here to specify all conditions; but the opinions of all lawyers agree in this, that Calcutta and its dependencies are the Country of the Enemy (Dar ul-Harb).  

Hunter wrongly introduces Mawlā‘Abd al-Ḥayy as the nephew of Shāh ‘Abd al-Azīz.  

Whether Hunter is correct or not in attributing this fatwā to Shāh ‘Abd al-Ḥayy, it is indeed frequently quoted by the later writers as his.

If the original source had been consulted, the Majmū‘at al-Fatawā of Abū al-Ḥasanāt Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Iḥāyy of Lucknow would not have been referred to as the work of a scholar of the family of Shāh Wālī Allāh and Shāh ‘Abd al-Azīz.

To take another case, there were two other persons bearing the same name. One of them, Ḥabīb al-Rahmān ‘Uthmānī (d. 1929) was the sixth administrator (mubtamīm) of Dār al-‘Ulūm, Deoband. He has been mistaken for Ḥabīb al-Rahmān Lūdhiyānāvī (d. 1956) (pp. 187 and 274).

It is not surprising that a few minor mistakes such as those mentioned above should creep into a work of such huge proportions. That does not detract, however, from the fact that the author deserves acclaim of the historians of the freedom movement of India and Pakistan for having written so informative a work about a major religio-political movement of Muslim India in the twentieth century.

Safir Akhtar


This book is a wide-ranging and ambitious undertaking. It makes an attempt to trace the development of the relationship between Sufi masters and disciples in the Naqshbandī order among Indian Muslims since the emergence of this

---


2 Ibid., 104.
order in India in the 16th century until the modern period. Furthermore, in the first two chapters (pp. 1–54), the author deals with the development of this topic in classical Sufism outside the Indian subcontinent. It is only natural that these chapters cannot consist of an analysis of a corpus of primary sources; they represent a synthesis of research by other scholars.

Since the center of early Naqshbandi activity was in central Asia, Buehler starts his chapter on the Naqshbandiyyah in India (pp. 55–81) with a survey of that activity. In order to accomplish this task, he made use of the archives of the late Joseph Fletcher, preserved at Harvard University (p. 59, n. 100). The brief survey of the Naqshbandis in India after the advent of Muhammad al-Baqi bi-Allah (d. 1012/1603) revolves around the question of their influence on Mughul rulers and politics. Scholars of Indian Muslim history know that this is a well-known motif in Indo-Muslim studies since Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi’s classic study, *The Muslim Community of the Indo-Pakistan Subcontinent (610–1947)*. Buehler is aware of the problematic nature of the view which supports the decisive influence of the Naqshbandis on the development of the Mughul dynasty from the so-called heresy of Akbar (r. 93–1014/1555–1605) to the orthodoxy of Awrangzeb (r. 1068–1118/1658–1707) (see p. 75, n. 62); nevertheless, he seems to accept this view and explains away the weighty evidence to the contrary. Immediately after his description of the association between Akbar and the Chishtis, he says, without providing any evidence, that “the Naqshbandi-Mughal partnership bolstered the Islamic identity of the Mughal regime...” (p. 66). He is not moved from his position by the fact that emperor Shâh Jahân (r. 1037–1068/1628–1658) banished Adam Banûrî (d. 1053/1643), “an influential successor of Ahmad Sirhindî” (d. 1034/1624), to the Hijâz in 1642–43 (p. 71; the attribution of this action to Jahângir (r. 1014–1037/1605–1628) on 172 is a slip of the pen). In a similar vein, the author does not see any contradiction between the proscription of Sirhindî’s *Maktûbât* by Awrangzeb and his previous association with the Naqshbandis. In order to substantiate this, he says that “political issues required political responses, and spiritual issues required spiritual responses (p. 71). In this reviewer’s opinion, this is not a very helpful explanation of the issue.

The main part of the book starts with chapter 4 (pp. 82–97), in which Buehler treats genealogy as a source of authority among the Sufis. He discusses the nature of Sufi spiritual genealogy (*silsilah*) and makes a rather intriguing comparison between this and the *isnād* used in the sciences of *hadîth*, *tafsîr*, and *fiqh*. He argues that the Naqshbandî order reduced the importance of the so-called Uwaysî initiations (in which the spiritual authority of a Sufi derives form a mentor who lived in the distant past and not from a living *pir*) and forges a connection between this development and the well known “sobriety”
of the Naqshbandi order. This may be essentially correct, but seems to be overstated. Buehler himself quotes in his notes (p. 95, n. 41; cf. Friedmann, Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī, 28) a letter in which Sirhindī declared himself an Uwaysi whose spiritual mentor is God himself; he also mentions two 20th century Naqshbandis who had Uwaysi experiences (p. 95). In a book devoted to the Indian Naqshbandiyyah it does not seem reasonable to relegate an important idea of Sirhindī to a footnote and to contend that the order in general went in a different direction, especially when there is evidence to the contrary among Naqshbandis of recent times.

The most innovative part of the book deals with the Naqshbandiyyah in the British period. The author describes here the attempts by certain Naqshbandis to combat the British influences on Muslim lifestyle and demeanor (pp. 184–186). Chapter 9 in its entirety (pp. 190–223) is devoted to the activities of Jamāʿat ʿAlī (1841–1951). Concentrating his activities in the Punjab, he founded in 1904 the Anjuman-i Khuddām-i Sufiyyah and established a monthly journal entitled Risāla-yi Anwār-i Sufiyyah under the editorship of his associate Anwar ʿAlī. Buehler has put this primary source to effective use and has been able to analyze the thinking of Jamāʿat ʿAlī and the importance of propagating his views by means of a journal in addition to his travels and maintaining personal contact with disciples. He has described the role of the Risāla-yi Anwār-i Sufiyyah in combatting the shuddhī activities of the Arya Samaj in the 1920s. He has also shown how the political and social developments in the Panjab during the Second World War caused Jamāʿat ʿAlī to shift his political loyalties, to give his support to the Muslim League and even call its westernized leader Muhammad Ali Jinnah (d. 1948) “an intimate of God” (p. 217).

Disappointingly weak is the chapter 10 (pp. 224–233), dealing with “The role of the Naqshbandi Sufis in Pakistan”. Except for a brief passage describing how two presidents of Pakistan tried to identify themselves with religious shrines in order to legitimize their political power (pp. 231–232), the chapter fails to fulfill the expectations raised by its title.

The book concludes with 4 appendices describing Naqshbandī literary genres (pp. 234–259). The first genre is entitled maʿmūlāt and deals with Naqshbandī practices such as prayers, supplications, use of amulets and other matters. The second and the third appendices deal with Naqshbandī contemplation of the divine (murāqabah), while the fourth includes examples of Mujaddidi teaching certificates. The book also includes an extensive bibliography (pp. 260–284) and an index (pp. 285–312).

As I have said in the beginning, the book is an ambitious undertaking. The author attempted to trace his topic from classical Sufism to the 20th
century; this means that a considerable part of the book is necessarily based mainly on secondary material, though the author took care to add some references to primary sources on many issues. It is obvious that he wanted to produce a comprehensive book on a major topic rather than analyze in depth a defined literary corpus. In the view of this reviewer, the latter approach would have been preferable and would have saved the author from some questionable assertions discussed above. Nevertheless, this is a valuable book; especially the parts on modern Naqshbandi developments are most welcome.

Yohanan Friedmann


An amazing feature of the present age is the recent conversion of a number of prominent western intellectuals to Islam. One of the most active and zealous of these is the retired German diplomat, Murad Wilfried Hofmann (born 1931). A participant in nearly every important Islamic conference, meeting and convention, he is also a prolific writer, the most regular contributor to the *Muslim World Book Review* (UK), besides being the author of several significant books. In the introduction, Khurshid Ahmad compares this diary in importance to Muhammad Asad’s *The Road to Mecca*. From a literary standpoint, there is no comparison between the two. The dignified majestic prose of *The Road to Mecca* contrasts with this diary’s highly colloquial idiom, at times degenerating into slang. Hofmann’s style is racy, as if he is always in a hurry, rushing here and there.

The diary is not so much on Hofmann’s life as it gives his views on a variety of issues directly affecting Islam/Muslims. Even this episodic, seemingly disjointed style can be legitimate in the case of a diary if the experiences and views related combine to form a coherent pattern as they do here.

If this diary fails to touch the heart, as *The Road to Mecca* does so powerfully, it may be because traditional Islamic civilization was so much more intact in 1922 than today and placed that much more fertile material at Asad’s disposal.