

Epistemology of Disagreement (Ilm-ul-Ikhtilaf) in Islam: A Comparative Case Study of Ahmad Raza Khan Barelwi and Rashid Ahmad Gangohi

Hafiz Ghulam Ali

*Ph.D Research Scholar
Institute of Ethics and Social Philosophy
Munich School of Philosophy, Germany*

Abstract:

The extensive range of hermeneutic understanding of Islamic thoughts has flourished the formation and division of complex topology of sectarianism that includes the different understanding of two entities on particular proposition. Though, the disagreement between two epistemic peers ascribed by the differences of social, political, and religious association, and the rational disagreement is an integral part of Islamic teachings. The research studies compare the hermeneutic behaviour of two Islamic scholars: Ahmad Raza Khan Barelwi and Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, and apprehend the traditional theory of Murat ul Khilaf. Overall, result indicted the several epistemic rational and irrational disagreement among two epistemic colleagues and found the presence of traditional Islamic theory. However, the comparative analyses indicated the self-interest relation of two variables including the association of particular religious group. Moreover, the research paper does not propose any solution to the disagreement, despite it reflects the general behaviour of disagreement triggered by alter epistemic affiliation.

Key Words: Islam, Epistemic, Behaviour, Rational, Faith

Introduction

A difference of opinion among scholars is not a new idea; it is as old as human intellect. In contemporary world, the pluralistic

experience occurs almost everywhere in the world. This pluralism and diversity can be seen in languages, cultures, customs, world views, and religions. Thus, it is a natural way of human thinking. *Ikhtilaf*, which denotes the difference of opinions among Islamic scholars is recognized as natural phenomena.¹ Moreover, textual interpretation depends on context, and different perceptions by emerging from different social, economic, and cultural factors. Diversity in Islam and among Muslims scholars were not happened at the time of colonization or confrontation with modernity, it was further reformed when it was introduced beyond the land of Arabia. New places adjusted Islam according to their cultural and historical background.² Islamic Hermeneutics had a very huge history, it was started from 798(A.D) until today; many scholars worked to the contribution of *Ikhtilaf* literature. Epistemology of disagreement or *Ilm-ul-Ikhtilaf* has been used to examine and investigate the nature and structure of different school of thoughts within Islamic jurisprudence.³

Humans have different understanding due to their different social settings and levels. Scholars of *Ikhtilaf* literature began to recognize that diversity among intellectual is a natural phenomenon and divine blessing. According to the Hadith of Prophet Muhammad: "*Ikhtilaf ul ummati rahma*" Diversity is a blessing among *Ummah*.

The earliest books were compiled on disagreement among jurists' opinions, and later several theories were developed to analyse the nature of differences of opinions. There are two approaches to explain this condition; first approach is, theoretically, to explain the main causes of disagreement with reference to knowledge of *Hadith* and diversity of local usage of language and customs. The other approach, methodologically, seeks to identify different methods adopted by schools with reference to understand these differences with their logical and legal reasoning.⁴

Historical Background

Fatwa war is phenomena of late eighteen and early twentieth century found in sub-continental context. It was evolved and further promoted under the reformist movements after the short period of downfall of Mughal Empire and it heated up during the British Raj. Sectarian political and social activities can also be traced in various revival movements against the colonial empowerment, when most of the religious and social groups were trying to depict the picture of Islam in the light of *Quran*, *Sunna*, *Ijtihad* and *Taqleed*, including modernist and fundamentalist ideologies respectively.

India had a marginal variety of Islamic movements and parties during colonial period. Among them, there were two Islamic reformist groups—*Deobandi* and *Barelwi*. *Deobandi* and *Barelwi* had their religious, formal and informal, institutions where they offered religious teaching and learning seminars in Deoband and Bareilly respectively. The reformist movements, *Debandi* and *Bralvi*, emerged for renewal of Islam by Muhammad Qasim Nanotvi, Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, and Ahmad Raza Khan *Barelwi* respectively. Both *Deobandi* and *Barelwi* belong to *Hanafi* school of thought but they are different on their practices and some beliefs. Both of them are also different on their doctrinal interpretation of religious knowledge.⁵

Darul-uloom-Deoband Madrassa was established in 1866 in *Deoband*, it is a small town in western *Uttar Pardesh* in India. The name of *Deobandi* has been taken by the name of town where the deobandi movement originated. The structure of seminaries and curriculum was based on religious education with emphasis on Arabic language rather than cultural and local custom interpretations. It was basically a reactionary movement against British colonial order and for the Muslim community. The *Deobandi* movement aimed to protect Islam from non-Islamic and western elements because at that time Britishers were introducing several new systems in India. Thus, they

emphasized on the interpretation of Islam that would not be based on local and pre-Islamic characteristics.⁶

Theologically, they were semi-literalist and semi-purist to the traditions of *Shah Wali Allah*. They paid more attention to the return to Holy Quran and traditions of Prophet Muhammad, but unlike *Wahabis*, they were not pure fundamentalist rather they synthesized their theology with *Hanafi* School of law.⁷ They had not only blended *Hanafi* School with *Quran*, *Sunna* and thoughts of *Shah Wali Allah*, but they also tried to protect Islam teachings from local cultural elements. Moreover, the mystic elements as well as connection with Sufi orders have been dominated in their group. They, however, opposed to the cultural understanding of Sufism that included worship of saints and their graves.

On the other hand, the *Barelwi* movement was established in late nineteenth centuries in a small town, Bareilly, of Uttar Pradesh. The *Barelwi Madrassa Manzar-e-Islam* founded by Ahmad Raza Khan himself in 1904, it was not as much formalized and institutionalized as *Dar-ul-uloom Deoband*. After 1900 the *Barelwi* group became more popular in Public and it became *Ahl-e-Sunnat-Wa-Jammāt* (The group of prophetic traditions). The association of group was an active network of students, disciples, adherents (*Muqallid*), and followers of Ahmad Raza Khan.⁸

Theologically, *Barelwi* also relied on the interpretation of *Hanafi* School of Law, but their doctrinal descent included *Shah Wali Aallah* and his son *Shah Abdul Aziz*. There are significant differences on readings of *Hanafi* script among *Deobandi* and *barelwi*. *Barelwis* induced cultural and local element to their worldview that was strongly criticized by *Deobandis*.⁹ Additionally, they sought many divine qualities in the personality of Prophet Muhammad and conceived him as infinite and immortal human. Ahmad Raza Khan reformed (*Tajdid*) Islam on prophetic model and placed him on highest level. He devoted three figures to attain spiritual experience in life—to establish a relation with *Pir*, *Shaikh*, and Prophet.¹⁰

Similarly, both *Deobandis* and *Barelwis* have more or less same sources to reinterpret Islam. They also shared common time, space, culture, language, and custom, but they have lot of differences with one another. But the question is that if both groups shared similarities in many things, then how they could interpret Islam differently? This complex and intricate issue may be approached and discussed from many angles. However, in this paper an honest attempt has been made to comprehend it philosophically and theologically.

Ahmad Raza Khan *Barelwi*

The *Ahlat- Sunnat Wa Jammāt* movement was led and shaped by Ahmad Riza Khan *Barelwi* himself. He was born in well-learned *Pathan* family in Bareilly, 1856. His ancestors were attached with the military services of *Mughals* in late 18th century. But soon after, his grandfather left that services and became *faqih* and Sufi under the *Qadri* Sufi order. The reason behind the leave of military services was the need of time, as colonial Indian, it was less important to remain with military as a future career.¹¹ At the time, when he was born the revolt against the British was on the peak. His family did not take a part on any intervention during the freedom movement in 1857. The post-mutiny period was peaceful and it did not left any influence on his family. His father strengthen his relation with *Maulana Irshad Hussain, Maulana* was a Sunni spiritual mentor of Rampur State of India.¹²

The political atmosphere of 19th century was fluctuated among Muslim *Ulema*. *Ulema* believed that the reason behind the fall of Muslims is the dis-attachment with the faith. Therefore, it's time to go back to the origin to solve the present problem. The idea of preservation of Islam is still alive in local mosque in India and Pakistan. Derrida says that when reader approaches the text with the specific goal to achieve something, then it becomes goal rather than origin. The goals are vary from mind to mind. The different minds produce different world-views and discourses.

A number of religious and social movements were established short after the mutiny of 1857 to stabilize the Muslim condition. The earlier movement was founded at *Deoband* in 1860; it was a *Madrassa* which emphasized the personal accountability of Muslim's life to Allah with the Prophetic traditions and the commands of God. The teachings were formulated by Sufi and scholars of *Deobandi* School of thoughts. Another waves rose around 1870 by *Syed Ahmad Khan*, he established Anglo- American College in Aligarh with the aim to provide western and Islamic education to Indian Muslims. In the late 19th century another religious education institute founded at *Lucknow*, *Nadwat al Ulema*, this was another attempt to find a balance between traditional Islamic education and modern western curriculum.¹³

It was a time when he was growing up. He was well aware of the intellectual climate of his time. On the contrary to the above mentioned movements, the origin of his movement was not based on *Madrassa* but on Ahmad Raza Khan himself. The primary education he received from his father, *Mualana Naqi Ali Khan* (1831-1880). From 1880, The *Uelma* of his time in North India considered him as a gifted scholar, because he possessed strong rational knowledge such as mathematics, logic, and Islamic law.¹⁴

In social term, the followers of Ahmad Raza Khan associated with his movement were called *Ahl-e Sunnat Wa Jamaati*. At the earliest stage of his movement, the followers were landed elites in the town of U.P and countryside. Some were wealthy *Pirs*, and small number of government employ in Patna. Generally, they were elite Muslims (*Aashraf*), and they were economically stable. Their economy was based on agricultural land, trade, and teaching. In addition, some scholars for example Ahmad Raza enjoyed social benefits because of their forefather lineage. This was the social surroundings of Ahmad Raza. The elite sociological behavior correspond the hierarchical notion of religious authority in his life. This outlook allows him to think about the importance of

intercession. The religious education introduced by him enriches the Sufi dimension of his movement. The hierarchical model of Islam led him to establish the relationship of *Pir*, *Shaikh*, and Prophet.¹⁵

Rashid Ahmad Gangohi

Maulana Raashid Ahmad Gangohi was born North Indian district of *Gangoh*. He was a Sufi of Chishti order. He was associated with the *Madrassa Dar-ul- Deoband*, the *Madrassa* came into exist in 1866. Gangohi and Muhammad Qasim Nanotvi was the cofounder of *Madrassa Deoband*.¹⁶ Both were the disciple of *Haji Imdadullah*.¹⁷ He also studied *Hadith* literature under the *Shah Abdul Al-Gahni*.¹⁸

He completed the Sufi training in forty days and, then, returned to his land to eliminate the forbidden practices at the shrine of his ancestors.¹⁹ According to the other source, he was remained with his Sufi master *Haji Imdad ullah at Shamil* in 1857 during the mutinity of India.

Gangohi work deeply deals with the observations and his stance towards Sufism. For Gangohi, *Shria* and Sufism are same and inseparable from each another. Sufism is a part of *Shria*, Sufism is fundamentally internalization and intensification of the ethics of the *Shria*. But Sufis, according to him, has been interpreted with multifarious cultural practices. It should be practiced according to the principles of *Sharia*. For that reason, he firstly refined the Sufism from local elements. He proposed four kinds of *Fatawa* that are based on cultural practices.

The first of his *Fatawa* deals with the rituals that are connected with place and time. Reformist like *Wahabis* only accept location and time based rituals. These types of rituals include Hajj, and Prayer to a specific time, and place. He excluded other rituals that unfit with this logic. It includes the Cultural Sufi practices in South Asia, such as visiting Sufi *Shaikh* shrine and the carnival of saint's birth or death anniversary. He declares, such celebrations, and practices may be possible when

Muslims are in majority, but now it's corruption of time (*Fasa al Zaman*), and it also resembles to Hindu socio-religious practices. So there is a need to draw a line of demarcation between permissible and impermissible acts.²⁰

Furthermore, he responds to a question on the legality of death and birth celebrations. He writes that there is nothing wrong to celebrate birthday, and it is also not directly against the Islamic law. But it is a not a proper age to celebrate such rituals. Similar to death, it may not be possible to certain times and spaces, although it is strongly prohibited.²¹ *Deobandis* were formally against the cultural practices the reason was that it resembled with the Hindus and other non-Muslims practices. The basis of his *Fatawas* are to separate Muslim and non-Muslim in all respects.

He also drew a proper line between permissible and impermissible ritual gestures. He explains that only Mecca is the place of gesture. There is no other place to act anywhere as compare to Mecca. Here he also pointed out that these practices are creating disturbing "*Mushaba*" (resemblance) to local rituals. He calls a person *kafir*, if a person performs such *Mushaba* practices.

He writes, "Circulation (*Tawaf*) of the shrines of pious *sheikh* or the saints is *bida* (bad innovation) without a single doubt as it did not happen and did not find in Islamic history. But nowadays, the difference (*ikhtilaf*) is concerned if this *bida* is permissible or the prohibited. This was never happened in past, but now it became an issue of ethics (*ikhlaq*) that if it is allowed or prohibited, and this is a wrong or right *biddah*. In some doctrines of *fiqh*, it is consider permissible, but in the other part of *fiqh* there is no space for these practices, and also it resembles with the idol-worship. Moreover, legal norms specified *tawaf* only in the surroundings of *Bait Ullah* (House of God). And to make resemblance between *Bait Ullah* and shrine is bad innovation. But a person performs such rituals then he would out from the domain of Islam".²² polytheism.²³ He also criticized rituals with regards to distributing sacred food (*Tabarak*) at the tomb in specified time. Perhaps, one can distribute the food in an unappointed time and space. According to him, all non-Islamic cultural practices are *Haram*,

and strongly prohibited from God.²⁴ He criticized almost all the rituals that are connected with the *Barelwi* sect of Islam at that time. He considered *Barelwi* practices as bad innovation. It is not a part of Islam, and Sufism. The understanding of Sufism in mid-nineteenth century was wrongly interpreted. Anyhow, he did not reject the Sufism at all, but he presented Sufism without these multifarious and divers practices. His model of Sufism is completely different from Ahmad Raza Khan. It is without any hierarchy, and without any mediating structure.

Comparative Analysis of Rashid Ahmad Gangohi and Syed Ahmad Raaza Khan Baarelwi

Epistemological Differences

Epistemology is a study of knowledge. Social epistemology emphasizes individual attitudes and their beliefs and disbeliefs in a social environment. The beliefs and disbeliefs portray the picture of the human epistemic situation. Institutions and social relation shape the individual situation.²⁵ Epistemological differences concern with the objective and subjective conditions, sources, and structures of one's mind internally and externally. Particularly, it deals with rational beliefs and individual opinions.²⁶

Both Khan and Gangohi shared almost same time and space. But both of them grew up in completely difference contexts. Their subjective interpretations and understanding on the issue of Sufism is different. Not only had their differences based on their surroundings but also on their sources. Thus they could produce difference discourses.

Differences in political and Social Surroundings

The movement of Ahmad Raza Khan was originated from rural area, and he was ultimate source and origin of *Barelwi* movement. His followers were included landlord, traders, teachers, and agriculturalists. Most of his followers belonged to elite class, and some of them were wealthy *Pirs*, and government employ. He also was getting social benefits

because of his forefather lineage. He had not started his movement through academia or formal gathering, but from the social surroundings of Khan. The socio-ontological behavior of his context remained in his whole life, which allowed him to establish a hierarchical notion of spiritual authority. The Sufi based education of religion attracted his followers. The social surrounding of Gangohi was completely different from Khan, he grew up in urban family. Unlike Khan, he was not a center of Deoband movement, but he was a cofounder of *Deoband Madrassa Deoband*, whose were from urban middle class family. The *deobandi* movement initially originated from Deoband. The students and teachers mobilized the community from the knowledge they received from *Madrassa*. The socio-economical surroundings of both scholars explained the cause of their disagreement. The followers of both also belonged to different classes of society.

The mutiny of India was one the factor of religious revival in British India. The stances of religious *Ulema* were different. They considered that the victory of non-Muslim over Muslim is due the lack of dis-attachment of Muslims from their faith. The concerns of religious leaders on mutinity of India (1857) flourished in different ways. The family of Ahmad Raza Kahn was migrated from *Afghanistan*, and they did not take any intervention in the mutiny of India. He also remained silent on the issue of British dominancy. He and his father were attached with Sunni Sufi mentor of Rampur state of India. However, *Deobandis* were actively involved during and after the mutinity of India. Rashid Ahmad Gangohi among his companions sought to reform Muslim community by involving them social and political activities. The awareness was based on Quran and Prophetic traditions.

Academic learning and influential sources

Apart from socio-political surroundings, both of them were grown up in different intellectual environment. The sources and influential personalities of both scholars were different. Ahmad Raza khan received his education from his father, and later from his spiritual mentor. He was associated with the *Qadiri* Sufi order, and he placed *Abdul Qadir Jilani* as second highest,

after Prophet, authority of his discourse of Sufism. According to sources, he possessed vital knowledge in the field of logic, mathematics and in Islamic law. Rashid Ahmad Ganoghi was a follower of *Chishti* order. He received his education on *Hadiths* from *Shah Abdul Gahni*, and Sufi education from *Haji Imdad Ullah*. Later on, he started his career at *Deoband Madrassa*. He taught *Hadith* in a comprehensive way.

Anyhow, theories of sources in *Ilm ul Ikhtilaf* help to address the problem of their disagreement. In formative period of Islamic law, several jurists added other sources to interpret other than Quran and *Hadiths*. In Imam *Sahfi school* of thoughts nineteen sources were used to understand the Quran and *Hadiths*. *Imam Shafi* suggested that *Ikhtilaf* can be based on the different sources. It can appear in the form of *Ijma* (consensus) and *Qiyas*. *Ijma* reduces the disagreement between two persons.²⁷ In *Sunna* as source, he included the words of four caliphs, Prophet's family, and the companions of Prophet. The list of source is included local customs, and the interest of society.

The theory of sources is one of major factor of disagreement. If the interpreter uses selected source to determine something then he would generate his own model that would be based on his sources. In case of Kahn and Gangohi, both of them have their own sources and personalities to determine the situation. The sources they have used primarily contradicted with one another. It includes the attachment of mentors, social structures, and the association of Sufi order.

Aesthetic and Rational disagreement

The soul-body dichotomy is an old philosophical problem. It widely deals with the sensory perception and rational thoughts of human. This research finds this dichotomy between Khan and Gangohi. The *Barelwi* discourse focused on the shrine-based rituals and practices. The medieval Sufi monuments are the production of aesthetic. Kahn systematically calendarized these rituals in the form of *Urs*, *Ghyarwin*, and *Milad*. It includes *Dastar bandi*, recitation of specific prayer for *Sheikh*,

and the celebration of Prophet Birthday. These practices were memorized for the birth or death days of *Pir*, *Sheikh*, and Prophet. On these specific rituals followers got together, asserting not only for their collective belief but also for their collective identity. These rituals were not in favor by other groups. The celebration of *Pir's Urs* was frowned by *Wahabis*, and *Deobandis* granted it if it is not involved with any forbidden exercise like dancing, singing, or use of intoxicant. Ahmad Raza Khan celebrated Sufi rituals by reciting of Quran (*Khatam*), poetry in honor of Prophet, and lectures by *Ulema*.²⁸ All these practices are associated with the aesthetical sense.

All of these rituals had rationally criticized by Gangohi. He considered all these rituals as bad innovation. He used his rationality to understand Islamic belief. He condemns the unawareness and irrationality of the people just in believing that a miracle is a symbol of the great *Pirs*. General people connects miracle into the spiritual qualities of *Pir*. First of all, he insists on *Tawhid*, it is the complete and supreme unity of God. The notion of *Tawhid* is opposed to the concept of *Shirk* (the association of another person or thing with the integrity of God). And the Second is *Sunnah*, the traditions of Holy prophet. It includes the right deeds, conducts, and words of Holy prophet. If something is diverge from the *Sunnah*, and then it would be *Biddah*. Fundamentally, he identifies four types of *Shirk*, the association of God's knowledge, God's power, God's worship, and God's command on customs or everyday life.²⁹

As it can be seen from Gangohi ideology, he sees power of God in rational way. He did not dissolve the power of God into the mediatory power. His way of argumentation reflects that he uses a logical formula. He draws conclusion from the premises (2+2=4). Both Gangohi and Khan evaluate the reality from different angles; both are inner and outer qualities of human understanding.

Differences in Sufi methods (Ricoeur's interpretive disagreement)

Sufi metaphysics principally evolved around two major Sufis methods. These are *Wahdat ul Wajood*³⁰, and *Wahdat ul*

*Sahood*³¹. Gangohi and Kahn had mainly differed from one another on this issue. Nevertheless, they did not label themselves on these categories, but it can be traced from their script when they historically refer specific personality for defining their position. For instance, Gangohi argues ““*Mansur Hallaj* was an arrogant and proud, and *Hallaj*’s execution was needed³²”. On the other hand, Khan wrote a number of poetry on the pride for *Junaid Baghdadi*, *Rumi*, and *Al busiri*.

For example, the Sufi method of Khan is much based on hierarchy. It starts from *Pir* then ultimately ends up into Prophet. He, in fact, bounded the relationship between *Pir* and *Murid* with complete absorption. The importance of *Pir* can be seen when he argues “*Pir* is not only important because of his physical presence, but he would also intercede after his death”³³. He further goes to Sheikh Abdul Qadir Jinali, and then Prophet. He wrote:

“Prophet Muhammad, and then Prophet to him as below:

From God to prophet, from Prophet to you,

In this order the divine command “Be” or “Don’t be” is followed, *O Ghaus*.” “*Ahad se Ahmad aur Ahmad se tuh ko*

Kun aur sub kun makun hasil hei ya ghaus”³⁴

For the pride of Sheikh Abdul Qadir Jilani, he placed him as last Ghaus, and after that there would not be any Ghaus, as the system of Ghaus has been explained in chapter three. Sometimes, he also quotes from *Hadith Qudsi* in order explain the power and qualities of Prophet such as “If you (Muhammad) have not been, I (God) would not have created the Heavens”³⁵. He equates the qualities of Prophet with God. It includes the Prophet knowledge of unseen, and he is present everywhere. Khan does not just make a hierarchical structure of Sufism, but he also stresses on Sufi performance in the form of *Ghyarwin*, *urs*, and *Eid Milad ul Nabi*.

On the other hand, Gangohi's Sufi method is purely based on personal piety and personal accountability towards God. It is without any intercession, and mediatory power. According to him, Sufi practices must be observed precisely and accurately. He emphasizes on concept of *faiz*, but this *faiz* does not come from *Pir*, *Sheikh* or *Prophet*, but from the God Himself. He relates the hierarchical concept with concept of *Shirk* which is forbidden in Islam. Interpretative theory of disagreement in *Ilm ul Ikhtilaf* helps to understand the different between Ahmad Raza Khan and Gangohi. Interpretative disagreement deals with meaning, usage and mutual contradictions on specific issue. The *Fiqh's* scholars distinguish two types of disagreement (*Mukhtalaf* and *Mukhtalif*). The meaning of *Mukhtalaf* can be explained and reconciled, but the meaning of *Mukhtalif* cannot be reconciled. In case of *Mukhtalif*, the meanings of both are allowed and explained.³⁶ In case of Khan and Gangohi, they do not just have disagreement on interpretation of various Hadith and other sources, but they also differ in their symbols and contexts. According to the Ricoeur theory of interpretation, Different modes of interpretations can be categorized by the aims of interpreter and how they set their aims. Interpretation conflicts with each other when interpreter opposes their hypothesis. He further explains that there are two kinds of disagreement, strong and weak disagreement¹⁶. Ricoeur theory of interpretation and *Ilm ul Ikhtilaf* Interpretative theory of disagreement confirm the hermeneutical problem between Gangohi and Khan.

Moreover, Khan describes Sufism in a symbolic way through various spiritual performances. And Gangohi opposes all these rituals, because he explains Sufism in another symbolic way. Ricoeur explains the reason of symbolic disagreement. He argues that signification of symbol can be defined in a structural way which is primary, direct, and literal. Meanwhile, it is also secondary, indirect, and figurative. Interpretation is a dialectical process between text and the understanding of reader towards the text. The symbolic meaning can be interpreted in a different of ways. The features of each interpreter's model of hermeneutics explain multiple meaning, and most of the elements of interpretation contradict with each other. So, *wahdat ul wajood* and *wahdat ul shahood* are two different

methods that is struggle to achieve ultimate reality. The scholars differ from one another because they believe in diver's perspective.

Sufism and Sharia

The dichotomy of *Sharia* and Sufism is a dichotomy of Sufi and *Alim*. The development of Islamic world in early 20th century is overlapping the discourses and functions of *Ulema* and Sufi. Both Sufi-minded *Alim* and *Sharia*-minded Sufi are tried to synthesize Sufism and *Sharia* into one. The concept of *Tajdid* as *Islah* and renewal of Islam signifies the reformation of Islam in a situation. Sometimes, it produces new ideas and practices. And sometimes, it preserves the Islamic practices and ideas.

Khan was a Sufi-minded person, he saw *Sharia* as an intergral part of Islam. He placed *Sharia* on higher categories; he argues that *Sharia* had been handed over from one generation to another. It would be difficult for a lay man to understand the Quran by his own, It can be led him wrong path. It is also similar with the gnostic knowledge (*Marifat*). The Gnostic knowledge has a chain of transformation even it cannot be excerpt from Quran and *Hadith* without the guidance of teacher.

According to him, *Sharia* cannot be independently interpreted without the guidance of teacher. He argues that the *Sharia* has been changed and it should be exercise with the help of teacher. But he sees Sufism as necessary part of *Sharia*, and *Sharia* cannot be implemented without Sufism. Through the practices of *Sufism*, one can exercise *Sharia*.

On the contrary, Gongohi also sees Sufism and *Sharia* are inseparable. But he fully relies on Quran and hadith. He relates knowledge of Sufism with the knowledge of *Shria*, and it relies on proper orthodox practice and belief. *Shriah* and Sufism are same and inseparable. *Shriah* is a matter of performance, when

a person practices *Shria* then it enters into his/her heart, and it will remain in his heart. This is what he calls “*Tarika*” (The Sufi Path). Both, Sufism and *Sharia* should be taken from the traditions of Holy prophet, and Quran.³⁷ So he more emphasizes on the practice of *Sharia*. Sufism is possible with the practices of *Sharia*.

Analytically, Gangohi and Khan agree to the importance of Sufism and *Sharia*. Sufism and *Sharia* are integral and inseparable elements of Islam. But both of them disagree on the priority of *Sharia* and Sufism. Gangohi gives more impotence to *Sharia* than Sufism, and Khan vice versa.

Theory of *Murat ul Khilaf*

Theory of Murat al Khilaf is suggestive and alternative approach to handle the situation between Gangohi and Khan, because both have conflicts of opinions with one another. The principle of the theory of *Murat ul Khilaf* reveals that the differences of opinions among scholars are not only existed but also valid. The theory also suggests that the conflicts should be avoided even in divergent views.³⁸

To illustrate, in Granada some issue aroused among the jurist in *Maliki* School. According to the *Usul-al Fiqh* all the contradictory opinion should be rejected. But later, it was realized that these disagreements already existed in the foremost part of the *Maliki* traditions. If the principle of contradiction would be applied to that situation, then major part of the tradition must be rejected. In that situation, they adopted the theory of *Murat ul Khilaf* confirming that all the opinions were admissible and valid.³⁹ In that sense the theory of *Murat ul Khilaf* suggests that the differences between *Deobandi* and *Barelwi* could be valid and admissible if the contradiction is available within the *Hanifi* School of thoughts.

Tlimsani affirms the validity of disagreement. The differences of opinions among *Mujtahids* are based on the certain evidences that they take from *Shria*. If one rejects other then it means that it is the rejection of the evidence of *Shria*. He also elaborates that the differences lay in the legal evidence itself.⁴⁰ He also suggests the legal implications of rejecting other. In

the light of this argument, *Deobandi* and *Barelwi* should accept with another, because the rejection would be the rejection of *Sharia*. *Ibn Arafat* supports the notion of *Murat ul Ikhtilaf* in more consistently. He explains that the difference emerges from the different perspective. The concept synthesizes the implications of *Sharia*, it does not confine in one way it also opens the intellectual debate among scholar. *Ibn Arafat's* point of view is very creative and progress. It opens the new horizons of intellectual debate. It is also a suggestive approach to the problem of disagreement.

Ibn al-Qabab regards that *Murat ul Khilaf* is the best principle of *Maliki* School. Because it grants the two pieces of evidence and its value: one is the case of disagreement where it is inevitable to prefer one opinion to other. The second situation would be where the both piece of evidence lead to the same conclusion but from different ways.⁴¹ *Ibn al Qabab* understands of *Murat ul khilaf* may translate the problem of disagreement between *deobandi* and *Barelwi*. Ultimately both seek nearness of God from different methods. Both use different tools to approach the God either from *Sharia* or from Sufism. But both of them lead themselves from different conclusion.

Conclusion

The conclusion has comprised the keys differences between *Deobandis* and *Barelwis*. It starts from their epistemic situation, context, and time. Further it dealt with their political and social surroundings and their behaviour towards given situations. The overall discussion reveals that the traditional and creative aspects of interpretation are always flourished differences between the interpreters. The differences in priorities, methods, stance, and practices are actually based on epistemic situation of humans. Lastly, disagreement is a part of intellectual debate. The last part of this chapter “theory of *Murat ul Khilaf*” may be taken as a suggestive approach to manage and handle the difference between *Deobandis* and *Barelwi*.

References

- ¹ Majid, Khalida, (2015), "Ikhtilaf and Unity in Muslim Ummah": A Comparative Analysis, International Journal of Humanities and Social Science invention. [http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v4\(3\)/Version-2/C0432010016.pdf](http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v4(3)/Version-2/C0432010016.pdf) (last accessed 22-12-2016)
- ² Zayd, Nasr Abu, (2006). "Reformation of Islamic Thought: a critical historical analysis" Zayd, Nasr Abu, (2006). "Reformation of Islamic Thought: a critical historical analysis" pp 57-59
- ³ Jabri, Taha, (2011), "Ethics of Disagreement in Islam".(Translated from Arabic by Abdul Wahid Hamid) 3rd ed,
Malta Gutenberg Press, Herndon,

(<http://islamstory.com/sites/default/files/en/uploads/multimedia/books/fiqh/Ethics-of-Disagreement-in-last> accessed 27-12-2016.
- ⁴ Majid, Khalida, (2015), "Ikhtilaf and Unity in Muslim Ummah": A Comparative Analysis, International Journal of Humanities and Social Science invention. [http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v4\(3\)/Version-2/C0432010016.pdf](http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v4(3)/Version-2/C0432010016.pdf) (last accessed 22-12-2016)
- ⁵ Reetz, Dietrich, (2006), "Islam in the Public Sphere: Religious Groups in India, 1900-194", Oxford University Press, New York, p-53
- ⁶ Sahni, Ajay, Edit by Barry Robin, (2010) "Guid to Islamic Movements" p-348, <http://islamicblessings.com/upload/Guide-to-Islamist-Movements-Volume-1.pdf>, (last accessed 23-12-2016)
- ⁷ Reetz, Detrich,(2006), p-63
- ⁸ Ibid p-65
- ⁹ Ajay Sahni,(2010), p-349.
- ¹⁰ Sanyal, Usha, Edited by T.N Madan, (2001) "Muslim communities of South Asia", Manohar Publishers, New Delhi, p-367.
- ¹¹ ,(1994), "Pir, Shaikh and Prophet: The Personalisation of Religious Authority in Ahmad Riza Khan's life",(
<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/006996694028001002>)
accessed 04-06-2017
- ¹² Ibid

-
- ¹³ Sanyal, Usha, (1996)“Devotional Islam and Politics in British India: Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi and His Movement, 1870-1920. Delhi”, Oxford University Press, New York, pp-40
- ¹⁴ Usha Sanyal,(1994) pp 36-37
- ¹⁵ Ibid
- ¹⁶ Muhammad ‘Ashiq Ilahi,(1978) “Tazkirat al-Rashid“, Maktaba Bahr al-‘Ulum, Karachi p-62.
- ¹⁷ Ibid p-40
- ¹⁸ Ibid p-90
- ¹⁹ Sayyid Mahboob Rizvi,(1980), “History of the Dar al-Ulum Deoband, Vol. 1”, Maulana Abdul Haq Press, Deoband, p-97.
- ²⁰ Ra shid Ahmad Gangohi,” Fatawa-yi Rashidiyya”, p-220
- ²¹ Ibid 115-116
- ²² Ibid 82
- ²³ Ibid 142
- ²⁴ Ibid 166
- ²⁵ Goldman, Alvin and Blanchard, Thomas, (2016), “The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Social Epistemology”, Stanford University(<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemology-social/>),last accessed 28-07-2017.
- ²⁶ Steup, Matthias, (2017) “The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Epistemology” Stanford University,(last accessed 28-07-2017.
- ²⁷ Masud, Muhammad Khalid Masud, (1996) “Apostasy and Judicial Separation in British India,” in Islamic Legal Interpretation: Muftis and Their Fatwa”, edited by Brinkley Messick and David S. Powers Muhammad Khalid Masud, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, p -76
- ²⁸ Usha Sanyal (2005) p -01
- ²⁹ Muhammad Ismail, “Taqwiyyat ul Islam”, Kutb Khana Majidya, Multan. took from a summary of book. Each type of shirk is explained by him chapter wise. pp 14-17
- ³⁰ Unity of being

-
- ³¹ Unity of witness that God and his creations are two different phenomena
- ³² Rashid Ahmad Gangohi,” Fatawa-yi Rashidiyya”, p 216
- ³³ Usha Sanyal (2005), p-93
- ³⁴ Khan aamd Raza Khan, (1976), “Haadaiq e Bakhshish”, Medina publishing company. Karachi, pp10-15.
- ³⁵ Graham William (1977), p-14
- ³⁶ Muhammad Khalid Masud, (1996), p-74
- ³⁷ Ibid-214
- ³⁸ Muhammad Khalid Masud, (1998), Shatibi’s Philosophy of Islamic Law, Kitab Bhavan Publishers, New Delhi, p-240
- ³⁹ Ibid-242
- ⁴⁰ Ibid-243
- ⁴¹ Ibid-244