-Shayāṭīn...he says that if he gets the power he will destroy the room of the Prophet, and replace the golden spout (mīzāb) of the Ka'ba with a wooden one...he says that the people have not been following the religion - have nothing to stand on - (laysū 'alā shay') for the last six centuries...he does not consider the differences of view among the religious

1. Dalā'il al-Khayrāt wa Shawāriq al-Anwār fī Dhikr aṣ-Ṣalāt 'alā n-Nabī l-Mukhtār, by Muḥammad al-Jazūlī who died in 854. This work has been persistently recited in many parts of the Muslim world, particularly in Turkey. See Hajjī Khalīfa, Kashf aẓ-Ẓunūn 'an Asāmī l-Kutub wa-l-Funūn (Istanbul, 1941), I, p. 752.
2. Rawḍ ar-Rayāḥīn fī Ḥikāyāt aṣ-Ṣāliḥīn, by 'Abd-Allāh al-Yāfi'ī al-Yamanī who died in 768. It contains five hundred stories of Muslim saints. See Ibid., I, p. 918.

imams as mercy (raḥma) but as misfortune...he destroyed the tombs of the martyr Zayd Ibn-al-Khaṭṭāb, and those of other Companions at al-Jubayla...he also demolished a mosque in the same location without any religious justification other than his own evil caprice...he considers as infidels those who do not agree with whatever he says and swear that it is the truth, while he regards as the true faithful those who believe him even if they are sinful; thus apparently he is preaching for his cult and not for the unity of God...he sent a message with one of his propagandists in which he swore that the knowledge which he possessed had not been known by the teachers under whom he claims to have studied, or by his father and the people of al-'Āriḍ...he declares both Ibn-al-Fāriḍ and Ibn-'Arabī to be infidels...he also declares nobles (Sādāt) direct descendants from the Prophet to be kāfirs because they accept votive offerings and anyone who does not agree with him in this is also a kāfir...he denounces religious endowments as illegal...he decries the wages for the performance of pilgrimage...he has abandoned the praise of the Sulṭān in the Friday sermon, claiming that he is dissolute... he considers as an innovation the ṣalāt for the Prophet on Friday...he regards as bribes whatever is received by the judges from the disputants, even if they do not have any other income, and even if they are just in their judgments...he declares to be infidels those who kill an animal for God, mentioning His name on it, but also hope in doing so to avoid the evil of the jinn, and he considers such an animal prohibited".[1]

1. As cited in Rawḍa, I, pp. 111-13.

These charges, as well as others later added to them by the same scholar, were discussed by the Shaykh and his supporters. The reformer described the first five charges in the letter as slanderous. He also denied that he decried the books of the Sunnī rites...that he claimed for himself the right of independent interpretation of the Shari'a...that he rejected imitation (taqlīd)...that he declared to be infidels those who sought the intercession (tawassul) of pious people...that he declared al-Būṣīrī to be kāfir because he addressed the Prophet as the most preeminent of human kind...that he was against the visit to the Prophet's grave and the graves of parents, and that he declared to be kāfirs those who swear by any other than God.[1]

However, just as the charges of Ibn-Suḥaym were to some extent exaggerated and distorted, so, too, must the refutal of some of them by the Shaykh be accepted with reservation. For example, he gives as the reason for the rumour about his burning the Dalā'il al-Khayrāt that he expressed his disapproval of the Ṣūfī escapades which it contained, and that he advised his friends not to think that its reading was more useful than the recitation of the Qur'ān. But aṣ-Ṣan'ānī praises the Shaykh for burning this work, and the Wahhābī chronicler Ibn-Ghannām, who cites this praise,[2] does not deny the basis of aṣ-Ṣan'ānī's reference to this matter. On the other hand, the reformer's son 'Abd-Allāh states that they - the Wahhābīs - do not destroy any work unless it

1. Ibid., p. 114.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 47.

contains things that may lead to polytheism, as do Dalā'il al-Khayrāt and Rawḍ ar-Rayāḥīn or may corrupt the belief as logic.[1]

Ibn-Ghannām claims that the locations of the graves of Zayd Ibn-al-Khaṭṭāb and other Companions were actually unknown, and states that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb destroyed the tombs alleged to be theirs as a sign of his obedience to the commandments of the Prophet, and because these were objects of idolatrous practices.[2] He also mentions that the Shaykh only rejected certain types of endowment called waqf al-Junuf, as, for example, when a person, desiring to prevent the female children from getting their proper heritage, would make the revenue of the waqf go to the males alone. As for the wages for the performance of pilgrimage, he states that this was an issue in dispute among the scholars, and the Shaykh was against those who do not make the pilgrimage unless they are paid. The reformer's abandonment of the praise of the Sulṭān in the Friday sermon was due to its being an innovation.

Concerning what is received by the judges, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb agrees with his opponents that what is taken to frustrate a right or establish a baseless claim is a bribe, but he adds that if the judge, unless he is paid, does not try to see that the entitled person gets his right, then what he receives is also a bribe. He alleges that certain judges

1. Ḥadiyya, pp. 30-31.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 123.

made it a custom to ask one of the disputants to pay them ten Aḥmar, and if he refused they would take it from the other and pass sentence in his favour.[1] Regarding the tadhkīr and ṣalāt for the Prophet on Friday, as practised in many parts of the Muslim world, the Shaykh admits that he considered it as innovation, quoting as-Suyūṭī who mentions that it was introduced at the time of an-Nāṣir Ibn-Qalāwūn.

Still, the letter of Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥaym seems to have created concern among the scholars of al-Aḥsā', though some of them had already been acquainted with the doctrines of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. Led by 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Abd-al-Laṭīf and Muḥammad Ibn-'Afāliq, they declared the Shaykh to be an infidel, an innovator and a Khārijite. As Ibn-'Abd-al-Laṭīf was a famous judge and an influential scholar, the reformer paid great attention to his criticism and sent him a letter,[2] expressing his deep sorrow at seeing him joining the opposition, and urging him "to be the Fārūq (the discerning one) of the contemporary Islam as 'Umar Ibn-al-Khaṭṭāb was in its early days". He pointed out that what he said or did was in accordance with the Sharī'a and not the result of ignorance. He maintained that he was not propagating for any particular imām, jurist, ṣūfī or theologian, but only for true Islam. He, also, invited his opponents to refer the matters of differences between them to the Qur'ān, the

---

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 186. The partiality of these judges and their acceptance of bribes was referred to by Ḥumaydān ash-Shuway'ir. See Khiyār, I, p.121.
2. As quoted by Ibn-Ghannām, Rawḍa, I, pp. 50-60.

Tradition, and the consensus of the scholars; if an agreement could not be reached through these three sources, then make a mubāhala (a mutual appeal to God to curse the one of the two that is in the wrong).

Although the attitude of the scholars in al-Aḥsā' was encouraging to the Najdī opposition to the Shaykh, their arguments seem to have been unsuccessful in preventing the increase in his followers not only among the inhabitants of the towns and villages but, also, among the nomads. Sympathy for his doctrines was demonstrated by poets such as Ḥumaydān ash-Shuway'ir,[1] and, moreover, his prestige extended beyond the region. The eminent scholar Muḥammad aṣ-Ṣan'ānī from the Yemen sent him a poem, praising him for his endeavour to revive Islam and expressing his delight to see him making propaganda for the principles which he himself believed in. This success being realized by his opponents, recourse was made to political means. They turned to the rulers, warning them that it was their obligation, as Muslim leaders responsible for the preservation of the faith, to put an end to Wahhābī errors and innovations, and suggesting that the Shaykh's purpose was nothing less than to stir up the common people to revolt against their authority.[2]

This appeal found a positive response from Sulaymān Ibn-Muḥammad, chief of Banū Khālid and ruler of al-Aḥsā', who might already have been worried that the rapidly increasing number of followers of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb would lead

1. Khiyār, I, pp. 113-4.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 32.

to the emergence in the area of a state able to challenge his authority. The military power of the Khālidī leaders and their economic aid to Āl-Mu'ammar, as well as the commercial importance of al-Aḥsā' and its harbours for the inhabitants of al-'Āriḍ, including al-'Uyayna, were strong factors in the hands of the chief of Banū Khālid to dictate his policy for the frustration of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb.

Both Ibn-Ghannām and Ibn-Bishr emphasize the significance of the adulteress's affair in widening the prestige of the Shaykh, and the former considers it, also, as the chief cause for the anger of the ruler of al-Aḥsā' who, as claimed by this writer, was an adulterer.[1] Although this claim is supported by another author,[2] it cannot be accepted without reservation; for even the latter is pro-Wahhābī. Still, the incident was exploited by the reformer's opponents who argued that he did not have the right to execute the woman without the permission of the supreme Imām,[3] and, therefore, it is most likely to have been one of the charges which they

1. Rawḍa, II, pp. 2-3; 'Unwān, p. 20. Compare Holt, Egypt and the Fertile Crescent, p. 150.
2. Anonymous, Kayf kān Ẓuhūr Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, f. 2.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 207. The Shaykh's answer to this was that any ruler exercizing power over a town or various towns has the authority to carry out the provisions of the Sharī'a; otherwise, these will be ignored since the Muslims have not been united under one leader for many centuries.

referred to the ruler against him.

However, Sulaymān Ibn-Muḥammad wrote to 'Uthmān Ibn-Mu'ammar, demanding that the preacher be disposed of. Although Ibn-Bishr states that the Khālidī chief ordered 'Uthmān to kill him, Ibn-Ghannām mentions that he instructed him either to kill him or expel him from the town. He threatened that, should he continue to countenance the Shaykh, he would cut off his economic aid (said to have been twelve hundred Aḥmars with food and clothes[1]) and to prevent him from collecting the harvest of the palm-trees which he possessed in al-Aḥsā'. Moreover, he would forbid the merchants of al-'Uyayna to enter this region.[2]

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 20; al-Ḥaydarī, op.cit., p. 231.
2. Lam', p. 34. The author of this work narrates that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb returned from his travels outside Najd to al-Yamāma, where disputes over his doctrines led to quarrels with his cousin, and to bloodshed between the Tamīmī clans. Sulaymān Ibn-Shāmīs, chief of Banū 'Anaza, wrote to the leaders of the town to expel the Shaykh, who finally departed to ad-Dir'iyya.

   As mentioned earlier, the reformer returned from his travels to Ḥuraymilā', and the events which this author mentions here are baseless. In another place, however, the author states that before settling in ad-Dir'iyya, the Shaykh spent some time in al-'Uyayna. He gives an account of his activities and the reasons which resulted in his expulsion from the town, all of which seem to be correct.

   Margoliouth ("Wahhābīya", EI[1]) who relied on the Lam' in respect of this matter, is confused, perhaps because of the author's reference in the first place to the departure of the Shaykh from al-Yamāma to ad-Dir'iyya. Therefore, he mixes the two stories about this expulsion from

[Contd.

Fearing these economic measures on the one hand and the possible military action on the other, 'Uthmān had to submit to the orders of Sulaymān Ibn-Muḥammad. Politely, he revealed the news to the Shaykh, who tried to persuade him to resist the threats, saying that those who stand for the cause of the religion and the revival of Islam would receive the aid of God and win victory over their opponents. 'Uthmān thought it rude to be rash in telling the former about his decision on the subject, thus he waited a few days before he informed him that he could no longer protect him and asked him to leave the town[1] at least for a year or two, after which the circumstances might change and he could come back.[2] While Ibn-Ghannām merely mentions that the Shaykh left al-'Uyayna for ad-Dir'iyya, Ibn-Bishr gives some details about the preparations for the journey and the way it was conducted. According to him, 'Uthmān ordered a group of horsemen among them al-Furayd and al-Ḥamrānī to accompany the Shaykh, who chose to go to ad-Dir'iyya. All along the way, he was reciting verses from the Qur'ān and repeating "Praise the Lord! Praise

---

Contd.] the two towns and makes them one. He mistakenly states that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb returned from his travels to al-'Uyayna, making it the place of the activities which the author of the Lam' mentions to have taken place in al-Yamāma, and stating that Sulaymān Ibn-Shāmis was the prince of al-Aḥsā', apparently confusing him with Sulaymān Ibn-Muḥammad whose name occurs in the second story of the Lam'.

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 3; 'Unwān, p. 20; MRMN, III, p. 340.
2. Lam', p. 34.

be to God! There is no god but Allāh and Allāh is the Greatest".[1]

1. In the printed copy of the 'Unwān, p. 21, which is consulted in the present work, the matter is dramatized; "al-Furayd rose while the Shaykh walked in front of him, waving his fan to cool the extreme heat of the summer. Near the grave of a saint called Ya'qūb, the horseman tried to kill the Shaykh, but God made him frightened and he could not move. Thus, he changed the direction of his horse and returned to al-'Uyayna". However, Ibn-Bishr "discovered that the story of 'Uthmān's orders to his horsemen to kill the Shaykh and the attempt to do so, as well as the walking of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb was absolutely baseless" so he omitted it. See the manuscript of this work in the British Museum Or. 7718, f. 8 which, was written in 1270 and seems to be the author's own handwriting.

CHAPTER III

Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb after the Alliance with Āl-Su'ūd.

A. Āl-Su'ūd at ad-Dir'iyya:

The history of Āl-Su'ūd in the district of al-'Āriḍ goes back to as early as the middle of the ninth century of the Hijra. An ancestor of this family called Māni' al-Muraydī, with a section of his clan, inhabited a place known as ad-Dir'iyya in the vicinity of al-Qaṭīf, while another section of the same clan under the leadership of Ibn-Dir' was settled in the hamlets of al-Jiz'a and Ḥajr in Wādī Ḥanīfa. Ibn-Dir' was a man of influence who owned extensive lands and was apparently of more consequence than Māni'. An exchange of letters between the two led to Māni' emigrating to al-'Āriḍ in 850.[1]

Ibn-Dir' presented the newcomer with the two fiefs of al-Mulaybīd and Ghaṣība, where a village was established which came to be known as ad-Dir'iyya, probably in remembrance of the emigrants' previous dwelling-place or in

---

1. al-Fākhirī, f.l. Ibn-Bishr (_'Unwān_, pp. 388-9) is confused about who was the first to emigrate; for while he says at the beginning of his account that it was Rabī'a Ibn-Māni', after a few lines he mentions that it was Māni' himself. However, he clears this up in his introduction to the second part of this work (p. 245) where he affirms that it was Māni' who corresponded with Ibn-Dir' and came to al-'Āriḍ. Ibn-'Īsā, on the other hand, records that Māni' was accompanied by his son Rabī'a when he emigrated to this region. See _Ḥawādith_, p. 34.

reference to Ibn-Dir' as a sign of gratitude. The new settlement of Māni' and his followers was situated between the territories of his relatives, ad-Durū' in the south-east and Āl-Yazīd in the north-west. However, it was Rabī'a Ibn-Māni' who laid the foundations of the family's prosperity and showed ambition for territorial expansion. Relatives and allies, called al-Mawālifa, gathered about him, increasing his military potential. By that time, his neighbours Āl-Yazīd had declined in power, and were incapable of holding a certain large section of their territories which they sold to Ḥasan Ibn-Ṭawq in 850.[1]

The ambitious Rabī'a, who coveted the farms of Āl-Yazīd, opened hostilities against them. His son, Mūsā, was a distinguished warrior, who achieved a prestige greater than that of his father. Inspired by an aggressive desire for the chiefdom, Mūsā attempted to murder Rabī'a, but the latter, badly wounded, escaped with his life and fled to al-'Uyayna, where he was made welcome by Ḥamad Ibn-Ḥasan Ibn-Ṭawq.

Mūsā increased his attacks against Āl-Yazīd and, finally, in an early morning battle which became proverbial,[2] he inflicted heavy losses upon them and obliged them to evacuate the area, leaving eighty of their men dead.[3] Thus, their territories were annexed to those of Mūsā and his

---

1. al-Fākhirī, f. 1; 'Unwān, p. 387; Ḥawādith, p. 35.
2. The expression Ṣabāḥ al-Mawālifa li-Āl-Yazīd is used to indicate a great disaster.
3. 'Unwān, p. 245; Ḥawādith, p. 37.

people. When he was succeeded by his son Ibrāhīm, the prestige of the family had been effectively established in Wādī Ḥanīfa to the south of al-Jubayla.

Ibrāhīm Ibn-Mūsā had several sons, one of whom was Markhān, who succeeded him in the chiefdom and who, in turn, was succeeded by his son Rabī'a. The latter is referred to as the amīr of ad-Dir'iyya in a notice concerning his pilgrimage with his brother Muqrin in the year 1039.[1] The fact that this event was thought worthy of being recorded is some indication of his fame at that time. Information about affairs at ad-Dir'iyya, following this pilgrimage, is very scant and,indeed, the next reference does not occur until the year 1065, when Waṭbān Ibn-Rabī'a murdered his cousin Markhān Ibn-Muqrin and took Ghaṣība.[2] Whether the chiefdom of ad-Dir'iyya passed from Rabī'a to his brother Maqrin and then to the latter's son or passed directly to Markhān Ibn-Muqrin is not recorded.

However, the chiefdom continued to be disputed between Āl-Maqrin and Āl-Waṭbān, passing from one branch to another until they both became weak, and a certain Sulṭān Ibn-Ḥamad al-Qibs came to power in the year 1107.[3] Thirteen years

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 395.
2. al-Fākhirī, f. 5; 'Unwān, p. 402.
3. 'Unwān, p. 413; Ḥawādith, p. 77. It is to be noticed that Ibn-Bishr refers to Sulṭān on the occasion of his assumption of power as Sulṭān al-Qays, but when mentioning his murder, he points out that his surname was al-Qibs. Ibn-'Īsā on both occasions refers to him as al-Qibs. Philby in Saudi Arabia (London, 1955, p. 20) makes his surname al-Qaysī.

later, he was killed and his brother who succeeded him did not survive for more than a year; he, too, being murdered.[1] Following this, Mūsā Ibn-Rabī'a Ibn-Waṭbān held the chiefdom but he was eventually deposed and the power passed into the hands of Su'ūd Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Muqrin, who died in the year 1137.[2]

Su'ūd was not succeeded by his son but by Zayd Ibn-Markhān,[3] who was apparently the senior member of the family. The latter was displaced by Muqrin Ibn-Muḥammad, who later sought a reconciliation with him. Zayd, however, would not agree to visit Muqrin unless his security was guaranteed by Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd and Muqrin Ibn-'Abd-Allāh. During the meeting, Muqrin Ibn-Muḥammad appeared to have made an attempt to murder Zayd, but he was immediately killed by the two guarantors, and Zayd returned to the chiefdom. In an effort to achieve prestige, he prepared an army to invade al-

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 417.
2. al-Fākhirī, f. 39; 'Unwān, p. 422. Philby in Arabian Jubilee (London, 1922, p. 255) erroneously states that Su'ūd died in 1747=1160.
3. 'Unwān, p. 422; Ḥawādith, p. 97. Sha'afy in his thesis, (p. 30) is mistaken in stating that on the death of Su'ūd Ibn-Muḥammad, his son Muḥammad succeeded him in the amirate of ad-Dir'iyya about 1726-1727. It is true that Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd assumed power in this year, but his father died two years earlier and was succeeded by Zayd Ibn-Markhān, who was deposed and later brought back to the chiefdom following the murder of Muqrin Ibn-Muḥammad. When Zayd was shot dead, Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd came to power. Both Philby (Arabian Jubilee, p. 255) and Amīn Sa'īd (Ta'rīkh ad-Dawla s-Su'ūdiyya l-Ūlā, Beirut, 1964, I, p. 50) state that Su'ūd was succeeded by his son Muḥammad, and the latter says that Su'ūd died in 1140.

'Uyayna, intending to exploit the confusion of the town which had been stricken by plague in the year 1138, losing its great leader and many of its men. However, Zayd's attempt failed and he was shot dead. The rest of the group which accompanied him returned to ad-Dir'iyya under the leadership of Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, who thenceforth remained its chief.

Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd had distinguished himself before assuming power. As mentioned above, he was in a position to guarantee the security of others from any harm the ruler might attempt against them. From the time he assumed power until his alliance with Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, ad-Dir'iyya enjoyed stability, and he passed these eighteen years unchallenged. This might have been partly due to his expulsion of the dangerous members of Āl-Waṭbān from the area.[1]

When it became desirable that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb should leave al-'Uyayna, the most attractive refuge for him was ad-Dir'iyya. This town had been growing in military strength. In the year 1122, its ruling family regained power, and eleven years later, when it was attacked by Su'dūn Ibn-Muḥammad the chief of Banū Khālid, the inhabitants of the town killed a great number of the invaders.[2] Its former defensive attitude developed into an offensive one, as can be seen in the preparations against al-'Uyayna in the year 1139; and it was only by the military aid of its ruler Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd that Dihām Ibn-Dawwās was able to put down the rebellion against him in Riyadh in the year 1152.[3]

1. Ḥawādith, p. 4.
2. 'Unwān, p. 421.
3. Rawḍa, II, p. 5.

On the other hand, the rulers of ad-Dir'iyya had been on bad terms with Āl-Ḥumayd the chief of which was behind the expulsion of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb from al-'Uyayna and, thus, would most probably welcome the expelled Shaykh whose enemy was theirs, too. Moreover, the reformer's doctrines had already been adopted by notable individuals in ad-Dir'iyya, among whom were Thunayyān and Mushārī, the brothers of its chief, and his son 'Abd-al-'Azīz.

B. The Shaykh's move to ad-Dir'iyya and his alliance with Āl-Su'ūd:

According to Ibn-Ghannām, when Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb arrived at ad-Dir'iyya he stayed for one day as a guest in the house of 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Suwaylim, and then he moved to the house of his former student, Aḥmad Ibn-Suwaylim. On learning of this, Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, accompanied by his two brothers, Thunayyān and Mushārī, paid him a visit and made him welcome to the town. He, also, offered him a protection equal to that of his own women and children, provided that he would not leave the place, and to this the Shaykh agreed.[1]

However, Ibn-Bishr tells the story of the Shaykh's arrival and his first meeting with Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd in a somewhat different way. According to him, the Shaykh arrived at ad-Dir'iyya in the late afternoon and went to

---

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 3. Palgrave (op.cit., I, p. 376) mentions that the Shaykh alighted at the ruler's castle-gate and claimed protection.

the house of Muḥammad Ibn-Suwaylim,[1] who was apprehensive of the reaction of Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd once he discovered the news of the reformer's stay. The Shaykh consoled him, affirming that God would provide an outlet for both of them. Certain distinguished men of the town knew of his whereabouts and secretly visited him. Having heard him preach, they intended to inform Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd of his presence and recourse and to advise that he be given support, but they did not have the courage to do so. Therefore, they made contact with his wife, Mūḍī bint-Waṭbān, who was known as a wise woman, and informed her about Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb and his doctrines. Impressed, she persuaded her husband to welcome the Shaykh and give him protection, saying "This man is granted to you by God; he is a blessing of which you should take advantage". Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd then intended to send for Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb to come to his house, but his associates advised him to go himself to the newcomer in order that the inhabitants, too, would show their respect by following the example of their chief. He did so, and in the house of Ibn-Suwaylim he received the Shaykh graciously, congratulating him on having arrived in a place which would offer him greater hospitality than his own. To this he received the reply, "and I usher in for you glory and power; for whosoever holds fast to the affirmation 'There is no God but Allāh'

1. In the manuscript of this work in the British Museum, Or. 7718, f.8 the author states that the Shaykh stayed in the house of 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Suwaylim and his cousin Ḥamad.

and labours for it and supports it, through it he will achieve dominion over lands and people". Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb took this opportunity to explain his doctrines to the amīr, comparing the situation of the early Muslims when they were strictly following the principles of Islam and the situation of the contemporary Najdīs who were neglecting these principles.

Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd imposed two conditions upon the Shaykh: first, that he would not leave ad-Dir'iyya once other towns followed his teachings, and second that he would not try to stop the amīr from taking the taxes which he received from the inhabitants of the town. The Shaykh agreed to the first condition but, reluctant to give a clear answer to the other, he said: "As for the second one, may God grant you victories, the booty from which will be much greater than these taxes".[1]

The account of Ibn-Ghannām seems to be nearer to the truth; for it is unlikely that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, who was now of great renown and whose followers in the town included the two brothers of the amīr and his son, would arrive at ad-Dir'iyya and be visited secretly by the notable people without the knowledge of the ruler himself.[2]

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 22.
2. Burckhardt, Notes, II, p. 97, and Brydges, op.cit., II, p. 7, mistakenly states that Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd was the first convert to the doctrines of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. In fact, these doctrines had been adopted by many people in various towns of the region before the Shaykh's emigration to ad-Dir'iyya.

This meeting between the Shaykh and Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd ended with a simple verbal agreement to work for the cause of Islam, and this may be regarded as the compact or alliance which laid the foundations for a new state in the area. Certain authors maintain that the two leaders agreed at this meeting that the temporal power should be left to Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd and his family, while the spiritual would be reserved for Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb and his descendants.[1] This is improbable, and such an opinion seems to be reached from the way in which affairs in the state were to proceed. It was natural that the political power remained in the hands of Āl-Su'ūd for it had been the ruling family; and the fact that the sons of the Shaykh were to hold offices of a religious character was partly due to their own qualifications and partly because of their father's prestige and rôle in the establishment of the state, not as a result of any previous condition or agreement.

The year in which the Shaykh moved to ad-Dir'iyya is not agreed upon by the chroniclers. According to Ibn-Ghannām, this was in 1157/1744-5.[2] Ibn-Bishr puts it in 1158,[4] and al-Fākhirī mentions that it took place either towards the end of 1158 or at the beginning of 1159.[3] Ibn-Ghannām's account can be regarded as more reliable than those other two authors for two reasons; he was a contemporary

1. Lam', p. 48; Abū-Ḥākima, op.cit., p. 225.
2. Rawḍa, II, p. 4.
3. 'Unwān, p. 25.
4. See f. 46.

of the Shaykh, and he mentions that the latter spent about two years in ad-Dir'iyya before the wars with his opponents started. These hostilities began in the year 1159, and on this all these chroniclers are in agreement.[1]

Ibn-Ghannām does not mention whether or not Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb remained in the house of Ibn-Suwaylim. The author of the Lam' (p. 48) says that Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd left his house to the Shaykh and moved in with his brother. Although the house of the ruler might have been offered to the reformer as a sign of respect and great hospitality, it is most likely that his residence was arranged somewhere

---

1. Many authors are mistaken about the date of the Shaykh's emigration to ad-Dir'iyya, as well as the name of the ruler with whom he made the alliance. Al-Ḥaydarī (op.cit., p. 331) al-Ālūsī (Ta'rīkh Najd, ed. by Muḥammad Bahjat al-Atharī, Cairo, 1343, p. 117) and G. Antonius (The Arab Awakening, London, 1938, p. 32) put the date of his arrival there in the year 1160. Ḥāfiẓ Wahba (Arabian Days, London, 1964, p. 88) places this event in 1157 in accordance with Ibn-Ghannām, but he erroneously converts it to the Christian year 1741 instead of 1744-5. Fu'ād Ḥamza (Qalb Jazīrat al-'Arab, p. 327) mentions that the agreement between the two leaders was in 1744, but he says that the arrival of the Shaykh at ad-Dir'iyya was a year earlier. Phoenix ("A Brief Outline of the Wahhabi Movement", JCAS, XVII, 1930, p. 402) says that the Shaykh moved to this town in 1736 and made the alliance with its ruler in 1742. Both Palgrave (op.cit., I, p. 376) and Rehatsek (op.cit., p. 278) state that the date of this event was 1760. Philby in his introduction to The Heart of Arabia (London, 1922) puts it in 1759, and Zwemer in Arabia (p, 191) makes mention of it in 1765. Margoliouth in The Early Development of Mohammedanism (London, 1914, p. 177) says it took place in 1760.

else. Ibn-Bishr in his description of ad-Dir'iyya during the reign of Su'ūd Ibn-'Abd-al-'Azīz, says that the residence of Āl-Su'ūd was in the western part of the town, while that of the Shaykh's sons was in the eastern quarter known as al-Bujayrī,[1] and here their father might have stayed.

C. The expansion of Wahhābī doctrines and Su'ūdī influence:

The Shaykh began his activities at ad-Dir'iyya by explaining his doctrines to the inhabitants.[2] In this he was supported by his old adherents and students, among whom ten names are specified, including three of the ruler's brothers.[3] It can be presumed therefore, that the reformer

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 23.
2. The author of the Lam' (p. 55) mentions that the first thing the Shaykh did after his arrival in ad-Dir'iyya was to build a mosque the floor of which he ordered to be covered with small stones (ḥaṣbā'). Here the people had to make their congregational prayers and men, as well as women and children, were to attend his explanation of tawḥīd.

   Burckhardt (Notes, II, p. 97), Crichton (op.cit., II, p. 292) and J. Zaydān (op.cit., p. 157) state that Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd married the Shaykh's daughter, and J. Zaydān, moreover, says that she was the mother of his son and successor 'Abd-al-'Azīz. Actually, the latter was born in 1133 twenty-five years before the Shaykh's move to ad-Dir'iyya. See Ḥawādith, p. 93. Both Burckhardt (Notes, II, p. 121) and Brydges (op.cit., II, p. 107) mention that 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad, too, married one of the Shaykh's daughters who was to give birth to his son Su'ūd. In fact, Su'ūd's mother was the daughter of 'Uthmān Ibn-Mu'ammar. See 'Unwān, p. 30.
3. Rawḍa, II, p. 4.

did not find it difficult to win the support of the people whose leading figures had already joined his cause. According to the author of the Lam' (p. 48) within a year of the Shaykh's arrival in the place all its inhabitants adopted his doctrines except four men who emigrated with their families to Tharmadā'.

No sooner had the Shaykh established himself in ad-Dir'iyya than some of his supporters in other towns of the region moved there. They emigrated either as a result of pressure upon them from their opponents or solely to be close to their great teacher and to study under him. It is noticeable that among these emigrants were numbers of the ruling family of al-'Uyayna, who were not on good terms with 'Uthmān Ibn-Mu'ammar. Describing the conditions of the newcomers, Ibn-Bishr says that they were very poor, and because they were eager to learn, they used to work during the night in order to earn enough money to meet their needs and allow them to attend the Shaykh's classes during the day.[1] However, this cannot be unreservedly accepted. Although the majority of these emigrants might have been poor, yet, it is improbable that the reason for their work during the night was to be able to attend the lectures during the day; for these would usually be given at certain hours and the rest of the day would be spent in work. Extra needs for water to be drawn from wells, for example, were met by working during the night. As work in such conditions was

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 23.

hard, jobs of this kind were perhaps offered by the natives to the newcomers, who had to accept them out of necessity. Those who found work were the luckiest, but in a small town like ad-Dir'iyya opportunities for earning were very limited, and the Shaykh, who felt responsible towards those who could not find jobs, had to borrow money in order to provide for their needs.

When 'Uthmān Ibn-Mu'ammar saw the increase of emigrants to ad-Dir'iyya from various towns including his own, he realized that he had made a mistake in letting Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb move from al-'Uyayna, and that the rule of Āl-Su'ūd would become strong, and, perhaps, dangerous to his own position. He, therefore, headed a delegation composed of the chief men of his town and paid a visit to the Shaykh in his new home, asking him to return to al-'Uyayna and promising him honourable treatment and loyal support. Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb told him that this matter should be referred to Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, who refused to agree to his request.[1]

Apart from teaching and composing short works on the principal doctrines of Islam, the Shaykh spent his first two years in ad-Dir'iyya writing letters to various rulers, scholars and tribal chiefs asking them to support his cause. His efforts in this direction were quite successful, and some towns showed a readiness to accept the invitation. Although the religious factor was central to the response he received whether in support of, or in opposition to, his appeals,

---

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 4; 'Unwān, p. 23; al-Ḥaydarī, op.cit., p.233.

particularly among the scholars, the political and economic motives cannot be discounted. Some leaders welcomed the invitation to join his movement because they saw it as a means of gaining an ally against their local rivals. Others, however, looked at it differently and realized the political and economic implications of acceptance; for it meant a sacrifice of part of their independence in favour of Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd and, also, an obligation to pay him at least a part of the revenues which were collected from their subjects.

The Shaykh and Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd were anxious at this time to win the support of Dihām Ibn-Dawwās, the chief of Riyadh, but in this they failed.[1] The opposition of Dihām was apparently for political reasons; otherwise, he was prepared to concede that the doctrines of the Shaykh were correct.[2]

The story of Dihām's rule in Riyadh actually begins at Manfūḥa in the year 1139 when his father Dawwās died,[3] and was succeeded by his eldest son Muḥammad. The latter was killed by his cousin Zāmil Ibn-Fāris, and his five brothers, including Dihām, were banished from Manfūḥa. They took refuge in Riyadh, which was then under the chiefdom of Zayd

1. It is worth mentioning that one of the scholars of this town, Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥaym, had been and was to remain an arch-enemy of the Shaykh.
2. Rawḍa, II, p. 4.
3. al-Fākhirī, f. 39; Ḥawādith, p. 100. Rentz in his thesis (p. 58) mistakenly states that the death of Dawwās was in the year 1093.

Ibn-Mūsā Abī-Zar'a. When Zayd was killed in the year 1146,[1] his slave Khumayyis seized power on behalf of his master's children. Five years later,[2] however, he took fright at the rumour of a plot against him and fled to Manfūḥa, where he was murdered. His departure was an opportunity for Dihām, whose sister was the widow of Zayd, to assume control of the town as regent for his nephew, but shortly afterwards he expelled the young boy from Riyadh and proclaimed himself its chief.

Ibn-Ghannām claims that the rule of Dihām was tyrannical and cites some stories in evidence of this,[3] and the fact that he is at such pains to discredit this chief can be taken as an indication of how seriously this hostility was regarded. It was, indeed, a matter of deep concern to the Shaykh and Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd that the ruler of Riyadh refused to join them.

By the year 1159, the time seemed ripe for the Shaykh to resort to force in order to achieve what he had not been able to do by means of persuasion and argument. His prestige was now firmly established and whatever he proposed was

---

1. Ibn-Ghannām, (Rawḍa, II, p. 5) says that Zayd was killed by his cousin who was insane, but al-Fākhirī (f. 42) and Ibn-'Īsā (Ḥawādith, p. 103) state that he was killed in the fighting with a section of Banū 'Anaza.
2. According to Ibn-Ghannām (Rawḍa, II, p. 5), Khumayyis stayed in power about three years. See also Philby, Saudi Arabia, p. 42, and Ḥamad al-Jāsir, Madīnat ar-Riyāḍ, p. 93. However, al-Fākhirī (f. 42) and Ibn-'Isa (Ḥawādith, pp. 103-4) seem more precise by mentioning his assumption of power in 1146 and his flight from the town in 1151.
3. Rawḍa, II, p. 6.

accepted by his followers. The inhabitants of the region had been indoctrinated to believe that the opponents of the Wahhābī cause were the enemies of Islam who should be fought against and whose properties were lawful spoil. The resources of ad-Dir'iyya were limited and could not meet the needs of the immigrants who had been steadily increasing, and a solution for this problem had to be found. These immigrants, on the other hand, could play an important rôle in the formation of an army. The persecution of Wahhābī adherents in places where the chiefs did not join the movement was, also, sufficient reason for the Shaykh to order his followers to take up the sword. Furthermore, Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, who appeared to be convinced that it was proper and obligatory to fight for this cause, was ready to undertake such an enterprise which might eventually extend his dominion beyond his present territories. Due to its being out of reach of an organized political authority, the region was not only an open field for the propagation of the Shaykh's teachings, but, also, an area where military designs could be fruitfully pursued. The people of the region were warlike and would be responsive to any call for fighting and raiding. Thus, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb ordered his followers to take up arms and wage war in God's path.[1]

According to Ibn-Bishr, the first Wahhābī raiding party

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 24.

was composed of seven men who were so poorly trained that they fell from the camels' backs when they went fast. He is not sure of their object but thinks that it was a group of Bedouins and states that the raiders gained booty and returned safely.[1] It is the practice of this author, in order to glorify the Shaykh, to demonstrate that the movement started weak and that its founder met with great obstacles. His account here, although supported by Burckhardt,[2] seems unlikely to be true, not only because of the numbers which he gives but, also, by the improbability that men who dared to make the raid and bring it to success would not be experienced in riding camels. This raid, however, is not mentioned by Ibn-Ghannām, who says that the first campaign from ad-Dir'iyya was directed against Dihām Ibn-Dawwās.[3] According to him, the latter started the hostilities when, supported by a section of Banū Ẓafīr, he attacked Manfūḥa, which had joined the reform movement. A relief force from ad-Dir'iyya was immediately sent to the place under 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, and the attackers were defeated, Dihām himself being wounded. Thus began the war which lasted for about twenty-eight years, during which time only short periods of truce were observed, and which was to end by Dihām's flight from Riyadh and its falling peacefully into the hands of 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd in 1187.

---

1. Ibid.
2. Notes, II, p. 98.
3. Rawḍa, II, p. 6. See also Lam', p. 79.

The relations between the Shaykh and Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd on the one part and 'Uthmān Ibn-Mu'ammar on the other seem to have been shadowed with suspicions from the beginning. 'Uthmān and his people supported ad-Dir'iyya in some of its raids against Riyadh in the year 1159. In the following year, although certain of the inhabitants of al-'Uyayna again joined Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, 'Uthmān would not participate because of his disapproval of the raid.[1] Following this he sent an invitation to Dihām through the ruler of Tharmadā', and the three leaders held a conference at al-'Uyayna without first informing the Shaykh. According to 'Uthmān, the purpose of the meeting was to win Dihām to the movement by peaceful means, but it was seen by certain supporters of the reformer in the town as a conspiracy against ad-Dir'iyya. It was only 'Uthmān's assurance that he intended to ask Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb to come and give his approval to Dihām's entry to the ranks of the new community that these suspicions were allayed. However, the Shaykh's refusal to come to al-'Uyayna led these supporters to beseige 'Uthmān's residence in order to attack Dihām on his departure; however, he safely escaped during the night.[2]

Realizing the seriousness of the situation, 'Uthmān went to ad-Dir'iyya, where he explained the matter and reaffirmed his loyalty to the doctrines of the Shaykh, promising to take part in the expeditions wherever they might be

---

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 9; 'Unwān, p. 28.
2. Rawḍa, II, p. 10.

directed. Whether or not he was trusted, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb was not in a position to risk disagreeing with him at this stage. His mission, therefore, was successful and he returned to al-'Uyayna with assurances that he would be given a leading rôle in the direction of affairs in the state. According to Ibn-Ghannām, he became the amīr of the Muslims, whose orders were followed by Ibn-Su'ūd himself in times of peace and war.[1] It seems, however, that it was only the military leadership which was left in his hands, and indeed, two unsuccessful attacks against Riyadh were carried out under his command in the year 1161. In the same year, he led an army against Tharmadā'; when its warriors came out to challenge him, they lost seventy of their number and the survivors were obliged to take refuge in a fortress nearby. Although 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd urged 'Uthmān to occupy the defenceless town by force, he refused and withdrew his forces. His refusal is seen by Ibn-Bishr as an attempt to preserve its inhabitants.[2] When 'Abd-al-'Azīz arrived at ad-Dir'iyya, he informed his father and the Shaykh about the battle and 'Uthmān's attitude. Although they disapproved of his conduct, once again they did not openly criticize the ruler of al-'Uyayna. Shortly afterwards, 'Uthmān made another raid on Tharmadā', but this time no fighting took place, and the raiders contented themselves with destroying the crops outside the town.[3] Thenceforth,

---

1. Ibid.
2. 'Unwān, p. 29.
3. Rawḍa, II, p. 13; 'Unwān, p. 29.

'Uthmān's relations with ad-Dir'iyya seem to have become distant, and he did not participate in the attack against Riyadh in 1162. In the following year, a group of his townsmen came to the Shaykh, expressing fear of a possible co-operation between their ruler and the enemy. Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb asked them to pledge him their loyalty and support against whosoever might be hostile to the religion of God, even if it was to be 'Uthmān himself. This they did.[1]

The ruler of al-'Uyayna appears to have seen this event as a provocative act. It, also, coincided with the arrival of a letter from Muḥammad Ibn-'Afāliq, urging him to dissociate himself from Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. Therefore, he began to take suitable measures. It is reported that he intended to expel from his town the devoted supporters of the Shaykh whom he regarded as dangerous elements. Moreover, he sent for Ibn-Suwayṭ, the chief of the Ẓafīr tribe, and Ibrāhīm Ibn-Muḥammad, the ruler of Tharmadā', to meet with him in order to work together against ad-Dir'iyya. However, his opponents acted very quickly, and a group of them, including Ḥamad Ibn-Rāshid, Ibrāhīm Ibn-Zayd and Mūsā Ibn-Rājiḥ, murdered him in the mosque, immediately after the performance of the Friday prayer.[2]

---

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 14.
2. 'Unwān, p. 30. In connection with the assassination of 'Uthmān, there is an incorrect account given by the author of the Lam' (p. 77) that he was killed by the people of al-'Uyayna, who felt that he was secretly a follower of the doctrines of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. Nine years after this event, the latter ordered 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad to invade the town with four thousand men, and this having been done, many of its inhabitants were

[Contd.

When the news of 'Uthmān's assassination reached ad-Dir'iyya, the Shaykh came to al-'Uyayna three days after the event in order to prevent a dispute over the amirate. It was the opinion of certain people, especially those involved in the murder, that no member of Āl-Mu'ammar should hold this post. However, they were opposed by the Shaykh, who thought that such discrimination would provoke the enmity of the family and its supporters. Therefore, he appointed Mushārī Ibn-Mu'ammar amīr. Curiously, ten years later, Mushārī himself was deposed from the governorship for alleged misbehaviour, and was replaced by Sulṭān Ibn-Muḥsin. The Shaykh in person superintended the destruction of the castle of Āl-Mu'ammar on this occasion.[1]

Meanwhile, the intellectual arguments and disputes between the Shaykh and his opponents had been continuing. His advocacy of fighting against those who did not follow his views and join his movement was one of the most important issues, and it was bitterly criticized not only by the scholars but, also, by the common poets. Ḥumaydān ash-

---

Contd.] massacred and the rest forced to depart, leaving their farms destroyed and palm-trees pulled down. Equally wrong is the allegation, which is cited by Waring (op.cit., p. 119) that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, "who was married to the sister of Ibn-Mu'ammar, had the ingratitude to murder his benefactor by his own hands, affirming that he was an oppressor and a tyrant". This author, however, realises that this story "was probably the invention of some bigoted and rancorous Musulman, willing to describe the character of this religious innovator", as he calls him "in the blackest colours".

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 57; 'Unwān, p. 41.

Shuway'ir, who had formerly praised the Shaykh, became somewhat reserved in his attitude towards him. In one of his poems, he says that he was most perturbed by that old man in ad-Dir'iyya whose sayings were correct but whose actions were wrong, and whose arms were books; who made men fight and kill each other while he was sitting comfortably on his carpet.[1]

Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, the Shaykh's own brother, who was the judge of Ḥuraymilā', had been active in opposition to him, and it was under his influence that the inhabitants of this town abandoned their former loyalty to the reform movement in the year 1165. This change of attitude was demonstrated by their dismissal of their amīr, Muḥammad Ibn-Mubārak, and his expulsion from the town. Certain supporters of the Shaykh, also, were forced to depart. After a short stay in ad-Dir'iyya, Ibn-Mubārak received an invitation from his relatives and sympathizers in Ḥuraymilā' to return, promising him full support. On his arrival, he spent the night unnoticed by his opponents, but at sunrise they were informed of his presence, and they immediately attacked the place where he was hiding himself. He was killed together with eight of his companions, and only Mubārak Ibn-'Adwān escaped to ad-Dir'iyya.[2]

The activities of Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb were not confined to Ḥuraymilā'. Indeed, he made efforts to win over to his side the people of al-'Uyayna, and his ideas were secretly spread among them by a certain native of the town

---

1. See Khiyār, I, p. 128.
2. 'Unwān, p. 32.

called Sulaymān al-Khuwayṭir, who was subsequently killed on the orders of the Shaykh. However, Sulaymān's ideas, which are expounded in his work: aṣ-Ṣawā'iq al-Ilāhiyya fī r-Radd 'alā l-Wahhābiyya, appear to have been so well received that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb had to write a book called: Mufīd al-Mustafīd fī Kufr Tārik at-Tawḥīd in refutation of them and send it to al-'Uyayna.

However, action against the rebellious town of Ḥuraymilā' in the year 1167 seems to have been effective, and in the following year, an army composed of eight hundred men under the command of 'Abd-al-Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd reduced it to submission. Members of Āl-Rāshid, who had played an important rôle in opposing its former amīr, were severely punished, and the crops of the town, as well as other properties of its inhabitants, were considered lawful booty. Many of its people fled, among them Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, who escaped on foot to the region of Sudayr. Mubārak Ibn-'Adwān was appointed amīr of the town. An attempt by the leaders of Riyadh, Manfūḥa, Tharmadā', certain of the inhabitants of Sudayr and Thādiq, and the exiled people of Ḥuraymilā' to regain the last town from its new ruler in 1168 did not succeed.[1]

Simultaneously, the people of Manfūḥa, who had been among the earliest adherents of the Shaykh's doctrines, dissociated themselves from his movement and banished their imām from the place. Following this about seventy of its Wahhābī members emigrated to ad-Dir'iyya. However, despite

1. Rawḍa, II,p. 47.

all these obstacles, the strength of the movement was growing. Village after village and town after town offered submission, either by peaceful means or as a result of force, and the balance of political power in the region was tilted in favour of the reformist movement. Fortunately for the Shaykh and his ally Ibn-Su'ūd, they had to struggle only with the petty chieftains in the area at this very early stage of their enterprise. The most likely interference with their progress could be expected to come from Banū Khālid, but the struggle over power among the leaders of this tribe delayed such intervention. It was not until the year 1172 that 'Uray'ir Ibn-Dujayn seems to have established his authority over its different sections. In this year, he prepared an army to invade Najd, but the news of his plans reached ad-Dir'iyya before he started his march, and all places under Wahhābī influence were asked to take precautionary measures and put their fighting men on the alert; ad-Dir'iyya itself was quickly surrounded by two defensive walls. 'Uray'ir penetrated into the region of al-'Āriḍ and finally reached al-Jubayla, which had been strengthened by reinforcements sent by the Shaykh and Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd. An attempt to occupy its castle did not succeed, and the determined resistance shown by its defenders compelled the attackers to withdraw.[1]

The failure of 'Uray'ir's campaign stimulated the morale of the Wahhābīs. Not only did their military activities in

---

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 55; 'Unwān, p. 40.

Najd increase, but, also, other districts now seemed to be vulnerable to their expansion. Indeed, 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd even dared to raid al-'Aḥsā' itself in 1176, just four years after its ruler had invaded his territories. The raid was successful, and seventy people from the village of al-Muṭayrīfī were killed and the town of al-Mubarraz, too, was attacked. It could have been this show of Wahhābī strength that led such an obstinate leader as Dihām Ibn-Dawwās to ask the Shaykh and Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd for a truce and to pay them two thousand Aḥmar in return.[1]

While 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad had been continuing his raiding, an event took place in the year 1177 which was to have serious results. A section of the Subay' tribe, which had joined the movement, was attacked and plundered by a group of Banū 'Ujmān. 'Abd-al-'Azīz learned of this on his way back from a raid against Sudayr, and he pursued the plunderers, taking their encampment by surprise near al-Quway'iyya, killing about fifty of their men and capturing others. The survivors took flight to Najrān, where they asked the support of its chief, Ḥasan Ibn-Hibat-Allāh, and various Yāmī tribes who had blood relations with them in revenging their slain brothers and getting their captives released. A large force set out for ad-Dir'iyya, and at a place called al-Ḥā'ir, nearby, a battle was fought between the army of Ḥasan and that of 'Abd-al-Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad. The latter suffered a decisive defeat; nearly five hundred of his

---

1. Ibid., p. 43.

men were killed and a great number taken as captives.[1]

The victorious Ḥasan stayed in the area for more than two weeks, during which a truce between him and the leaders of ad-Dir'iyya was concluded and an exchange of captives was made. However, just about this time he received a message from 'Uray'ir Ibn-Dujayn urging him to stand his ground until he could arrive so that together they might eliminate the new movement once and for all. Whether or not this message reached Ḥasan after he had concluded the agreement with his opponents, it seems that he was satisfied that the battle at al-Ḥā'ir had met the purpose of his campaign, and, therefore, he withdrew his forces and returned home.[2]

Ḥasan's withdrawal, although it must have caused some discouragement, did not interrupt the march of 'Uray'ir to ad-Dir'iyya, and, indeed, he did possess other advantages which could be expected to ensure the success of his enterprise. Not only did his army have artillery but the power of his enemy had just been shaken. Furthermore, on his arrival at the walls of ad-Dir'iyya, he was joined by many Najdīs who were hostile to the town. However,all these advantages proved to be less important and decisive than had been expected. The cannon seem to have been used ineffectively, and the fact that the man responsible for the guns

---

1. Rawḍa, II, pp. 65-6; 'Unwān, p. 44. Compare Peter Holt, Egypt and the Fertile Crescent, p. 152.
2. Rawḍa, II, p. 67. According to the author of the Lam' (p. 86) Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, advised by Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, sent a hundred and twenty horses to the Najrānī leader as a present and asked him for peace. He, also, mentions that the message of 'Uray'ir reached Ḥasan after he had concluded the truce. Ibn-Bishr, however, says that the message had arrived before the agreement was reached.

lost his arm while operating one of them shows how poor their experience was in such matters.[1] The defenders of the town, on the other hand, fought with utmost bravery in the firm belief that God was on their side and that it was He who had diminished the effect of the guns of the besiegers as a sign of His favour towards them. They were encouraged by the conviction that death in such circumstances would be rewarded by immediate entry into Paradise.[2] When units of the attacking army, discouraged by the uncertainty of the outcome, began to melt away, 'Uray'ir himself had to give up the siege and leave for home.[3]

The failure of 'Uray'ir's campaign did much to repair the damage to morale which the Wahhābīs had suffered as a result of their defeat at the hands of the army of Najrān. Dihām Ibn-Dawwās, who had turned against ad-Dir'iyya during the battle with Ḥasan Ibn-Hibat-Allāh and the siege of 'Uray'ir, once more asked for peace. This was willingly granted but it did not last for more than ten months, and once again he resumed his hostilities by attacking Manfūḥa.[4]

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 71. According to Rehatsek (op.cit., p. 280) the ruler of al-Aḥsā' had with him four Portuguese or Turkish cannon.
2. However, Sell's statement in The Faith of Islam (p. 154) that "on the day of battle the chief of the Wahhābīs used to give each soldier a paper, a safe-conduct to the other world. This letter was addressed to the Treasurer of Paradise. It was enclosed in a bag which the warrior suspended to his neck", is absolutely baseless. See also Thatcher, "Wahhābīs," Encyclopaedia Britannica.
3. 'Unwān, p. 45.
4. Rawḍa, II, p. 73.

In the year 1179/1765, Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd died, leaving to his eldest son and successor Abd-al-'Azīz the direction of the movement which he had begun over twenty years earlier when he made the alliance with Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. Delegations from various towns, villages and tribes under Wahhābī influence came to ad-Dir'iyya and, under the direction of the Shaykh, pledged their allegiance to the new leader along with the townspeople. Shortly afterwards, 'Abd-al-'Azīz attacked Riyadh, which was immediately supported by a group of Banū Subay', and the skirmishing between the two sides did not bring about any important result. However, the Wahhābīs continued their expeditions against various districts of Najd, and by the year 1183 their territories extended to include parts of the province of al-Qaṣīm.[1] Four years later, Dihām Ibn-Dawwās, who for about twenty-eight years had been their most stubborn opponent, gave up the struggle, and, accompanied by his family and a great number of the inhabitants, fled from Riyadh.[2] The town was shortly afterwards entered by 'Abd-al-'Azīz and annexed to his domains; its palm-groves and other properties, particularly those that had belonged to the people who had fled, were confiscated to the treasury of ad-Dir'iyya.[3]

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 55.
2. Rawḍa, II, p. 85.
3. Rawḍa, II, p. 85; 'Unwān, p. 57. Laoust (Essai, p. 510) mistakenly states that the occupation of Riyadh was in 1178.

The fall of Riyadh marked a new stage in the career of the Shaykh who, henceforth, concentrated on teaching and worship, and left the financial and other affairs of the new community in the hands of 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd.[1] This victory was, also, of particular importance for the Wahhābī movement, both militarily and economically.[2] The capital was now more secure, and the revenues from the agriculture of the newly occupied town greatly contributed to the central treasury and helped it to meet the increasing expenses. On the other hand, the opponents of the Wahhābīs were alarmed by this growth in power, and were determined to redouble their resistance before they, too, were engulfed. However, the campaign of the ruler of al-Aḥsā' against the Wahhābī territories in the following year did not exceed al-Khābiya in the province of al-Qaṣīm where he died and his son, Buṭayn, decided to give up the struggle and return home. Similarly, the joint forces of ad-Dilam, ad-Dawāsir and Najrān which advanced on al-Ḥā'ir failed to achieve their aim and were forced to withdraw. The failure of these two invasions against the Wahhābīs proved once more their strength, and many of their opponents in the region seem to have lost hope of defeating them and went to ad-Dir'iyya to offer submission. Prominent among these were Zayd Ibn-Zāmil of ad-Dilam and two delegations from az-Zulfī and Munayyikh. With

---

1. 'Unwān, p. 25.
2. The significance of this event was fully realized by Ibn-Ghannām, who composed a long poem to mark the occasion, affirming that it was a victory for Islam. See Rawḍa, II, pp. 86-8.

the latter was Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, who was received with honour on his arrival by the Shaykh and the amīr 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad. He was, also, generously provided from the public treasury with all that was required for his comfort until his death in the year 1208.[1]

The military activities of the Wahhābīs continued and they were generally successful. By the end of the 13th/18th century, not only had the whole region of Najd fallen into their hands but, also, the rich province of al-Aḥsā' was on the way to surrender. Indeed, in 1208, the Khālidī leader, Barrāk Ibn-'Abd-al-Muḥsin, became its governor, administering it for the Su'ūdīs.[2]

It is to be noticed that the social and political situation in Central Arabia at the advent of the Wahhābī movement, as well as the full exploitation of it by the Su'ūdī rulers, played an important part in extending their influence over the region. As soon as some towns and tribes joined this movement, the balance of military power in the area was broken, making it easy for the new rising force to develop. Towns and tribes had either to be loyal or to suffer harsh consequences, which included the destruction of crops - especially palm-trees which were so important in the economic life of the inhabitants - and the confiscation of

---

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 97; 'Unwān, p. 61.
2. Ibid., p. 65. The struggle among Āl-Ḥumayd over the leadership of Banū Khālid made it easier for the Wahhābīs to get the upper hand over them. About this struggle See Rawḍa, II, pp. 142, 168; 'Unwān, pp. 73, 80, 92.

animals from the nomads. It also included a characteristic Su'ūdī military measure, which was to build a fortress near every town which showed resistance, armed with soldiers who would attack any group trying to enter or leave it; thus isolating it economically until it surrendered.

Meanwhile, the Sharīfs of Mecca had been exhibiting a hostile attitude towards the Shaykh and his movement since its early stage. According to Daḥlān, the Wahhābīs sent thirty scholars to Sharīf Mas'ūd (1146-1165) asking permission for their followers to perform the pilgrimage. The 'ulamā' of Mecca, who had already been informed about the rise of the Wahhābī movement in Najd, discussed with the delegation different religious questions and, according to this author, proved that the Wahhābī doctrines were heretical. Accordingly, Mas'ūd asked the qāḍī of the shar' to declare the Wahhābīs kāfirs, and ordered that the delegation be imprisoned.[1] However, Daḥlān's account cannot be unreservedly accepted. The number of the Wahhābī scholars which he gives is unlikely to be true, especially at that stage of the movement. On the other hand, if such a delegation had been sent it is not likely that it would have escaped the notice of Ibn-Ghannām, who shows a deep concern for the religious aspect of the activities of the Shaykh. Indeed, Ibn-Bishr writes that "the Najdī (i.e. Wahhābī) pilgrims were imprisoned by Sharīf Mas'ūd in the year 1160 or 1161, and some of them died in prison".[2]

---

1. Futūḥāt, I, p. 246.
2. 'Unwān, p. 30.

It is probable, therefore, that the scholars referred to by Daḥlān were merely ordinary people who were followers of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, and who might have been asked by the 'ulamā' of Mecca about the Shaykh's doctrines which had reached the Hijaz in a distorted form through his Najdī opponents.[1] Of course, such people would not be able to provide answers to counter these misrepresentations. Having been declared kāfirs, the Wahhābīs were prevented from entering the Holy City,[2] and their repeated requests to be permitted to perform the pilgrimage were turned down by Sharīf Mas'ūd and his successor Musā'ad (1165-1184). However, the fatwā of the Meccan scholars against the Wahhābīs did not hinder other Sharīfs from lifting the ban on their entry to Mecca, and from occasionally inviting and receiving deputations from their 'ulamā' for discussion on the points of difference between the two sides.

When Sharīf Aḥmad came to office in the year 1184, the relations between ad-Dir'iyya and Mecca took a turn for the better. This might have resulted from the fact that by now

---

1. Among these was Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥaym whose rôle was referred to earlier. See above, pp. 94-7. The imprisonment of the Wahhābī pilgrims seems, however, to have been due to efforts made by certain other Najdī opponents. In his letter to Muḥammad Ibn-'Īd (Rawḍa, I, pp. 107-11) the Shaykh mentions that al-Muwayyis, Ibn-Ismā'īl and Ibn-Rabī'a went to the Hijaz and incited its people against his followers. More explicitly he states in his letter to Aḥmad Ibn-Ibrāhīm (Rawḍa, I, pp. 160-1) that the efforts of those opponents were made in the year of the imprisonment of his adherents.
2. Khulāṣa, p. 228; Futūḥāt, I, p. 248.

the Wahhābīs had become a considerable force which could retaliate against Sharīfī hostility by interfering with the routes of the Eastern pilgrims and preventing them from going to Mecca. This would have caused serious damage to the prosperity of the Hijaz which greatly depended on the revenues from this source, and the Sharīfs could not ignore the danger. However, Sharīf Aḥmad's accession to power coincided with an event which seems to have paved the way for negotiations between him and the Wahhābīs. In the year 1183 (perhaps towards its end) a Wahhābī raiding party chanced upon a group of Meccan people under the leadership of a certain Manṣūr, who was a member of the Sharīfī family. The latter was taken to ad-Dir'iyya, where 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad showed magnanimity and set him free without demanding any ransom. After this, Manṣūr returned to ad-Dir'iyya with a message from the Sharīf of Mecca giving permission to the Wahhābīs to perform the pilgrimage.[1] This was followed by correspondence between Mecca and ad-Dir'iyya, and, at the invitation of the Sharīf, a delegation, headed by 'Abd-al-'Azīz al-Ḥusayyin, visited the Holy City in 1185. With the delegation were sent gifts and a letter from Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb in which he expressed his pleasure at the initiative taken by the Sharīf. In addition to the flattering terms in which the ruler of the Hijaz is addressed, the letter is interesting, also, in that it proposes that in case of disagreement between the two sides Ḥanbalī works

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 79.

should be consulted in order to clarify the Wahhābī position.[1] A debate was held between al-Ḥuṣayyin and selected Meccan scholars in which three questions were proposed for discussion: the allegation that the Wahhābīs considered all other Muslims kāfirs (takfīr bi-l-'umūm), the demolition of the domes placed over tombs, and the rejection of calling upon the saints for intercession with God. According to Ibn-Ghannām, al-Ḥuṣayyin denied that the Wahhābīs considered all other Muslims infidels, and was able to convince the scholars of Mecca of the correctness of the Wahhābī attitude towards the other two questions.[2] Sharīf Aḥmad was impressed by the delegation and it is reported that it was for this reason he lost his office to his brother Surūr in 1186.[3] With the latter at the head of affairs in Mecca, relations with ad-Dir'iyya again became strained, and it was not until 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd sent presents of horses and camels in 1197 that the ban against the Wahhābīs making the pilgrimage was lifted. However, neither Ibn-Ghannām, who mentions this event and states that three hundred people performed the ḥajj in this year,[4] nor the other available chroniclers record any further Wahhābī pilgrimage taking place during the reign of Surūr. This suggests that the permission was granted for only one year, after which the ban was again imposed.

---

1. The letter of the Shaykh is given by Ibn-Ghannām in Rawḍa, II, pp. 80-1.
2. Ibid.,p. 81.
3. al-Faqi, Athar ad-Da'wa l-Wahhābiyya (Cairo, 1354), p. 75.
4. Rawḍa, II, pp. 119-20.

Following the death of Surūr in the year 1202, Sharīf Ghālib came to power and two years later he asked 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd to send a scholar from ad-Dir'iyya to explain the doctrines of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. 'Abd-al-'Azīz al-Ḥuṣayyin was again sent to the Hijaz, bearing a letter from the Shaykh to the 'ulamā' of Mecca in which he reaffirmed that he was a follower of Aḥmad Ibn-Ḥanbal. He, also, stated that "if the matters proposed for discussion had already been agreed upon by the scholars, there could be no further debate or dispute about them between the two sides; but if they had not, independent judgment should not be rejected and no one should be denied the right of applying the law in his domain according to the rules of his school".[1] Al-Ḥuṣayyin held several meetings with Sharīf Ghālib and asked him to bring the 'ulamā' of his city for discussion. However, they refused to attend and warned the Sharīf against the ambitions of the rulers of ad-Dir'iyya.[2]

Whether or not the influence of the 'ulamā' was persuasive to Ghālib, it must still have been his realization of Wahhābī growth, both military and political, that moved him to adopt a hostile attitude. By now the Wahhābīs had begun to menace the integrity of his own domains, and the teachings of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb had spread among tribes in areas considered to be parts of Sharīfī territories.[3] Thus,

---

1. The text of the letter is given by Ibn-Ghannām, Rawḍa, II, pp. 144-5.
2. Ibid.
3. Burckhardt, Notes, II, p. 183.

in 1205, he moved to open hostility with ad-Dir'iyya and dispatched his brother 'Abd-al-'Azīz with an army of ten thousand men and twenty guns to destroy the power of Najd.[1] Although his army was augmented on the way by certain tribesmen from the Hijaz and Najd, it was unable to overcome the resistance of the inhabitants of Qaṣr Bassān in the district of as-Sirr. Reinforcements under the leadership of Ghālib himself left Mecca and joined the main body of the army at the village of ash-Sha'rā' in the Najd uplands. All efforts to occupy this place failed, and Ghālib, after a month of fruitless endeavour, gave up the idea of continuing the march to ad-Dir'iyya and returned home.[2] The failure of the Sharīfī campaign against the Wahhābī territories proved the strength of the new community in Central Arabia and, coupled with the simultaneous advance of the Su'ūdī army into the province of al-Aḥsā', must have filled the heart of its founder with great joy and confidence before he died.

According to Ibn-Ghannām, in Shawwāl 1205 Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb fell ill and at the end of the month passed away.[3] Ibn-Bishr, however, mentions that his death took place at the end of Dhu-l-Qa'da in the same year.[4] Since

---

1. Rawḍa, II, pp. 145-7; 'Unwān, p. 78; Futūḥāt, II, p. 234; Burckhardt, Notes, II, p. 183.
2. Rawḍa, II, p. 147; 'Unwān, p. 79.
3. Rawḍa, II, p. 154.
4. 'Unwān, p. 89. Many writers mistakenly mention the date of the Shaykh's death as 1201/1787. See, for example, Crichton, op.cit., II, p. 292; Rehatsek, op.cit., p. 280; el-Batrik, op.cit., p. 31; Smith, Islam in Modern History, (3rd Edition, New York, 1963), p. 49, and Margoliouth, [Contd.

the Shaykh was born in 1115, his age would have been ninety-one according to the lunar calendar, or eighty-eight in solar reckoning, the corresponding dates being 1703-4 and 1792. Towards the end of his life he had grown very weak and had to be supported by a man on either side of him when he went to the mosque to take his place among the worshippers.[1]

Ibn-Ghannām emphasizes the asceticism of the Shaykh and claims that he left no wealth to his children and relatives, only debts.[2] However, this seems to be untrue; for by the time of his death the revenues of the state were considerable, and it is most unlikely that the founder of the movement on which it rose would need to borrow money. Indeed, the debts which he had incurred in the early years of his residence at ad-Dir'iyya were settled from the booty taken at the fall of Riyadh in the year 1187.[3] In contrast to Ibn-Ghannām's account is the statement by the author of the Lam' that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb and his relatives used to receive from the public treasury about fifty thousand golden coins every year, and that his descendents were given even greater incomes as the state continued to expand.[4]

The death of the Shaykh did not affect the progress of the new community which he had originated about half a

---

Contd.] The early Development of Muhammadanism, p. 177. In his article on "Wahhābīya", EI[1], the latter is confused about this matter. While he refers to the death of the Shaykh in 1787 in the beginning of the article, he mentions it in 1792 later on.

1. 'Unwān, p. 89.
2. Rawḍa, II, p. 155.
3. 'Unwān, p. 24.
4. Lam', p. 112.

century earlier, and its political and military expansion continued steadily. Not only was it able to resist Sharīfī attacks on its territory, but it even gained the upper hand in the struggle, and twelve years after the Shaykh's death his followers under the leadership of Su'ūd Ibn-'Abd-al-'Azīz entered Mecca.[1] In the year 1220 Medina, too, fell into their hands, and thus the Holy Cities were annexed to the domains of the rulers of ad-Dir'iyya.[2] On the north-eastern frontiers similar victories were gained, and the successive campaigns organized by the Pāshā of Baghdad against them were successfully repulsed. Moreover, they repeatedly invaded Iraq itself and won battles against its people, including their famous assaults on the Shī'ī Holy Cities of Karbalā' and an-Najaf.[3]

By the end of the first quarter of the 13th century A.H. the empire of Āl-Su'ūd was at its height, and Wahhābī influence extended in some form or other from the gates of Damascus and Baghdad to the Yemen and Hadhramaut, and from the Persian Gulf to the Red Sea. The political and military history of the early Su'ūdī state, as well as its expansions after the death of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, have already been studied in some detail by various scholars[4] and will not be repeated here. Instead, the focus of attention will be

1. Futūḥāt, II, p. 235; Hadiyya, p. 27.
2. 'Unwān, p. 131.
3. Ibid., pp. 121, 135.
4. Notable among these are ash-Sha'afī, Philby, Rentz and Winder, whose works will be found in the Bibliography.

shifted to the rôle played by the Shaykh in shaping the new community of the Wahhābīs and giving it spiritual meaning and direction.

D. The Shaykh's rôle in the formation of the Su'ūdī state:

It is clear that from the earliest stages of his movement Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb was aiming at reviving the true Islam and establishing a community where only the principles of the Sharī'a, as he interpreted it, would be applied and practised. Not only did he denounce the polytheistic attitudes prevailing among the Muslims of his time, just as the Prophet had done towards the Arab pagans, but in negotiating with the Najdī rulers, he even used the same phrases as the Prophet himself had used in his relations with his supporters in Medina;[1] an illustration of the Shaykh's deep conviction in following the Sunna. The circumstances which attended his movement were in some respects similar to those which existed at the rise of Islam: both arose in the Arabian Peninsula, and just as the Prophet had done, Muḥammad

---

1. Thus, when the Shaykh met with Ibn-Mu'ammar he said to him: "I hope that you will rule Najd and its Arabs once you support the cause of this religion", and when Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd agreed to support him and expressed his fears that the Shaykh might leave ad-Dir'iyya for another place after the success of the movement, he received the answer: "ad-damm ad-damm wa-l-hadm al-hadm", a phrase which was used by the Prophet in his answer to the leaders of al-Aws and al-Khazraj of Medina. See 'Unwān, pp. 18, 22. Compare Ibn-Hishām, as-Sīra n-Nabawiyya, edited by M. as-Saqqā and others (2nd edition, Cairo, 1375/1955) I, p. 442.

Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, too, first preached his doctrines among the people and then sought the support of various chiefs and rulers to help carry them out. He emigrated from his native town, used force against his enemies, and had faithful followers who were willing to sacrifice their lives for the cause they believed in. However, despite his conviction in following the Sunna the Shaykh did not envisage a nostalgic recreation of the life of Medina at the time of the Prophet, but rather followed the principles which he advocated within the context of the life of the people of the region.

As mentioned earlier, the Shaykh condemned polytheistic practices and innovations when he was in Basra.[1] When he returned to Najd he vigorously preached his ideas at Ḥuraymilā', at the same time training others to propagate them. After his move to al-'Uyayna where he won the sympathy of the ruler, he saw that the time was now ripe for action and then he ordered his followers to pull down the trees held in veneration by certain people and to destroy the buildings which had been erected over the graves of the Companions. He himself participated in the demolition of the dome over the grave of Zayd Ibn-al-Khaṭṭāb, and in uprooting Shajarat adh-Dhīb.[2]

During his first two years of residence in ad-Dir'iyya, the Shaykh concentrated on teaching the principles of tawḥīd to the inhabitants, arguing his views with other scholars, inviting chiefs of tribes and rulers of towns in the region

1. See above, p. 77.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 31; 'Unwān, p. 20.

to accept his doctrines and join his movement, and preparing his followers for the struggle against those who opposed him. In the early stages of the newly founded community, he was in charge of almost all affairs, although military operations were entrusted to his associates. According to Ibn-Ghannām and Ibn-Bishr, the Shaykh had the final word in decisions affecting the direction of the state, and it was he who received the delegations who brought the submission of various towns, villages, and tribes.[1] In the year 1159, for example, he received a deputation from al-'Uyayna, bearing a pledge of allegiance;[2] and in 1169 he received a delegation from the people of al-Quway'iyya and agreed to their request to join the new community.[3]

The position the Shaykh held in the new state was fully realized by 'Uthmān Ibn-Mu'ammar who claimed that it was his intention to invite him to attend the conclusion of the treaty with Dihām Ibn-Dawwās in 1160.[4] This position was, also, recognized by the opponents of Ibn-Mu'ammar when they came to ad-Dir'iyya to refer to him their suspicion about the latter's attitude and sincerity towards the Wahhābī movement.[5] It was he who asked all the rulers of towns and chiefs of tribes, which had already joined the movement, to assemble at ad-Dir'iyya for a conference which he headed in

---

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 74; 'Unwān, p. 84.
2. Ibid., p. 25.
3. Rawḍa, II, p. 47; 'Unwān, p. 36.
4. Rawḍa, II, p. 10.
5. Ibid., p. 13.

1167, and in 1170 he appointed Dakhīl Ibn-Suwaylim governor of Thādiq.[1] In matters of great importance, he would even leave ad-Dir'iyya and go to the places in the region where his presence was felt to be necessary. Thus, in 1163, following the assassination of 'Uthmān Ibn-Mu'ammar, he went to al-'Uyayna in order to appoint a new ruler for the town,[2] and in 1173 he came here once again to dismiss its governor Mushārī Ibn-Mu'ammar and superintend the destruction of the palace of Āl-Mu'ammar.[3]

According to Ibn-Bishr, "a fifth of all the booty, the alms and all revenues brought to ad-Dir'iyya were handed over to the Shaykh, who would use them as he wanted. Neither 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad nor any one of Āl-Su'ūd received anything without his permission. The moves for peace as well as the moves for war were made on his orders.[4] Even down to the year 1179, when Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd died, the Shaykh is described by Ibn-Ghannām as "the head of the system to whom everything was referred", and it was under his direction that the delegations, which came to ad-Dir'iyya in this year, took the oath of allegiance and loyalty to 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad.[5] However, following the fall of Riyadh in 1187 he transferred responsibility for financial

1. Ibid., pp. 19, 50.
2. Rawḍa, II, p. 14.
3. 'Unwān, p. 41.
4. Ibid., pp. 24, 84.
5. Rawḍa, II, p. 74.

administration to 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad, who, nevertheless, continued to consult him on all affairs,[1] and his decision was required in matters affecting the future of the state. Thus, in 1202 it was he who sent to all provinces and tribes under Wahhābī influence, urging them to acknowledge Su'ūd Ibn-'Abd-al-'Azīz as the future ruler, and ordered the governors and the chiefs to have their people take the bay'a.[2]

The relations between the rulers of ad-Dir'iyya and the Shaykh were deeper than ordinary ties between a secular ruler and a spiritual leader. They seem to have believed implicitly in his doctrines and the cause which he was proclaiming. Indeed, 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad had been a follower of the Shaykh before his emigration to ad-Dir'iyya and had even sent a letter to him, asking him to explain Sūrat al-Fātiḥa.[3] After the Shaykh took up residence at ad-Dir'iyya, he was one of his intimate students, who was eventually to become a significant Wahhābī scholar, one of whose works is included in the Hadiyya, pp. 5-26. His son Su'ūd was also a student of the Shaykh and was versed in the Tradition and Jurisprudence. During his reign he used to leave his residence every morning at sunrise in order to attend the religious assembly at al-Bāṭin where the Qur'ān and the interpretations of Ibn-Kathīr and other authorities were studied, participating in the discussions which ensued.[4]

1. Rawḍa, II, p. 84; 'Unwān, p. 25.
2. Rawḍa, II, p. 137; 'Unwān, p. 75.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 222.
4. 'Unwān, pp. 163-7.

Although the affairs of the state were run through full co-operation between the Su'ūdī rulers and the Shaykh, it can be assumed that matters of military nature were entrusted to the former while religious and educational affairs were under direct supervision of the latter. Thus, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb used to appoint the qāḍīs, who were sent from ad-Dir'iyya to all districts under obedience to the Su'ūdī rulers. These were carefully chosen from able and learned men, and an annual salary was granted to them from the public treasury. They were strictly forbidden to accept fees - let alone bribes - from the contending parties.[1] Notable among these qāḍīs at the time of 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd were 'Abd-al-'Azīz al-Ḥusayyin, who was sent to al-Washm,[2] Ḥamad al-'Urayni to Sudayr, Muḥammad Ibn-Shabāna to Munayyikh, 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Suwaylim to al-Qaṣīm, Muḥammad Ibn-Suwaylim to al-Kharj and Sa'īd al-Ḥajjī to the southern district of Najd.[3] All these scholars were among the Shaykh's students. Besides, he was a teacher of other prominent scholars including his sons 'Abd-Allāh and Ḥusayn as well as his grandson 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Ḥasan and Ḥamad Ibn-Nāṣir Ibn-Mu'ammar, etc.[4]

1. Ibid., p. 125; Brydges, op.cit., II, p. 115.
2. al-Ḥusayyin is the same scholar who was dispatched to Mecca during the reign of Mas'ūd and, later, in the time of Aḥmad to explain the doctrines of the Shaykh to the Sharīfs and the 'ulamā' of this city. He died in 1237. See 'Unwān, p. 229.
3. 'Unwān, p. 125.
4. 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb (d. 1242) was one of the most celebrated Wahhābī scholars. He succeeded his father in administrating religious affairs, and was the

[Contd.

Linked with the qaḍā' was the system of Mutawwi', which was established in order that the prescription of the Sharī'a be fully observed. The members of this organisation, which was financed from the public treasury, were charged to command good and forbid evil. Any member of the community who did not fulfil his religious obligations or who violated the principles of the law was harshly punished.[1]

The sources of Wahhābī revenues were similar to those of the early centuries of Islam. Chief of these was the one fifth of the booty gained in fighting with the enemies, the remainder being divided among the troops: one share for the foot soldier and two for the horseman.[2] The second was

---

Contd.] author of several works enlisted in the bibliography. He fought bravely during the siege of ad-Dir'iyya in 1233, and was taken by Ibrāhīm Pāshā to Egypt where he died.

Ḥusayn Ibn-Muḥammad (d. 1224), too, was versed in the Tradition and Jurisprudence, and was a qāḍī in ad-Dir'iyya. Some of his fatāwī are included in the MRMN, I, pp. 13-43.

'Abd-ar-Raḥman Ibn-Ḥasan (d. 1285) was, also, a qāḍī in ad-Dir'iyya and one of its active defenders during its siege. He was taken to Egypt where he stayed eight years as a student at al-Azhar. In 1241, he returned to Najd where he became a qāḍī in the new Su'ūdi capital Riyadh. Shaykh 'Abd-ar-Raḥman was the author of many books and treatises. See the bibliography.

Ḥamad Ibn-Naṣīr Ibn-Mu'ammar (d. 1225) was the head of a delegation sent in 1211 by 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd to the Sharīf of Mecca to explain the Wahhābī doctrines. A summary of his discussions with the 'ulamā' of this city is to be found in the Rawḍa, II, pp. 203-32. He was also the author of certain fatāwī which are included in the MRMN, IV, pp. 591-659.

1. MRMN, II, pt. II, p. 7.
2. 'Unwān, p. 69.

the zakāt, which was collected according to the rules of the Sharī'a from agricultural produce, animals and business. The third was the fay', the spoils gained without fighting (as happened at the fall of Riyadh in 1187), and the fines which were paid by those who did anything against the security of the state or who disobeyed its ruler. These revenues were considerable and in excess of normal expenditure, particularly in the time of Su'ūd Ibn-'Abd-al-'Azīz. It is not strange, therefore, to find Ibn-Bishr reporting that the latter had about 1,400 horses and five hundred slaves, both male and female.[1]

The payment of the zakāt constituted one of the essential bases of the relationship between the central government and the tribes. Refusal to pay it by any tribe justified the declaration of war against it and would usually lead to confiscating its property. Tribes had, also, to support the government in all expeditions as circumstances required, and to give up their customs which were in conflict with religion, as well as to abandon their local wars and private feuds.

Thus, the Su'ūdī State which was the outcome of the movement of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, and which was based on the Sharī'a and aimed at fulfilling its principles in every detail, changed the region from one of numerous tribes and principalities into a strong community where security and stability were realized and law and order strictly observed.

---

1. Ibid., p. 169.

CHAPTER IV

The works of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb

Although the Shaykh wrote on a variety of Islamic subjects such as theology, exegesis, jurisprudence and the life of the Prophet, it is the first that most engaged his intellectual activities. His works consist of books, treatises, letters and sermons.

In general, the style of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb is simple and does not strive for literary effect through the use of unfamiliar or unusual words. The sentences are unrhymed and often quite short, and almost invariably correct in grammar. However, he does not use one specific style in all his works; the nature of the subject treated as well as the occasion of its composition necessitating changes in tone and argument. Although certain of his works are devoted to but one subject, such as tawḥīd, yet the methodology observed and the style chosen may differ from one to another of his works on this subject in conformity to the purpose for which it was written.

The style of the works can frequently serve as an indication of the date of their composition, for it is observable that the writing of the Shaykh did vary from period to period; and on such evidence it could be shown that the Kitāb at-Tawḥīd was the first book which he wrote - there is a striking contrast between this work and the later Kashf ash-Shubuhāt, the one being simply expository while the other is patently polemical - a judgment, in fact, supported by the

accounts of the local historians.[1]

In a chronological description of his works this, therefore, should be studied first.

1. Kitāb at-Tawḥīd:

The full title of this work is: Kitāb at-Tawḥīd alladhī huwa Ḥaqq Allāh ʻalā l-ʻAbīd, and according to Ibn-Ghannām, it was written during the Shaykh's residence at Ḥuraymilāʼ,[2] which most likely fell between 1147 and 1155. How long it had been completed by the time of his father's death in 1153 cannot be determined, but it was after this date that it became well-known.[3] His purpose in writing this book was to expound his ideas about the unity of God and polytheism, as well as to demonstrate that many of the practices of his contemporaries were not in conformity with the true Islamic faith. Indeed, the book can be regarded as the manifesto of Wahhābī doctrines. The reception it received at the time of its appearance and the way in which it maintained its appeal show what importance was attached to it. Students and sympathizers from Ḥuraymilāʼ and other Najdī towns gathered about the Shaykh to read its chapters with him and listen to his comments thereon, and copies of it spread quickly all over the region.[4] Ibn-Bishr maintains that it

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 30.
2. Ibid.
3. ʻUnwān, p. 18. The serious activities of the Shaykh began after the death of his father, who was not very much in agreement with his son's way of preaching.
4. ʻAbd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh, op.cit., p. 9.

was the best work ever written on the subject of tawḥīd,[1] and this view seems to have been shared by other scholars, many of whom wrote commentaries on it.[2] Up to the present time it has been the Wahhābī work that most attracts the attention of scholars and students,[3] and it has been printed repeatedly.[4]

Compared to his other works, the methodology observed by the Shaykh in this book is unique. He divides it into sixty-nine chapters (bāb) each of which is given a title under which the author collects Qur'ānic verses and

1. 'Unwān, p. 85.
2. Notable among these are: Taysīr al-'Azīz al-Ḥamīd by his grandson Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-Allāh; Qurrat 'Uyūm al-Muwaḥḥidīn and Fatḥ al-Majīd by 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Ḥasan, also, a grandson; Ibṭāl at-Tandīd by Ḥamad Ibn-'Atīq.
3. The fact that it figures in the curriculum of the modern religious institutes in Su'ūdī Arabia is evidence of the value and importance attached to it.
4. Manuscript copies of this book are preserved in many places. In the British Museum, for example, it is to be found among collections under Or. 134, ff. 1-37; Or. 4529, ff. 132-196; Or. 7778, ff. 160-196 and Add. 23, 346, ff. 280-330. Two copies, one of which was written by Ibn-Durayjān and the other by Ibn-Ḍuwayyān, are in my possession. It was first printed in Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd (Delhi, 1308); other editions are: in Qurrat 'Uyūn al-Muwaḥḥidīn (Cairo, 1345); in M.T.N.; with some notes by Muḥammad Munīr (Cairo, 1346); in Fatḥ al-Majīd (Cairo, 1347); the edition by al-Faqī (Cairo, 1371); in al-Majmū'a l-'Ilmiyya s-Su'ūdiyya (Cairo, 1374) and in the MRS. The edition used in the present work is the one edited by Muḥammad Munīr, and it is referred to as K.T.

traditions supporting his views on this topic. There then follows quotations from the Companions of the Prophet or their immediate successors in support of his interpretation of these verses and traditions, and occasionally reference is made to later scholars such as Ibn-Taymiyya. Finally, brief notes are given on the conclusions to be drawn.

All this is written in a very concise way. For the most part the Qur'ānic verses are not given in their entirety, only the salient part being cited. To explain this brevity one has to assume that the author intended to use this book as an outline of what was going to be taught to his students, that is to say, as lecture-notes. And being so concise, it naturally led other scholars to write commentaries on it. Between the title and the Qur'ānic verses Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb uses the conjunction and the verbal noun, for example, he says: Bāb faḍl at-Tawḥīd wa mā yukaffir min adh-dhunūb wa qawl Allāh ta'ālā: alladhīn āmanū wa lam yalbisū imāna-hum bi-ẓulm. etc.[1] The normal practice of other writers was to give the title, and then introduce the verse by the word qāl Allāh etc. However, by using the verbal noun in place of the verb the Shaykh emphasizes the importance of the verse to the extent that it seems to be a part of the title. In other words, he intends to show that what he advances to the reader is the judgment of the Qur'ān itself, which must be accepted. Indeed, he makes the verse

1. K.T., p. 5; Qur'ān, 6/82.

a title of certain chapters.[1]

The traditions cited in the Kitāb at-Tawḥīd are taken from various works of the Traditionists. In all, there are one hundred and twenty-five ḥadīth, given; eighteen related by Muslim alone, six by al-Bukhārī alone, thirty-one by both of these two, seven by Ibn-Ḥanbal alone and seventeen by the latter and others. The rest are related by other Traditionists. In some cases the Shaykh does not mention the name of the Traditionist from whom he reports the ḥadīth, and this is the information that is supplied by his commentators, as, for example, 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Ḥasan.[2]

The brief conclusions, written in very short sentences, which the Shaykh calls masā'il, contain nothing of a polemical nature and are original to him. In some he obviously intended that a certain idea was going to be explained orally to his students, as for example on page 98 when he says: "The first point in the chapter is the interpretation of the verse of al-A'rāf". In fact, no such interpretation is given.

Although at first sight this book, most of its text being quotations from other sources, may not appear to deserve the praise and importance attached ot it, yet the collection and organization of the pertinent materials, along with the conclusions drawn therefrom, are sufficient evidence of the originality and scholarship of its author. When we

1. K.T.,pp. 91, 94, 105.
2. Qurrat 'Uyūn al-Muwaḥḥidīn fī Taḥqīq Da'wat al-Anbiyā' wa-l-Mursalīn (Cairo, 1345), pp. 41, 209.

recall that, to the traditionalists of Islam, religious knowledge has to be based on the Qur'ān and the Sunna, in writing on a subject which concerns the Muslim belief, the Shaykh does not seem to be making any great innovation in following this system of composition.

Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb commences his book with a chapter bearing the title of Kitāb at-Tawḥīd under which he cites Qur'ānic verses showing that God created the jinn and mankind in order that they should worship Him alone, and that Prophets were sent to their peoples, calling upon them to fulfil this obligation.[1] Following this, he mentions a tradition in which the Prophet explains to his companion, Mu'ādh Ibn-Jabal, the duty of human beings towards God and what they will receive as a reward for fulfilling this duty.[2]

After giving his conclusions on this chapter, the Shaykh proceeds in the following two bābs to show the benefit of observing the duty of monotheism, since all sins other than polytheism can be forgiven by God. In the title of the third bāb he uses the words: "Any one who fully observes the tawḥīd will enter heaven without undergoing trial"—on the day of judgment,[3] and he supports this view with two verses from the Qur'ān and a tradition related from 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-

---

1. K.T., p. 3. Compare Qur'ān, 51/56; 16/36; 17/23; 4/35; 61/151-4.
2. K.T., pp. 3-4. Compare al-Bukhārī, al-Jāmi' aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ, ed. by M. Ludolf Krehl and Th. W. Juynboll, 4 vols. (Leiden, 1862-1908), IV, p. 445. The expression ḥaqq Allāh 'alā l-'abīd, which occurs in this ḥadīth, is used in the full title of the Shaykh's work.
3. K.T., p. 7. Compare Qur'ān, 16/120; 23/60.

'Abbās.[1] However, one should be very vigilant on matters that may vitiate his faith and lead him to polytheism, which is the sin that God hates most and will not pardon. This idea is further elaborated in the fourth chapter, where the author mentions a tradition which says that hypocrisy (riyā') - explained as a minor form of polytheism - was the thing which the Prophet most feared that Muslims might become involved in.[2]

In the following chapters, emphasis is laid on the significance of the confession that there is no god but God and the call upon people to declare it, and the Shaykh reiterates that monotheism is the first duty upon mankind. Although preaching comes before force of arms, fighting is legal against those who refuse to join Islam and oppose its representatives. This same idea is developed in the sixth chapter in which the author, supporting his views with a tradition related by Muslim,[3] states that the utterance of lā ilāh illā Allāh by itself is not enough to protect the blood and property of a man, but in addition to this, he must worship God alone and, without hesitation or doubt, do away with all that might be associated with Him in worship.

Following this bāb in which the meaning and implications of the confession of the creed are explained, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb goes on to point out certain kinds of polytheistic

---

1. K.T., p. 7. Compare Muslim, al-Jāmi' aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ, 4 vols. (Cairo, 1377), I, p. 93.
2. K.T., p. 10. Compare at-Tirmidhī, Ṣaḥīḥ - commented by Ibn al-'Arabī - 13 vols. (Cairo, 1350), VII, p. 19.
3. K.T., p. 14. Compare Muslim, op.cit., I, p. 24.

practices indulged in by some contemporary Muslims. Among these are the wearing of rings or threads and similar talisman, believing that by doing so evil will be avoided and disasters averted. According to a tradition related from 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Mas'ūd, incantations (ruqā), amulets (tamā'im) and spells (tiwala) are kinds of polytheism.[1] However, the author states that certain scholars allow incantations, provided that Qur'ānic verses are used.[2]

To seek blessing from trees, stones and the like is a major polytheistic practice, which also includes sacrifices to any being other than God. Moreover, no sacrifices to God should be made in places where other sacrificial acts are practised, for this may lead to polytheism. Votive offering is a kind of worship and, therefore, must be made to God alone. Similarly, help or aid (istighātha) and protection or refuge (isti'ādha) are not to be sought from any one except Him.

---

1. K.T., p. 17. Compare Ibn-Ḥanbal, al-Musnad, ed. by Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir, 12 vols. (Cairo, 1368-72), V, p. 219. Ruqā (singl. ruqya) are words spelled or written by which a person having an evil affection is treated; tamā'im (singl. tamīma) signify certain beads hung on children to repel the evil eye; tiwala is the spell which makes a husband love his wife. See K.T., p. 18.
2. 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Ḥasan, however, agrees with those who prohibit tamā'im even if Qur'ānic verses are used, and this for three reasons: that the Prophet banned their use completely; that the permission to use verses from the Qur'ān may lead to using also what is not Qur'ānic; the wearing of Qur'ānic verses on the person could imply disrespect for the words of God as when the bearer might enter places such as a water closet. See Qurrat 'Uyūn al-Muwaḥḥidīn, p. 78.

A chapter of this work is devoted to the subject of intercession which the Shaykh shows cannot be granted without God's permission and His satisfaction with the one for whom it is asked, who has to be a true monotheist. Therefore, the intercession commonly sought from dead saints is forbidden. As it had been a practice among many people to invoke the Prophet in order that he would intercede for them before God, the author goes on to prove that this, too, is not permitted, pointing out that the Prophet was neither able to guide those whom he liked to Islam without the will of God nor was he allowed to ask forgiveness from Him for polytheists.[1] Following this, he explains that excessive devotion (ghuluww) to the saints and the use of their graves as places for worship, let alone invoking them in prayers, had led people from other religions to infidelity. The Prophet himself predicted that some Muslims would follow the practices of others and worship idols.[2] Therefore, one should take care and have fear of falling into polytheism.

Magiṣ is prohibited, and any one who practises it deserves the death penalty.[3] 'Iyāfa, ṭarq, ṭiyara and tanjīm are kinds of magic and, therefore, should not be indulged in.[4] Moreover, mischievous talk and some forms

---

1. K.T., pp. 40-1. Compare Qur'ān, 28/56, 9/113.
2. K.T., pp. 55-60. Compare Abū-Dāwūd, Sunan, ed. by Muḥammad 'Abd-al-Ḥamīd 4 vols. (Cairo, 1369-70), IV, p. 139.
3. K.T., pp. 65-66. Compare at-Tirmidhī, op.cit., VI, p. 246.
4. K.T., pp. 66-70. Compare Abū-Dāwūd, op.cit., IV, pp. 21-2. 'Iyāfa is augury by the flight of birds; ṭarq is the practising of geomancy or making lines or marks upon the ground with two fingers and then with one finger, usually performed by a woman; ṭiyara is augury of evil either by

[Contd.

of eloquence can be magican acts.[1] Kihāna and 'irāfa are also prohibited and any one who practises them is violating the religion of Islam.[2]

Having demonstrated his views on these subjects, the Shaykh proceeds to show that a Muslim has to love God and His Prophet more than anyone else; and relations between individuals, too, must be based on religious grounds.[3] A true believer should rely on God alone, be hopeful of His mercy and fear of His anger, and this will strengthen him in his resolve to condemn what is prohibited and preach what is approved by religion, without reservation or fear of any one.[4]

Following this, the Shaykh elaborates his earlier remarks on hypocrisy (riyā'), as when a man takes extra-ordinary care in the performance of prayers because others

---

Contd.] the flight of birds or the running of animals; tanjīm is astrology and, according to 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Ḥasan (Qurrat 'Uyūn al-Muwaḥḥidīn, p. 184) is prohibited only when the astrologist claims knowledge of things which will take place in the future.

1. K.T., p. 70. Compare al-Bukhārī, op.cit., IV, p. 69. The reason for considering these as magic is the effect which both have upon the mind of the listener. However, it is that eloquence by which falseness is shown as truth and vice versa that is denounced. See Qurrat 'Uyūn al-Muwaḥḥidīn, p. 168.
2. K.T., pp. 72-4. Compare Abū-Dāwūd, op.cit., IV, p. 22. Kihāna is acquiring knowledge of the past and of the future, while 'irāfa is giving information of the past only.
3. K.T., p. 93. Compare Muslim, op.cit., I, p. 31.
4. K.T., p. 97. Compare Qur'ān, 8/2, 65/3.

are watching him. This is a minor form of polytheism, and the author states that a Muslim should not seek worldly reward for acts of a religious nature.[1] Then he moves to another chapter, the title of which reads: "He who follows scholars and rulers who ban what God allows and permit what He forbids is making them deities".[2] As pointed out by the commentator,[3] this may be understood to imply the author's criticism of the unquestioning acceptance of the legal decisions of a certain school, even if they go against the texts of the Qur'ān and Tradition. After this, the Shaykh speaks of other practices which are offensive to religion. Among these are swearing by beings other than God, and the expression: "Whatever God intends and you intend" (mā shā' Allāh wa shi't), for the wāw, here, signifies the participation of both the Creator and the created in the action.[4] Similarly, cursing the time and the wind is condemned for it implies cursing God, who is, in fact, the Disposer of all things.[5] A man should not take a title like judge of judges or king of kings[6] nor bear a name which is among the names of God, such as al-Ḥakam,[7] nor a name starting with the word 'abd

1. K.T., pp. 100-1. Compare al-Bukhārī, op.cit., II, p. 220.
2. K.T., p. 102.
3. Qurrat 'Uyūn al-Muwaḥḥidīn, p. 228.
4. K.T., pp. 106-8. Compare Ibn-Ḥanbal, op.cit., II, p. 253.
5. K.T., pp. 109-19. Compare al-Bukhārī, op.cit., IV, p. 378.
6. K.T., p. 110. Compare al-Bukhārī, op.cit., IV, pp.159-60.
7. K.T., p. 111. Compare Abū-Dāwūd, op.cit., IV, p. 396.

added to a being other than the Almighty like 'Abd-'Alī or 'Abd-al-Ka'ba.[1]

The expression as-salām 'alā Allāh is not to be used, for as-Salām is one of God's names.[2] In his strict emphasis on absolute monotheism, the Shaykh, supporting his views by the Tradition, maintains that even the words which are used in expressing the rela tion between God and His creation cannot be applied among human beings themselves. Thus, a slave is not to say rabb-ī, meaning "my master", and the master is not to use 'abd-ī when referring to his slave. Instead, one can apply sayyid or mawlā and fatā or ghulām for master and slave respectively.[3]

Belief in predestination is obligatory, and any one who denies it or doubts it will have his good deeds rejected by God and he will enter hell.[4] The purpose of holding such a conviction is to enable one to be patient when he is confronted by troubles and thankful to God for whatsoever grace he may receive. A believer who meets with failure should not say: "If I had not done so and so, I might have succeeded"; for "if" (law) opens the way for the devil to penetrate into the mind of man.[5]

A chapter of Kitāb at-Tawḥīd is devoted to the subject of taṣwīr, which seems to have been understood by the author

1. K.T., p. 115.
2. K.T., p. 116. Compare al-Bukhārī, op.cit., I, p. 315.
3. K.T., p. 117. Compare Muslim, op.cit., IV, p. 42.
4. K.T., p. 122.
5. K.T., p. 119. Compare Muslim, op.cit., IV, p. 219.

as the making of both statues and pictures. The Shaykh cites traditions to show what punishment has been prepared for those who do this, for they imitate God in His creation; therefore, every such work must be destroyed.[1]

Pledges given to others must be honoured; but since a promise may sometimes be broken, people of responsibility are recommended to place the burden of the pledge upon themselves and not involve the guarantee (dhimma) of God and His Prophet.[2] Just before the last chapter of his work, the Shaykh mentions yet again the efforts of the Prophet to direct people to monotheism and block the roads that may lead to Polytheism. Here, he cites a tradition in which the Prophet is shown as disapproving of being addressed as "our lord" (sayyid-nā) and of being praised too much.[3]

Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb finishes the book with a somewhat long chapter in which he touches upon the subject of the belief in the unity of God in His names and attributes. He quotes a verse from the Qur'ān and traditions in which God is spoken of as having fist, fingers and hand, and of being on His throne. However, these are theological problems which the Shaykh did not wish to enter into here, and reserved treating of them to later works. The Kitāb at-Tawḥīd was

1. K.T., p. 123.
2. K.T., p. 126. Compare Muslim, op.cit., III, pp. 130-31.
3. K.T., p. 128. Compare Abū-Dāwūd, op.cit., IV, p. 352. Indeed, even the title of this bāb is almost the same as that of the 22nd chapter in this work. See K.T., p. 51. However, the Shaykh in one of his letters does not seem to object to using sayyid-nā. See Rawḍa, I, p. 129.

written for a community in which there was no developed intellectual speculation, and the serious problem, in the Shaykh's view, was that his people had been practising things contrary to the unity of God in their worship. Therefore, it was on this aspect of monotheism that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb laid emphasis in this work.

2. Faḍl al-Islām.[1]

Although the available sources do not give the date when this work was written, the subject treated in it, as well as its style of composition, suggest that it belongs to the early stage of the Shaykh's career. It is most likely that it was at this period that the need for works showing the virtues of Islam was felt. As in Kitāb at-Tawḥīd, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb divides this short work into sections, each of which is given a title under which appropriate materials are collected. However, unlike the former, this work quotes almost exclusively from the Tradition, with only very few verses from the Qur'ān being used in the introductions to certain chapters. No interpretation of the traditions is given nor are conclusions drawn at the end.

It begins with a chapter designating Islam as the best of religions and which, therefore, should be embraced. Then, an explanation of the meaning of Islam is given, and a chapter

1. A manuscript of this work, copied by 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Māni', is in my private possession. It was first printed in the Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd, and it is also included in the MḤN, edited by Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā (Cairo, 1343) and reprinted (Qaṭar, 1383). The last edition is the one used in the present work.

is devoted to showing that anyone who follows a religion other than Islam will have his deeds rejected by God.[1] The injunction that the Prophet must be followed is explicitly demonstrated, and warning is given about innovations which are considered, in their offensiveness to the religion, more grievous than other major sins, excepting polytheism. Moreover, it is even stated that repentance of an innovation may not be accepted.[2] A section of this work is devoted to the vicissitudes that Islam will undergo, and the virtues of those who hold fast to its true principles. Finally, the Shaykh warns once more against innovations and urges the reader to follow the traditions of the Prophet and his companions.

3. Al-Uṣūl ath-Thalātha[3]

The work seems to have been written before the Shaykh's residence at ad-Dir'iyya. According to Ibn-Bishr, when Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb settled there, he started

1. MHN, p. 243.
2. Ibid., p. 248.
3. A manuscript of this work is in the British Museum included in a collection of works under Or. 7778, ff. 1-6. Three other copies are in my possession; the first was written in 1300 by 'Abd-al-'Azīz ad-Du'ayj; the second, the date of which is not given, was by 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Durayjān; the third indicates neither date of copying nor the name of the scribe. It was first printed in the Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd. It is, also, included in the Majmū', which was published by 'Īsā Ibn-Rumayḥ (Cairo, 1340) - referred to here and after as Majmū' - ; in the M.T.N.; in al-Majmū'a l-'Ilmiyya s-Su'udiyya and in the MRS. The last edition is the one used here.

teaching its people the three principles of religion,[1] which would suggest that the book had already been written by that time. Indeed, the subject of the work - religious belief - being basic to the Shaykh's teaching, would support this assumption about the date of its composition. All manuscript copies which have been examined accord with the printed texts, the only exception being the edition of Muḥammad Rashīd Rīḍa in which the introduction is omitted and certain changes are made in the language of the text.[2]

Al-Uṣūl ath-Thalātha begins by emphasizing the fact that one should learn four things: to know about God, His Prophet and Islam; to work according to this knowledge; to preach it and, finally, to be patient with the troubles which may arise therefrom.[3] Then, knowledge of three further matters is recommended: that God, who created us, did not neglect us but sent a Prophet who should be obeyed; that God does not allow any being, whether angel, prophet or anyone else, to be associated

---

1. ʻUnwān, p. 23. In some Najdī towns, this tradition continued to be observed for a long time. Usually, the imām of the mosque or one of the learned men would ask individuals after the performance of the dawn prayer to come forward and answer three questions about these three principles of religion.
2. See, for example, M.T.N. (p. 124) where it is written "rabb-ī alladhī rabbā-nī bi-niʻmati-hi wa khalaqa-nī min ʻadam ilā wujūd", and compare MRS (pp. 5-6) where the sentence is "rabb-ī Allāh alladhī rabbā-nī wa rabbā jamīʻ al-ʻālamīn bi-niʻmati-hi wa huwa maʻbūd-ī laysa l-ī maʻbūd siwā-hu.
3. MRS, p. 5.

with Him in worship; that obedience to the Prophet and monotheism in worship should prevent the individual from sympathizing with those who are enemies of God and His Prophet, even if they are close relations.[1]

Following this, the Shaykh, in the form of question and answer, elaborates on the three principles which are the main subject of this book; knowledge about God, religion and the Prophet. God is the Disposer of the universe and Giver of all blessings. He can be known through His signs (āyāt), such as night and day, the sun and the moon, and through His creations, such as heaven and earth and those living therein. Therefore, He alone should be worshipped. The aspects of ʿibāda, which are proper to Him alone are invocation, hope, fear, reliance, seeking refuge, offering sacrifices and vows. This is all supported by reference to verses from the Qur'ān.[2]

The second principle is to know religion. The author divides this into three grades: Islam, Īmān and iḥsān. Each has its own basis or arkān. There are five in Islam: the profession of the faith, the performance of prayer, giving alms, keeping the fast of Ramaḍān and making the Pilgrimage. Īmān has over seventy branches, the principle one being the utterance of the formula "There is no diety but God" and the lowest one being the removal of dirt from the road. However, its basic elements are six; to believe in God, angels, Holy Books, Prophets, the resurrection and predestination.

---

1. Ibid., p. 6.
2. Ibid., pp. 7-9.

Iḥsān has only one rukn and that is to worship God as if you are actually in His presence. These divisions, too, are supported by Qur'ānic verses and quotations from the Tradition.[1]

The third principle is to learn about the Prophet, whose lineage is briefly given. His age before and after prophethood, the first revelation, the major events of his life in Mecca and his emigration to Medina are mentioned.[2] The author finishes the work by stressing once again the belief in the resurrection and explaining the meaning of ṭāghūt which every Muslim has to reject. The ṭawāghīt are numerous, but their heads are five: the Devil, he who is content to let others worship him, he who commands others to worship him, he who claims to know the divine secrets and he who makes judgment contrary to the Sharī'a.[3]

4. Ma'nā ṭ-Tāghūt wa Ru'ūs Anwā'i-hi:[4]

The last point in al-Uṣūl ath-Thalātha is elaborated in more detail in a short independent treatise under the above title. Hence, the Shaykh says that the rejection of the ṭāghūt should lead to the rejection of polytheism, hatred for people who practise it and love for the true believers in God. When he speaks of the heads of ṭawāghīt, here, he

1. Ibid., pp. 10-12.
2. Ibid., pp. 13-4.
3. Ibid., p. 16.
4. This short treatise was printed in the Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd, and then republished in the M.T.N., pp. 122-4.

quotes Qur'ānic verses to support his classification. On the other hand, he mentions the tyrant who changes the rules of God as the second kind of ṭawāghīt instead of he who commands others to worship him whom he referred to in the previous work.

5. Talqīn Usūl al-'Aqīda li-l-'Āmma:[1]

This treatise is also related to al-Uṣūl ath-Thalātha, and similarly composed in question and answer form. However, it is written in a colloquial style in order to be more easily understood by the common people, especially the nomads. Unlike the former, it has no introduction and begins directly by explaining the three principles which should be known by every Muslim: God, religion and the Prophet. Otherwise the contents are identical.

6. Mufīd al-Mustafīd fī Kufr Tārk at-Tawḥīd.[2]

According to Ibn-Ghannām this work was written in the year 1167 as a refutation of the dubious arguments made against the doctrines of the Shaykh by his brother Sulaymān, who was the judge of Ḥuraymilā' at that time.[3] Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb argues that a Muslim cannot be

1. This work is to be found in the M.T.N., pp. 118-21.
2. This work is quoted, without a title, by Ibn-Ghannām, Rawḍa, II, pp. 21-44. Two manuscript copies of it are in my possession; the one being made by Muḥammad as-Suwayyil in 1304 and the other by Sulaymān ad-Dakkīl in 1317. The copy used in the present work is the one edited by 'Abd-al-'Azīz Āl-ash-Shaykh (Cairo, 1373).
3. Rawḍa, II, p. 20.

excluded from the community even if he makes votive offerings, prayers and sacrifices to an absent or dead person, or strokes a grave and keeps some of its soil for its blessed qualities. He states that the Shaykh's interpretation of the texts of the Sharī'a, which is against his views, is not acceptable, and maintains that personal interpretation of these is only confined to the absolute legist (al-mujtahid al-muṭlaq) whose rank is not reached by Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. He, also, says that Ibn-Taymiyya considered these practices as forms of minor polytheism which, though forbidden, do not amount to infidelity, and that he did not exclude any individual from Islam,[1] while the Shaykh, on the contrary, regards them as forms of major polytheism and applies the rules concerning the Apostates against all people living where these practices are made.[2]

As mentioned earlier,[3] the ideas of Sulaymān were well received at Ḥuraymilā' as well as al-'Uyayna, and the Shaykh had to write the Mufīd al-Mustafīd in order to defend his views and his methods of implementing them. It is natural, therefore, that this work is written in an argumentative style. It begins with a tradition in which the Prophet says that he was sent in order that idols be destroyed and God be worshipped alone. Performing prayers to God at sunrise and sunset is forbidden in the same tradition because the time of the worship coincides with that at which the pagans

1. Ṣawā'iq, p. 17.
2. MRS, p. 8.
3. See above, pp. 126-7.

used to prostrate before the sun. Therefore, all practices which resemble those of the polytheists in any form are prohibited, and as the destruction of idols implies the use of force, the author concludes that the sword should be unsheathed against those who do not comply with the principles of Islam.[1]

Following this, the Shaykh quotes Ibn-Taymiyya to show that he, contrary to what Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb alleges, considers sacrifices to any being other than God infidelity, and those who practise them, apostates. He states that it is only the individual who has not received the proof (lam tablagh-hu l-ḥujja) that Ibn-Taymiyya hesitates to declare an infidel, innovator or sinner because of the belief that he holds and the deeds which he practises.[2] He quotes Ibn-Taymiyya as saying that showing an excessive devotion to a prophet or saint and attributing to him any form of divine power such as addressing him "My lord, give me your aid, deliver me, provide me with subsistence" are polytheistic practices, and any person who is involved in these practices should be killed unless he makes repentance to God.[3] The Shaykh, however, explicitly states that, even if Ibn-Taymiyya or anyone more learned than him is mistaken in such a matter, one should declare to be an infidel any person who associates other beings with God after the arrival of the ḥujja, or the person who prefers the polytheist to the true monotheist, or

1. Mufīd al-Mustafīd, p. 21.
2. Ibid., p. 26.
3. Ibid., p. 28.

claims that he is in the right or practises any form of the obvious infidelity which has been described by God and His Prophet. But, the Shaykh maintains that, as far as he knows, neither Ibn-Taymiyya nor any other scholar differs from him on this question.[1]

Besides citing extracts from Ibn-Taymiyya, the Shaykh quotes Ibn-al-Qayyim and other scholars from different schools to support his views on declaring the infidelity of a specific Muslim.[2] Then, he proceeds to argue that if the scholars declare to be an infidel any person who, for example, invokes the name of ʿAlī Ibn-Abī-Ṭālib, then it would be equally proper to regard as kāfirs those who maintain that such a person is any sort of Muslim and defend his action. The Shaykh claims that although most of his opponents agree with him that what many common folk do beside the graves of saints, as well as their votive offerings to the dead and to the jinn, are kinds of the major polytheism, they still try to find apologies for these ignorant people by suggesting that the daʿwa did not reach them or, sometimes, by saying that it is only the individual who rejects Islam completely and embraces another religion who is to be excluded from the Muslim community.[3] He gives examples of groups and of individuals who, though called Muslims, were treated as infidels by the Companions, their immediate followers and

---

1. Ibid., p. 27.
2. Ibid., pp. 30-33.
3. Ibid., p. 44.

scholars of the successive centuries.[1]

After quoting the tradition in which the Prophet predicted that idols would be worshipped by a section of his community, the Shaykh mentions that it is obligatory for every Muslim to stand firmly against the infidels, the apostates and the hypocrites, apparently meaning his opponents, and affirms that innovators should not be associated with. He cites many traditions to support his attitude on the subject and then finishes the work with a letter written by Ibn-Taymiyya to show that one has to be determined in the struggle against the enemies of God, and quotes his pronouncement on the ḥashīsha, in which he says that anyone claiming that it is permitted is an infidel and is to be killed unless he repents.

7. Kashf ash-Shubuhāt ʻan at-Tawḥīd.[2]

This is the full title of the work, although it is more commonly known as Kashf ash-Shubuhāt. Although there

1. Ibid., p. 46. Among the examples given are the wars against those who refused to pay alms to Abū-Bakr, the burning of those who showed excessive devotion to ʻAlī Ibn-Abī-Ṭālib and the killing of al-Jaʻd Ibn-Dirham because of his heretical ideas.
2. Two manuscript copies of this work are to be found in the British Museum; the first under Add. 23, 346, pp. 662-717, and the other under Or. 7778, ff. 269-289. Two other copies are in my possession; the one, in which neither the name of the copyist nor the date of the copying is given, forms a part of a collection of Wahhābī treatises, while the other was copied by Ibrāhīm aḍ-Ḍuwayyān in 1313. The Kashf ash-Shubuhāt was first printed in the Majmūʻat at-Tawḥīd. It is, also, quoted by Ibn-Ghannām (Rawḍa, I,

[Contd.

is no mention of the date of its composition in the available sources, it would seem to have been after the Shaykh had moved to ad-Dir'iyya. It was written in order to expose and answer the dubious arguments which had been made by his opponents against his views on the conception of monotheism. The Kashf is written in a polemical style much like that of Mufīd al-Mustafīd, which was, also, composed with similar aims. The sentences are long and the use of the conditional clause is common; sometimes, a whole series of such clauses being elaborated before arriving at the apodosis.[1]

The Shaykh begins this work by defining monotheism as the worship of God alone, and describes it as the religion of all the prophets, the last of them being Muḥammad, who was sent to preach the doctrine that to invoke created beings as intercessors before God is a polytheistic practice. He, also, states that it is only the unity of God in devotion (tawḥīd al-'ibāda) that was denied by the pagans at the time of the Prophet. This kind of monotheism is the meaning of "There is no god but God", and what "god" (ilāh) meant to those pagans is exactly the same as the word "sayyid" means to contemporary polytheists; an object of invocation, votive offerings and sacrifices etc.[2]

Following this, the Shaykh refers to the fact that

Contd.] pp. 61-72) and included in the Majmū'; in the M.T.N.; and MRS. The last edition is the one referred to in the present work.

1. e.g. MRS, pp. 121-2.
2. MRS, p. 121.

every Prophet met with strong opposition and hostility, and states that on the path of God one finds enemies who may be well equipped with knowledge and eloquence. Therefore, a Muslim should learn from religion what he can use as an effective weapon against those devils, whose leader said to God: "I shall surely sit in ambush for them (mankind) on Thy straight path; then I shall come on them from front and rear, from their right hands and their left hands; Thou wilt find most of them thankful".[1] However, the author confidently affirms that an ordinary monotheist gets the better of a thousand polytheistic scholars, and maintains that there are in the Qur'ān convincing answers to any dubious argument that can be made by heretics.[2]

The arguments of the opponents can be refuted in two ways: concisely or in detail. Concisely, when confronted with an argument claimed to be based on the Qur'ān or Tradition, it is enough to say that God has mentioned in His book that those whose hearts are filled with error and doubt pass over the definitive passages from the Qur'ān and follow those which are ambiguous; and as to those verses which say that the pagans agreed that God alone is the Disposer of the universe and that their infidelity arose from invoking beings other than Him are clearly stated, and as the Qur'ān does not contradict itself nor meet contradiction from the Tradition, the argument of the opponents is dubious and, therefore,

---

1. Ibid., p. 123. Compare Qur'ān, 7/16-17.
2. MRS, p. 123.

cannot be accepted.[1]

As for answering the opponents in detail, the Shaykh mentions certain of their arguments which he then refutes individually. Of the three most serious arguments which they advance the first is: we are not associating any one with God; for we believe that He is the only Disposer of the universe and that the Prophet, not to mention 'Abd-al-Qādir or others, does not possess any power that may bring good or prevent disaster; however, we are sinners and the saints have a special rank before God and, therefore, we approach Him through them. The author maintains that the pagans at the time of the Prophet professed that God was the Disposer of everything and claimed that their invocation of others was to get nearer to Him, and he supports this view by verses from the Qur'ān.[2]

The second argument of the opponents is that such verses were revealed about those who worshipped idols and it is wrong to put the saints or prophets on the level of idols. The Shaykh refutes this by saying that invoking anyone other than the Almighty is an idolatrous practice and that the Qur'ān considers to be infidels those who worshipped idols and those who invoked saints, angels or prophets without any distinction.[3]

Thirdly, the opponents argue that the infidels expected

---

1. Ibid., p. 124.
2. Ibid., p. 125. Compare Qur'ān, 10/18, 39/3.
3. MRS, p. 126.

something from those whom they invoked, while their hopes were only from God and the approach through the saints was only to obtain their intercession before Him. The author maintains that the polytheists, too, sought only the intercession of those whom they invoked before God.[1]

Following this, the Shaykh mentions other arguments which he considers to be easier to refute than these three, and maintains that the polytheism of those whom the Prophet fought against was less grievous than that of the present day. The ancients associated others with God only during easy times, but in times of crisis or need they invoked Him alone; the people of today, however, associate others with Him at all times. Moreover, in the past sinful and irreligious individuals were not used as intercessors as they are at present.[2]

Then, the Shaykh turns to the objections made by his opponents to having applied to themselves the Qur'ānic verses which were revealed about the pagans; for they, unlike those pagans, profess that there is no god but God and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of God, believe in the truth of the Qur'ān and in the resurrection, perform the daily prayers and observe the fast. He refutes this argument by saying that accepting only a part of the Qur'ān, just as rejecting it all together, is an infidelity, and claims that his opponents still deny the tawḥīd and, therefore, they are

1. Ibid., p. 127.
2. Ibid., pp. 131-3.

polytheists.[1] After mentioning some other arguments and refuting them, he finishes this work by affirming that the tawḥīd must be in heart, in tongue and in action. The neglect of any one of these excludes the individual from Islam.

8. Arab' Qawā'id li-d-Dīn.[2]

In this short treatise, the Shaykh reaffirms certain ideas which he had already dealt with in some of his other works. He begins by stressing the fact that mankind has been created to worship God alone; and as polytheism vitiates worship, one has to know the former very well in order to avoid it.[3] The four bases which he deals with here can be summarized as follows:

1. The pagans against whom the Prophet fought admitted that it is only God who is the Disposer of the universe, the only Creator, Maintainer and Provider.

2. They invoked their idols as a form of intercession to God and thereby come nearer to Him.

---

1. Ibid., pp. 133-4.
2. Two manuscripts of this work are in the British Museum under Or. 7778, ff. 203-207 and Or. 134, ff. 94-97. Two other copies are in my possession; the one, the date of which is not given, was made by Ibn-Durayjān and the other was copied in 1300 by 'Abd-al-'Azīz ad-Du'ayj. It was first printed in the Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd; and was republished in the Majmū'; in the M.T.N.; and in the MRS. The last edition is the one referred to here.
3. MRS, p. 26. Compare K.T., p. 3.

3. The Prophet did not differentiate between those who invoked angels, prophets, saints, trees or stones, but considered them all infidels.

4. The polytheism of the ancient people was less grave than that of the author's contemporaries; for the former practised polytheism only at ordinary times, but in crisis they turned to God alone; the latter, however, practise polytheism all the time.[1]

9. Al-Masā'il al-Khams al-Wājib Ma'rifatu-hā[2]

The five questions which are discussed in this treatise had already been dealt with in other parts of the author's works. Here, he begins the subject without any introduction, stating that one should know these five points:

1. Above all else warning against polytheism had priority in the Prophet's mission.

2. Warning against polytheism implies worshipping God alone.

3. The adherence to these two principles must lead to hating polytheists and loving true Muslims.

4. God warned His Prophet against polytheism, and accordingly every Muslim has to be aware of it and avoid it.

5. A Muslim should believe in all matters mentioned in the Qur'ān. Thus, for example, he who denies the right of woman in inheritance is an infidel because he does not believe

---

1. MRS, pp. 27-29. Compare Kashf ash-Shubuhāt in MRS, pp. 119-25, 128, 132.
2. This work is included in the MRMN, IV, pp. 9-14.

in all that is in the Qur'ān.

10. Tafsīr Kalimat at-Tawḥīd[1]

This short treatise is about the meaning and implications of the formula "There is no god but God". After stressing its importance, the Shaykh explains that it negates and rejects the deification of any being other than God and affirms it to Him alone. Here he maintains that what his contemporaries meant by walī or sayyid and the like is exactly what was meant by god (ilāh) in the context of the formula.[2] He illustrates these views by two examples: first, the infidels at the time of the Prophet confessed that God alone was the Disposer of the universe, but this confession by itself did not make them Muslims; secondly, what made them infidels was that they did not single out God for deification and devotion.[3] He then reiterates what he had already stated so often in his other works: that the ancient infidels invoked beings other than God only to gain their intercession before Him, and that their infidelity is less grave than that of his contemporaries because the former invoked God alone at times of

1. A manuscript of this work, written in 1287 by Sa'īd Ibn-Ṣunqūr, is in my possession. With certain minor alterations it is to be found in two collections of works in the British Museum under Or. 4529, ff. 225-31 and Add. 23, 346, pp. 743-64, both bearing the title: Tafsīr ash-Shahāda. The same text as the latter is included in the MRMN, IV, pp. 15-23, where it is entitled Risāla fī Kalimat lā ilāh illā Allāh. It is also quoted by Ibn-Ghannām (Rawḍa, BI, pp. 175-8). Tafsir Kalimat at-Tawḥīd is the title given to it in the M.T.N. which is used here.
2. M.T.N., p. 111.
3. Ibid., p. 112.

crisis while the latter made devotion at all times.[1]

11. Risāla fī ah-Shahādatayn[2]

Related to the previous treatise is this risāla in which the Shaykh reiterates his views concerning the exclusion of the individual from Islam and maintains that the mere utterance of the faith is not enough to ensure the Islam of any person or secure his life and property. He supports this opinion by historical examples, and speaks of some signs of Muḥammad's prophethood.

Besides this risāla, there are notes by the author on the same topic all of which present the same attitude to the subject.[3]

12. Sittat Uṣūl 'Aẓīma Mufīda[4]

This short treatise is on six points clearly explained in the Qur'ān, and can be summarised as follows:

1. Tawḥīd implies the rejection of all kinds of polytheism.
2. Unity in religious affairs should prevail in the Muslim community.
3. The best knowledge is the learning of the Sharī'a.
4. Obedience to rulers has to be observed.
5. The walī is the individual who works according to the commands of God.

---

1. Ibid., p.114. Compare MRS, p. 131-2.
2. This risāla is to be found in the MRMN, IV, pp. 24-32.
3. Ibid., pp. 33-46 and I, pp. 2-6.
4. This treatise is included in the M.T.N., pp. 138-40.

6. A Muslim should base his knowledge of religion on the Qur'ān and the Tradition.

The Shaykh claims that certain scholars are confused about these matters and disagree with those who preach them.[1]

13. Mukhtaṣar Sīrat ar-Rasūl[2]

Realizing the need to purify Islam of all other beliefs and practices which had crept into it, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb wrote this concise work in order to make it easy for people to know about the life of the Prophet and, consequently, to follow his way. Although the main source on which the Shaykh relies is Ibn-Hishām, works by other historians and Traditionists are also used. The work is written in a simple narrative style, and begins with the lineage of the Prophet about which the author says that the genealogists are in agreement up till 'Adnān, but not beyond this. He speaks of the Prophet's father, his grandfather, his uncle Abū-Ṭālib, his travels to Syria and his marriage with Khadīja bint

---

1. Ibid., p. 138.
2. The manuscript of this work which is preserved in the British Museum in a collection of works under Or. 4529, ff. 1-131, is entitled Mukhtaṣar as-Sīra, and the copy in my possession is called Kitāb fī Sīrat Rasūl Allāh. On the other hand it is referred to in GAL, s, ii, 532 as Kitāb as-Sīra. It was edited by Muḥammad al-Faqi (Cairo, 1375) under the title Mukhtaṣar Sīrat ar-Rasūl and this corresponds to that of the edition by 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh (Beirūt, 1387). The edition by al-Faqī is used in the present work, and referred to as Sīra.

Khuwaylid,[1] in the course of which he alludes to the reconstruction of the Ka'ba and certain Arab practices and idols before Islam.[2] Then, he refers to the beginning of the revelation and mentions the different ways in which it took place. This is followed by the description of the important events in the life of the Prophet in Mecca, such as the reaction of Quraysh to his call, the emigration of some of his followers to Abyssinia, his midnight journey to Jerusalem and his ascension from there to heaven.[3]

The emigration of the Prophet to Medina and his early activities there are mentioned, and the author points out that when the Muslims became powerful, God first allowed them to fight their enemies and, later on, He made it obligatory for them to do so in order that worship be devoted to Him alone.[4] Then, he speaks in detail of the Prophet's military expeditions and the morals which may be drawn therefrom; the delegations from different tribes to Medina offering their submission to Islam; the last pilgrimage of the Prophet, his illness and his death.[5]

However, this work does not finish here. The author goes on to speak of the consequences that followed, mentioning the meeting at the Saqīfa, the pledge of allegiance to Abū-Bakr and the wars between the Muslims and the Apostates.[6]

---

1. Sīra, p. 36.
2. Ibid., pp. 40-46.
3. Ibid., p. 56.
4. Ibid., p. 84.
5. Ibid., p. 106.
6. Ibid., p. 197.

Then, he refers briefly to the events which took place between the years 12 and 60 A.H.; mention is made of the Umayid Caliphs and the most important events of their reigns; the advent of the 'Abbasids, the names of whose Caliphs are given down to al-Ma'mūn, whom he describes as the one who made innovations which were to corrupt the beliefs of Muslims.[1] Finally, he refers to earlier books on various subjects by the Muslim authors.

14. Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'[2]

In the short introduction to this work, the author says that the knowledge of the religion is obligatory, and that one of the best ways of achieving this is to study the stories of ancient peoples; of those who obeyed God and those who did not, and what happened to each.[3] Like that of the Mukhtaṣar Sīrat ar-Rasūl, the style of the Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā' is simple and direct. The narrative is sometimes interrupted to point out a moral or to offer pious homilies appropriate to the occasion.[4]

---

1. Ibid., p. 250.
2. A manuscript of this work is preserved in the British Museum in a collection of works under Or. 7778, ff. 47-74. The fact that it repeats many points which are dealt with in the Mukhtaṣar Sīrat ar-Rasūl suggests that it is an independent work, as mentioned in this copy. However, it is presented as an introduction in both editions of the Mukhtaṣar Sīrat ar-Rasūl and is, therefore, referred to here as a part of the Sīra.
3. Sīra, p. 3.
4. Ibid., pp. 4, 6, 13, 21.

It begins with the story of Ādam, which the Shaykh takes from the Qur'ān, in the course of which the reader is urged to learn about all the Prophets and their peoples in general, and about Muḥammad and the Companions in particular. He states that the descendants of Ādam remained faithful to true religion for many centuries, but they then started showing excessive devotion to the saints and finally worshipped them. Therefore, Nūḥ was sent to persuade the people to return to the right path.[1] After Nūḥ, polytheism re-appeared and other prophets were sent to preach the doctrine of the one God. The author speaks in detail of Ibrāhīm and his children, especially Ismā'īl, for Ibrāhīm guided all people to the true religion, and monotheism has never disappeared among his descendants.[2]

Following this, the Shaykh refers to the introduction of idols into the Arabian Peninsula by 'Amr Ibn-Luḥayy and gives the names of these idols and their shrines. He, also, speaks of the building of the Ka'ba and the history of Quraysh before Islam, and includes some events which took place in the life of the Prophet from his birth till the beginning of the revelation. Here, the author mentions that warning against polytheism is the duty of all Muslims; and just as the Prophet attacked the religion of the pagans and their idols, a Muslim should declare his enmity against those who do not follow the principles of Islam.[3] The

1. Ibid., p. 5.
2. Ibid., pp. 6-12.
3. Ibid., p. 21.

Prophet was asked not to seek the mercy of God for his uncle Abū-Ṭālīb, despite his defence of Muḥammad and his sympathy for Islam, for he did not reject and denounce the religion of the pagans.[1] The Shaykh mentions the story of the Prophet's emigration to Medina, and refers to a passage in the Qur'ān criticising the Muslims who, for certain reasons, did not leave Mecca,[2] from which he concludes that faith must be supported by action. The important battles which the Prophet fought are referred to briefly, and the Qur'ānic verses which were revealed about them are cited. The wars which were fought after the Prophet's death against the Apostates, including those who refused to pay the zakāt to Abū-Bakr, provide the Shaykh with evidence to refute the claims of those scholars who maintained that the individual who utters the Shahāda is a Muslim and that therefore his blood and wealth should be respected. Other historical examples are given in support of his opinion that the Bedouins who denied the resurrection,neglected religious obligations and mocked people who accepted the judgement of the Sharī'a, should all be regarded as infidels.[3] Some of these examples are, also, mentioned in the Kashf ash-Shubuhāt.[4] Finally, he challenges his opponents, wondering how they, in spite of their agreement that the individual who denies the resurrection

---

1. Ibid. Compare Qur'ān, 9/113.
2. Sīra, p. 23. Compare Qur'ān, 9/24.
3. Sīra, p. 28.
4. Ibid., pp. 29-34. Compare MRS, pp. 125-26.

or curses the Sharī'a is an infidel, did not condemn the infidelity of those Bedouins, but instead defended their attitude.[1]

15. Sittat Mawāḍi' Manqūla min as-Sīra n-Nabawiyya[2]

The purpose of composing this work is given in its short introduction; to know the religion of the Prophet and that of the polytheists, so that one might follow the former and avoid the latter; for many who claim to know Islam do not properly understand these six topics:

1. The early Qur'ānic verses were directed against idols and polytheists who hoped that, by practising idolatry, they would get nearer to God. Thus, it is clear that this matter had priority in the Prophet's mission before other social vices, such as adultery, which were practised by some of his contemporaries.

2. The Prophet met with strong opposition only when he openly denounced the religion of the polytheists. Therefore, the Islam of the individual cannot be complete unless he hates polytheism and declares his enmity to those who practise it.

3. While the Prophet was reciting verses from the Qur'ān

---

1. Sīra, p. 35.
2. Two manuscripts of this treatise are in the British Museum included in a collection of works under Or. 7778, ff. 152-58 and Or. 4529, ff. 231-6. It was first printed in the Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd, and is, also included in the M.T.N. The last edition is the one referred to here.

in the presence of some pagans, the Devil added certain phrases to the recitation in praise of some of their idols. The pagans then thought that they could come to terms with the Prophet; however, he denied having said anything of the kind and attacked paganism all the more vigorously.[1] Thus, it is obvious that there should be no compromise with the enemies of monotheism.

4. The story of Abū-Ṭalīb is related; how he agreed that the religion of Islam was correct and defended the Prophet, but as he did not reject the religion of polytheists, God blamed Muḥammad when he asked His forgiveness for him. This shows, once more, that Islam should imply the rejection of all kinds of polytheism.

5. This is followed by the story of the Hijra. God criticized those Muslims who could have emigrated, but out of love for their relatives, wealth or town did not leave Mecca. Belief should be backed by action and determination to bear the consequences.

6. Finally comes the story of the ridda. The Companions adopted the same attitude towards those who returned to paganism, those who only believed in the Prophethood of Musaylama and others, and those who merely refused to pay the alms to Abū-Bakr, regarding them all as apostates. Therefore, the argument of the scholars who maintain that the individual who professes the creed cannot be declared as an infidel is invalid.[2]

---

1. According to Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā (M.T.N., f.n. 1, p. 105) this story is related through many channels all of which are weak and cannot be trusted.
2. M.T.N., pp. 103-09.

16. Masā'il al-Jāhiliyya[1]

The work deals with a hundred and twenty nine problems concerning the practices and beliefs of the illiterate pagans, as well as those of adherents to other religions before the advent of Islam, and which were rejected by the Prophet. The purpose of its composition was apparently to point out the similarity between the practices of the ancient polytheists and non-Muslims and those of some of his contemporaries; thus justifying his opposition to them. The work is very concise; indeed, the presentation of the points under consideration gives the impression of a collection of lecture-notes, only a few questions being gone into in detail. However, most of its conclusions are supported by references to the Qur'ān. Significant among the topics treated are: the aim of the ancient polytheists in worshipping the saints was only to get their intercession before God; and therefore to become nearer to Him; the belief in the correctness of certain matters merely because they were practised by the majority of people; the excessive devotion to the 'ulamā' and saints; the sacrifices at their graves, making the graves of the Prophets places for worship;

1. A manuscript of this work is in the British Museum under Or. 134, ff. 73-81. It was first printed in the Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd, and later published in the M.T.N. A commentary on it by Maḥmūd Shukrī al-Ālūsī was published by Muḥḥib ad-Dīn al-Khaṭīb (Cairo, 1347). In his commentary, al-Ālūsī changed somewhat the organization of the original work, and even made his own additions to the points under consideration, reducing the work to an even hundred questions.

cursing the time and the fanatical enthusiasm for one's own madhhab even if the truth is clearly against it.

17. Uṣūl al-Īmān[1]

Although the available sources do not give the date in which this work was written, the subject it deals with, being mainly tawḥīd al-asmā' wa-ṣ-ṣifāt, suggests that it does not belong to the early stage of the Shaykh's career during which he was concerned most about tawḥīd al-'ibāda. As in Faḍl al- Islām, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb divides this work into sections, each of which is given a title under which appropriate materials are collected, and, like the former, too, it quotes almost exclusively from the Tradition, with only very few Qur'ānic verses being used in the introductions to certain sections. No interpretation of these traditions is given nor are conclusions drawn at the end.

Uṣūl al-Īmān begins with a bāb entitled "Knowledge of God and Belief in Him". Here, the Shaykh mentions different traditions in which certain of God's attributes are referred to, implying that one should believe in all that is attributed to the Almighty by Himself or by His Prophet. God is spoken of as having hand, fist and face, and the actions and states of hearing, seeing, speaking, loving and sitting on

1. A manuscript of this work is in a collection of works in the British Museum under Or. 134, ff. 64-73. Another copy, made by 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Salmān in 1304, is in my possession. It was first printed in the Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd, and republished in the MḤN, which is used here.

the throne are ascribed to Him. He is, also described as the Merciful, the Knowing and the One who does not sleep, and nothing may escape His knowledge or happen without His willing it.

This is followed by a chapter dealing with predestination. In the introduction to this bāb, the author cites verses from the Qur'ān showing that everything is foreordained, and this is followed by traditions, which elaborate what the Qur'ān reveals on the subject. Although one should believe in fate, he has to behave in the way prescribed for him by God and His Prophet. On the other hand, treatment of illness and disease does not vitiate the belief in predestination or contradict dependence on God.[1]

The third chapter deals with angels and the belief in them. It begins with verses from the Qur'ān which say that the faith includes the belief in angels, and these are followed by a collection of traditions which speak of individual angels, such as Jibrīl, Mīkā'īl, Isrāfīl and the angel of death whose name, according to certain traditions, is 'Izrā'īl. The Shaykh mentions the duties of these and, also, refers to other angels like the guards of hell, the carriers of the throne of God and those who record what man does.

After this, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb turns to the Qur'ān, the contents of which every Muslim has to believe in, as well as follow what it prescribes. Other revealed books

1. MḤN, pp. 218-21.

are not to be read: the Prophet grew angry when his companion, 'Umar Ibn-al-Khaṭṭāb, brought to him a certain section of the Tawrāt.[1] The Qur'ān enjoins that whatever the Prophet orders should be done and whatever he bans should be avoided. Therefore, his Sunna is to be followed and any innovation in the religion must be rejected.

Learning is encouraged and praised, and the 'ulamā' are referred to as the inheritors of the Prophets.[2] The ideal way of acquiring religious knowledge is to refrain from asking questions about matters which God and His Prophet did not deal with; and one should not study for the sake of disputation.[3] The Shaykh finishes the Uṣūl al-Īmān with a section in which conciseness in speech is recommended, and idle talk is decried.[4]

18. Kitāb al-Kabā'ir

19. Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn bi-Aḥādīth Khātam al-Mursalīn[5]

The fact that these two works deal with ethical behaviour in the community and the relations among its members, as well as the relations between the ruler and the ruled,

1. Ibid., p. 229.
2. Ibid., p. 236.
3. Ibid., p. 238.
4. Ibid., pp. 239-40.
5. Two manuscript copies of Kitāb al-Kabā'ir are preserved in the British Museum in collection of works under Or. 7778, ff. 7-45 and Or. 4529, ff. 196-223. Another copy, made by 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Salmān in 1307, is in my possession. Both this work and the Naṣāḥat al Muslimīn are in the MḤN, which is used in the present work.

suggests that they were written after the establishment of the Su'ūdī state. Both are collections of traditions which the author cites under appropriate titles. While the bābs of the first one are very short, those of the second are somewhat longer and divided into various sections.

The Kitāb al-Kabā'ir begins with two verses from the Qur'ān warning Muslims against committing major sins, which Ibn-'Abbās defines as any of those which God says deserve hell or His curse, anger or torture. The most serious among these are polytheism, recalcitrance towards parents and false testimony.[1] Then, the Shaykh mentions the major sins of the heart and proceeds to the treatment of other sins which he thinks comparable, such as arrogance, and false opinion about God.[2] Thereafter, he moves to the major sins of the tongue, treated in bābs dealing with bragging, exaggeration in argument, swearing, lying and adulation.[3] After this, he deals with some social vices such as impatience, cowardice, meanness, jealousy, ill-thinking of others, false accusation of fornication, slander and revealing secrets.[4]

Then, the Shaykh states that intercession should not be made for those who deserve legal punishment for this increases crime; and he says that anything which may cause troubles within the community must be avoided. Pride in

1. MHN, p. 258.
2. Ibid., pp. 258-64.
3. Ibid., pp. 265-70.
4. Ibid., pp. 276-82.

one's learning, as well as denial of favour and the mockery of pious people, are blameworthy.

Presents to governors are not to be made, and the acceptance of them is to be prohibited.[1] Here the author dwells on the necessity of obedience to rulers and the patience that should be shown even if they are oppressors, stressing that rebellions and disturbances should be avoided.[2] However, power is a heavy responsibility which is not to be sought, and the ruler should be sincere and kind towards his subjects. He should not hide himself from them, ignore their needs or favour one rather than another in administration without any sound reason. Just as the ruler is responsible before God towards his subjects, every member in the community has, also, a certain responsibility. Thus, a man is responsible towards his family, a woman towards her house, a son towards the wealth of his father and a servant towards the property of his master.[3] Gentleness towards women and slaves, as well as kindness to animals, is obligatory, and oppression of all kinds is prohibited. Finally, the Kitāb al-Kabā'ir ends with a chapter dealing with brotherhood in Islam and the obligations of individuals towards each other.[4]

The Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn begins with a chapter on the manner of salutation for which the formula "as-salām 'alaykum" is to be used. Mutual greeting is recommended for it reveals friendship and love among the members of the

1. Ibid., pp. 283-92.
2. Ibid., pp. 293-95.
3. Ibid., p. 305.
4. Ibid., pp. 309-10.

community.[1] There follow bābs on asking permission to enter other's places, shaking hands and embracing at meeting, the manner of sitting, sleeping and walking, as well as sneezing, yawning and laughing.[2] After this, the Shaykh cites traditions dealing with the naming of children; what names are preferred and what are disapproved of.[3] Then, he treats eloquence and poetry, slander and fulfilment of promises. Boasting of tribal origins, charitable gifts, relations with neighbours, kindness to old people and orphans, as well as helping others and concealing their defects, are spoken of in the various sections.[4]

Following this, the author includes chapters dealing with deserting one another, anger, modesty and oppression.[5] Then, he quotes traditions about commanding good and forbidding evil, and the best means of achieving such a purpose. He, also, speaks of piety, ascetism and the virtues of the poor people who accept predestined poverty with patience, as well as the virtues of the rich who thank God for His grace and spend their wealth in a proper way.[6] Again he condemns hypocrisy and striving for reputation and lays emphasis upon sincerity and fearing God.[7] The question of the Muslims

1. Ibid., pp. 312-18.
2. Ibid., pp. 319-31.
3. Ibid., pp. 332-4.
4. Ibid., pp. 354-66.
5. Ibid., pp. 376, 387-91.
6. Ibid., pp. 392-423.
7. Ibid., pp. 429-32.

pursuing the wrong path, which people of other religions had followed, is also dealt with here, and the Shaykh mentions traditions warning against innovations and change in the religious practices.[1] Finally, he quotes traditions in which the Prophet predicted certain things which came to pass, and he considers this proof of his prophethood.[2]

20. Mukhtaṣar al-Hady an-Nabawī[3]

The work is abridged from Zād al-Ma'ād fī Hady Khayr al-'Ibād or as it is sometimes called al-Hady an-Nabawī, written by the celebrated scholar Ibn-Qayyim al-Jawziyya. It deals with all aspects of the life of the Prophet, which ought to be taken as an example by every member of the Islamic community. After an introduction of three pages in which the author glorifies God and emphasizes the necessity of following the way of the Prophet who is the best of men, al-Hady begins with a section on ritual ablution. This is followed by sections dealing with the performance of the

1. Ibid., pp. 438-40.
2. Ibid., pp. 443-4.
3. The work has not been published. It is referred to in GAL S, II, 531, as Mukhtaṣar al-Hudā an-Nabawī. A manuscript of it is preserved in al-Maktaba s-Su'ūdiyya in Riyadh under $\frac{48}{86}$. Another copy is in my possession and its description is: 48 ff.; 9½ x 6½ (7¼ x 5); 30-32 lines varying; heavy, white, glazed paper; margins not ruled; black ink with headings and cartouches in red; small, poor naskh; unbound and untrimmed; some words on ff. 1-3 are illegible due to decay; ff. 27 and 28 are, also, slightly damaged with waterstains, but still readable. It was copied by a certain Muḥammad Ibn-Sayf Ibn-Khamīs in the year 1197.

prayers, including those of Friday, the two Feasts and the prayers of the eclipse.[1] The Prophet's way of reciting the Qur'ān, visiting the sick people, burying the dead and visiting their graves is then discussed.[2] Next, the author treats in detail almsgiving, charity of all kinds, the fast and the Pilgrimage. Entering places, greeting and behaviour when angry are, also, discussed in detail.[3]

Following this, the Shaykh speaks of the Jihād, which he divided into four categories:

1. Against oneself; to endeavour to learn the way of the Prophet in all aspects of life; to work according to it, to preach it and finally to be steadfast whatever may be the consequences resulting from such an attitude.
2. Against the Devil; to resist doubts about God and religion that he may introduce into your mind, and to defy his temptations to do what is prohibited.
3. Against infidels and hypocrites; this should be pursued with one's heart, tongue, wealth and blood.
4. Against oppressors and innovators; if possible they should be shown physical opposition, but in any case the heart should be against them.[4]

The reaction of Quraysh to the Prophet's call, the emigration of some of his followers to Abyssinia, his own

1. al-Hady, ff. 3-9.
2. Ibid., ff. 9-12.
3. Ibid., ff. 19-23.
4. Ibid., f. 24.

emigration to Medina and his early activities there are dealt with, and the author, also, refers to the way in which the Prophet made peace and treated the non-Muslims living in the Islamic community.[1] He, also, speaks in detail of the wars which the Prophet fought, drawing a moral from each and explaining the way the booty and spoils of war were divided.[2] The work finishes with a section dealing with marriage.

21. Majmū' al-Ḥadīth 'alā Abwāb al-Fiqh[3]

The work treats all those subjects usually discussed in works of jurisprudence. In general, it adds little to what is found in the standard texts of Ḥanbalī fiqh, and is less detailed than the author's other works on this subject. However, it does show his preference for demonstrating his views by Ḥadīth rather than depending upon the opinions or arguments of the doctors of the law; a preference, in fact,

1. Ibid., ff. 30-35.
2. Ibid., ff. 36-45.
3. The work is still unpublished. A manuscript of it is preserved in al-Maktaba s-Su'ūdiyya in Riyadh under $\frac{186}{86}$. Its description is: 70 ff.; 10 x $8\frac{1}{2}$ ($8\frac{1}{2}$ x $6\frac{1}{4}$); 21-30 lines varying; heavy yellowish paper; black ink with headings sometimes in red; medium ordinary riq'a; the copyist of the first twelve ff. seems to be different from the one who copied the rest of the book; some marginal comments in the same hand; damage due to decay or waterstaining is found on ff. 43, 45, 49, 52-58, but this is limited to the margins and the text is not affected; bound and trimmed. Neither the names of the copyists nor the date of copying is given.

which is characteristic of most of his works. The available sources do not mention the date of its composition, but it seems that it was written in a somewhat late stage of the Shaykh's career as its subject deals with jurisprudence and not with the belief which was the main concern of its writer's early activities.

It begins with a chapter on ritual ablution and all matters relevant to it, such as wiping the shoes with water, performing the major ritual ablution "ghusl" and tayammum. Then, the Shaykh cites traditions dealing with prayers; the obligatory and the voluntary, as well as those of Friday, the two Feasts, the eclipse and the prayers for rain. This is followed by a chapter about almsgiving in which the zakāt of cattle, agricultural products and other properties are spoken of in detail. The fast and pilgrimage are, also, minutely dealt with, and the author speaks of the Jihād, dwelling on how the spoils of war should be shared, the rules governing occupied agricultural lands, the methods of making peace and truces, and the treatment of non-Muslims.

Following this, the Shaykh devotes chapters to the laws of sale, all kinds of commerce, commercial enterprise, endowment and bequest respectively. He, then, speaks of marriage, divorce, guardianship, as well as blood money, punishment for illegal acts, dietary laws and manners. The work finishes with a chapter about the administration of justice and all things which are attached to it.

22. Aḥkām Tamannī l-Mawt.

23. Ḥukm al-Ghība wa-n-Namīma.

24. Ḥukm Katm al-Ghayẓ wa-l-Ḥilm.[1]

These titles are given to collections made from Tradition by the Shaykh.[2] Unlike his other works on the subject, such as Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn, these collections are not well organized, nor all the traditions classified under special headings.

The first contains traditions concerning death. A Muslim out of despair should not ask God to take his life, but rather to pray for whatever is best for him. Detailed treatment is given to the words which should be said in the presence of a dying person; the way the soul leaves the body; the condition of the believer and the infidel in the grave; the salvation of the former and the damnation of the other; and the visitation of graves.

The second deals with ethical matters. Slanderous speech, insults and cursing, spying on people, quarrelling, rebellion against rulers and lying are warned against. However, telling lies with the good intention of settling disputes between two sides in the Muslim community is permitted. The work then passes in to a miscellany of topics:

---

1. These three works are part of a manuscript preserved in the Leyden Library under Or. 2497 and have not been published. A microfilm of this manuscript, used here, is in my possession.
2. See GAL, S, II, p. 531.

kindness towards parents and other relatives; the virtues of the 'ulamā'; the etiquette of sneezing and yawning; dying beards; conceit, wearing amulets; and pessimism.

The third deals with the life to come. Everyone except God will die and then be revived by Him; all creatures will be judged, the faithful entering heaven and the infidels being damned to hell.

25. Mukhtaṣar al-Inṣāf wa-sh-Sharḥ al-Kabīr[1]

The work is of particular importance not only because of its scope - being the longest of the Shaykh's books - but, also, because of the subject it deals with. The main concern of all his teaching centred upon the purity of belief and in the early stages of his career he was especially drawn to the fundamentals of the religion, known as uṣūl ad-dīn. Later, however, he felt it necessary to turn his attention to other branches of the Sharī'a, and in this work he examines fiqh. Here he shows the importance which he attached to this subject in general, and particular attachment to the Ḥanbalī school, a fact which is, also, emphasized in some of his letters.[2]

---

1. The work was published in Cairo (n.d.) at the expense of 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh by Muḥibb-ad-Dīn al-Khaṭīb. According to the publisher, the manuscript on which it was based was written by a certain Sa'd Ibn-Muḥammad for Ibn-Murshid Aḥmad Ibn-Huwayr in the year 1224. See page 4.
2. In a letter to the Sharīf of Mecca, Aḥmad Ibn-Sa'īd, the Shaykh suggests that in case of disagreement between his delegation and the 'ulamā' of the Holy City the books of Ḥanbalī scholars should be consulted in order to see that his views are in accordance with those of the Ḥanbalītes,

[Contd.

Both al-Inṣāf and ash-Sharḥ al-Kabīr are commentaries on al-Muqni', which was written by the celebrated scholar Muwaffaq-ad-Dīn Ibn-Qudāma (d. 620).[1] Al-Muqni' is one of the principal works on Ḥanbalī fiqh, and it attracted numerous commentaries and marginal interpretations by the scholars of this madhhab, the first of which was made by Ibn-Qudāma's nephew Shams-ad-Dīn (d. 682). Shams-ad-Dīn called his commentary ash-Shāfī, but it became known as ash-Sharḥ al-Kabīr.[2] Al-Inṣāf was written by 'Alā'-ad-Dīn al-Mardawī (d. 885).[3]

It is noticeable that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb relies to a greater extent on ash-Sharḥ al-Kabīr than on al-Inṣāf. Indeed, it is only towards the end of the chapters that he animadverts to the latter and in some chapters it is not mentioned at all.[4] Although the work is an abridgement, the author substantiates the position taken on every point treated by evidential citations, such as a verse from the Qur'ān, a tradition of the Prophet or any Companion. In addition, he mentions the various views of Ḥanbalī scholars,

---

Contd.] See Rawḍa, II, p. 81. In another letter sent to the scholars of the city, he explicitly says that he is a follower of the Ḥanbalī madhhab. Ibid., p. 144.

1. GAL, S, I, p. 688; Ḥajjī Khalīfa, Kashf aẓ-Ẓunūn, II, p. 1810.
2. GAL, S, I, p. 688. Ash-Sharḥ al-Kabīr, in which al-Muqni' was included, was published in 12 volumes by Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā (Cairo, 1341-8/1922-30).
3. Ismā'īl Pāshā, Iḍāḥ al-Maknūn fī dh-Dhayl 'alā Kashf aẓ-Ẓunun, I, p. 134.
4. For example see the chapters on the prayers of eclipse, p. 138, on the making of truces, pp. 263-4.

as well as those of the 'ulamā' of other schools.[1]

The work is written in a simple direct style, divided into chapters, each of which is further sub-divided into the particular aspects under consideration. It begins with a chapter on water, which is made to serve as an introduction to the ritual ablution. All matters relevant to this subject, such as the siwāk, tayammum and menstruation are discussed in detail.[2] Then, the Shaykh devotes a long chapter to the varieties of prayer,[3] and this is followed by a discussion of funerals.[4]

A chapter is devoted to the zakāt, in which detailed treatment is given to its conditions, the minimum amount of property - including cattle, agricultural products, money and other commercial possessions - on which it is calculated, the personal zakāt at the end of Ramaḍān and the people to whom it should be paid.[5] This is followed by a discussion of fasting and all matters pertaining thereto, such as secluding oneself in a mosque, (i'tikāf).[6] Next there comes a chapter in many sections dealing with the pilgrimage, its rendezvous points and times, the iḥrām, the redemption, the

---

1. Mukhtaṣar al-Inṣāf wa-sh-Sharḥ al-Kabīr, pp. 11-2.
2. Ibid., pp. 6-59.
3. Ibid., pp. 59-140.
4. Ibid., pp. 140-51.
5. Ibid., pp. 152-69.
6. Ibid., pp. 170-79.

rules governing hunting in the sacred territories, the manner of entering Mecca and the rest of the pilgrimage's rites.[1] Jihād is the subject of the next chapter, and it is held to be obligatory upon the individual under three conditions: at times of actual battle, when an enemy enters the country and when the imām calls people to fight.[2] The division of spoils of war, the rules governing occupied agricultural lands, the fay' - what is taken from the enemy without fighting -, the treatment of a vanquished enemy, concluding truces and making peace, and the status of non-Muslims are all dealt with in detail.[3]

There comes then a long chapter devoted to the laws of sale and all relevant matters, such as usury, money changing, lending and borrowing, mortgaging and assignment.[4] The revocation of those who are legally incompetent, the varieties of commercial enterprise, endowments, gifts and bequests are each discussed.[5] The next chapter treats details of marriage, its conditions, those to whom it is prohibited, the dowry and the relations between husband and wife; and this is followed by a discussion of divorce and the problems resulting from it.[6] He then deals with the guardianship of children and other dependent relatives.

---

1. Ibid., pp. 180-237.
2. Ibid., p. 238.
3. Ibid., pp. 238-67.
4. Ibid., pp. 268-353.
5. Ibid., pp. 354-419.
6. Ibid., pp. 421-58.

Crime and its punishment are next dealt with, and this leads to a description of the attitude which should be taken against those in the community who commit outrageous actions, "bughāt".[1] A chapter is devoted to diet in which the Shaykh, also, deals with the slaughtering of animals and birds, and with hunting. This is followed by a chapter on oaths and vows in all their varieties. The work finishes with three chapters on the administration of Justice; the first discusses the qualifications and manners required in a judge, the way decisions on disputed issues should be made and the treatment of conflicting claims; the second is on testimony, the the third deals with confession.[2]

25. Ādāb al-Mashy ilā ṣ-Ṣalāt[3]

This work is on fiqh and, compared with the previous one, is very concise, even though they deal with the same matters. The Shaykh seems to have written it for novices in the subject. Therefore, he does not mention the various views of Ḥanbalī scholars on the points treated, nor does he refer to the 'ulamā' from other schools. Although its title would suggest that it is concerned only with the practices to be observed by the individual in the performance of prayer, the book, in fact, also discussed almsgiving, charity and

1. Ibid., pp. 462-70.
2. Ibid., pp. 490-506.
3. At one time, the work was prescribed in the curricula of the primary schools of Su'ūdī Arabia. It was published (Cairo, n.d.) in two parts; the first on prayers, and the other on the almsgiving and fasting.

fasting. It is noticeable, however, that it makes no mention of the ritual ablution and the other relevant matters, which are usually dealt with before speaking of prayer in most works on fiqh.

Thus, the book opens with a chapter on what a person ought to say or do from the time he leaves home until the moment he starts his prayer. Following this, the author treats in detail the obligatory and voluntary prayers, including the five daily ones, those of Friday, the two Feasts, the eclipse, the tarāwīḥ and the prayers for rain. Next he discusses funerals; and after mentioning that all kinds of medical treatment are lawful unless specifically prohibited, he explains the manners of washing the dead, performing the prayers over him and preparing the grave. Here he states that illuminating graves and building tombs are not permitted, and that these should be removed if they exist. He then devotes a chapter to almsgiving, dealing with all the relevant points which he treated in much more detail in Mukhtaṣar al-Inṣāf wa-sh-Sharḥ al-Kabīr. The work finishes with a chapter on fasting, discussing all those matters arising therefrom.

27. Shurūṭ aṣ-Ṣalāt[1]

This is a very concise treatise on fiqh, and although its title would suggest that it is about the conditions

1. Two manuscripts of this work are in my possession; one undated, written by 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Durayjān, and the other anonymous, copied in 1301. It was published in the Majmū', and republished in the MRS. The last edition is the one used here.

required for prayer in general, it deals in fact with all the necessary conditions associated therewith. These are divided into conditions "shurūṭ", bases "arkān" and obligations "wājibāt". The shurūṭ are the conditions which should be fulfilled before actually starting prayer; the arkān are the matters without which the prayer cannot be regarded as valid, whether their omission be deliberate or due to forgetfulness; the wājibāt are those required things which, if omitted due to forgetfulness, do not wholly invalidate the prayer, provided an extra prostration, called sujūd as-sahw, is performed.[1] All these shurūṭ, arkān and wājibāt are treated in detail and in accordance with Ḥanbalī teaching.[2]

28. at-Tafsīr ʻalā Baʻḍ Suwar al-Qurʼān[3]

This work is on certain chapters or verses from the Qurʼān and was collected by Ibn-Ghannām. It begins with a commentary on the first sūra, al-Fātiḥa, which the Shaykh wrote when he was living at al-ʻUyayna in response to a request from ʻAbd-al-ʻAzīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Suʻūd.[4] Compared to the rest of this work, the commentary on al-Fātiḥa is the

1. MRS, p. 25.
2. Ibid.,pp. 17-25. Compare al-Buhūtī, ar-Rawḍ al-Murbiʻ (Cairo, n.d.) pp. 62-9.
3. This is the title given to this work in GAL, S, II, p.531. Ibn-Ghannām quotes it in the fifth chapter of his work without a title, saying only that it is a commentary by the Shaykh on certain verses from the Qurʼān. See Rawḍa I, pp. 222-82.
4. Ibid., I, p. 222.

most detailed.[1]

Besides explaining the words and commenting on the verses, certain conclusions are drawn about their significance. Comparisons are made with other verses and extracts from Tradition are cited. However, sometimes the Shaykh confines himself only to drawing a moral from the verses he mentions. This would suggest that some of this work was prepared as lecture-notes for what he was going to teach in his classes. In general, it shows the Shaykh's ability to understand the verses and draw inferences from them.

29. Al-Khuṭab al-Minbariyya[2]

These khuṭab were delivered on various occasions, such as the prayer of Friday and the two Feasts. Written in short rhyming sentences, they are usually quite brief, beginning with the glorification of God and the confession of the faith, with praises for the Prophet who carried out his mission in the most proper and perfect way. After the ammā ba'd, the sermon proper follows with exhortations to piety: God is to be feared and His commandments obeyed; the way of the Prophet is that which should be followed in all aspects of life; prohibited things are to be avoided. Then come observations appropriate to the occasion of the sermon, such as the arrival of Ramaḍān or pilgrimage. Qur'ānic verses and quotations from the Tradition are often cited, and towards

1. The Commentary on al-Fātiha alone is in the British Museum MS, under Add 23, 346, pp. 719-41, and was printed in the Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd, and republished in the M.T.N.
2. These khuṭab were published at the expense of King 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Su'ūd (Mecca, n.d.).

the end God is asked to grant guidance and mercy not only to the preacher but to the audience as a whole. It is noticeable that in these khuṭab no blessings are invoked on the Sulṭān or any ruler, for this was considered by the Shaykh as an innovation and, thus, to be avoided.[1]

30. Rasā'il wa-Ajwiba[2]

These letters and certain answers to questions on points of religion form two long chapters of the first volume of Ibn-Ghannām's work. Written on various occasions to different scholars, students and chiefs of towns or tribes in Najd and other regions, they supply valuable information about the Shaykh's life, his views and doctrines. Some of them, such as those sent to 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Abd-al-Laṭīf who was a scholar from al-Aḥsā',[3] and 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Suḥaym, a judge at al-Majma'a,[4] are even longer than most of the Shaykh's treatises on the concept of tawḥīd. The style in which these letters are written differs, depending on the situation and the individuals they are addressed to, sometimes being quite argumentative. Colloquial, impolite words are used, especially when writing to an obstinate opponent, such as Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥaym from Riyadh.[5] Most of these

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 132.
2. Ibid., I, pp. 50-61, 95-221.
3. Ibid., pp. 50-61.
4. Ibid., pp. 91-104, 113-23.
5. Ibid., pp. 138-45. Here, he writes: "ṣāyir li-kum 'ind khummāmih fī Mi'kāl: qiṣāṣīb wa ashbāhi-him ya'taqidūn ann-kum 'ulamā'", p. 138, and again: man ant ḥatta ta'rif kalām al-'ulamā'?, p. 142.

letters deal with matters affecting _'aqīda_, while a great deal of the answers treat of questions on _fiqh_.[1] They will be used extensively in the following chapter in the discussion of the doctrines of the Shaykh.

Two other works are erroneously attributed to Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. The first entitled _Risāla fī Mabḥath al-Ijtihād wa-t-Taqlīd_,[2] is part of _A'lām al-Muwaqqi'īn_ by Ibn-Qayyim al-Jawziyya, and it deals with the attitude which ought to be taken by scholars towards conflicting views and interpretations of the Companions and their immediate followers.

The second has the title: _as-Risāla l-Madaniyya fī Ma'rifat Bahā' al-Ilāhiyya_.[3] However, this would appear to be a description of Wahhābī doctrines sent by 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd to the scholars of al-Ḥaramayn and other regions which was published in the _Hadiyya_.[4] The few differences between the texts are almost certainly due to the copyists. It is very unlikely that a work of such

1. His answer on those payments to judges which can be regarded as bribes form part of a manuscript in the British Museum under Or. 7778, ff. 79-86, and in _Rawḍa_, I, pp. 184-9.
2. A copy of this with attribution to Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb is in Leyden Library, MS, Or. 2498; cf., _GAL_, S, II, p. 531. The original is to be found in _A'lām al-Muwaqqi'īn_, ed. by Muḥammad 'Abd-al-Ḥamīd (Cairo, 1374), IV, pp. 119-62.
3. John Rylands Library, MS. 92 (618), ff. 1-19, cf. _GAL_, S, II, p. 531.
4. _Hadiyya_, pp. 5-26.

importance would have escaped mention by Wahhābī scholars and historians if it really did come from the pen of the Shaykh; and indeed, the compiler of the Hadiyya, the great Wahhābī scholar Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥmān, attributes it to 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd. Again there is the fact that in one portion of the Rylands text (f. 15) the words: "what Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb warned against" occur, and it would be very unlikely that he would have written of himself in this way.

Also ascribed to him is a treatise entitled: al-Jawāhir al-Muḍī'a.[1] Actually, this is not an independent work, but extracts from his Kashf ash-Shubūhāt 'an at-Tawḥīd combined with part of a letter he wrote to a certain Iraqi scholar called 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-'Abd-ar-Raḥmān.

---

1. MRMN, IV, pp. 2-8 and compare pp. 2, 3, 7, 8 to Rawḍa, I, pp. 152-54; and pp. 4, 5, 6, 7 to Kashf ash-Shubuhāt in the MRS, pp. 104-8.

CHAPTER V

Wahhābī Doctrines

A. Preface:

Wahhābiyya or Wahhābism is the name applied to the movement of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb by his opponents as a term of abuse. It is not exceptional that such movements be designated by the second distinctive element of the name of their founders, as for example the school of Aḥmad Ibn-Ḥanbal which is called Ḥanbalism. To have named it after its founder would, in this case, have resulted in Muḥammadiyya thereby confusing it with the "way" ascribed to the Prophet himself. However, this designation seems to have been the reason for the confusion of certain writers who maintained that the founder of the movement was 'Abd-al-Wahhāb.[1]

Evidently, the term Wahhābiyya was used by local opposition to the Shaykh at a quite early period of his activities,[2] and it has been freely applied by different scholars and writers ever since. The purpose in calling

---

1. Among these writers are Niebuhr, Travels, II, p. 131; Burckhardt, Notes, II, p. 96; Bridges, op.cit., II, p. 7; Crichton, op.cit., II, p. 288.
2. The Najdī poet Ḥumaydān ash-Shuway'ir, who died in 1160, is said to have urged people to follow what the "Wahhābī" preached. See Khiyār, I, p. 114. And Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb called his book, which he wrote before 1168, aṣ-Ṣawā'iq al-Ilāhiyya fī r-Radd 'alā l-Wahhābiyya, and used the term throughout this work.

his followers Wahhābīs was obviously to deter others from accepting his teachings, and to suggest that he was preaching a new religion or a fifth madhhab, as it was occasionally called.[1]

On the other hand, the adherents of the movement of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb reject the name Wahhābī, and refer to themselves as the Muslims and to their religion as Islam.[2] However, sometimes they use specific terms like the "Muwaḥḥidūn" to identify themselves, and for their doctrines they use expressions like "Da'wat at-Tawḥīd", "ad-Da'wa l-Muḥammadiyya", "ad-Da'wa s-Salafiyya" or merely "ad-Da'wa".[3] Apparently, they chose the name Muwaḥḥidūn in order to show their emphasis on pure monotheism and to distinguish themselves

---

1. See the Shaykh's letter to Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥaym (Rawḍa, I, p. 139) in which he refutes the accusation that he was founding a fifth madhhab, which would mean that his teachings were not in accordance with the four accepted Sunnī schools. Or, in other words, they were the doctrines of the Khārijites. This was explicitly expressed by Ḥumaydān ash-Shuway'ir who says that the fifth branch in the religion is that of the Abāḍīs, who are Khārijites. See Khiyār, I, p. 128.
2. This is so throughout the works of Ibn-Ghannām, Rawḍa and Ibn-Bishr, 'Unwān.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 31; Ḥadiyya, p. 27. 'Ulamā' ad-Da'wa is used as a title of work on certain Wahhābī scholars by 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Āl-ash-Shaykh. Winder's assertion (op.cit., p. 2) that when the Wahhābīs say: the Muḥammadan call they refer to Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb and not to the Prophet of Islam is in fact baseless. They use it in the same sense as they say the Ibrāhīmī religion meaning the monotheistic belief. See Ghayāhib, p. 94 and Ḍiyā', p. 15.

from those who follow the superstitious beliefs and non-Islamic practices which had crept into the Muslim society.

However, in recent years, certain Wahhābī scholars seem to have been less vigorous in rejecting the term Wahhābiyya, and indeed it has been used in some of their works.[1] This must have resulted from a conviction that their doctrines had by now been sufficiently understood, and that the popular designation could no longer carry a pejorative implication.

Actually, the confusion about Wahhābism had largely resulted from misunderstanding or misrepresentation.[2] False accusations, made by its adversaries for different reasons, played a great rôle in this respect.[3] It is not strange,

---

1. Ghayāhib, pp. 93, 110, 117; aṣ-Ṣawā'iq al-Mursala sh-Shihābiyya, 'alā sh-Shubah ad-Dāḥiḍa sh-Shāmiyya (2nd edition, Riyadh, 1376) p. 37. A collection of works by Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥmān is entitled al-Hadiyya s-Saniyya wa-t-Tuḥfa l-Wahhābiyya n-Najdiyya, and al-Qaṣīmī names one of his works ath-Thawra l-Wahhābiyya (Cairo, 1354). Al-Faqī, too, calls his book Athar ad-Da'wa l-Wahhābiyya, and Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā uses the term in his introduction to the MḤN and his work al-Wahhābiyyūn wa-l-Ḥijāz (Cairo, 1344).
2. Once correctly understood, Wahhābism was admitted to be in accordance with the true Islam. The scholars of Cairo, who discussed it with two of its learned members in 1815, affirmed this fact and unreservedly agreed with the principles demonstrated in the works of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb. See 'Unwān, p. 182; al-Jabartī, 'Ajā'ib al-Āthār, IV, p. 224; Burckhardt, Notes, II, p. 113. Similar attitude was taken by the scholars of Mecca in various occasions. See Rawḍa, II, pp. 81, 201-3; 'Unwan, p. 56; Hadiyya, p. 39.
3. Rawḍa, I, pp. 112-5; Hadiyya, p. 31; Burckhardt, Notes, [Contd.

therefore, that the Wahhābī objection to the invocation of the Prophet, for example, would be misinterpreted as if they did not have any respect or love for him. Similarly, their demolition of the domes on the graves of saints was taken to mean that they hated these saints and denied their karāma.[1] Moreover, as is the case in every movement, the extremists among the Wahhābīs, who were often far from knowing their doctrines, helped in promoting such a misunderstanding. For example, some early Wahhābīs declared as a prohibited practice the tradition of wearing distinguished clothes by the Sharīfs, and certain individuals destroyed the books which they found after the capture of aṭ-Ṭā'if in 1217. Both attitudes were strongly criticized by their scholars; the first by the Shaykh and the other by his son 'Abd-Allāh.[2]

Many of those who wrote about the movement in its early period made great mistakes. Niebuhr, for example, who

---

Contd.] II, pp. 100-1, 182-3. Compare Khulāṣa, p. 228 and Durar, p. 62.

1. Burckhardt, Notes, II, p. 110; ash-Shaṭṭī, al-Wasīṭ Bayn al-Ifrāṭ wa-t-Tafrīṭ (Damascus, 1340), p. 7. Compare Hadiyya, p. 32.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 158; Hadiyya, p. 31. The Wahhābī 'Abd-al-Karīm, who told Palgrave (op.cit., II, 282) that the most grave sin after polytheism is smoking tobacco, can be identified with this group. As far as we know, no Wahhābī scholar bearing such a name lived at the time of Palgrave's visit to the area. And although the Wahhābīs forbid tobacco (MRMN, I, p. 652), they mention being recalcitrant towards parents and giving false testimony as the grievous sins next to polytheism. See MḤN, p. 258.

admits that he was not in a position to give accurate information about the Wahhābī tenets, states that they considered Muḥammad and other prophets as merely great men, denying that any book had been revealed from heaven.[1] Some European writers of the early 19th century agreed with Niebuhr's allegation that the Wahhābīs denied the divine origins of the Qur'ān,[2] while others said that they only rejected the Tradition.[3] De Sacy called them innovators and enemies of Islam, who denied the divinity of the Qur'ān and the mission of Muḥammad, and he went on to describe them as an off-shoot of the Qarmaṭīs.[4]

As for the Muslim opponents of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, they mostly followed the line of criticism taken by Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥaym in the early days of the movement.[5]

---

1. Travels, II, pp. 133-4. Indeed, Niebuhr is confused about the movement. While he mentions (p. 131) that it was a new religion, he states in another place (p. 138) that it was a reform of Muḥammadanism and a return to its simple origin.
2. Waring, op.cit., p. 120; Rousseau, op.cit., p. 129.
3. Malcolm, History of Persia from the Early Period to the Present Time (London, 1815), p. 379; Raymond, Memoire sur l'origine des Wahabys (Cairo, 1825), p. 6; Corancez, op. cit., pp. 4, 6.
4. "Observations sur les Wahhabites", Magazine Encyclopaedique, IV (1805), p. 36. See also Rousseau, op.cit., p. 126. In fact, there could be no more contrast than that between the Qarmaṭī doctrines, which are extremely Shī'ī, and those of the Wahhābīs, which are anti-Shī'ī.
5. Rawḍa, I, pp. 112-3.

Some of them, like al-Ḥaddād and Daḥlān, were unreasonable in their allegations against the Shaykh and even claimed that he entertained the idea of being a prophet, but he did not dare to declare this openly, and practised religious obligations merely to conceal his heresy and deceive people.[1] Besides being named as Wahhābīs, they were denounced as heretics, infidels and Khārijites. However, it is the last name which has been most often used. This is based on the assumption that the Wahhābīs, like the Khārijites, considered themselves the only Muslims and killed those who disagreed with them. They were steadfast in religious observation but intolerant of other views and they rebelled against the established government.[2]

Even the modern scholar, Ameer Alī, states that the Wahhābīs are "the direct descendants of the Azāriqa, a branch of the Khārijites, who, after their defeat by al-Ḥajjāj Ibn-Yūsuf, had taken refuge in the recesses of Central Arabia", and he goes on to say that their doctrines "bear the closest resemblance to those held so firmly by the followers of Nāfi' Ibn-al-Azraq".[3]

---

1. Al-Ḥaddād, Miṣbāḥ al-Anām wa Jalā' aẓ-Ẓalām fī Radd Shubuhāt al-Bid'ī n-Najdī alladhī Aḍall bi-hā l-'Awāmm (n.p., 1325) p. 3; Durar, p. 47. Compare Asinna, p. 12.
2. Ṣawā'iq, p. 34; Durar, pp. 62-3; Khulāṣa, pp. 230-1, 236; Minha, p. 2; Sulh, p. 7; al-'Āmilī, Kashf al-Irtiyāb fī Atbā' Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb (Damascus, 1346), p. 3.
3. The Spirit of Islam (London, 1923), p. 357.

Some of the adversaries of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb tried to make capital out of the coincidence of his appearance in a district which was once inhabited by Musaylạma and his followers. They cited traditions, also, in which the Prophet condemned Najd and predicted that the descendants of Dhu-l-Khuwayṣira of the Banū Tamīm, the tribe from which the Shaykh descended, would renounce the religion of Islam.[1] Such an argument was, however, easily refuted by the Wahhābīs, who maintained that a place could not be taken as a measure by which ideas and doctrines should be judged; and, indeed, there is no prophet in whose birth place there was not, at one time or another, infidelity, heresy and war. The striking example of this is Mecca, in which idols were worshipped and from which the Prophet had to emigrate. They added that it was the Najd of Iraq which was meant in these traditions, and that those who were predicted to renounce the religion of Islam were, in fact, the Khārijites, known as the Ḥarūriyya, who rebelled against 'Alī Ibn-Abī-Ṭālib.[2]

Although the Wahhābīs resembled the Khārijites in the intensity of their faith and uncompromising attitude, they differed from them fundamentally in doctrine. Unlike the Khārijites, the Wahhābīs respected all the Companions and

---

1. Ṣawā'iq, pp. 30-6; al-Ḥaddād, op.cit., pp. 9-13; Khulāṣa, pp. 234-6.
2. Miṣbāḥ, pp. 142-4; Asinna, pp. 84-91; Ḍiyā', pp. 48-52.

never disowned 'Uthmān or 'Alī, and on this question, as well as on the matter of imāma, they adhered to orthodox views.[1] Indeed, while this question had priority among the doctrines of the Khārijites, it was very rarely discussed by the Wahhābīs, and, when they did so, they advocated complete obedience to the ruler, even if he were a black slave or a tyrant, unless he were to order the ruled to commit sins.[2] Moreover, as demonstrated in the first chapter of the present work, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb appeared in a province which was completely cut off from the dominion of the then Muslim Sulṭān; an area which was divided into numerous city-principalities the rulers of which did not recognize the authority of Constantinople. Therefore, the early Wahhābīs could not be charged with making rebellion against the Muslim supreme authority. On the contrary, it could be said that, at least until the beginning of the 13th-19th century, they were on the defensive and fighting for their own existence. They attacked al-Aḥsā', Iraq and the Hijaz only after the governors of these regions had launched attacks against their territories.

Another point in which the Wahhābīs differed from the Khārijites and which is very important from the doctrinal point of view is the attitude towards the person who commits a grave sin "kabīra" other than polytheism. To the

---

1. MRMN, IV, pp. 59-62; Hadiyya, p. 90; Tawḍīḥ, p. 51.
2. MḤN, p. 294; Hadiyya, p. 89; Tawḍīḥ, p. 52.

Khārijites he is an infidel,[1] but the Wahhābīs adhered to the views of the orthodox in maintaining that he is merely sinful and should not be excluded from Islam but should be left to the mercy of God.[2]

On the other hand, the Wahhābīs simply claimed that their movement was a revival of monotheism and Sunna at a time when there remained nothing of Islam but the name, and maintained that they were on the path shown by the virtuous ancestors.[3] They, also, asserted that they held the views of the orthodox or ahl-as-Sunna wa-l-Jamā'a in matters of the uṣūl of the religion, and that they were adherents of the Hanbali school as regards fiqh or furū'.[4]

However, the chief points of dispute between them and their opponents centred on tawḥīd, intercession, visitation of graves and erection of tombs, takfīr, bid'a, igtihād and taqlid. Each of these will be given individual consideration here, along with their attitude towards imāma and commanding the good and forbidding the evil.

---

1. Watt, Islamic Philosophy and Theology (Edinburgh, 1962), p. 12; Muslim Intellectual (Edinburgh, 1962), p. 88; Gibb, Mohammedanism (3rd ed., Oxford, 1969), p. 82; Fazul Raḥman, Islam (London, 1966), p. 86; Abū-Zahra, Ibn-Taymiyya: Ḥayātu-hu wa 'Aṣru-hu, Ārā'u-hu wa Fiqhu-hu (Cairo, 1371/1952), p. 166.
2. K.T., p. 7; Hadiyya, p. 75.
3. Rawḍa, I, pp. 37, 52.
4. Hadiyya, p. 29.

B. Tawḥīd:

It can be said that tawḥīd was the fundamental point in the doctrines of the Wahhābīs. Most of their works were devoted to its treatment. Any belief or practice which they thought to be in violation of its principles was strongly denounced as polytheism, and the person who committed it was declared to be an infidel and should be killed. In a letter to Muḥammad Ibn-Īd, the Shaykh states that his fame was based on four main points, which he maintains to have characterized his doctrines. These are the interpretation of tawḥīd, the demonstration of what polytheism actually was, the denounciation as infidels of those who, in spite of knowing full well that monotheism is the religion of God and His Prophet, hate it, deter people from it and fight against those who support the Prophet in its cause; the denounciation, too, of those who know what polytheism is and realize that the Prophet was sent to combat it, and yet persist in praising it and arguing that the people who practise it, because they are the vast majority (as-sawād al-aʿẓam), are not in error, and finally, sanctioning warfare against such as these so that religion should be exclusive to God alone.[1]

However, although the Shaykh mentions that there are four bases to his doctrines, the first, tawḥīd, is cardinal,

---

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 107. This summary of his work is repeated in another letter of the Shaykh to certain notables of Najd. See Ibid., I, p. 150.

and the other three proceed therefrom. According to him, tawḥīd is nothing less than the religion of Islam itself which, as he claims, had not been understood before him by any scholar from the region of Najd, including his own teachers.[1] It is, as he and other Wahhābīs maintain, the eternal religion of God, to explain the various meanings and implications of which He raised up Prophets and revealed Books.[2] Thus, it is man's first duty to learn and practise tawḥīd.[3]

The Wahhābis divide tawḥīd into three kinds, tawḥīd ar-rubūbiyya, tawḥīd al-asmā'wa-ṣ-ṣifāt and tawḥīd al-ilāhiyya or tawḥīd al-'ibāda.[4] The first is defined as the assertion of the unity of God in His actions, such as to believe and confess that He alone is the Creator, the Provider and Disposer of the universe.[5] They claim that there is no disagreement over this kind of tawḥīd between Muslims and others; for even the worshippers of idols admitted the unity of God in these matters.[6] Linked with tawḥīd ar-rubūbiyya is the question of predestination and the will of the created. To the Wahhābīs, it is one of the pillars of īmān to believe in predestination. This means that one

1. Ibid., I, pp. 146, 155.
2. MRMN, IV, p. 16; Fatḥ al-Majīd Sharḥ Kitāb at-Tawḥīd (Cairo, 1347), p. 12.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 104; K.T., p. 2; MRS, p. 118.
4. Rawḍa, I, p. 195.
5. Ibid.; M.T.N., p. 119.
6. Ibid., pp. 74, 78; MRMN, IV, p. 104.

should believe that God knew what everybody would do before His creation of them, and who would go to heaven or to hell, and that all this had already been recorded and would take place according to His knowledge. It, also, means that one should believe that God created the actions of man and that they take place according to His will. However, although the actions are the creation of God, as He is the Creator of man, they are, also, the latter's actual action, and he has his own will. Therefore, he deserves reward or punishment.[1]

As for tawḥīd al-asmā' wa-ṣ-ṣifāt, the Wahhābīs claim that their views are in strict conformity with the doctrines of the virtuous ancestors, and that their interpretation of the names and attributes of God is what He Himself desired to be understood and in accordance with what His Prophet explained to his followers. The way of the salaf is followed in this important matter because it is the "safest, most rational and the surest".[2] By the salaf, they mean the Prophet, the Companions, the Successors and all who follow in their path.[3] They strongly criticize those who are of the opinion that the salaf depended entirely on the letter of the Qur'ān and the Tradition, without making any effort to understand the philosophy behind them; and maintain that it is

---

1. Hadiyya, p. 30; MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 171-3. Tawḍīḥ, p. 41. Compare Abū-Zahra, Ibn-Taymiyya, p. 307.
2. MRMN, III, p. 118; IV, pp. 99, 163; Hadiyya, pp. 38-9.
3. Tawḍīḥ, p. 40; MRMN, IV, p. 95; Bariyya, p. 7.

ridiculous to suppose that the imperfect and puzzled khalaf know more or are more correct in their views about God - His essence and attributes - the Qur'ān and the faith, than those virtuous ancestors.[1] The latter were more likely to understand these texts, believe in their meanings and work in accordance with their implications because these were in their own language and delivered at their time and because they were the best generation of the Muslim community. Moreover, it cannot be admitted that the attitude of the khalaf in this matter is more sound than that of the salaf for this would imply that the Prophet and his companions did not tell the truth which should be believed in, and this in turn would mean that the Qur'ān and the Tradition do more harm than good for the creed of the people.[2]

Following the way of the salaf, the Wahhābīs assert as authentic all the names and attributes which God ascribed to Himself in the Qur'ān or which were attributed to Him by the Prophet; and this must be without taḥrīf or ta'ṭīl, and unmodified by takyīf, tashbīh or tamthīl.[3] Equally, they

1. Tawḍīḥ, p. 40; MRMN, IV, pp. 121-2; Bariyya, pp. 12-3. Compare M.A. Bari, A Comparative Study of the Early Wahhābī Doctrines and Contemporary Reform Movements in Indian Islam, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Oxford University, 1953, p. 13.
2. Bariyya, p. 13.
3. Taḥrīf is altering the words of the text either in form or in implication so that its proper meaning is distorted. As an example of formal alteration is putting Allāh in the Qur'ānic verse "wa kallam Allāh Mūsā taklīm" in the accusative instead of the nominative in order to suggest that it was Mūsā who spoke, and thus to deprive God of the attribute of speech. Alteration in implication would be

[Contd.

exempt God of attributes from which the Qur'ān or the Tradition exempt Him, such as sleeping and tiredness; and they keep silent on all that is not affirmed to Him or negated from Him in these sources. Thus, they do not use words like body (jism) substance (jawhar) or accident ('arad) in describing God, because these words were not used in this context by Him or His Prophet. To say that He is or is not a body, substance or accident is, therefore, an innovation which should be avoided.[1]

The Wahhābīs do not limit the Divine attributes to a certain number. Instead, they maintain that whatever was revealed as such by God or so described by His Prophet should be accepted as authentic; for everything mentioned in the Qur'ān and the Tradition is true, and the corollary of the truth is a truth "lāzim al-ḥaqq ḥaqq".[2] They are of the opinion that the Mu'tazilī interpretation of tawḥīd which implies the negation of the attributes of God is, in fact, against the correct conception of tawḥīd, the perfection of which is to affirm to God all that He or His Prophet affirmed.

Contd.] to explain away all apparent meaning, such as "the hand" which is attributed to God in the Qur'ān as His power or grace. Ta'ṭīl is the disavowal of all or some of the names or attributes of God. Takyīf is qualifying an attribute such as describing the manner of God's istiwā' on the throne. Tashbīh or tamthīl is to maintain that the attributes of God are the same as, or similar to those of human beings, such as saying that His hand is like that of the created. See Ibid., pp. 10-11.

1. Rawḍa, I, pp. 98-99; Bariyya, p. 8.
2. MRMN, IV, p. 118.

God exists with all His Divine attributes. Whenever a person says: I prayed to God or I worshipped Him, he surely means God with all His attributes and not the name denuded from these attributes; for He can never be but Himself; His essence cannot but be associated with the attributes and His name cannot but indicate all that it signifies.[1]

Just as the Wahhābis denounce those who do not ascribe any positive attributes to God, so also do they criticize those who regard all the Divine attributes to be one and the same; and they argue that such a belief leads inevitably to pantheism.[2] God has already manifested Himself in two very significant words: Aḥad and aṣ-Ṣamad, which occur in sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ. As He has no partner, like or equal to Him in His essence, so also, His attributes in no way resemble those of His creations. His attributes are meant for Him alone, and this is the significance of these two words. Aḥad denies any similarity between God and His creations, and aṣ-Ṣamad in ascribing all perfection to Him, perforce denies to Him all that is imperfect. He must be assumed to possess the opposite of all those qualities which He Himself or His Prophet deprive Him of; for absolute negation (an-nafy al-maḥḍ) is only non-existence (ʿadam maḥḍ).[3] Negation in this context must, therefore, be taken to imply an affirmation of an opposite attribute which is praiseworthy. Thus,

---

1. Ibid., p. 132. Compare M.A. Bari, op.cit., p. 39.
2. MRMN, IV, p. 133.
3. Ibid., pp. 134-6.

denying to God the attribute of oppression or injustice, for example, should imply the affirmation of their opposite, justice, to Him.[1]

The Wahhābīs maintain that their attitude towards God's attributes is a middle way between the Mu'tazilites and the anthropomorphists (mushabbiha). The former and other nufāt deny these attributes or interpret them incorrectly; as for example, they hold the Qur'ānic word istawā to mean istawlā, and yad to mean iḥsān; thereby committing ta'ṭīl and taḥrīf. The anthropomorphists, on the other hand, believe istawā to be the same as the julūs of a human being on a chair, and yad to be literally part of an arm; in this they are guilty of tamthīl.[2] The Wahhābīs would, therefore, explain the word istawā in the same way as they do God's other attributes and say, as Mālik Ibn-Anas said before them, that istiwā' in itself is familiar, but the modality (kayf) of it in this connection is not intelligible; however belief in it is obligatory and to question it is an innovation (bid'a).[3] However, they state that the istiwā' of God on His throne means His istiqrār on it.[4]

The attitude towards the istiwā' can be applied to all the attributes of God; for He ascribed them to Himself without telling us about their modality, and just as we affirm

---

1. Bariyya, pp. 8-9.
2. Hadiyya, p. 87; MRMN, I, p. 51; III, p. 123; IV, pp. 101, 108; Tawḍīḥ, p. 41.
3. Hadiyya, p. 30; MRMN, I, p. 50; IV, p. 99; Ḍiyā', pp. 97-100.
4. MRMN, I, p. 51; IV, p. 158; Bariyya, p. 24.

His essence without describing its nature, so must we affirm His attributes, because talking about the attributes is merely a result of talking about the essence.[1]

Although the Wahhābīs do not, in principle, deny that there are allegorical expressions in the Qur'ān, they strongly repudiate the slightest suggestion that the Qur'ānic verses concerning the attributes of God are used in an allegorical sense or that they should be understood as mutashābihāt.[2] It is simply impossible to admit the views of the nufāt that these verses and expressions have been used allegorically and are to be interpreted accordingly; for such an admission would lead to a false situation which could ultimately destroy the faith. If it is conceded that, in spite of the avowed aim of the Qur'ān to lead people out of the darkness of ignorance into the light of guidance, all these clear verses and their apparent meanings are misleading and do not signify the truth, one has then to admit that there is no necessity for such a Divine revelation. Moreover, if it is believed that the Prophet either did not know the true meanings of these verses or that he knew but did not explain them, it will be necessary to ask the reason for the Prophet's mission itself; for even without him, as the nufāt claim, one may reach the actual meaning of the revelation and eventually find the truth.

Again, if it is assumed that, in pursuance of a

---

1. Ibid., p. 25. See also MRMN, IV, p. 101.
2. Bariyya, p. 55; MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 13-4.

concerted plan, the Companions purposely suppressed all information they received about these verses from the Prophet, one may accordingly question the authenticity of both the Qur'ān and the Tradition; for these two main sources of Islam exist only through the narration of these very people. But, faithful to the universal acceptance of the veracity of the Prophet and his Companions, the Wahhābīs do not allow themselves to be dragged into such a false position.[1] In support of their views that these verses may not be considered as mutashābihāt, the Wahhābīs quote a statement attributed to Ibn-Rushd that if the many verses of the Qur'ān supporting, for example, the ʿuluww of God are treated as allegorical and are consequently explained away, most of the Sharīʿa,too, can be similarly interpreted; for its rules (aḥkām) are drawn only from the apparent meaning of the texts; and the texts on prayers, alms and fasting, for example, are less in number than those concerning the ʿuluww of God. Therefore, they believe that God is above His creations and that He is on His throne and has two hands and a face as befit Him. They believe, also, that the faithful will see Him in heaven with their corporal eyes.[2]

To the allegation made by their opponents that the acceptance of these verses in their apparent and literal meaning virtually implies an anthropomorphic conception of God, the Wahhābīs reply that in this case the Qur'ān and the

1. MRMN, IV, pp. 100, 120-2; Ḍiyā', pp. 131-6; Bariyya, pp. 5-8. Compare M.A. Bari, op.cit., p. 45.
2. M.T.N., p. 150; MRMN, III, pp. 120-6; Bariyya, pp. 54-5.

Tradition must first be declared full of anthropomorphic ideas; for they do not make any addition or alteration to what God or His Prophet said on this matter. Consequently, they accept the meaning of these verses and affirm to God those attributes with the unequivocal declaration: both in essence and qualities He is bā'in from His creations.[1]

In accordance with their attitude towards all the attributes of God, the Wahhābīs affirm to Him the attribute of speech. They believe that He speaks whenever He wishes, and that His speech consists of letters and sounds.[2] The Qur'ān is the word of God which He really uttered and revealed to Muḥammad through Jibrīl. From Him it was initiated and to Him it will end "min-hu bada' wa ilay-hi ya'ūd". They maintain that it is uncreated; for it is the word of God, and His speech is one of His attributes which are admittedly uncreated. They strongly criticize those who say that it is created, as well as those who make no comment on whether it is created or not.[3] However, they differentiate between the Qur'ān itself and the recitation of it. While what is recited is the word of God and, thus, uncreated, reciting it is the action of the person who reads it and, therefore, is created; for man himself is created.[4]

---

1. Diyā', pp. 81-2; Hadiyya, pp. 30, 87-9.
2. MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 97, 111; Bariyya, p. 41.
3. MRMN, II, pt. III, p. 104; Hadiyya, p. 88. Winder (op. cit., p. 9) mistakenly states that the Wahhābīs hold the view that the Qur'ān "is neither created nor uncreated".
4. MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 109-10, 113-4; Bariyya, p. 42.

The third kind of tawḥīd, according to the Wahhābīs, is tawḥīd al-ilāhiyya or tawḥīd al-'ibāda. To them, this forms the most important part of monotheism, and should be distinguished from tawḥīd ar-rubūbiyya. Their emphasis on it often led them to define tawḥīd as the worship of God alone.[1] Their adversaries accuse them of unnecessarily differentiating between tawḥīd ar-rubūbiyya and tawḥīd al-ilāhiyya when there is no distinction between them in the Qur'ān and the Tradition, for the former actually includes the latter. Just as the word ilāh in the formula: lā ilāh illā Allāh is sufficient to give the idea of tawḥīd al-ilāhiyya and tawḥīd ar-rubūbiyya, the word rabb, too, gives the meaning of ilāh. In the beginning of the creation, God asked the would-be human beings "Am I not your lord "rabb"?,[2] and this must certainly mean ilāh. In their graves the dead are asked about their rabb; and, moreover, the Prophet did not explain to the Bedouins, who came to him accepting Islam, the difference between tawḥīd ar-rubūbiyya and tawḥīd al-ilāhiyya. Indeed, rubūbiyya and ilāhiyya mean the same thing to the believer.[3]

The Wahhābīs, in turn, admit that the word rabb may sometimes mean the worshipped (ma'būd), but they maintain that even if the two expressions give identical meanings to the believer, they are in fact two different expressions with

---

1. M.T.N., p. 74; MRS, p. 118.
2. Qur'ān, 7/172.
3. Ṣulḥ, pp. 125-31; Durar, pp. 49-51.

distinct characteristics of their own. Thus, tawḥīd ar-rubūbiyya may mean tawḥīd al-Mālik or al-Mutaṣarrif, while tawḥīd al-ilāhiyya may indicate tawḥid al-'abd to his Creator in worship or tawḥīd al-Ma'būd. To think that both expressions are synonymous and interchangeable is illogical. The confessor of tawḥīd ar-rubūbiyya may not be a true believer; for such a confession is not identical to that of the faithful. Even the worshippers of idols believe in the rubūbiyya of God. However, this confession does not include an element of great importance in this aspect of belief, and that is the tawḥīd al-ilāhiyya which is the characteristic sign of the true Muslim.[1] The Prophets did not call upon their people merely to believe that God was the sole Creator and the Lord, but they also emphasized that worship should be devoted to Him alone. This is what made Quraysh, for example, say: "Did he make the gods only one God?".[2]

However, the Wahhābīs maintain that the differentiation between the two types of tawḥīd does not diminish the importance of either in their eyes. On the contrary, they insist that it is absolutely necessary to believe in both in order to be truly faithful.[3] Such an obligation is indicated in the Qur'ānic verse: "Thee only we worship and Thee alone we beseech".[4] The first part shows that God alone is the object for worship, love, sanctification and fear, while the second

---

1. MRMN, IV, p. 37; Rawḍa, I, p. 196.
2. M.T.N., p. 76; Qur'ān, 38/5.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 200; Hadiyya, p. 16.
4. Qur'ān, 1/4.

signifies the perfection of surrender to the will and power of God.[1]

According to the Wahhābīs, one should know the meaning of the shahādatayn before learning the other pillars of Islam.[2] The formula "There is no god but Allāh" negates any kind of worship to any being other than God and affirms all its kinds to Him alone. It denounces āliha, arbāb, andād and ṭawāghīt, and emphasizes the fact that intention, love, fear and hope are parts of worship and therefore should be devoted solely to God.[3]

The meaning and implication of the second part of the shahādatayn, namely that Muḥammad is the Prophet of God, are succinctly but comprehensively expressed by the Wahhābīs. To the Shaykh, Muḥammad is an apostle not to be worshipped; a prophet not to be lied against but to be obeyed and followed.[4] Although he must have first place in the affections of his followers, he should not be deified. One has to distinguish between God, the Lord and Creator, and the Prophet, the servant and created, and accordingly bear in mind the difference between the rights of each. However, by virtue of prophethood he occupies an exceptional position among all human beings. He is infallible, and every Muslim

---

1. M.T.N., p. 133; Tawḍīḥ, p. 116.
2. MRMN, IV, pp. 15, 33.
3. Ibid., p. 34; K.T., p. 42; M.T.N., pp. 122-3.
4. Ibid., p. 127.

should not only believe in the truth of the Book revealed to him, but also follow his way in faith and behaviour. Every opinion or practice must be compared with his own and be accepted or rejected accordingly.[1]

C. Intercession:

This question was one of the main points of dispute between the Wahhābīs and their oponents. The former's attitude towards it depended on their understanding of worship or 'ibāda. Many definitions of 'ibāda were given by them, but the most common is that it is a general term for all the utterances and actions - inward as well as outward - that God wishes and commands.[2] Du'ā', isti'āna, istighātha, nadhr, khawf, rajā', tawakkul, ināba, maḥabba, khashya, raghba and ta'ẓīm are some of its principal forms, and these belong to God alone.[3] The Wahhābīs quote two traditions, one of which speaks of du'ā' as being 'ibāda, while in the other it is the essence of worship. They try to establish that su'āl (request) is a form of du'ā' and could, therefore, be worship as well. Consequently, from the point of view of both religion and reason, one should always avoid making su'āl from beings other than God. As it is an expression of one's humility before Him and a recognition of

---

1. MRMN, IV, pp. 30-3.
2. Hadiyya, p. 5; Tawḍīḥ, p. 55; Burūq, p. 93.
3. M.T.N., p. 119; MRMN, IV, pp. 16-17.

His power, su'āl is a part of worship which must be directed exclusively to God. Moreover, supplication to a creature, who himself is incapable of doing good to or preventing evil from his own person, is irrational.[1]

However, the Wahhābīs divide su'āl, as they do also isti'āna and istighātha, into two categories: what cannot be achieved by any but God, and what may be fulfilled by a creature. Examples of the first type are recovery from disease, dispelling of calamities and the guidance of the soul. Of the second, the Wahhābīs mention mutual help and assistance, but this must be asked from a living person. It is permitted, according to them, to ask a living fellow Muslim to pray to God on one's behalf.[2] But when a person is dead or absent, he must not be invoked with or for du'ā', for such an action is a kind of polytheism.[3] Even when he was alive and could be asked to perform du'ā', the Prophet did not approve of such a request being made to him, for surely God is to be besought directly for such matters.[4]

The Wahhābīs do not accept the view that those who seek succour (ghawth) from a prophet or saint are in fact using the word in its allegorical sense. They also refuse to agree that because God is the Creator of all human actions, prayer to a prophet or saint for help is ultimately directed to Him ījād and to the prophet or saint tasabbub.[5]

---

1. Tawḍīḥ, p. 187; M.T.N., p. 90.
2. MRMN, IV, p. 592; Rawḍa, I, p. 71.
3. Ibid.; M.T.N., pp. 89-90; Miṣbāḥ, p. 113; Hadiyya, p. 10.
4. K.T., p. 30; M.T.N., p. 19.
5. Ḍiyā', p. 210; Intiṣār, f. 9. Compare Durar, pp. 15-20.

If it is supposed by the argument that because He created every human action, all human activities are consequently to be attributed to Him, one has then to admit that the union of two contradictory qualities, perfection and imperfection, is possible in the person of God.[1] Similarly, they are not convinced by the reasoning of their opponents that those who pray to a prophet or saint do not believe them to possess any kind of Divine power.[2] Accordingly, they denounce all such prayers, no matter what name they take - be it tawassul, tashaffu', taqarrub or tabarruk - for the important thing is the actual fact and not the name it is given. The journeys these people undertake to the graves of saints, the writing on pieces of paper they insert into their tombs and the language they use in invoking their names are clear proof of their hopeful belief that their prayers will be listened to and answered by them.[3] Such prayers, therefore, are polytheistic, and those who utter them are not only similar to the old pagans against whom the Prophet fought but even surpass them, for while the pagans invoked their gods in times of ease and turned to Allāh exclusively in periods of crisis, these people associate others with Him at all times.[4]

---

1. Diyā', p. 252; Asinna, p. 75; Burūq, p. 86. Compare M.A. Bari, op.cit., p. 72.
2. Durar, p. 15. Compare Rawḍa, I, p. 65.
3. Aṣ-Ṣawā'iq al-Mursala, p. 65; Hadiyya, pp. 13-4.
4. Rawḍa, I, p. 67; MRMN, IV, pp. 3-4.

The adversaries of the Wahhābīs objected to having the veneration shown to the Prophet and the saints compared with the idolatry of the pagans, and pointed out that the stones and trees to which the devotions of the latter were directed could not be regarded as having the same status in the eyes of God as those individuals whom He had singled out for His special favour. Surely, the intercession of such as these must have particular access to His mercy.[1] To this the reply was that the old pagans did not confine their worship to inanimate objects, but also invoked saints, prophets and angels; and that the Qur'ān and the Tradition do not make any distinction between stones and angels in this matter. Worship of anything or being other than God is polytheism. Even being granted that saints and prophets - and indeed, angels and children who died in infancy - do have powers of intercession, no one has the right to ask that they be used while God Himself is there to answer prayers.[2]

The Wahhābīs maintain that the nature of intercession has been misunderstood by two groups of extremists; those who denied it altogether and those who assumed that it is a personal right possessed by the Prophet and thus can be asked from him. The former, including the Mu'tazilites and the Khārijites, interpreted the Qur'ānic verses, which indicate that intercession belongs to God alone, as if the Prophet, even on the Day of Judgment, will not intercede for the sinners of his community. All these extremists are in error.[3]

1. Ibid., pp. 18-9; Rawḍa, I. p. 64.
2. Miṣbāḥ, p. 156; Rawḍa, I, p. 66; M.T.N., pp. 81-2.
3. Tawḍīḥ, p. 47; Miṣbāḥ, p. 132; MRMN, IV, p. 607.

Many traditions affirm that the Prophet will ask God's permission to intercede before Him not only for good believers but also for Muslim sinners, and that through his intercession even they may gain admission to heaven.[1] However, it should be remembered that God is the Supreme master of shafā'a, and that the Prophet will not intercede for anyone without His permission. God will not permit the Prophet to intercede except for those He is pleased with, and they must be monotheists. Thus, the only intercession which the Wahhābīs accept as valid is based on two conditions; God's permission to the intercessor to make shafā'a, and His being content with the one whom it is asked for.[2] Therefore, to obtain the Prophet's intercession, they ask it from God according to His command, and attack those who seek it from any being other than Him.[3]

It is to make God in the image of our earthly king to assert that prayers addressed to Him through one of His favourites will receive special attention, whether these individuals be prophets or saints. This would pre-suppose that He, like an earthly king, does not know the conditions of His people and is not aware of their prayers until the intermediaries put them before Him; or, in other words, that He is unable to look after His vast kingdom without the aid of others. Any such notion leads, according to the

---

1. Tawḍīḥ, p. 48.
2. M.T.N., p. 81; Tawḍīḥ, p. 200.
3. K.T., p. 39.

Wahhābīs, not only to the violation of tawḥīd al-ilāhiyya but also to the denial of tawḥīd ar-rubūbiyya.[1] They maintain that it is only the du'ā' - not the dhāt or jāh and the like - of a living person that can be taken as wasīla, and they claim that the Companions understood that tawassul through the prayers of the Prophet was only lawful during his lifetime.[2] So long as he lived, they approached him for his du'ā', and also addressed prayers to God through his wasīla; but once he died, they avoided this practice. Instead, they took al-'Abbās Ibn-'Abd-al-Muṭṭalib as the wasīla, as when they would pray for rain.[3]

However, the Wahhābīs do not denounce the tawassul by the Prophet's jāh or dhāt as polytheism, nor the person practising it as an infidel.[4] They say merely that such a tawassul is a reprehensible innovation which was not practised either by the Companions or the Successors.[5]

The Prophet, like any other human being, has passed from this world to another. Although the Wahhābīs affirm life after death, they maintain that such life cannot be compared with that on earth. During their lifetime the Prophets have physical needs, such as hunger, and they guide others to the religion of God; but once they are dead they neither require food nor are they concerned with the guidance

---

1. MRMN, IV, p. 605; Tawḍīḥ, p. 115; Hadiyya, p. 50. Compare Ibn-Taymiyya, al-Wāsita in the Majmū', p. 71.
2. Ghayāhib, p. 274.
3. MRMN, II, pt. 11, p. 24; IV, p. 620; Asinna, p. 78.
4. MRMN, IV, pp. 226-7; Misbāḥ, p. 106.
5. Hadiyya, p. 33; MRMN, IV, p. 629; Ḍiyā', p. 179; Ghayāhib, p. 180.

of their peoples. Thus, it is ridiculous to assume that after death they are leading the sort of life as they did on earth.[1] To them, the life after death does not mean being bodily but spiritually alive, and although earth may not consume their bodies, the Prophets do not respond to the prayers made to them.[2]

The Wahhābī view on the Prophet's life after death is clearly expressed by the Shaykh's son 'Abd-Allāh. According to him, they believe that the Prophet is living a barzakhī life in his grave; a life which is much higher in rank than that of the martyrs; that he hears those who address him; that whoever spends his time in reciting the recommended ṣalāt for him wins the happiness of both worlds.[3]

The Wahhābīs hold the view that one should love God's friends, awliyā', who are described by Him and distinguished from His enemies.[4] To them, a true walī is not known by his flowing robe, long sleeves or prayer-beads, but by his piety, strict observance of religious obligations and devout adherence to the Qur'ān and the Tradition.[5] They divide the awliyā', therefore, into the awliyā' of Shayṭān and the awliyā' of God. While the latter would not go against the principles of the Sharī'a and would derive their inspiration from faith and piety, the former ignore the rules of religion and indulge in forbidden actions, such as prayers to

1. Asinna, pp. 176-9; aṣ-Ṣawā'iq al-Mursala, p. 37.
2. Tawḍīḥ, p. 141; Ḍiyā', p. 260; Asinna, p. 177.
3. Hadiyya, p. 32.
4. Rawḍa, I, p. 64. Compare Qur'ān, 10/62.
5. Hadiyya, pp. 7, 32; Asinna, p. 181.

to the dead, dancing with women, and draw their inspiration from whistling and clapping.[1] The Wahhābīs, also, do not deny the karāma of the Walī, pointing out that God has created this as a reward to him for the piety of his life; but they accept such a karāma only when it is in accordance with the Sharī'a.[2] They reject the popular Ṣūfī belief in the hierarchy of ghawth, awtād, aqṭāb, abdāl and the like as an innovation.[3]

D. Visitation of graves and erection of domes:

Linked with the Wahhābī attitude towards the nature of the respect to be shown to prophets and saints is their view on the matter of visiting graves and building domes on them. Visitation, if performed in the true spirit of religion without violating the prohibitions imposed thereon, constitutes a pious and praiseworthy act.[4] Thus, they divide it into recommended and objectionable. The former is what is in

1. Ibid., p. 128; Tawḍīḥ, pp. 123-4.
2. Ibid., p. 124; Hadiyya, p. 32.
3. Asinna, p. 177. It is to be noticed that although the Wahhābīs object to such Ṣūfī orders, as well as pantheism, they approve of the sort of Ṣūfīsm which means the purification of the inward of man so that he would avoid all sins. (Hadiyya, p. 38). Thus, while they show a marked respect for certain Ṣūfīs like 'Abd-al-Qādir al-Jaylānī (Tawḍīḥ, pp. 10, 214; aṣ-Ṣawā'iq al-Mursala, p. 45), they refer to Ibn-'Arabī with open hostility and call him an infidel (Rawḍa, I, p. 120; aṣ-Ṣawā'iq al-Mursala, p. 106).
4. Rawḍa, I, p. 114; Hadiyya, p. 32; Ḍiyā', p. 179; Ghayāhib, p. 252. E. Bethmann (Bridge to Islam, London, 1953, p. 105) mistakenly states that the Wahhābīs ban the visit of graves. The fact is that they ban it for women. See K.T., p. 50.

accordance with the teachings of the Prophet, and it can serve three purposes:

1. As a reminder of the world-to-come. The Tradition enjoins "visit the cemeteries, for they remind you of the second life".[1]

2. As a means of keeping alive the memory of the dead person.

3. As a source of mutual benefit for both the visitor - because of his observance of the Prophet's tradition - and for the visited because of the prayers being offered there for him.[2]

This is further illustrated by both ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz Ibn-Muḥammad and Ḥamad Ibn-Muʿammar. According to them, "the prayers of the Muslim for another is a recommended action, in support of which sound traditions have been related. In the case of the dead, it is more required; for the Prophet used to stand beside a grave after the burial and say: "Pray that he be strong, for now he will be interrogated".[3] The dead are thus in greater need of prayers. When the Muslim stands up for his salāt al-Jināza, he prays for and not through him. With prayers said over his coffin he intercedes for but does not seek intercession from him. The polytheists and innovators, however, have exchanged what they were told for what they were not told; they have changed the prayers for

---

1. Tawḍīḥ, p. 144. Compare Muslim, op.cit., II, p. 388.
2. MRMN, IV, p. 279; Tawḍīḥ, pp. 144-5; Taʾsīs, f. 16.
3. Abū-Dāwūd, op.cit., III, p. 292.

the dead to prayers to the dead. The true Muslim visits graves - as recommended by the Prophet - to pray for the dead person and as a remembrance of the hereafter. The misguided people changed it into beseeching the dead, and made graves places of prayer".[1]

Unlawful or objectionable visitation is defined by the Wahhābīs as repairing to graves for prayers, thereby placing them in the category of mosques as places of assembly for devotional purposes.[2] Travelling to any grave, including that of the Prophet is forbidden.[3] The reason for banning such visits is that they might lead to the evil practices of the idol-worshippers.[4] The fact that the graves of saints have during successive centuries been rendered into shrines where pilgrimage is performed, sacrifices and votive gifts are offered and prayers for help are made, is a convincing proof of such a possibility. This matter has been treated by Goldziher in his essay on the veneration of saints in Islam. He correctly states that "the belief in the sanctity of the saint's graves reaches its peak in the idea of the merit of pilgrimage to them (ziyāra), or even that the ziyāra to the graves of saints could replace the ḥajj".[5] Indeed, rites have been established for the pilgrimage to these shrines,[6]

---

1. Hadiyya, p. 10; Rawḍa, II, pp. 204-5.
2. K.T., pp. 45-51; Tawḍīḥ, p. 152.
3. M.T.N., p. 401; Hadiyya, p. 13; Asinna, p. 213.
4. K.T., pp. 46-8.
5. Muslim Studies tr. into English by Barker and Stern (London, 1971), II, p. 287.
6. Tawḍīḥ, p. 135; Intiṣār, f. 10.

and hundreds of thousands made their way to visit them.[1] However, one who undertakes such a pilgrimage, though responsible for going against the Tradition, may not be declared an infidel unless he, also, commits some grievous act of polytheism.[2] An example of the latter would be to ask the dead for something that only God can do, such as granting favour and preventing calamity, or to beseech him to be an intercessor to God for this purpose.[3]

The opponents of the Wahhābīs are unanimous in their approval of both the journey to, and the visitation of the grave of the Prophet. They maintain that their recommendation is based on the Qur'ān, the Tradition, ijmā' and qiyās.

Though revealed on a special occasion, the Qur'ānic verse: "If, when they wronged themselves, they had come to thee, and prayed forgiveness of God, and the Messenger had prayed forgiveness for them, they would have found God turns, All-compassionate",[4] must also embrace any such case where the three conditions mentioned in the verse are present. The verse refers to a simple unqualified "coming" and thus

---

1. According to Muḥammad al-Ghazālī (ʻAqīdat al-Muslim, Cairo, 1954, p. 55), three millions are estimated to have visited the tomb of Aḥmad al-Badawī in one year.
2. K.T., p. 48; Tawḍīḥ, p. 156.
3. Rawḍa. I, p. 66; Miṣbāḥ, p. 113. It is to be noticed here that Ibn-Taymiyya regards beseeching the intercession of the dead merely as an innovation but not as a grave act of polytheism. See Ziyārat al-Qubūr in the Majmūʻ, pp. 156-60.
4. Qur'ān, 4/67.

it makes no differentiation between coming to the Prophet before or after his death. This is supported by the ḥadīth in which the Prophet says: "He who visits me after my death differs not from the one who visited me during my life time".[1] It also indicates that there is no distinction as to whether or not the visit is performed by a journey.

Besides this ḥadīth, there are many other traditions in which ziyāra and journey for it are recommended. Two are of particular significance: that in which the Prophet says "He who visits my graves is sure to obtain my intercession";[2] and the other in which he warns: "He who performs the pilgrimage and does not offer a visit to me angers me".[3] These two traditions are related by ad-Dāraquṭnī.

As for the consensus, the scholars have agreed on the legality of ziyāra and journey for this purpose; and the Muslims, as a whole, have been observing it and making the journey from different parts of the world, both in connection with the Pilgrimage and independently. To defy this ijmā' is to commit a great error.

The word ziyāra, like the words majī' and hijra mentioned in the Qur'ān, implies movement from one place to another. Therefore, it means both the very action of movement and presumably the consequence of this action, or arrival

---

1. Durar, p. 94; al-Kasm, al-Aqwāl al-Mardiyya fī r-Radd 'alā-l-Wahhābiyya (Cairo, 1901), p. 9.
2. al-Ḥaddād, op.cit., p. 65; al-Kayyālī, Naṣīḥa Jalīla (Aleppo, 1351), p. 8.
3. al-Maḥjūb, Risāla fī r-Radd 'alā-l-Wahhābiyya (Tunis, 1327), p. 16.

at the destination. Moreover, if a qurba like the ziyāra depends on a journey, such a journey must be a qurba, too.[1]

The Wahhābīs, on the other hand, are convinced that the "coming" referred to in the Qur'ān was limited to the Prophet's life time only and should not be taken to apply to the time after his death; no more than taḥkīm in the following verse. A visit to a living man must not be put on the same level with a visit to his grave.[2] They reject the traditions mentioned by their adversaries as "false and fictitious".[3] One should not accept these weak traditions, coming from sources like ad-Dāraquṭnī, against sound traditions, such as "travel may not be undertaken except to three mosques", which are related by reliable sources like al-Bukhārī.[4] They claim that the scholars unanimously agreed that no journey should be made to any other mosques - not even to the one at Qubā', though a visit to the latter from nearby places is recommended - for reasons of prayers or dhikr. Thus, a journey to a tomb would be forbidden; for ziyāra to a grave cannot be as meritorious as to a mosque, which is the best spot on the surface of the earth.[5] The conclusion, therefore, is that one ought to make the intention of the journey

---

1. Ṣawā'iq, p. 17; Durar, pp. 121-5; al-Ḥaddād, op.cit., p. 54. Compare M.A. Bari, op.cit., p. 92.
2. Burūq, pp. 36-8.
3. Tawḍīḥ, p. 155; Ghayāhib, pp. 336-42; Hadiyya, p. 12.
4. Ibid., p. 13. Compare al-Bukhārī, op.cit., I, p. 497.
5. Tawḍīḥ, p. 154; Ta'sīs, f. 16.

the visit to the mosque of the Prophet itself, whereby the ziyāra to his grave would automatically follow.[1]

The Wahhābīs hold the view that those who are present at Medina are permitted to go to the grave of the Prophet and recite prayers (du'ā') for him and his two Companions, Abū-Bakr and 'Umar. Such visits, however, may not be repeated many times in one day; for the Companions and the Successors did not do so. As for those who have arrived in this town or are setting out on a journey, they are recommended to stand beside the grave and recite prayers, after they have performed two rak'a to God in the mosque.[2] When praying a visitor must face the qibla and not the rawḍa itself. One ought to approach the Prophet's grave with all honour and respect, and, when saluting him, face the tomb with the same manner as would be shown if he were alive.[3]

Because those who employ the graves of their prophets as mosques are cursed in a tradition, the Wahhābīs forbid prayer (ṣalāt) beside the Prophet's tomb;[4] and on the basis of another ḥadīth, "Do not make my grave 'īd, nor turn your homes into graves, and recite prayers for me wherever you may be; for your ṣalāt will reach me", they denounce gathering at his tomb, as well as at other shrines, at an appointed time of the year.[5] Because, also, of the widespread

---

1. Hadiyya, p. 32.
2. Tawḍīḥ, p. 149.
3. Asinna, p. 228.
4. K.T., p. 46; Ta'sīs, f. 15; MRS, p. 64. Compare al-Bukhārī, op.cit., I, p. 121.
5. K.T., p. 53; Dalā'il, p. 56. Compare Abū-Dāwūd, op.cit., II, p. 293.

reputation for piety enjoyed by prophets and saints, and the belief in their power to answer the prayers of the devout, the danger of committing polytheism at their graves by ignorant people is more likely than at other places. The excessive veneration of deceased persons of holy repute was the first step which had led people to idol-worship in the past.[1] The Wahhābīs maintain that the veneration shown to the graves corrupts the minds of the people and makes them consider what is bid'a as sunna and what is prohibited as obligatory or recommended. Moreover, it leads to forsaking mosques. Indeed, one can observe that these shrines are frequented and properly looked after, but mosques are deserted and neglected.[2] Consequently, they regard it as an obligation to pull down all the tombs which were built in spite of the Prophet's ban.[3] They would, moreover, seize the property of all such tombs and employ it for the common good of the Muslim public.[4] The Wahhābīs, also, hold the view that burial mounds should not be raised much higher than the ground, and that writings, decoration or illumination of graves should be avoided.[5] They claim that the Companions, the Successors and the best scholars held the same view.[6]

---

1. K.T., pp. 42-4; Miṣbāḥ, p. 169; Ḍiyā', p. 195.
2. Asinna, p. 73.
3. K.T., p. 52; M.T.N., p. 403; Tawḍīḥ, p. 134. Compare Muslim, op.cit., II, p. 384.
4. M.T.N., p. 248; MRMN, III, p. 451.
5. K.T., p. 50; M.T.N., p. 405; Hadiyya, pp. 67-9.
6. Tawḍīḥ, p. 134. Compare at-Tirmidhī, op.cit., IV, pp. 269-71; Abū-Dāwūd, op.cit., III, p. 293; Aḥmad Ibn-Ḥanbal, op. cit., IV, p. 206 and al-Buhūtī, op.cit., pp. 151-2.

E. Takfīr and qitāl:

These two questions were among the most serious matters which gave rise to controversy and conflict between the Wahhābīs and their adversaries. The Shaykh himself explicitly stated that he met more opposition in these matters than in all his other doctrines. In his letter to Ibn-'Īd, he claims that most of his opponents accepted his opinions on the meaning of tawḥīd and shirk but rejected his arguments about takfīr and qitāl.[1] A similar statement is to be found in another letter in which he alleges that, with the exception of his views on these two points, his explanation of the religion of God and His Prophet was accepted as being correct. He protests that his aim was not to anathematize others and fight against them, but to ask them to follow what they agreed to be sound.[2]

However, such a claim cannot be unreservedly accepted. It is true that his opponents agreed that tawḥīd should be observed and shirk be avoided, but certainly they disagreed with him over many practices which he considered to be grievous acts of polytheism. Indeed, he himself mentioned that some of them regarded the interpretation of tawḥīd which he preached as a form of innovation.[3] Moreover, the attitude towards takfīr (and its consequence, qitāl) depends very much on the understanding of tawḥīd and shirk. Declaring

1. Rawḍa, I, pp. 107-8.
2. Ibid., p. 150.
3. Ibid., pp. 116, 185.

anyone to be an infidel or a polytheist must come from the conviction that he is involved in irreligious or pagan practices and beliefs which are in conflict with the principles of tawḥīd and the teachings of the Sharī'a. Therefore, it is not easy to separate completely any one of these four topics from the other.

The Wahhābīs held it obligatory on all Muslims to work for the preservation of the purity of Islam and to stand firmly against those who violated its teachings. In this they could claim the support of scholars from different schools throughout the centuries. A special chapter in works on fiqh, known as bāb ar-ridda, treats especially of certain offences which lead to infidelity and justify delcaring anyone who practises them to be an infidel or an apostate.[1] Not only did the Wahhābīs accept what these other scholars had written, but they also worked out its implementations. Although their attitude towards those who they believed to be polytheists was uncompromising, they emphasized that one should not make a judgment on the subject of excommunication from Islam unless he is well-equipped with knowledge and proof, which should be based on the Qur'ān, the Tradition and the opinions of the virtuous ancestors.[2]

The opponents of the Wahhābīs argued that the individual who professes the faith, performs the daily prayers and pays the alms should not be excluded from Islam. In support of this argument, they referred to Qur'ānic verses as well as to

1. See, for example, al-Buhūtī, op.cit., pp. 499-501.
2. MRMN, IV, p. 522; Tawḍīḥ, p. 78.

traditions in which the Prophet mentioned that war should be launched against people until such times as they accepted the faith and said there is no god but Allāh; but that once they had done so, their lives and property were secure. He was angry when he knew that Usāma Ibn-Zayd had killed a man after uttering the shahāda. Thus, they maintained that Muslims should not be described as infidels or polytheists even if they invoke the dead or make sacrifices and vows to them. The Qur'ānic verses which were revealed in connection with the worshippers of idols at the time of the Prophet should not apply to such as these, as there has to be a differentiation between those who accept Islam and those who reject it.[1]

The Wahhābīs refuted this argument by saying that the rules and teachings contained in the Qur'ān are eternal and applicable at any time and everywhere. Therefore, these verses and their implications should apply to any people, including Muslims, among whom the idolatrous practices which they mention exist. Mere affiliation with Islam cannot be enough in itself to prevent anyone becoming a polytheist, nor does it protect him from being stigmatized as an infidel or an apostate.[2] Although the Wahhābīs accepted that the Muslim

---

1. Sawā'iq, p. 2; Durar, p. 38; Khulāsa, p. 252. Compare Rawḍa, I, p. 64.
2. Rawḍa, I, pp. 70-1.

community as a whole cannot err,[1] yet certain sections of it might do so, and indeed some did. The Prophet predicted that religious disintegration would affect the Muslims as it had affected people from other religions, and that they would be divided into seventy-three factions, all of which, except one, would go to hell.[2] He even predicted that some people of his community would go back to worshipping idols.[3] It is, therefore, illogical to say that Muslims cannot be idolatrous or to think that the same act which is called polytheism when practised by a non-Muslim can be regarded otherwise when done by a Muslim. It is the action, not the person, that matters here, and anyone committing a grievous act of polytheism can and should be called a polytheist. The traditions which mention that when an individual professes the faith he enters Islam and secures his life and property refer to those polytheists who formerly did not utter the shahāda; utterance of it was taken as an indication that they had embraced Islam. But the person who utters it and still practises polytheism, should be denounced as an infidel and killed.[4] In support of this argument the Shaykh mentions the

---

1. K.T., p. 59; M.T.N., p. 33; Tawḍīḥ, p. 6. Macdonald in his Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory (New York, 1903), pp. 283-4 mistakenly states that the Wahhābīs maintain that "the whole people of Muḥammad can err and has erred".
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 144; Tawḍīḥ, p. 6. Compare Abū-Dāwūd, op.cit., IV, p. 276.
3. K.T., pp. 55-8; Mufīd al-Mustafīd, p. 48. Compare at-Tirmidhī, op.cit., IX, p. 63; al-Bukhārī, op.cit., IV, p.380.
4. See the collection in the British Museum, MS, Or. 7778, f.104.

following historical examples:

1. The Hypocrites uttered the confession of the faith, performed the daily prayers and even fought beside the Prophet. Yet, the Qur'ān denounced them and said that they would occupy the lowest level of hell.[1]

2. The unanimous resolution of the Companions to fight against those who refused to pay the alms and to denounce them as apostates.

3. Banū Ḥanīfa accepted Islam and performed the daily prayers; but because they regarded Musaylama as a prophet the Companions fought against them.

4. The extremists among 'Alī's supporters claimed to be Muslims, but because they paid excessive veneration to him, he burnt them alive; the Companions, too, agreed that they should be declared infidels and killed.

5. The Khārijites were so devout in their worship and piety that the Companions felt small before them. Yet, once they started behaving in ways contrary to the Sharī'a the Companions fought against them.

6. Some Companions were called infidels by the Qur'ān because they violated the faith by saying things derogatory to the Prophet and his followers, even though they claimed to be jesting.

7. Al-Ja'd Ibn-Dirham was well-known for his piety and knowledge, but because of his heretical views about the attributes

---

1. Rawḍa, I, pp. 68-71; M.T.N., pp. 85-7; MRS, pp. 135-7. Compare Qur'ān, 4/145.

of God he was killed by the Umayad governor of Khurāsān, and the Tābi'ūn approved his action.[1]

However, the opponents of the Wahhābīs refused to accept that these examples were sufficient proof of the soundness of the Wahhabi attitude; some of them, indeed, could be shown to be invalid. The Hypocrites did not hold a sincere conviction about the religion and they were unfaithful to the Muslim community in which they lived. Despite this, the Prophet accepted their apparent submission to Islam. As for fighting those who refused to pay the alms, it should be remembered that the Apostates were divided into two groups. Most of them rejected Islam altogether, but some of them only refused to pay the alms. The latter were thus branded only because they shared the views of the absolute Apostates in their hostile attitude towards the authority in Medina . This is why, for example, 'Umar Ibn-al-Khaṭṭāb felt some hesitation in agreeing with Abū-Bakr on fighting against them. The Banū Ḥanīfa accepted Musaylama as a prophet and thus rejected the Qur'ān and the principle that Muḥammad was the last of God's messengers. The extremists who were burnt alive by 'Alī showed clear signs of infidelity because they prostrated themselves before him and said "you are Allāh". It was only after their persistent refusal to repent for this sin that he took action against them. Despite the fact that the Khārijites rebelled against 'Alī, neither he nor any Companion or imām declared them to

1. Rawḍa, I, pp. 68-71; M.T.N., pp. 85-7; MRS, pp. 135-7; Mufīd al-Mustafīd, pp. 46-7.

be infidels. In fact, they were fought against in retaliation for their fierce aggression. As for those whom the Qur'ān described as having said the word of infidelity and having changed from Islam to kufr, they mocked the Qur'ān, the Prophet and the best Companions. Regarding al-Ja'd Ibn-Dirham, he was a heretical leader, and the scholars are agreed that it is right to kill such heretics because their dangerous views may corrupt the belief of common people. But they did not consider them infidels or apostates.[1]

The Wahhābīs claimed that they differentiate between takfīr and qitāl on the grounds that the former is a purely religious question while the latter can also be for other reasons. In one of the Shaykh's letters, he states "Regarding takfīr, I consider to be an infidel only the person who has known the religion of the Prophet and yet stands against it, prevents others from accepting it and shows hostility towards those who adhere to it. As for fighting, until today we have not fought anyone except to protect our own lives and honour. It was they who attacked our territories and used all possible means against us. However, sometimes we attacked them in retaliation".[2] The enemies

---

1. Ṣawā'iq, pp. 11-7.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 154; Miṣbāḥ, p. 229. The Wahhābīs seem to be inconsistent in their views on the questions of takfīr and qitāl. While they claim to differentiate between them, they always described people who rebelled against their authority, apparently for political reasons, as apostates. See, for example, Rawḍa, II, p. 19. And while they maintain that the Khārijites were not infidels,

[Contd.

whom he describes as infidels are divided into four groups:

1. Those who know that tawḥīd is the religion of God and His Prophet and that to have recourse to beings other than God is polytheism, yet refuse to follow the former and renounce the latter.

2. Those who accept these two principles but still prefer the common belief in saints to a rigid monotheism.

3. Those who accept and practise these principles, but feel hatred for others who do so and affection for those who do not.

4. Those who join their townspeople in war against monotheists.[1]

In another place, the Shaykh mentions ten points which vitiate the belief of the individual and exclude him from Islam:

1. To associate any being with God in worship.

2. To invoke others by prayer to intercede with Him.

3. To refuse to declare the polytheists to be infidels, to doubt their infidelity or to approve of their ways and ideas.

4. To believe that another guidance is more perfect than

Contd.] they cited them alongside those extremists who paid excessive veneration to 'Alī whom they considered infidels. See Rawḍa, I, p. 64. Moreover, while the Shaykh mentions in one of his letters that they only fight against those who refuse to profess the faith, later in the same letter he admits that they also fight against those who do not practise the other four pillars of Islam in order to make them do so. See Rawḍa, I, pp. 179-80; Asinna, p. 105.

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 108; MRMN, IV, pp. 300-1.

that of the Prophet or that another rule is better than his.

5. To feel aversion to something which he has taught, even if there is accordance with it in practice.

6. To deride any part of his religion, such as its punishments or its rewards.

7. To believe that anyone has the right to deviate from the Sharī'a.

8. To practise or approve of magic.

9. To support the polytheists against the Muslims.

10. To turn away from religion by showing carelessness in its study or its practice.

However, he allows that one who falls into any of these categories under compulsion is to be exempted and remains a Muslim.[1]

The Shaykh asserted that tawḥīd should first be explained to people; and only after they know it and still go against it should they be regarded as infidels.[2] No one can be excommunicated from Islam before proof (ḥujja) has been established against him.[3] By establishing proof, however, he did not mean that it should be understood by the person accused. When asked about this, he replied "The trouble is that you do not differentiate between the establishment of proof (qiyām al-ḥujja) and the understanding of it (fahm al-ḥujja). The production of proof and its establishment is one thing and its being understood is another".[4]

---

1. M.T.N., p. 134.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 108.
3. Ibid., p. 131.
4. Ibid., p. 168; MRMN, IV, p. 639.

These views were held by the Shaykh's immediate successors, who maintained that the proof has been "established" on everyone whom the Qur'ān and the call of the Prophet have reached.[1] However, in accordance with their claim that their doctrines were the true Islam, the Wahhābīs considered their call sufficient to "establish" the proof, and 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Muḥammad states "We declare to be infidels only those to whom our call to the truth has reached, to whom the right way has become clear and on whom the proof has, thus, been established and, yet, continue in their obstinacy".[2]

On those who died before this call came, and whose beliefs and practices had apparently been polytheistic, the Wahhābī scholars were hesitant to pass judgment, maintaining that they should be left to God.[3] The justification for such an attitude is the difficulty of knowing exactly the religious condition of the person at the time of his death; and, therefore, although they condemned all those who did not follow Islam, they did not pass a judgment of infidelity on any particular person.[4] In fact, 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Muḥammad not only excused the ignorant people, but the departed scholars as well, because there had been no one in their times to champion tawḥīd with the tongue, the pen and the sword.[5]

---

1. Ibid., pp. 513, 637.
2. Hadiyya, p. 34. See also MRMN, IV, pp. 540, 574.
3. Ibid., p. 640.
4. Ibid.
5. Hadiyya, pp. 34-5.

Regarding loyalty and hostility in religion, the Shaykh and his followers maintained that Islam cannot be sound without animosity towards polytheists and friendship to monotheists.[1] In his Ḥukm Muwālāt Ahl ash-Shirk, Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-Allāh gives twenty-one proofs from the Qur'ān and the Tradition to support the view that loyalty to polytheists is infidelity.[2] In another treatise entitled Awthaq 'Urā l-Īmān, he draws up a list of twenty offences which constitute such loyalty, ranging from a general liking to them to living among them.[3]

The Wahhābīs divided shirk into major and minor. The first is to associate other beings with God in worship, and it cannot be forgiven by Him except by repentance. The other is not specifically defined, but consists of acts which do not constitute worship, such as swearing by beings other than God. While the former excludes one from Islam, the latter does not.[4] As for observance of the five pillars of Islam, the Shaykh stated that it is only those who do not confess the shahāda or do not carry out its implication, who are to be considered infidels. Dereliction of the other four, namely prayers, fast, alms and pilgrimage, does not excommunicate one from Islam. But he mentioned that certain scholars do hold different views on the question of prayers.[5] However,

---

1. M.T.N., p. 121; MRMN, IV, p. 10.
2. M.T.N., pp. 193-208.
3. Ibid., pp. 178-92.
4. K.T., p. 10; M.T.N., p. 8; Hadiyya, p. 18.
5. Rawḍa, I, pp. 179-80.

his successors considered as infidels all those who were derelict in prayer or alms, even if this were due to neglect or laziness, and they maintained that such should be coerced into their proper performance.[1] In support of this argument, they refer to the Qur'ān, the Tradition and the unanimous agreement of the Companions. The Qur'ān enjoins "If they - the polytheists - repent, perform the prayers and pay the alms, then let them go their way".[2] The Prophet says: "I have been ordered to fight people until they confess that there is none to be worshipped except God and that Muḥammad is His Prophet, till they keep up the prayers and pay the alms. Once they do so, they secure their lives and property".[3] Abū-Bakr argued that it was permissible to attack those who refused to pay alms on the analogy of the permission given to fight against those who would not perform the prayers; and this shows that there must have been agreement among the Companions on the latter point. Moreover, since they accepted the argument of Abū-Bakr, they legitimized warfare against the alms-avoiders, as well.[4]

F. Bid'a:

Literally, bid'a means novelty or innovation. As a juridical term, it is, in general, used to describe any doctrine or action which is not based on the Qur'ān, the

---

1. Ibid., II, p. 217; Hadiyya, pp. 51-2.
2. Qur'ān, 9/5.
3. MRS, p. 139. Compare Muslim, op.cit., I, p. 24.
4. Hadiyya, pp. 51-67.

Tradition or the authority of the Companions.[1] It is the antithesis of sunna. The concept of bid'a became important when conflict between Muslim Traditionists and their opponents broke out during the second century of Islam. However, from an early period it was felt necessary to distinguish between a good bid'a and a bad one. Both Macdonald[2] and Robson[3] quote ash-Shāfi'ī for the principle that any innovation which contradicts the Qur'ān, the Tradition, the ijmā' or the opinions of the Companions is an error. But a good bid'a which is not in conflict with any of these sources is praiseworthy. Accordingly, innovations are classified in Muslim jurisprudence as farḍ, ḥarām, mandūb, makrūh and mubāḥ. For example, it is incumbent (farḍ kifāya) on the Muslims to study and teach the sciences which enable the Sharī'a to be correctly understood, and which provide a means of refuting its detractors. Heretical systems and doctrines are ḥarām or prohibited. The establishment of schools and the like is mandūb, or a recommended innovation; while those practices which defy the spirit of canonical prescription, even though not specifically forbidden are disliked (makrūh). Finally, there are the permitted (mubāḥ) innovations, such as eating good food and wearing fine clothes.

However, ash-Shāfi'ī's definition of bid'a and its

1. Al-'Ukbarī, Ash-Sharḥ wa-l-Ībāna 'alā Uṣūl as-Sunna wa-d-Diyāna, ed. by H. Laoust (Damascus, 1958), p. 84.
2. EI[1], "bid'a".
3. EI[2], "bid'a". See also Goldziher, op.cit., II, pp. 36-7.

classification into five categories by Muslim jurisprudence cannot be left without discussion. Pronouncing upon innovations on the basis of ijmā' means that their acceptance or rejection is determined by the opinions of the learned people in a certain time and place. But it is obvious that an opinion may differ from one generation to another according to change of circumstances. This would mean that what is considered bid'a today may be regarded as sunna tomorrow. Moreover, ijmā' may differ from country to country, for there has never been a universal ijmā' for all Muslims, and, as Professor Lewis puts it, "the dividing-line between bid'a and sunna may thus vary with place as well as time".[1]

Regarding the classification into five categories, there is no form of bid'a which would be called farḍ 'ayn or a duty obligatory to every Muslim. On the other hand, the fifth kind of bid'a, that to which the religion is indifferent, is difficult to accept. For in fact, the word bid'a is usually linked with religious matters, and it is only used of something introduced into religion as a part of doctrine or practice. It is apparent that bid'a, when mentioned without an adjective, means an action or doctrine contrary to the Sharī'a, or not to be found in its sources. In this sense, therefore, it could only be under the categories of ḥarām or makrūh.

The Ḥanbalites are against innovations as a whole, and they maintain that all forms of worship ('ibādāt) which are

1. "Some Observations on the Significance of Heresy in the History of Islam", Studia Islamica, I (1953), pp. 52-3.

not recommended by the sources of the Sharī'a are prohibited.[1] To Ibn-Taymiyya, the religion of Islam is based on two principles: worship is to be devoted to God alone, and it should be carried out only in accordance with His commandments and the teachings of His Prophet.[2]

It was this conservative attitude that was adopted by the Wahhābīs. The Shaykh condemned all forms of innovations; and rejected the views of those who maintained that a bid'a could be good or praiseworthy, basing his rejection on the words of the Prophet: "Every bid'a leads to astray".[3] His son 'Abd-Allāh defined bid'a as anything that was introduced into religion after the third century of Islam; and, contrary to those who divide it into good and objectionable or into five categories, he maintained that it could not but be condemned (madhmūma). However, he was prepared to accept these divisions so long as the good bid'a was meant to be the tradition of the virtuous ancestors, which would in this case include the farḍ, mandūb and mubāḥ. The objectionable bid'a must then mean what is not in accordance with that tradition, and would include that which is prohibited and disliked.[4] He affirmed that to the Wahhābīs the term bid'a pertains only to matters affecting the doctrine and the practice of religion. What has no bearing on worship or belief, such as the use of

---

1. Abū-Zahra, Aḥmad Ibn-Ḥanbal: Ḥayātu-hu wa 'Aṣru-hu, Ārā' u-hu wa Fiqhu-hu (Cairo, 1367), p. 203.
2. Risālat al-'Ubūdiyya in the Majmū', p. 19. Compare Hadiyya, p. 43.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 143. Compare Muslim, op.cit., I, p. 336.
4. Hadiyya, p. 41.

coffee, innocent games, training in methods of war, etc., cannot be regarded as an innovation, and, therefore, is lawful.[1] Other Wahhābī scholars explicitly differentiated between mu'āmalāt, or customary practices, and 'ibādāt, or worship when dealing with the subject of innovation.[2] Statements by certain modern scholars that they did not make such a distinction are, therefore, baseless.[3]

A list of objectionable innovations is given by 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Muḥammad in his report of the Wahhābī entry to Mecca in 1218. This includes:

1. Mentioning loudly any Qur'ānic verse or prayers for the Prophet after the call to prayer, while carrying the dead to the cemetery or while pouring water on the grave.
2. Gathering at an appointed time to listen to the story of the Prophet's birth, believing that this is religiously recommended. Also included is the poetic version of this story with musical accompaniment, mixed with prayers for him and recitation from the Qur'ān and the Tradition. This used to be performed after the prayers of tarāwīḥ, in the

---

1. Ibid., p. 37. Certain scholars mistakenly mentioned that the Wahhābīs banned the use of coffee and considered it as an innovation. See Goldziher, op.cit., II, p. 34, and Abū-Zahra, al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyya (Cairo, 1365) p. 251. Indeed, the Wahhābīs are very fond of coffee and use it so much. 'Abd-al-Laṭīf Ibn-'Abd-ar-Raḥmān strongly opposed those who did not allow it. See MRMN, III, pp. 362-6.
2. Minhāj, p. 94. This is the attitude of the Ḥanbalites in general. See Laoust, "Aḥmad Ibn-Ḥanbal", EI^2.
3. Goldziher, op.cit., II, p. 34 and Abū-Zahra, al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyya, p. 251.

belief that it is a qurba.[1]

3. Attending the rawātib - superogatory exercises of devotion - instituted by the heads of religious orders, such as those of as-Sammān and al-Ḥaddād. These usually involved seeking intercession from the founders of the orders and could thus become grievous polytheism. Reading selections made by scholars from the Qur'ān and the Tradition is, however, allowed and even recommended.

4. Reciting the Fātiḥa on behalf of the founders of the Ṣūfī orders after the five daily prayers, as well as praising them excessively, believing this to be a recommended devotional act.

5. The use of beads for counting prayers.

6. The tradition of performing the five daily prayers all over again after the final Friday prayer in Ramaḍān.[2]

The Wahhābīs condemned the building of domes over tombs, the decoration of graves, the wearing of gold jewellery and silken clothes by men because they were prohibited by the Tradition,[3] and not because they were merely innovations, as mistakenly stated by certain authors.[4] Similarly, they did not mention bid'a as the reason for prohibiting the use of

---

1. It is to be noticed here that the Shaykh did not object to prayers being said for the Prophet on Friday, but condemned the way in which they were commonly performed, such as when three or more people would do them from the top of the minarets, chanting loudly. See Rawḍa, I, p. 132.
2. Hadiyya, pp. 35-7.
3. Rawḍa, II, pp. 229-32. Compare Abū-Dāwūd, op.cit., III, p. 293; Ibn-Daqīq al-'īd, 'Umdat al-Aḥkām in the MHN, pp. 141, 203-4.
4. Among these is Winder, op.cit., p. 11.

tobacco; it was forbidden because it causes intoxication when it is smoked after a period of abstinence, and because it gives a bad smell (khabīth). The khabā'ith are forbidden by the Qur'ān.[1] It should be mentioned here that the Wahhābīs do not stand alone in this. Many scholars forbade the use of tobacco, among whom was Muḥammad Ḥayāt as-Sindī.[2] It should also be noticed that the allegation by certain writers that the Wahhābīs objected to minarets and demolished them as godness innovations are absolutely baseless.[3] The fact that the mosques in the Wahhābī land have minarets stands as a striking proof against such an allegation.

G. Ijtihād and taqlīd:

According to Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb and his followers, God commanded people to obey Him and follow the

1. MRMN, I, p. 652.
2. Zubāra, Nashr al-'Arf li-Nubalā' al-Yaman Ba'd al-Alf (Cairo, 1376), II, pp. 640-6. Indeed, the Mahdia regarded the sin of the smoker of tobacco more grievous than that of the drinker of wine. See Holt, the Mahdist State in the Sudan - 1881-1898-(2nd edition, Londom, 1970), p. 131. However, there is no evidence that the Wahhābīs hold such views, and although they prohibit smoking tobacco they do not seem to regard it as grave a sin as drinking wine.
3. Among these are Stoddard, The New World of Islam (London, 1921), p. 25; Lammens, Islam: Beliefs and Institutions, tr. by Sir E. Denison Ross (London, 1929), p. 183 and Abu-Zahra, Ibn-Taymiyya, 530.

teachings of His Prophet, and did not make it obligatory upon them to obey anyone else.[1] This implies complete adherence to the Qur'ān and the Tradition, which form the essential sources of the Sharī'a and to which all disputes among Muslims should be referred.[2] The importance of the Qur'ān lies in the fact that it is the word of God, which was revealed to guide human beings from darkness to light. The Tradition, also, is of first importance because it explains in detail what is in the Qur'ān and shows the way of the Prophet, who is infallible in what he preached about God and taught as religion. Therefore, Islam is complete in these two sources, and anyone who follows them will not go astray.[3] In matters of usūl, the Wahhābīs rely solely on the Qur'ān and the Tradition, and claim that such an attitude is the way of ahl as-Sunna wa-l-Jamā'a. Their reference to other scholars in this field is merely to support their conclusions. Moreover, although they formally adhere to the Ḥanbalī school in questions of furū', they affirm that they will not hesitate to reject their own madhhab over any particular issue if it is not in accordance with the two prime sources.[4] Thus, the texts of the Qur'ān and the Tradition occupy first place in Wahhābī thinking and

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 52; MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 2, 122. Compare Qur'ān, 8/20.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 55; MRMN, II, pt. III, p. 4; pt. IV, p. 123. Compare Qur'ān, 3/17.
3. MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 2-3; MḤN, p. 227. Compare Qur'ān, 5/3; al-Bukhārī, op.cit., IV, p. 430.
4. Rawḍa, I, pp. 38, 51; Hadiyya, p. 30.

come before consensus.

Before giving their opinion on the latter, it is worth mentioning the attitude of the Ḥanbalites in general on this matter. According to Abū-Zahra, Aḥmad Ibn-Ḥanbal did not absolutely deny the possibility that ijmā' could exist, but he said that it would be difficult to know that it was taking place. That is to say, that a certain question was discussed by all mujtahids everywhere, that they all agreed on one decision and their agreement reached the person who claimed to act on such a consensus.[1] Therefore, instead of saying there is an ijmā' permitting something or other, Aḥmad used to say that he did not know of any opposition to it; and although he might hold something to be lawful, he would not claim consensus on it.[2] However, the knowledge of the ijmā' of the Companions could be achieved, and the Ḥanbalites recognized this.[3]

To Ibn-Taymiyya, ijmā' means that the Muslim scholars agree on the rule of a certain question, and through this the agreement of the Muslim community as a whole is to be assumed. Once this has been realized, it becomes a binding source of the Sharī'a.[4] However, he maintains that every

1. Abū-Zahra, Aḥmad Ibn-Ḥanbal, p. 266.
2. Ibid.
3. Abū-Zahra, Ibn-Taymiyya, p. 454.
4. Ibn-Taymiyya, Ma'ārij al-Wuṣūl in the Majmū', pp. 197-8; The statement of Schacht, (An Introduction to Islamic Law, Oxford, 1964, p. 63) that Ibn-Taymiyya rejected the all-embracing function of the consensus of the scholars, cannot be unreservedly accepted.

ijmā' must have been based on a sound tradition, though it might be known to only some of these scholars.[1]

The Wahhābīs do not reject ijmā', as suggested by certain authors.[2] On the contrary, they consider it to be a binding source of the Sharī'a; for the Muslim community as a whole will not agree on error.[3] However,things which are in conflict with the Qur'ān and the Tradition, even though practised by the majority of the people, are not to be accepted, and the silence of many scholars about them or even their approval, cannot be taken as the consensus of the community. Sound ijmā' cannot be contradictory to the texts of the prime sources.[4]

In his letter to Ibn-'Abd-al-Laṭīf, the Shaykh states "There is no disagreement between you and us on the question that if the scholars agree on a certain issue their decision should be followed. But if they disagree, we say that the matter has to be referred to God and His Prophet - i.e. the Qur'ān and the Tradition - and you accept the views of other scholars without any proof".[5] In another place, he

1. Ibn-Taymiyya, Ma'ārij al-Wuṣūl in the Majmū', pp. 210-2.
2. Among these are Macdonald, The Development of Muslim Theology, p. 293; Bethmann, op.cit., p. 104; Zweemer, Arabia, p. 193.
3. K.T., p. 59; M.T.N., p. 33; Tawḍīḥ, p. 6; MRMN, IV, p. 807.
4. MRMN, I, p. 238; Ḍiyā', p. 75. Therefore, the excesses of the cult of saints, for example, which Goldziher (op.cit., II, pp. 332-3) adduces as demonstrating the power of Ijmā', cannot be accepted for two reasons: firstly, there has not been complete ijmā' on it because, as he himself states, the strict followers of the Sunna opposed it, and, secondly, it goes against the teachings of the Prophet.
5. Rawḍa, I, p. 55.

concedes that what is agreed on by all the scholars is the truth which should be accepted.[1] His respect for the consensus of the 'ulamā' can be seen in many of his letters,[2] and other Wahhābī scholars seem to have adhered to his views on this matter.[3] Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥmān explicitly states that ijmā' constitutes the third source of the Sharī'a, after the Qur'ān and the Tradition.[4]

In judging any religious question, the Wahhābīs will first try to find out whether there is anything about it in the texts of the Qur'ān and the Tradition, and if so they will give their views accordingly. If they cannot find a reference to it in these texts, they will look for the consensus of virtuous ancestors, particularly the Companions and the Successors, and the ijmā' of the scholars. Such an attitude was mistakenly taken by their opponents to mean that they claimed for themselves the right of absolute ijtihād and rejected entirely the imitation (taqlīd) of other scholars. From an early period, Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb was accused by Sulaymān Ibn-Suḥaym of claiming to have the right to exercise ijtihād and reject taqlīd, and of banning the works of the Ḥanbalī school.[5] He was urged to accept taqlīd

1. Ibid., p. 43.
2. See, for example, Ibid., pp. 58, 60, 108, 144, 186, 228.
3. MRMN, II, pt. I, p. 12; Pt. III, p. 114.
4. Ḍiyā', p. 94.
5. Rawḍa, I, p. 114.

because he was not qualified to exercise ijtihād.[1] Muḥammad Ibn-'Afāliq wrote a treatise called Taḥakkum al-Muqallidīn bi-man Idda'ā Tajdīd ad-Dīn in which he tried to prove that the conditions required for the exercising of ijtihād were not attained by the Shaykh. Al-Khālidī, too, in his tract Ashad al-Jihād fī Ibṭāl Da'wā l-Ijtihād had the same aim.[2]

In fact, the Wahhābīs reject the view that deductions from the original sources should not be undertaken by late scholars, and that this is the privilege of the absolute mujtahid alone.[3] The reason for this rejection is that such a view would imply that it is impossible for anyone, except that mujtahid, to make use of the Qur'ān or seek guidance from it; and instead, therefore, of being a source of guidance to all people, as it is meant to be, the Qur'ān would be only for a select few.[4]

Although the Shaykh explicitly denied that he was claiming the right of ijtihād for himself or that he was completely against taqlīd,[5] the Wahhābī attitude towards this question was elaborated in more detail by his followers. According to his son 'Abd-Allāh: "We are not qualified to exercise ijtihād, nor does anyone of us claim to be. However,

---

1. Ibid., pp. 52, 114.
2. Al-Khālidī, Ashadd al-Jihād fī Ibṭāl Da'wā l-Ijtihād (Bombay, 1305), pp. 25, 40-2.
3. Ibid., p. 35.
4. Rawḍa, I, pp. 56, 112.
5. Ibid., pp. 42-3.

we will not hesitate to abandon the position of our Ḥanbalī school on any issue in favour of the opinion of one of the other three Imāms, if this latter is supported by a clear text from the Qur'ān or the Tradition, which is not abrogated, limited or opposed by another clear text. In many, but by no means all, cases, there is no objection to ijtihād. Many eminent scholars, who formally followed one or another of these schools, on certain issues held independent views which were contrary to the general opinion of the madhhab to which they belonged".[1]

The Wahhābīs are against both extreme views on ijtihād; that it is always, and in every case, allowed or that it is not permitted at all at the present time. Thus, although they would not allow it in all questions, they equally reject the idea that the doors of ijtihād have finally been closed. They divide it into absolute and limited, and its practitioners into mujtahid muṭlaq and mujtahid muqayyad or merely mujtahid. The former were such as the four Imāms, well qualified in matters of religion and competent to exercise independent judgment; the latter, while not of the same general authority, were exceptionally learned in the particular matter on which they were to pronounce.[2]

As for taqlīd, the Shaykh affirms that it is not obligatory upon Muslims to follow anyone in their religion, except the Prophet. The four Imāms warned against unquestioning

---

1. Hadiyya, p. 30.
2. MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 21-7; Diyā', p. 295.

imitation even of themselves, and enjoined their followers to abandon their views once they were found in conflict with the Qur'ān and the Tradition, or when other sounder opinions were advanced.[1] He maintains that in matters of uṣūl, taqlīd is not permitted to anyone; but in questions of furū', the common people are to adhere to it, while those who are capable of independent judgment should avoid it.[2] However, he points out that scholars hold different views about the last group. Some of them say that taqlīd is always permissible for them, while others maintain that it is always prohibited. A third group allow it to them when necessary, as, for example, when they have no time to look into the sources and study the proofs (dalā'il). The Shaykh would seem to agree with the latter view.[3]

As mentioned earlier, the Wahhābīs follow the Ḥanbalī school in the furū' of the religion. But they claim that they do not follow it blindly, and that whenever it is proved to be wrong on any issue they will abandon it for the sounder position. As an example of this, they depart from their school in preferring the grandfather to the brother of the deceased in inheritance.[4] They will not follow even the

---

1. Rawḍa, I, p. 43.
2. MRMN, II, pt. IV, p. 127.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 44.
4. Ibid., p. 45.

celebrated scholars Ibn-Taymiyya and Ibn-Qayyim without good proof, and they venture to disagree with them on certain questions, such as ṭalāq ath-thalāth bi-lafẓ wāḥid in one place, which the former consider it one divroce and the Wahhābīs, following the four Imāms, regard it as definite or irrevocable.[1] Although they are Ḥanbalites, the Wahhābīs do not object to anyone following the other Sunnī schools. However, they insist that the Rāfiḍites, the Zaydites and the Imāmites should follow one of the four Sunnī imāms.[2] They, also, disapprove of changing from one school to another out of personal interest: such as being Ḥanafite when one is claiming the right of preemption against his neighbour, and changing to Shāfi'ite when this right is claimed against him.[3]

However, the Wahhābīs divide taqlīd into three kinds:
1. Prohibited or ḥarām. That is to imitate the Imām despite the fact that his opinion is proved to be against the texts of the Qur'ān and the Tradition; for in this case the Imām is in fact treated as a god or a prophet. The Shaykh strongly condemns those who are so fanatical towards their madhhab that they try by every possible means to reject the traditions of the Prophet which go against it, arguing, when shown the proof, that their opponents cannot know these traditions as well as their Imām did.[4]

---

1. Hadiyya, p. 37.
2. Ibid., p. 30.
3. MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 6-7.
4. Rawḍa, I, p. 55.

2. Disliked or madhmūm. This applies to a person who is capable of independent judgment but follows a certain Imām blindly. Such a person should look for the proper truth and adhere to it even if it is against his own school. If he does so he obeys the command of God and still remains loyal to the principles of his Imām.[1]

3. Permitted or mubāḥ. This is the taqlīd allowed to two groups of people:

A. The common people who have no knowledge of the Qur'ān, the Tradition and fiqh.

B. Those whose knowledge in these fields is limited or confined to their own madhhab only, and those who are acquainted only with the works of late scholars; these are not expected to go beyond their limited knowledge.[2]

H. Imāma:

Judging by their writings, this question was not an important polemical issue to the Wahhābīs. Neither the Shaykh nor any of his immediate followers discussed it in detail. However, the scant references to it show that their views are in accordance with those of the Sunnī scholars in general and the Ḥanbalites in particular. It is necessary to have an Imām to carry out the rules of the Sharī'a, unite the Muslim community and lead it against its enemies. Islam cannot be dominant without the unity of its followers, and this, in turn, cannot be achieved without an

1. MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 6, 21.
2. MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 6-7.

imām.[1] According to Sulaymān Ibn-'Abd-Allāh, the appointment of the īmām is a collective duty upon Muslims. The ideal imām should be free, male, just, know the Sharī'a and be capable of administering the social affairs of the people. If these qualifications are present in someone from Quraysh, he ought to be given preference. His appointment can be made by the agreement of influential people (ahl al-ḥall wa l-'aqd) or through designation by the previous imām. However, he may also come to power by force; but in all cases he deserves obedience from his subjects.[2]

The Shaykh holds the view that obedience to rulers is obligatory, even if they are oppressive or sinful, and he maintains that their commands should be followed as long as they do not contradict the rules of religion, affirming that their call for jihād should be willingly met.[3] The same attitude was taken by other Wahhābī scholars, who advised patience with the oppression of rulers, and denounced any armed rebellion against them.[4]

It is to be noticed that neither Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd nor his son 'Abd-al-'Azīz was called imām during his lifetime. Instead, they were referred to as amīr. But, after the latter's death, imām became a title of the Su'ūdī rulers.[5]

---

1. Ibid., pp. 170-2.
2. Tawḍīḥ, p. 51. According to 'Abd-Allāh Abū-Buṭayn (MRMN, II, pt. III, p. 169) an Arab has priority in this matter over a Turk.
3. M.T.N., pp. 94, 129; MḤN, p. 297.
4. MRMN, III, pp. 62, 63, 67, 179; MRMN, IV, pp. 78-81; Tawḍīḥ, p. 52.
5. MRMN, II, pt. III, p. 129.

However, while the Shaykh insists on obedience to rulers, he emphasizes the fact that imāra is a heavy responsibility which should not be lightly assumed. The amīr has to be just and should not appoint anyone who may be biased in administration or in dealing out justice. He also has to be kind to his subjects, listen to their complaints and work for their interest.[1] The primary duty of the ruler is to do his best to see that the principles of the Sharī'a are applied, and this can be achieved through co-operation with the scholars.

Belief occupies the first place among the pillars of Islam, and, therefore, the ruler should give this matter priority and prevent anything which may corrupt the beliefs of the people. He must see that the daily prayers are performed in the mosques, and punish anyone who does not attend. He must, also, collect the alms and distribute them according to the rules of the Sharī'a. Similarly, he should compel all upon whom the obligation falls to perform the pilgrimage. He should seek to prevent crimes against the religion and society, to work for the protection of Muslims, and to strive for the spread of Islam through jihād. In short, the aim of the ruler should be to make the word of God reign and reveal itself in all aspects of life, both religious and secular.[2]

---

1. MḤN, pp. 302-4.
2. MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 5-13.

I. Al-amr bi-l-ma'rūf wa-n-nahy 'an al-munkar:

The adherence to this important Islamic principle is one of the main reasons for which Muslims are described in the Qur'ān as "the best community".[1] Emphasis on its importance and the obligation to observe it is to be found in many Qur'ānic verses, as well as in the Tradition.[2] It was given particular attention by scholars and theologians from different schools and sects, and it also figures among the five bases of Mu'tazilī doctrine.[3] Ibn-Taymiyya in his work al-Ḥisba fi-l-Islām treats of it in detail: according to him, the religion of Islam is based on two principles: amr and nahy; the commanding of good and the forbidding of evil. He maintains that the observance of this matter is an obligatory duty on the Muslim community and on every individual Muslim capable of exercising it. However, the application of this injunction should be done in a reasonable way so that it does not provoke a contrary reaction. The Prophet was tolerant with 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Ubayy, despite his notorious hypocrisy, because to attack him might have resulted in reprisals from his supporters, and Muḥammad could then have been criticized for going against his own followers. He gives three conditions which ought to be present in anyone

1. Qur'ān, 5/39.
2. Ibid., 3/104; 7/157; 9, 71; MḤN, p. 393. Compare al-Bukhārī, op.cit., IV, p. 376; Muslim, op.cit., I, p.32.
3. W.M. Watt, Islamic Philosophy and Theology, p. 68; Abū-Zahra, Ibn-Taymiyya, p. 181.

who exercises this principle: to know the ma'rūf and the munkar, as well as the state of the person upon whom they are urged; to be gentle and non-violent; and, finally, to be patient with the consequences of its application. However, it should not be abandoned if one of these conditions is lacking, for this would cause harm to the community.[1]

All the Wahhābī scholars affirmed the importance of commanding the good and forbidding the evil and urged its application on rulers and ruled alike. Ibn-Bishr attributes the disintegration of Islam in Najd before Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb to the fact that nobody had carried out this religious obligation, and states that the alliance between the Shaykh and Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd was based on its implementation. According to him, the adherence to it by the Su'ūdī rulers was their most laudable quality.[2] 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Ibn-Ḥasan, too, emphasizes the fact that religious and worldly affairs cannot be perfectly fulfilled without applying this principle, which he describes as the sign of the faith.[3] In his opinion, the Prophets were sent to command the good - the greatest good being monotheism - and to forbid evil, which, of course, includes polytheism. Jihād comes under the category of this subject; for without it the word of God would not have reigned.[4] His son 'Abd-al-Laṭīf supports

1. Ibn-Taymiyya, al-Ḥisba fī-l-Islām, in the Majmū', pp. 232, 277, 281-2.
2. 'Unwān, pp. 21-3; 120, 172.
3. MRMN, IV, p. 380.
4. Ibid., p. 555.

this view and mentions that this principle is obligatory on the Muslim community, as well as being one of its best qualities.[1] Everyone should try to apply it according to his ability; for the Prophet says that he who sees an objectionable act should oppose it either by force or by words. If he cannot do either, he must at least hate it.[2]

The Wahhābīs seem to adhere to the conditions mentioned by Ibn-Taymiyya for applying this Islamic basis. In his letter to Aḥmad Ibn-Suwaylim and Thunayyān Ibn-Su'ūd, the Shaykh states that one should not object to anything without knowing that it is prohibited.[3] In another letter to his supporters in Sudayr, he observes that certain people were denouncing objectionable acts, and goes on to say that although this is the duty of every Muslim, yet, the way in which they were performing it could not be approved, for their criticism was so harsh that it gave rise to disunity among Muslims. Anyone who takes this task upon himself has to know what to command and what to oppose, to be kind in applying this, and to be patient with all possible consequences. He adds that protest against misdeeds should not be made if it could engender disunity.[4]

However, the Wahhābī views on this principle are best illustrated by the ways in which it was applied. In order

---

1. Ibid., p. 224.
2. Hadiyya, p. 90; MḤN, p. 392. Compare Muslim, op.cit., I, p. 32.
3. Rawḍa, I, p. 158.
4. Rawḍa, I, p. 171.

to ensure its observance, they appointed special people to see that it was not neglected. In the past, such an official was called muḥtasib;[1] among the Wahhābīs he bore the title muṭawwi' or nā'ib. One of his chief duties was to force people to attend the daily prayers in the mosques. In every district, a roll of the names of every adult male used to be read after the prayers, especially the dawn prayer, and anyone found absent without sufficient reason was punished. Besides this, he had to prevent objectionable practices, such as drinking alcohol, smoking tobacco, wearing silk clothes or gold jewels, and playing or listening to music.[2] At present, the muṭawwi's are organized and financed by the state in Su'ūdī Arabia. Their offices are called: Hay'āt al-Amr bi-l-Ma'rūf wa-n-Nahy 'an al-Munkar. However, their power is decreasing, being replaced by the police under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Interior.

1. Ibn-Taymiyya, al-Ḥisba fī-l-Islām, in the Majmū', p. 223.
2. Rawḍa, I, p. 153; MRMN, II, pt. II, p. 7.

CONCLUSION

The Western conception of the separation of Church and State, of religion and politics, finds no counterpart in Islam, which views the political organization of human affairs as merely among the means through which the ideals of the religion can best be achieved. It is as a consequence of this attitude that throughout history movements of religious reform in Islam, when successful, have always entailed some change in the form and the leadership of the political structure. As a corollary to this, when such changes have occurred without the support of a religious idea, they were invariably transient and provocative of social unrest. In this respect, the alliance of the Wahhābī movement with the Su'ūdīs may be regarded as a fulfilment of this basic Islamic quest for political forms which will give expression to religious aims, and the survival of both is a measure of the success achieved by this partnership.

It can be seen that time and circumstances were favourable to both: the flaccid grip of the Ottomans on Arabia as a whole had, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, become all but negligible, and Najd, which had always lived in virtual independence, was ripe for some effort to give political coherence to the disparate city-states and tribal territories therein. Local superstitions which had been allowed to penetrate into the practice of the religion, as well as neglect of religious obligations by most of the nomads,

necessitated a move for the restoration of the pure faith and the enforcement of its principles upon those who were ignoring them. Thus, the secular objectives of political power coincided with the religious purpose of total adherence to the Sharī'a. How far the Su'ūdīs could have succeeded in exerting their influence over their neighbours without the doctrines of Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb and to what extent he could have achieved his aims without their military support must, of course, remain a matter of speculation; but it can be said that many other reformers, preaching similar doctrines, failed because they lacked the support of a secular power, and that the Su'ūdīs before their alliance with the Shaykh had, apparently, not been able to expand outside their own territories. It may be, also, thought most unlikely that the Su'ūdīs could have retained their hold over other chiefs - whose normal form of social contact was through the divisive feud - without the leavening and unifying influence of a universal doctrine; and there can be no argument that throughout its course, to the present day, these two aspects of the state have been virtually interchangeable, with orthodoxy the patent of citizenship. This is not to question the sincerity of the belief of such early Su'ūdī leaders, such as 'Abd-al-'Azīz Ibn-Muḥammad Ibn-Su'ūd, nor to see their acceptance of the Shaykh's views as crude opportunism. Even before the movement gave any indication of its future growth, he had shown himself dedicated to the

Wahhābī cause; and after becoming ruler, he figures among its most active scholars.

Central Arabia, too, was a favourable area for the propagation of the reform which the Shaykh felt to be necessary. The people here were either town-dwelling Ḥanbalites, who held the Sunna in highest regard, or nomads, who were committed to no fixed religious system and thus were able to accept his ideas, especially if they offered them some economic advantages as a result of the holy war. Moreover, here there existed no organized body of 'ulamā' to criticize his argument or to question his right to advance them; and the general level of education among the people was so low that a man such as he could be regarded as a paragon of learning, to be heeded and obeyed.

Almost cut off from the rest of the Islamic world, Najd was a favourable ground in which the seeds of a new doctrine could be planted and nurtured into vigour, without having to endure the tests and trials that a more exposed position in the complex and sophisticated regions of other countries could have allowed. When the Su'ūdīs emerged from the desert as a conquering power they were sustained and directed by a doctrine that developed over half a century and had by then become the only conception of Islam intelligible to an entire generation. This, in fact, provides the explanation of the fanaticism which has been often associated with the Wahhābī movement. It was, also, this unshakable conviction that encouraged the early adherents to stretch themselves to the

limits of their military capacity and venture to challenge the might of the Ottomans by occupying the sacred cities of Islam. The reaction to this was a disastrous military setback which resulted in the destruction of their capital ad-Dir'iyya in 1233/1818.

Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb was in most respects the man most qualified to initiate a movement of reform such as this. His family was well-respected and had already produced men of recognized scholarly attainment, and he himself had the personal qualities appropriate to his task. He was very interested in learning and showed ability in understanding since his early youth. He did not confine himself to the study at home, but travelled abroad in search of knowledge, and this widened his mind and his education. His own devotion to the Qur'ān and the Sunna gave a force of sincerity to his arguments which was to prove unanswerable by his opponents and to exert a profound appeal on the common people.

It was as a reformer that the Shaykh presented himself, and not as the charismatic leader of a new or revolutionary interpretation of Islam. In most respects his written works confirm the basic Ḥanbalī position, particularly that of Ibn-Taymiyya, on the questions to which they are addressed. But, it is characteristic of his attitude that he would give no servile acceptance to any statements of the 'ulamā' which did not have the clear support of the two basic sources of the religion. However, though the doctrines he promulgated could not be regarded as new in Islam, the people to whom

he preached had until then not heard them so authoritatively expounded by one from amongst themselves. Unlike some fundamentalist reformers, the Shaykh did not envisage a nostalgic re-creation of the life of Medina or Mecca of the Prophet, but placed the principles which he advocated firmly within the context of the life of the people of the region: though these were to restore Islam to early purity, they never sought to produce a society that would have been a picturesque archaism in the contemporary world. This sense of reality, too, must have had its appeal to the first adherents of the movement.

It cannot be claimed that Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb occupies a prominent place in the history of Ḥanbalī thought, and the most noticeable quality of his works is the depth of conviction and sincerity with which he tried to revive the traditional orthodoxies. From this emerged his uncompromising attitude towards his adversaries, and the steadfastness with which he endured the bitterness and trials of conflict in pursuit of the truth as he saw it. The success of his movement produced in Central Arabia a political unity such as the region had seldom known in the course of its history, with tribal differences submerged under an identity of belief; and once its aims had been realized there was produced here a security and prosperity unknown in the past. Moreover, the way in which it focused the attention on the basic principles of Islam and advanced its own arguments in their defense stimulated thought on such religious matters among a

people who had, in many instances, let their faith decline into indifference and crude superstitions; and in this respect it can be seen as providing an impetus to education as a whole.

The example of Wahhābīsm was to encourage reformers of similar views in many various sections of the Islamic world, and while none was to achieve the success of the original, each contributed in some measures to re-awakening thought and discussion on matters which had passed out of the realm of controversy. Also, by their rejection of servile adherence to conventional attitudes and practices and their insistence on the primacy of the basic sources of the religion, the Wahhābīs forced a re-examination of doctrine on the contemporary expounders of the faith, who could no longer take shelter in doctrines of previous scholars. Even when the reaction to it was critical, or even hostile, the influence exerted by the movement was to prove fruitful in this respect, and it has remained one of the seminal forces of modern Islam.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Unpublished Works:

Abū-Buṭayn, ʻAbd-Allāh,

20 ff.; 9½" x 6½" (7½" x 4½"); 22 lines; heavy, white glazed paper; medium, ordinary naskh; unbound and untrimmed; copied in 1293 by Muḥammad aṣ-Ṣaqʻabī:
al-Intiṣār li-Ḥizb Allāh al-Muwaḥḥidīn wa-r-Radd ʻalā l-Mujādil ʻan al-Mushrikīn.

___ 18 ff.; 9½" x 6½" (7½" x 4½"); 24 lines; white glazed paper of medium weight; waterstained; small, casual naskh; unbound and untrimmed; copied in 1273. The name of the copyist is not given:
Taʼsīs at-Taqdīs fī Kashf Talbīs Dāwūd Ibn-Jirjīs.

Both manuscripts are in my private possession.

Anonymous,

Kayf Kān Ẓuhūr Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad Ibn-ʻAbd-al-Wahhāb, Bibliothique Nationale, No. 6061.

Bari, M.A.,

A Comparative Study of the Early Wahhābī Doctrines and Contemporary Reform Movements in Indian Islam, Ph.D. thesis, Oxford University, 1953.

el-Batrik, A.H.,

Turkish and Egyptian Rule in Arabia (1810-1841), Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1947.

al-Fākhirī, Muḥammad,

al-Fākhirī's work is untitled. It records the events in Najd between the years 850-1288/1446-1871. The copy consulted here is a photo copy of the original manuscript of 70 ff. which is in the private library of Muḥammad Ibn-Ḥamad al-ʻUmarī in Riyadh.

Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Muḥammad,

Aḥkām Tamannī l-Mawt.

__ Ḥukm al-Ghība wa-n-Namīma.

__ Ḥukm Katm al-Ghayẓ wa-l-Ḥilm.

These three works are in Leyden Library, Or. 2497.

__ Majmū' al-Ḥadīth 'alā Abwāb al-Fiqh,
al-Maktaba s-Su'ūdiyya-Riyadh - No. 186/86.
48 ff.; 9½" x 6½" (7¼" x 5"); 30-32 lines varying; heavy, white glazed paper; small poor naskh, bound, untrimmed; copied in 1197 by Muḥammad Ibn-Sayf Ibn-Khamīs:

__ Mukhtaṣar al-Hady an-Nabawī. This manuscript is in my private possession.

Ibn-'Afāliq, Muḥammad,
Tahakkum al-Muqallidīn bi-man Idda'ā Tajdīd ad-Dīn, Köneglichen Bibliothik zur Berlin, No. 2157.

Ibn-Bassām, Muḥammad,
ad-Durr al-Fākhir fī Akhbār al-'Arab al-Awākhir, British Museum, Add. 7358.

Ibn-Bishr, 'Uthmān,
'Unwān al-Majd fī Ta'rikh Najd, British Museum, Or. 7718.

Ibn-Ḥumayd, Muḥammad,
as-Suḥub al-Wābila 'alā Ḍarā'iḥ al-Ḥanābila, a manuscript in the private library of Sayyid Ḥusayn Naṣīf in Jidda.

Ibn-Nāṣir, 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān,
'Unwān as-Sa'd wa-l-Majd fī-mā Stuzrif fī Akhbār al-Ḥijāz wa Najd, manuscript, photostatic copy in possession of the Arabian American Oil Co.,

Ibn-Ruzyaq, Ḥamīd,
aṣ-Ṣaḥīfa l-'Adnāniyya, British Museum, Or. 6569.

Ibn-Sanad, 'Uthmān,
Sabā'ik al-'Asjad fī Akhbār Aḥmad Najl Rizq al-As'ad, British Museum, Or. 7565.

Juḥāf, Luṭf-Allāh,

Durar Nuḥūr al-Ḥūr al-'Īn bi-Sīrat al-Imam al-Manṣūr wa A'yān Dawlati-hi l-Mayāmīn, a microfilm - taken from a manuscript in the library of Ta'iz No. 61 - in possession of Sayyid 'And-Allāh Ḥāmid al-Ḥuyayd.

Nashshabah, Hisham,

Islam and Nationalism in the Arab World: a selected and annotated bibliography, Master thesis, McGill University, Montreal, 1955.

Rentz, G.,

Muḥammad Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb (1703/04-1792) and the Beginning of Unitarian Empire in Arabia, Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1948.

Sha'afy, Muḥammad,

The First Sa'ūdi State in Arabia (with special reference to its administrative, military and economic features) in the Light of Unpublished Materials from Arabic and European Sources, Ph.D. thesis, University of Leeds, 1967.

as-Suwaydī, 'Alī,

al-Mishkāt al-Muḍī'a, Köneglichen Bibliothik zur Berlin, No. 2156.

al-'Umarī, Yāsīn,

ad-Durr al-Maknūn fī Ma'āthir al-Māḍiya min al-Qurūn, British Museum, Add. 23, 312-3.

B. Printed Works:

al-'Abdalī, Aḥmad,

Hadiyyat az-Zanan fī Akhbār Mulūk Laḥj wa 'Adan, Cairo, 1351/1932.

'Abd-al-Qādir, Muḥammad,
Tuḥfat al-Mustafīd bi-Ta'rīkh al-Aḥsā' fī l-Qadīm wa-l-Jadīd, ed. by Ḥamad al-Jāsir, 2 vols., Riyadh, 1379/1960.

Abū-Buṭayn, 'Abd-Allāh,
Rasā'il wa Fatāwī, MRMN, II, pt. III, pp. 96-257; IV, pp. 466-583.

Abū-Dāwūd, Sulaymān Ibn-al-Ash'ath,
Sunan Abī-Dāwūd, ed. by Muḥammad 'Abd-al-Ḥamīd, 4 vols., 2nd edition, Cairo, 1369-70/1950-51.

Abū-Ḥākima, Aḥmad,
History of Eastern Arabia (1750-1800), Beirut, 1963.

Abū-Ṭāmī, Aḥmad,
ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb: 'Aqīdatu-hu s-Salafiyya wa Da'watu-hu l-Iṣlāḥiyya wa Thanā' al-'Ulamā' 'alay-hi, ed. by 'Alī Ṣubḥ al-Madanī, Cairo, 1383/1963.

Abū-Zahra, Muḥammad,
Aḥmad Ibn-Ḥanbal: Ḥayātu-hu wa 'Aṣru-hu, Ārā'u-hu wa Fiqhu-hu, Cairo, 1367/1947.
___ Ibn-Taymiyya: Ḥayātu-hu wa 'Aṣru-hu, Ārā'u-hu wa Fiqhu-hu, Cairo, 1371/1952.
___ al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyya, Cairo, 1365/1945.

al-'Ajlānī, Munīr,
Ta'rīkh al-Bilād al-'Arabiyya s-Su'ūdiyya, Beirut, 1385/1965.

al-Ālūsī, Maḥmūd Shukrī,
Ta'rīkh Najd, ed. by Muḥammad Bahjat al-Atharī, Cairo, 1343/1924.

Ameer 'Alī,
The Spirit of Islam, London, 1923.

al-'Āmilī, Muḥsin,
Kashf al-Irtiyāb fī Atbā' Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Damascus, 1346/1927.

Amīn, Aḥmad,
Zu'amā' al-Iṣlāḥ fī l-'Aṣr al-Ḥadīth, Cairo, 1368/1948.

Anonymous,
"Min Ta'rīkh al-Aḥsā'", al-'Arab, VII (1387), pp. 601-10.

Antonius, G.,
The Arab Awakening: the Story of the Arab National Movement, London, 1938.

Arnold, T.W.,
The Preaching of Islam, London, 1913.

'Attār, Aḥmad,
Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Cairo, 1362/1943.

'Azzāwī, 'Abbās,
Ta'rīkh al-'Irāq Bayn Iḥtilālayn, 6 vols., Baghdad, 1373/1954.

Bethmann, E.W.,
Bridge to Islam, London, 1953.

Blunt, A.,
A Pilgrimage to Najd, London, 1871.

Bosworth, C.E.,
The Islamic Dynasties, Edinburgh, 1967.

Brockelmann,C.,
Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur, 2 vols., 2nd edition, Leiden, 1943-49; Supplement, 3 vols., Leiden, 1937-42.

___ History of the Islamic Peoples, tr. into English by T. Carmichael and M. Perlmann, 3d edition, New York, 1960.

Brydges, H.J.,
An Account of His Majesty's Mission to the Court of Persia in the Years 1807-11. To Which is Appended a Brief History of the Wahaubys, 2 vols., London, 1834.

al-Buhūtī, Manṣūr,
ar-Rawḍ al-Murbi' Shark Zād al-Mustaqni', ed. by Aḥmad and 'Alī Muḥammad Shākir, Cairo, n.d.

al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad Ibn-Ismā'īl,
al-Jāmi' aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ, ed. by M. Ludolf Krehl and Th. W. Juynaboll, 4 vols., Leiden, 1862-1908.

Burckhardt, J.L.,
Notes on the Bedouins and Wahābys, 2 vols., London, 1831.
___ Travels in Arabia, London, 1829.

Cash, W.W.,
The Expansion of Islam, London, 1928.

Cheesman, R.E.,
In Unknown Arabia, London, 1926.

Chodzko, A.,
"Le Déisme des Wahhabis expliqué par eux-mêmes", Journal asiatique, IX (4 ème ser., 1848), pp. 168-186.

Corancez, L.A.,
Histoire des Wahabis depuis leur origine jusqu'à la fin de 1809, Paris, 1810.

Crichton, A.,
History of Arabia: Ancient and Modern, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1833.

Daḥlān, Aḥmad Zaynī,
al-Futūḥāt al-Islāmiyya Ba'd Muḍī l-Futūḥāt an-Nabawiyya, 2 vols., Mecca, 1302/1884.
___ Kitāb ad-Durar as-Saniyya fī r-Radd 'alā l-Wahhābiyya, Cairo, 1302/1884.
___ Khulāṣat al-Kalām fī Bayān Umarā' al-Balad al-Ḥarām min Zaman an-Nabī 'alay-hi ṣ-Ṣalāt wa-s-Salām ilā Waqti-nā Hādhā bi-t-Tamām, Cairo, 1305/1887.

ad-Dajawī, Yūsuf,
"at-Tawassul wa-l-Istighātha", Nūr al-Islām, III (1350), pp. 206-211; V (1350), pp. 248-357.
___ "Tawḥīd al-Ulūhiyya wa Tawḥīd ar-Rubūbiyya", Nūr al-Islām, IV (1352), pp. 209-26.

Dayrānī, Ibrāhīm,
Kitāb Miṣbāḥ as-Sārī wa Nuzhat al-Qāri', Beirut, 1272/1855.

Dickson, H.R.,
The Arab of the Desert, London, 1949.

ad-Dimashqī, Mīkhā'īl,
Ta'rīkh Ḥawādith ash-Shām wa Lubnān, Beirut, 1330/1911.

Doughty, C.M.,
Travels in Arabia Deserta, 2 vols., London, 1936.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st edition, Leiden, 1913-34.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd edition, Leiden and London, 1960 (in progress).

al-Faqī, Muḥammad Ḥāmid,
Athar ad-Da'wa l-Wahhābiyya th-Thaqāfī wa-l-'Umrānī, Cairo, 1354/1935.
___ ed. al-Majmū'a l-'Ilmiyya s-Su'ūdiyya, Cairo, 1374/1954.

Fazlur Rahman,
Islam, London, 1966.

Fernau, F.W.,
Moslems on the March, London, 1955.

Freeman-Grenville,
The Muslim and Christian Calenders, London, 1963.

Gaury, Gerald de,
Rulers of Mecca, London, 1951.

Gharāybih, 'Abd-al-Karīm,
Muqaddimat Ta'rīkh al-'Arab al-Ḥadīth, Damascus, 1380/1960.

al-Ghazālī, Muḥammad,
'Aqīdat al-Muslim, Cairo, 1374/1954.

al-Ghaznawī, 'Abd-al-Wāḥid,
ed. Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd, Delhi, 1308/1890.

Gibb, H.A.R.,
Modern Trends in Islam, Chicago, 1947.
___ Mohammedanism: An Historical Survey, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1969.
___ Whither Islam? A Survey of Modern Movements in the Islamic World, London, 1932.

Goldziher, T.,
Muslim Studies, tr. into English by C.R. Barker and S.M. Stern, 2 vols., London, 1967, 1971.

al-Ḥaddād, 'Alawī'
Miṣbāḥ al-Anām wa Jalā' aẓ-Ẓalām fī Radd Shubuhāt al-Bid'ī n-Najdī alladhī Aḍall bi-hā l-'Awāmm, n.p., 1325/1907.

al-Ḥajjī, Sa'īd,
al-Kalām al-Muntaqā min-mā Yata'allaq bi-Kalimat at-Taqwā, ed. by Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā, Cairo, 1349/1930.

Ḥamza, Fu'ād,
al-Bilād al-'Arabiyya s-Su'ūdiyya, Mecca, 1355/1936.
___ Galb Jazīrat al-'Arab, Cairo, 1352/1933.

al-Ḥātam, 'Abd-Allāh,
ed. Khiyār mā Yultaqaṭ min ash-Shi'r an-Nabaṭ, Vols. I, 2nd edition, Damascus, 1387/1967.

al-Ḥaydarī, Ibrāhīm,
'Unwān al-Majd fī Bayān Aḥwāl Baghdād wa-l-Baṣra wa Najd, Baghdad, 1382/1962.

Hitti, P.K.,
History of the Arabs, 3d edition, London, 1943.

Hogarth, D.G.,
Arabia, Oxford, 1922.
___ The Penetration of Arabia, New York, 1904.

Holt, P.M.,

Egypt and the Fertile Crescent 1516-1922, London, 1966.

___ The Mahdist State in the Sudan 1881-1898, 2nd edition, London, 1970.

Hourani,A.,

Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age 1798-1939, London, 1962.

al-Hulwānī, Amīn,

Mukhtaṣar Ta'rīkh ash-Shaykh 'Uthmān Ibn-Sanad al-Musammā bi-Maṭālī' as-Su'ūd bi-Ṭayyib Akhbār al-Wālī Dāwūd, Bombay, 1304/1886.

al-Ḥuqayl, Ḥamad,

Kanz al-Ansāb wa Majma' al-Ādāb, Beirut, 1387/1967.

Ibn-'Abd-Allāh, Sulaymān,

Awthaq 'Urā l-Īmān, M.T.N., pp. 178-91.

___ Ḥukm Muwālāt Ahl ash-Shirk, M.T.N., pp. 192-208.

___ Kitāb at-Tawḍīḥ 'an Tawḥīd al-Khallāq fī Jawāb Ahl al-'Irāq wa Tadhkirat Ulī l-Albāb fī Ṭarīqat ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, n.p., 1319/1901.

Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, 'Abd-Allāh Ibn-Muḥammad,

Jawāb Ahl as-Sunna fī Naqḍ Kalām ash-Shī'a wa-z-Zaydiyya, MRMN, IV, pp. 47-222.

___ Mukhtaṣar Sīrat ar-Rasūl, Beirut, 1387/1967.

___ al-Kalimāt an-Nāfi'a fī l-Mukaffirāt al-Wāqi'a, M.T.N., pp. 229-90.

___ Rasā'il wa Fatāwī, MRMN, I, pp. 48-317.

___ Risala, Hadiyya, pp. 27-38.

Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Muḥammad,

Ādāb al-Mashy ilā ṣ-Ṣalāt, Cairo, n.d.

___ Faḍl al-Islām, MḤN, pp. 244-57.

___ Kashf ash-Shubuhāt 'an at-Tawḥīd, MRS, pp. 118-44.

___ Kitāb al-Kabā'ir, MḤN, pp. 258-311.

___ Kitāb at-Tawḥīd alladhī huwa Ḥaqq Allāh 'alā l-'Abīd, ed. by Muḥammad Munīr, 2nd edition, Cairo, 1346/1927.

___ al-Khuṭab al-Minbariyya, Mecca, n.d.
___ Ma'nā ṭ-Ṭāghūt wa Ru'ūs Anwā'i-hi, M.T.N., pp.122-4.
___ al-Masā'il al-Khams al-Wājib Ma'rifatu-hā, MRMN, IV, pp. 8-12.
___ Masā'il al-Jāhiliyya, M.T.N., pp. 94-103.
___ Mufīd al-Mustafīd fī Kufr Tārik at-Tawḥīd, ed. by 'Abd-al-'Azīz Āl-ash-Shaykh, Cairo, 1373/1954.
___ Mukhtaṣar al-Inṣāf wa-sh-Sharḥ al-Kabīr, ed. by Muḥibb-ad-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, Cairo, n.d.
___ Mukhtaṣar Sīrat ar-Rasūl, ed. by Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Faqī, Cairo, 1375/1956.
___ Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn bi-Aḥādīth Khātam al-Mursalīn, MHN, pp. 311-444.
___ Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā', published as an introduction to Mukhtaṣar Sīrat ar-Rasūl by Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Faqī, pp. 1-35.
___ Rasā'il wa Ajwiba (letters and answers to various questions), Rawḍa, I, pp. 95-221.
___ Risāla fī sh-Shahādatayn, MRMN, IV, pp. 24-32.
___ Sittat Mawāḍi' Manqūla min as-Sīra n-Nabawiyya, M.T.N., pp. 103-10.
___ Sittat Uṣūl 'Aẓima Mufīda, M.T.N., pp. 138-40.
___ Shurūt aṣ-Ṣalāt, MRS, pp. 17-25.
___ at-Tafsīr 'alā Ba'ḍ Suwar al-Qur'ān, Rawḍa, I,
___ Tafsīr Kalimat at-Tawḥīd, MRMN, IV, pp. 15-23.
___ Talqīn Uṣul al-'Aqīda li-l-'Āmma, M.T.N., pp. 118-21.
___ Uṣūl al-Īmān, MHN, pp. 210-39.
___ al-Uṣūl ath-Thalātha, MRS, pp. 5-16.

Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Sulaymān,
aṣ-Ṣawā'iq al-Ilāhiyya fī r-Radd 'alā l-Wahhābiyya, Bombay, 1306/1888.

Ibn-al-Athīr, 'Izz-ad-Dīn,
al-Kāmil fī t-Ta'rīkh, vol. IX, Leiden, 1863.

Ibn-Bishr, ʻUthmān,
ʻUnwān al-Majd fī Tārīkh Najd, Beirut, 1387/1967.

Ibn-Fayrūz, Muḥammad,
ar-Risala l-Marḍiyya fī r-Radd ʻalā l-Wahhābiyya, Bombay, 1307/1889.

Ibn-Ghannām, Ḥusayn,
Taʼrīkh Najd al-Musammā: Rawḍat al-Afkār wa-l-Afhām li-Murtād Ḥāl al-Imām wa Taʻdād Ghazawāt Dhawī l-Islām, 2 vols., Cairo, 1368/1949.

Ibn-Ḥanbal, Aḥmad,
al-Musnad, ed. by Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir, 12 vols., 3d edition, Cairo, 1368-72/1949-53.

Ibn-Ḥasan, ʻAbd-al-Laṭīf Ibn-ʻAbd-ar-Raḥmān,
Dalāʼil ar-Rusūkh fī r-Radd ʻalā l-Manfūkh, 2nd edition, Cairo, 1382/1962.
___ Miṣbāḥ aẓ-Ẓalām fī r-Radd ʻalā man Kadhab ʻalā sh-Shaykh al-Imām wa Nasaba-hu ilā Takfīr Ahl al-Īmān wa-l-Islām, Bombay, n.d.
___ Rasāʼil wa Fatāwī, MRMN, I, pp. 408-24; III, pp.1-455.

Ibn-Ḥasan, ʻAbd-ar-Raḥmān,
Bayān al-Ḥujja fī r-Radd ʻalā l-Lujja, MRMN, IV, pp. 228-85.
___ Bayān Kalima t at-Tawḥīd wa-r-Radd ʻalā l-Kishmīrī ʻAbd-al-Maḥmūd, MRMN, IV, pp. 319-64.
___ Fatḥ al-Majīd: Sharḥ Kitāb at-Tawḥīd, Cairo, 1347/1928.
___ Khams Rasāʼil, M.T.N., pp. 142-77.
___ al-Mawrid al-ʻAdhb az-Zulāl fī Kashf Shubah Ahl aḍ-Ḍalāl, MRMN, IV, pp. 287-318.
___ Qurrat ʻUyūn al-Muwaḥḥidīn fī Taḥqīq Daʻwat al-Anbiyāʼ wa-l-Mursalīn, Cairo, 1345/1926.
___ Rasāʼil wa Fatāwī, MRMN, II, pt. I, pp. 1-136; pt. II, pp. 1-96; IV, pp. 404-30.

Ibn-Hishām,

as-Sīra n-Nabawiyya, ed. by Muṣṭafā s-Saqqā et al., 2 vols., 2nd edition, Cairo, 1375/1955.

Ibn-Īsā, Ibrāhīm,

'Iqd ad-Durar fī-mā Waqa' fī Najd min al-Ḥawādith wa-l-Ibar fī Awākhir al-Qarn ath-Thālith 'Ashar wa Awwal ar-Rābi' 'Ashar, published as a supplement to Abū-Buṭayn edition of the 'Unwān, Cairo, 1373/1953.

___ Ta'rīkh Ba'ḍ al-Ḥawādith al-Wāqi'a fī Najd wa Wafayāt Ba'ḍ al-A'yān wa Ansābi-him wa Binā' Ba'ḍ al-Buldān, ed. by Ḥamad al-Jāsir, Riyadh, 1386/1966.

Ibn-Iyās, Muḥammad Ibn-Aḥmad,

Badā'i' az-Zuhūr fī Waqā'i' ad-Duhūr, vol. V, ed. by Muḥammad Muṣṭafā, 2nd edition, Cairo, 1380/1961.

Ibn-Khaldūn, 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān,

Kitāb al-'Ibar wa Dīwān al-Mubtada' wa-l-Khabar, vol. IV, Cairo, 1287/1870.

Ibn-La'būn, Ḥamad,

Ta'rīkh Ibn-La'būn, Mecca, 1357/1938.

Ibn-Mu'ammar, Ḥamad,

al-Fawākih al-'Idhāb fī r-Radd 'alā man lam Yuḥakkim as-Sunna wa-l-Kitāb, Hadiyya, pp. 39-71.

___ Rasā'il wa Fatāwī, MRMN, I, pp. 526-93; II, pt. II, pp. 1-94; IV, pp. 592-659.

Ibn-al-Muqarrab, 'Alī,

Dīwān Ibn-al-Muqarrab, ed. by 'Abd-al-Fattāḥ al-Ḥilw, Cairo, 1383/1963.

Ibn-Qā'id, 'Uthmān,

Najat al-Khalaf fī 'Tiqād as-Salaf, Damascus, 1350/1931.

Ibn-Qayyim, Muḥammad Ibn-Abī-Bakr,

A'lām al-Muwaqqi'īn, ed. by Muḥammad 'Abd-al-Ḥamīd, 4 vols., Cairo, 1374/1955.

Ibn-Suḥmān, Sulaymān,

al-Asinna l-Ḥidād fī Radd Shubuhāt ʻAlawī l-Ḥaddād, 2nd edition, Riyadh, 1376/1956.

___ aḍ-Ḍiyāʼ ash-Shāriq fī Radd Shubuhāt al-Mādhiq al-Māriq, 2nd edition, Riyadh, 1376/1957.

___ ed. al-Hadiyya s-Saniyya wa-t-Tuḥfa l-Wahhābiyya n-Najdiyya, n.p., n.d.

___ Irshād aṭ-Ṭālib ilā Ahamm al-Maṭālib, Cairo, 1340/1921.

___ Kashf Ghayāhib aẓ-Ẓalām ʻan Jalāʼ Awhām Jalāʼ al-Awhām, 2nd edition, Riyadh, 1376/1956.

___ Kashf Shubuhāt ʻAbd-al-Karīm al-Baghdādī, 2nd edition, Riyadh, 1377/1957.

___ Minhāj Ahl al-Ḥaqq wa-l-Ittibāʻ, Cairo, 1340/1921.

___ aṣ-Ṣawāʻiq al-Mursala sh-Shihābiyya ʻalā sh-Shubah ad-Dāḥiḍa sh-Shāmiyya, 2nd edition, Riyadh, 1376/1956.

___ Tabriʼat ash-Shaykhayn min Tazwīr Ahl al-Kadhib wa-l-Mayn, 2nd edition, Riyadh, 1377/1357.

Ibn-Taymiyya, Aḥmad Ibn-ʻAbd-al-Ḥalīm,

al-Ḥisba fī l-Islām, Majmūʻ, pp. 229-310.

___ Maʻārij al-Wuṣūl, Majmūʻ, pp. 181-214.

___ Risālat al-ʻUbūdiyya, Majmūʻ, pp. 1-65.

___ Risālat al-Wāsiṭa, Majmūʻ, pp. 66-80.

___ Ziyārat al-Qubūr, Majmuʻ, pp. 150-180.

al-ʻĪsā, Muqbil,

"Jawānib min Ḥayāt ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Ibn-ʻAbd-al-Wahhāb", al-ʻArab, IX (1390), pp. 859-64.

al-ʻIṣāmī, Ḥusayn Ibn-ʻAbd-al-Malik,

Simṭ an-Nujūm al-ʻAwālī fī Anbāʼ al-Awāʼil wa-t-Tawālī, 4 vols., Cairo, 1380/1960.

Ismāʻīl Pāshā,

Iḍāḥ al-Maknūn fī dh-Dhayl ʻalā Kashf aẓ-Ẓunūn ʻan Asāmī l-Kutub wa-l-Funūn, 2 vols., Istanbul, 1364-6/1945-7.

al-Jabartī, ʿAbd-ar-Raḥmān,
ʿAjāʾib al-Āthār fī t-Tarājim wa-l-Akhbār, 4 vols., Būlāq, 1287/1879-80.

al-Jāsir, Ḥamad,
Madīnat ar-Riyāḍ ʿAbr Aṭwār at-Taʾrīkh, Riyadh, 1386/1966.
___ "Muʾrikhū Najd", Majallat al-Jāmiʿa - University of Riyadh -, III (1379), pp. 39-49.

Kaḥḥāla, ʿUmar,
Muʿjam al-Muʾallifīn, 6 vols., Damascus, 1378/1958.

al-Kasm, Muḥammad,
al-Aqwāl al-Marḍiyya fī r-Radd ʿalā l-Wāhhabiyya, Cairo, 1319/1901.

al-Kayyālī, Muḥammad,
Naṣīḥa Jalīla, Aleppo, 1351/1932.

al-Khālidī, Dāwūd,
Ashadd al-Jihād fī Ibṭāl Daʿwā l-Ijtihād, Bombay, 1304/1886.
___ al-Minḥa l-Wahbiyya fī r-Radd ʿalā l-Wahhābiyya, Bombay, 1304/1886.
___ Ṣulḥ al-Ikhwān min Ahl al-Īmān wa Bayān ad-Din al-Qayyim fī Tabriʾat Ibn-Taymiyya wa Ibn al-Qayyim, Bombay, 1306/1888.

Khalīfa, Ḥajjī,
Kashf aẓ-Ẓunūn ʿan Asāmī l-Kutub wa-l-Funūn, 2 vols., Istanbul, 1360-2/1941-3.

Khan, Muʿīn-ad-Dīn Aḥmad,
"A Diplomat's Report on Wahhabism of Arabia", Islamic Studies, VII (1968), pp. 33-46.

Khan, Muḥammad Ṣiddīq Ḥasan,
Abjad al-ʿUlūm, 3 vols., Bhopal, 1878-9.

al-Khaṭīb, ʿAbd-al-Karīm,
Muḥammad Ibn-ʿAbd-al-Wahhāb: al-ʿAql al-Ḥurr wa-l-Qalb as-Salīm, Cairo, 1379/1959.

Khaz'al, Ḥusayn,
Ḥayāt ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Beirut, 1388/1968.

al-Khuwayṭir, 'Abd-al-'Azīz,
'Uthmān Ibn-Bishr: Manhaju-hu wa Maṣādiru-hu, Riyadh, 1390/1970.

Kurd, Muḥammad 'Alī,
al-Qadīm wa-l-Ḥadīth, Cairo, 1343/1924.

Lammens, H.,
Islam: Beliefs and Institutions, tr. into English by Sir Denison Ross, London, 1929.

Laoust, H.,
"Aḥmad Ibn-Ḥanbal", EI^2.
___ Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Taḳī-d-Din Aḥmad b. Taimiyya, Cairo, 1939.
___ "Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb", EI^2.

Lewis, B.,
"Some observations on the Significance of Heresy in the History of Islam", Studia Islamica, I (1953), pp. 43-63.

Longrigg, S.H.,
Four Centuries of Modern Iraq, Oxford, 1925.

Mackdonald, D.B.,
"Bid'a", EI^1.
___ Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory, New York, 1903.

al-Madanī, 'Alī Ṣubḥ,
ed. Majmū'at ar-Rasā'il as-Su'ūdiyya, Cairo, 1380/1961.

Maghniyya, Muḥammad Jawād,
Hādhihi Hiya l-Wahhābiyya, Beirut, 1384/1964.

al-Maḥjūb, 'Umar,
Risāla fī r-Radd 'alā l-Wahhābiyya, Tunis, 1327/1909.

Majmū', ed. at the expense of 'Īsā Ibn-Rumayḥ, Cairo, 1340/1921.

Majmū'at ar-Rasā'il wa-l-Masā'il an-Najdiyya, 4 vols. (in 3) Cairo, 1344-9/1925-30.

Malcolm, J.,
The History of Persia from the Early Period to the Present Time, 2 vols., London, 1815.

al-Maqdisī, 'Abd-al-Ghanī,
'Umdat al-Aḥkām min Kalām Khayr al-Anām, MḤN, pp. 95-208.

Margoliouth, D.S.,
The Early Development of Muhammadanism, London, 1914.
___ "Wahhabīs", Encyclopaedia of Religions and Ethics.
___ "Wahhābīya", EI[1].

al-Mārik, Fahd,
Min Shiyam al-'Arab, 4 vols., 2nd edition, Beirut, 1383/1963.

Miles, S.B.,
The Countries and Tribes of the Persian Gulf, 2 vols., London, 1919.

al-Muḥibbī, Muḥammad,
Khulāṣat al-Athar fī A'yān al-Qarn al-Ḥādī 'Ashar, 4 vols., Cairo, 1284.

Musil, A.,
Northern Najd, New York, 1928.

Muslim, Ibn-al-Ḥajjāj,
al-Jāmi' as-Ṣaḥīḥ, 4 vols., Cairo, 1377/1957.

an-Nabhānī, Muhammad,
at-Tuḥfa n-Nabhāniyya fī Ta'rīkh al-Jazīra l-'Arabiyya, Cairo, 1342/1923.

Nickolson, R.A.,
A Literary History of the Arabs, Cambridge, 1966.

Niebuhr, C.

Description de l'Arabie faite sur des observations propres et des avis recueillis dans les Lieux mêmes, Amsterdam, 1774.

___ Travels through Arabia and Other Countries in the East, tr. into English by R. Heron, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1792.

Palgrave, W.G.,

Narrative of a Year's Journey through Central and Eastern Arabia (1862-63), 2 vols., London, 1865.

Philby, S.J.

Arabia, London, 1930.

___ Arabia of the Wahhabis, London, 1928.

___ Arabian Days, London, 1943.

___ Arabian Jubilee, London, 1952.

___ Forty Years in the Wilderness, London,1957.

___ The Heart of Arabia, 2 vols., London, 1922.

___ Saudi Arabia, London, 1955.

___ "The Triumph of the Wahhabis", JCAS, XIII (1929), pp. 293-319.

Phoenix, A.

"A Brief Outline of the Wahhābī Movement", JCAS, XVII (1930), pp. 401-16.

al-Qaṣīmī, ʿAbd-Allāh,

al-Burūq an-Najdiyya fī ktisāḥ aẓ-Ẓulumāt ad-Dajawiyya, Cairo, 1350/1931.

___ aṣ-Ṣirāʿ Bayn al-Islām wa-l-Wathaniyya, 2 vols., Cairo, 1356/1937.

___ ath-Thawra l-Wahhābiyya, Cairo, 1354/1935.

Qur'ān, the Egyptian edition.

ar-Rāfiʿī, ʿAbd-ar-Raḥmān,

ʿAṣr Muḥammad ʿAlī, 3d edition, Cairo, 1370/1950-51.

ar-Rashīd, Ḍārī,

Nubdha Taʾrīkhiyya ʿan Najd, Riyadh, 1386/1966.

ar-Rayḥānī, Amīn,
Mulūk al-'Arab, 2 vols., Beirut, 1343-4/1924-5.
___ Ta'rīkh Najd al-Ḥadīth wa Mulḥaqāti-hi, Beirut, 1347/1928.

Raymond, J.,
Memoire sur l'origine des Wahabys, Cairo, 1925.

Rehatsek, E.,
"The History of the Wahhábys in Arabia and in India", JRAS, Bombay Branch, XIV (1878-80), pp. 274-401.

Rentz, G.,
"al-'Āriḍ", EI^2.
___ "al-Arab: Djazīrat", EI^2.

Riḍā, Muḥammad Rashīd,
ed. Majmū'at al-Ḥadīth an-Najdiyya, 2nd edition, Qatar, 1383/1963.
___ ed. Majmū'at at-Tawḥīd an-Najdiyya, Cairo, 1346/1927.
___ al-Wahhābiyyūn wa-l-Ḥijāz, Cairo, 1344/1925.

Robson, J.,
"Bid'a", EI^2.

Rousseau, J.L.,
Description du Pachalik de Bagdad, Paris, 1809.

Rubkī, Ḥasan,
Lam' ash-Shihāb fī Sīrat Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, ed. by Aḥmad Abū-Ḥākima, Beirut, 1387/1967.

Sacy, S. de,
"Observations sur les Wahhabites", Magazine Encyclopaedique, IV (1805), pp. 36-41.

Sa'īd, Amīn,
Sīrat al-Imām ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Ibn-'Abd-al-Wahhāb, Beirut, 1382/1962.
___ Ta'rīkh ad-Dawla s-Su'ūdiyya l-Ulā, 2 vols., Beirut, 1384/1964.

as-Sakhāwī, Shams-ad-Dīn,
ad-Ḍaw' al-Lāmi' li-Ahl al-Qarn at-Tāsi', vol. I, Cairo, 1353/1934.

as-Samhudī, 'Alī Ibn-'Abd-Allāh,
Wafā' al-Wafā' bi-Akhbār Dār al-Muṣṭafā, 2 vols., Cairo, 1326/1908.

aṣ-Ṣan'ānī, Muḥammad Ibn-Ismā'īl,
Taṭhīr al-I'tiqād 'an Adrān al-Ilḥād, Cairo, 1340/1921.

Schacht, J.,
An Introduction to Islamic Law, Oxford, 1964.

Sell, E.,
The Faith of Islam, 2nd edition, London, 1896.

ash-Shaṭṭī, Muḥammad,
al-Wasīṭ Bayn al-Īfrāṭ wa-t-Tafrīṭ, Damascus, 1340/1921.

ash-Shawkānī, Muḥammad,
al-Badr aṭ-Ṭāli' bi-Maḥāsin man Ba'd al-Qarn at-Tāsi', 2 vols., Cairo, 1348/1929.

Shaykhū, L.,
"Ḥawl Jazīrat al-'Arab", al-Mashriq, XIII (1920), pp. 24-35, 107-17, 178-84, 282-87, 425-9.

ash-Shayyāl, Jamāl-ad-Dīn,
Muḥāḍarāt 'an al-Ḥarakāt al-Islāḥiyya wa Marākiz ath-Thaqāfa fī sh-Sharq al-Islāmī, Cairo, 1377/1757.

Smith, W.C.,
Islam in Modern History, 3d edition, New York, 1963.

Stoddard, L.,
The New World of Islam, London, 1921.

ath-Tha'ālibī, Muḥammad Ibn-Ḥasan,
al-Fikr as-Sāmī fī Ta'rīkh al-Fiqh al-Islāmī, 4 vols., Rabat, 1345/1926.

Thatcher, G.W., "Wahhābīs", Encyclopaedia Britannica.

at-Tirmithī, Muḥammad Ibn-'Īsā,
Ṣaḥīḥ at-Tirmithī bi-Sharḥ al-Imām Ibn-al-'Arabī l-Mālikī, 13 vols. (in 7), Cairo, 1350-3/1931-4.

Tritton, A.S.,
Islam: Belief and Practice, 3d edition, London, 1954.

al-'Ukbarī, 'Ubayd-Allāh Ibn-Muḥammad,
Kitāb ash-Sharḥ wa-l-Ibāna 'alā Uṣūl as-Sunna wa-d-Diyāna, ed. by H. Laoust, Damascus, 1958.

al-'Uthaymīn, Muḥammad,
Fatḥ Rabb al-Bariyya bi-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥamawiyya, Cairo, 1380/1960.

Wahba , Ḥāfiẓ,
Arabian Days, London, 1964.
___ Jazīrat al-'Arab fī l-Qarn al-'Ishrīn, Cairo, 1365/1946.
___ "Wahhabism in Arabia: Past and Present", JRCAS, XVI (1929), pp. 458-67.

Waring, E.S.,
A Tour to Sheeraz, London, 1807.

Watt, W.M.,
Islamic Philosophy and Theology, Edinburgh, 1962.
___ Muslim Intellectual, Edinburgh, 1962.

Wellsted, J.R.,
Travels in Arabia, 2 vols., London, 1838.

Winder, R.B.,
Saudi Arabia in the Nineteenth Century, London, 1965.

Zaydān, Jurgī,
Ta'rīkh Miṣr al-Ḥadīth, 2 vols., 2nd edition, Cairo, 1333/1914.

az-Zirikli, Khayr-ad-Din,
al-A'lam, 10 vols. (in 5), 2nd edition, Cairo, 1374-9/1954-9.

Zubara, Muhammad,
Nashr al-'Arf li-Nubala' al-Yaman Ba'd al-Alf, 2 vols., Cairo, 1376/1956.

Zwemer, S.M.,
Arabia: the Cradle of Islam, New York, 1929.
___ ed. The Mohammedan World of Today, New York, 1906.
___ "The Wahhabis: their Origin, History, Tenets and Influence", Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute, XXXIII (1901), pp. 311-30.